Table of Contents

Tables

Figures

No table of contents entries found.

4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

This section addresses risks associated with hazardous materials, including the potential presence of and risk of upset and exposure from hazardous materials at the project site and the potential risk of airport hazards at the project site. The background information and analysis in this section is based partially on the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* (Phase I ESA) prepared for the project by Rincon Consultants, Inc. in February 2023, which is included as Appendix I, and the *Results of Environmental Soils Analysis* prepared for the project by Earth Systems, which is included in Appendix O.

4.8.1 Environmental Setting

a. Overview of Project Site

Historically, the project site was used for agricultural production, until the construction of the drive-in movie theater in 1967. Currently, the project site is developed with the inactive drive-in movie theater and public market with a concession building and smaller associated structures.

Historical Land Uses of the Project Site and Adjacent Sites

As part of the Phase I ESA, historic aerial photographs and topographic maps of the project site were reviewed. This review of past records demonstrated that the project site has been historically used for agricultural purposes, before the construction of the drive-in movie theater in 1967.

The project site was recorded as vacant/undeveloped from 1928 to 1947. After 1947, part of the project site was used for agricultural use (dry farming), before the project site reverted to undeveloped land in 1950. From 1950 through 1954, the project site continued to be undeveloped; after 1954, agricultural use on the project site resumed, in the form of row crops. In 1967, a drive-in movie theater with three buildings and a freestanding screen was constructed on the project site. In 1992, the Santa Barbara Swap Meet began to occur on the project site; and in 2010, the Goleta Public Market also began to occur on the project site. The project site currently contains the inactive movie theater and inactive public market, with an associated concessions stand and smaller structures.

The project site is adjacent to roadways, open space land uses, and industrial land uses, several of which have handled or generated hazardous materials historically. Residential properties are located beyond SR 217 to the east of the project site and a few are located to the west of the site in the Corta and Placencia Streets neighborhood. Industrial uses are located to the north and west of the project site. Tidal wetland and stormwater infrastructure are located to the south, undeveloped land with existing trees and shrubs are located approximately 30 feet to the southwest, and undeveloped land with existing trees and shrubs approximately 260 feet away to the northwest of the project site.

Table 4.8-1 lists historical uses of adjacent properties that have the potential to result in soil or groundwater contamination on the project site, based on a review of aerial photographs, topographic maps, fire insurance maps, city directories, and building permits conducted as part of the Phase I ESA.

Table 4.8-1 Historic Land Uses of Adjacent Properties of Potential Concern

Site Address	Distance to Project Site	Historical Land Use and Year(s) of Operation
873 South Kellogg Avenue	Approximately 60 feet north	Automotive repair (1972) Industrial finishing facility (1986-2017)
879 South Kellogg Avenue	Approximately 40 feet north	Automotive repair (2005-2017) Sheet metal and heating facility (2010)
891 South Kellogg Avenue	Approximately 100 feet north	Automotive salvage/recycling facility (1992-2017) Automotive repair (2014, 2017)
905 South Kellogg Avenue	Immediately north; adjacent to project site	Automotive repair (1981-2017)

Source: Phase I ESA, Appendix I

Current Project Site Conditions

As part of the Phase I ESA (Appendix I), site reconnaissance was conducted in order to observe existing project site conditions and to obtain information indicating the possible presence of recognized environmental conditions (REC). During the site reconnaissance, Rincon Consultants, Inc. did not observe any of the following on-site: aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) or evidence of underground storage tanks (USTs); odors; pools of liquid; drains, clarifiers, or sumps; degreasers/parts washers; pits, ponds, and lagoons; stressed vegetation; wastewater; septic systems/effluent disposal systems; soils piles; or fill material. On the northwestern side of the concession building, Rincon observed containers of floor finish and spray paint; containers of tractor hydraulic fluid, gear/transmission oil, chlorinating tablets, and waste oil; two unlabeled five-gallon containers; one pad-mounted transformer; and dark-stained asphalt beneath and surrounding this area of stored hazardous substances and petroleum products. Several plastic 55-gallon drums for trash disposal were observed throughout the project site. On the southeastern portion of the project site, Rincon observed two dewatering wells with sump pumps. Heating/cooling equipment was observed in one of the on-site projection buildings, and solid waste/debris was observed throughout the project site, including an abandoned recreational vehicle, dumped fridge, tires, bags of mulch and asphalt patch, and rubber traffic cone bases.

As a follow-up to the database search and the site reconnaissance, the Phase I ESA reviewed the following reports, provided by the City of Goleta:

- *Environmental Lien and AUL Search* prepared by Environmental Data Resources in January 2023 –based on a review of this report, no environmental liens or Activity/Use Limitation reports (AULs) were identified in connection with the project site.
- *Geotechnical Engineering Report Update* prepared by Earth Systems Pacific in August 2022—based on a review of this report, fill soils on the project site were encountered to depths of approximately 4 feet below ground surface. Additionally, groundwater was reported to be encountered at depths ranging from 3 to 7.5 feet below ground surface. This report recommended the removal of any existing fill soils, and replacement with compacted fill in the proposal building and surface improvement areas.
- *Preliminary Title Report* prepared by Chicago Title Company in June 2022—based on a review of this report, the title to the project site is vested in Goleta Gardens LLC and easements for public utilities, roads, and an airport clear zone are located on the project site.

The Environmental Soils Analysis (Appendix O) was conducted in August 2023 and included sampling, screening, and laboratory analysis of soils on the project site. The results of the laboratory analyses were compared to regulatory environmental screening levels, for commercial/industrial land use. These environmental screening levels have been established by the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) and are based on potential health effects that consider potential exposure levels during commercial/industrial land use construction and operation. Project site soil samples did not exceed the regulatory thresholds for commercial/industrial land use for total petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) or semi-VOCs, metals, organochlorine pesticides, and polychlorinated biphenyls (Appendix O).

Arsenic was detected in all soil samples at concentrations ranging from 1.55 to 4.23 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg), which exceeded the environmental screening levels of 4.2 mg/kg. However, the DTSC notes that background concentrations of arsenic in soil often exceed risk-based screening-level concentrations and assessments should eliminate from consideration those whose range of concentrations fall within the range of local ambient conditions. In a study of a large data set from sites throughout southern California, arsenic soil concentrations ranged from 0.15 to 19.6 mg/kg, with an upper-bound 95 percent confidence level concentration of 12 mg/kg. As such, the DTSC states that the upper tolerance limit for arsenic concentration, consistent with statistical evaluations, supports an estimate of 12 mg/kg as a 95 percent upper confidence limit of mean ambient arsenic concentrations. The detected concentrations of arsenic in project site soils are below this alternate threshold of 12 mg/kg and are well within the statistically determined 95 percent upper confidence limit for ambient arsenic concentrations. Therefore, the *Environmental Soils Analysis* concluded that arsenic represents background concentrations and does not constitute a contaminant of concern (Appendix O). The concentrations of arsenic detected in project site soil samples are consistent with background concentrations and are not indicative of elevated arsenic in project site soils.

While the soil samples did not exceed regulatory thresholds for petroleum hydrocarbons or volatile organic compounds, the *Environmental Soils Analysis* noted that the ground surface to the west of the existing concession stand, an area approximately 15 feet in diameter, was visibly stained and emitted a moderately strong hydrocarbon odor. Petroleum hydrocarbons detected in this location were only detected in the shallow 6-inch sample and not detected in the 24-inch sample; therefore, the impacted soils are not considered to be laterally or vertically extensive. Because samples from 6 inches below ground surface at this location were below the environmental screening levels for total petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs, and semi-VOCs, the *Environmental Soils Analysis* concluded that the contamination at this location is limited to the upper few inches of soil. Therefore, it is possible that if sampling been conducted at the surface or at a shallower depth, results would be above the environmental screening levels for these contaminants.

b. Known Hazardous Materials Sites

The term “hazardous material” refers to both hazardous substances and hazardous waste. A material is identified as “hazardous” if it appears on a list of hazardous materials prepared by a federal, State, or local regulatory agency or if it has characteristics defined as hazardous by such an agency. A “hazardous waste” is a “solid waste” that exhibits toxic or hazardous characteristics. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) defines the term “solid waste” to include many types of discarded materials including any gaseous, liquid, semi-liquid, or solid material, which is discarded or has served its intended purpose, unless the material is specifically excluded from regulation. Such materials are considered waste whether they are discarded, reused, recycled, or reclaimed. U.S. EPA

classifies a material as hazardous if it has one or more of the following characteristics at specific thresholds: ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, and/or toxicity.

As part of the Phase I ESA, a regulatory database search was conducted on December 28, 2022, to identify hazardous waste sites on and within one-eighth mile of the project site (Appendix I). The project site was listed on the Hazardous Waste Tracking System (HWTS) and HAZNET[1] databases as AmericanStar Transportation, City of Goleta, Goleta Public Market at 907 South Kellogg Avenue. These listings indicate that hazardous materials are currently or were previously handled and stored on-site; however, no releases have been reported. Additionally, several other off-site facilities and properties were to determined to be of potential environmental concern, based on the following factors:

- Reported distance of the facility from the project site;
- The nature of the database on which the facility is listed, and/or whether the facility was listed on a database reporting unauthorized releases of hazardous materials, petroleum products, or hazardous wastes;
- Reported case type (e.g., soil only, failed underground storage tank [UST] test only);
- Reported substance released (e.g., chlorinated solvents, gasoline, metals);
- Reported regulatory agency status (e.g., case closed, "no further action"); and,
- Location of the facility with respect to the reported groundwater flow direction.

Table 4.8-2 summarizes characteristics of hazardous material sites determined in the Phase I ESA to be of potential environmental concern, both on the project site and within the one-eighth-mile vicinity. For more detailed information regarding these hazardous materials sites, please refer to Appendix. In addition to these sites, in 2011, the City approved a concrete and asphalt recycling and crushing center at 909 South Kellogg Avenue, approximately 230 feet northwest of the project site (City of Goleta 2019). This center is anticipated to commence operation by the Spring of 2024.

Table 4.8-2 Hazardous Material Sites of Potential Environmental Concern

Site Name	Site Address	Relation to Project Site	Potential Concern/Contaminants
AmericanStar Transportation, City of Goleta, Goleta Public Market	907 South Kellogg Avenue	On project site.	Previous storage and handling of pesticides
Garcia's Auto Repair, National Autobody[1]	905 South Kellogg Avenue	Immediately north; adjacent to project site	Current or previous storage and handling of total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH)
Santa Barbara Industrial Finishing[1]	873 South Kellogg Avenue	Approximately 60 feet north	Current or previous storage and handling of TPH
Santa Barbara Auto Salvage/Steelhead Recyclers	891 South Kellogg Avenue	Approximately 100 feet north	Potential hazardous material impacts to project site soil, soil vapor, or groundwater due to TPH, metals, and lead

[1] A California Department of Toxic Substances Control database that records annual hazardous waste shipments.

Site Name	Site Address	Relation to Project Site	Potential Concern/Contaminants
Hertz Service Center	5919 Corta Street	Approximately 170 feet west	Potential hazardous material impacts to groundwater and soils in project site vicinity due to TPH, lead, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs)
Channel Industries	839 Ward Drive	Approximately 500 feet northeast	Potential hazardous material impacts to groundwater and soils in project site vicinity due to VOCs and metals
Santa Barbara Airbus	750 Technology Drive	Approximately 570 feet north	Potential hazardous material impacts from past release of hazardous substances, contaminants unknown

[1] The databases on which this facility is listed are not indicative of a hazardous materials release; however, they indicate that hazardous materials are currently/were previously handled and stored onsite.

Source: Appendix I

c. Recognized Environmental Conditions

A recognized environmental condition (REC) is defined by American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E1527-21 as:

(1) the presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at the subject property due to a release to the environment; or

(2) the likely presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at the subject property due to a release or likely release to the environment; or

(3) the presence of hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at the subject property under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment."

As stated in ASTM-E1527-21, "likely" pertains to:

> "that which is neither certain nor proved, but can be expected or believed by a reasonable observer based on the logic and/or experience of the environmental professional, and/or available evidence, as stated in the report to support the opinions given therein."

The Phase I ESA found evidence of two RECs in connection with the project site: former agricultural use of the project site, and fill soils from an unknown source on the project site. Each of these RECs are discussed in the following subsections.

Former Agricultural Use of Project Site

According to the historical resources reviewed, the project site appears to have been used for agricultural purposes from at least 1947 to 1954 (dry farming in at least 1947 and row crops in at least 1954). Agricultural land use, with the exception of dry farming, is typically associated with the use of pesticides and arsenic. Therefore, the former agricultural use of the project site is considered a REC (Appendix I).

Fill Soils on Project Site

According to the 2022 *Geotechnical Engineering Report Update* prepared for the project site, the project site is underlain by approximately 4 feet of fill soils. Based on the unknown origin of the fill

soils, the on-site fill soils are considered an REC (Appendix I). As discussed previously, soil samples collected on the project site did not exceed regulatory thresholds for hydrocarbon or other contamination. However, the *Environmental Soils Analysis* noted that the ground surface to the west of the existing concession stand was visibly stained and emitted a moderately strong hydrocarbon odor.

Asbestos and Lead

The existing buildings on the project site were constructed in approximately 1967, and consequently, asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paints (LBPs) may be present in structures on the project site according to the Phase I ESA (Appendix I).

d. Airport Safety Hazards

The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is located approximately 0.25-mile west of the project site. The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport provides commercial and general aviation access to the national air transportation system in support of business and leisure travel. Aircraft flight operations are regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

The primary hazard associated with land uses near the airport is the risk of aircraft incidents on approach and takeoff. According to the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) the project site is located within the Airport Influence Area, and specifically within Airport Safety Zone II of the Santa Barbara Airport, which includes safety restrictions and height limitations for development within the safety area. The northern half of the project site is located within Safety Area 1 (Clear Zone) which is the area beneath the airplane take off or landing path and is the most restrictive area because it is subject to the greatest airport hazard. The southern half of the project site is located within Safety Area 3 (General Traffic Pattern Zone), which is the area in which airport traffic patterns occur and has the least restrictive requirements. The ALUP development standard of a maximum intensity of 25 people per acre, as a site-wide average, would apply to the project (Airport Land Use Commission [ALUC] 1993).

According to the Santa Barbara County ALUP, the industrial use of the proposed project is not designated as a noise-sensitive land use. The project site is located within the 60-65 decibel Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour, and the project's industrial operations would be compatible with this contour (ALUC 1993).

4.8.2 Regulatory Setting

a. Federal Regulations

Occupational Safety and Health Act

Created by the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (Title 29 CFR), Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) is the federal agency responsible for ensuring worker safety. OSHA regulations provide standards for safe workplaces and work practices, including those relating to hazardous materials handling.

Toxic Substances Control Act

The Toxic Substances Control Act was passed by the United States Congress in 1976 and is administered by the U.S. EPA to regulate the introduction of new or already existing chemicals. Under

the Toxic Substances Control Act, the U.S. EPA evaluates potential risks from new and existing chemicals and acts to address any unreasonable risks chemicals may have on human health and the environment. The Federal Toxic Substances Control Act provides U.S. EPA with authority to require reporting, record-keeping and testing requirements, and restrictions relating to chemical substances and/or mixtures.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 established a program administered by the U.S. EPA for the regulation of the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste. RCRA was amended in 1984 by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Act, which affirmed and extended the "cradle to grave" system of regulating hazardous wastes. Among other things, the use of certain techniques for the disposal of some hazardous wastes was specifically prohibited by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Act.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) was enacted in 1980 and amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act in 1986. This law provides broad federal authority to respond directly to releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances that may endanger public health or the environment. Among other things, CERCLA established 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. CERCLA also enabled revision of the National Contingency Plan, which provided the guidelines and procedures needed to respond to releases and threatened releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, or contaminants.

Process Safety Management Standard

The OSHA Process Safety Management Standard (29 CFR 1910.119) includes requirements for preventing or minimizing the consequences of catastrophic releases of toxic, reactive, flammable, or explosive chemicals for general industry and construction. Requirements include providing employees with information pertaining to hazardous chemicals, training employees on the operation of equipment with hazardous materials, and employer requirements to perform a process hazard analysis.

National Incident Management System

The National Incident Management System (NIMS) provides a systematic, proactive approach to guide government agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector to work together to prevent, report , recover from, and mitigate the effects of incidents, regardless of cause, size, location, or complexity, in order to reduce the loss of life and property harm to the environment.

Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act

The U.S. Department of Transportation regulates hazardous materials transportation on all interstate roads pursuant to its authority under the Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act of 1990 (49 United States Code §5101 et seq.). In California, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and California Highway Patrol enforce federal law. Together, these agencies determine driver training requirements, load labeling procedures, and container specifications.

Federal Air Regulations Part 77

Federal Air Regulations (FAR) Part 77 states that all applicants proposing any construction or alterations that may affect navigable airspace must file a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). This notice allows the FAA to conduct an initial screening determination for applicable projects. The initial screening determination from the FAA may state one of the following:

- The project is not identified as an obstruction and would not be a hazard to air navigation; or
- The project would be an obstruction unless reduced to a specified height and is presumed to be a hazard to air navigation pending further study.

If a proposed development is identified as a presumed hazard, the FAA may require further aeronautical study or allow the project to be revised to include a reduction in the height of the proposed improvements. After the FAA completes the additional aeronautical study, it will typically issue a Determination of Hazard to Air Navigation or a Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation.

b. State Regulations

Hazardous Waste Control Law

The DTSC, a department of the California EPA, is the primary agency in California that regulates hazardous waste, cleans up existing contamination, and looks for ways to reduce the hazardous waste produced in California. DTSC regulates hazardous waste in California primarily under the authority of RCRA and the California Health and Safety Code. DTSC also administers the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code §§ 25100, et seq.) to regulate hazardous wastes. While the Hazardous Waste Control Law is generally more stringent than RCRA, until the U.S. EPA approves the California program, both state and federal laws apply in California. The Hazardous Waste Control Law lists 791 chemicals and approximately 300 common materials that may be hazardous; establishes criteria for identifying, packaging, and labeling hazardous wastes; prescribes management controls; establishes permit requirements for treatment, storage, disposal, and transportation; and identifies some wastes that cannot be disposed of in landfills.

Government Code Section 65962.5

Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the DTSC, the State Department of Health Services, the SWRCB, and CalRecycle to compile and annually update lists of hazardous waste sites and land designated as hazardous waste sites throughout the state. The Secretary for Environmental Protection consolidates the information submitted by these agencies and distributes it to each city and county where sites on the lists are located. Before the lead agency accepts an application for any development project as complete, the applicant must consult these lists to determine if the site at issue is included. If any soil is excavated from a site containing hazardous materials, it would be considered a hazardous waste if it exceeded specific criteria in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). Remediation of hazardous wastes found at a site may be required if excavation of these materials is performed, or if certain other soil disturbing activities would occur. Even if soil or groundwater at a contaminated site does not have the characteristics required to be defined as hazardous waste, remediation of the site may be required by regulatory agencies subject to jurisdictional authority. Cleanup requirements are determined on a case-by-case basis by the agency taking jurisdiction.

Cal OSHA Title 8

Pursuant to the requirements of OSHA Title 8, employers must develop site-specific Health and Safety Plans. Workers potentially exposed to hazardous materials in their workplace must be trained so that they are aware of the hazards and provided necessary protection from the hazardous materials.

Hazardous Waste Management

Waste that is toxic, corrosive, flammable, or reactive must be handled, stored, transported, and disposed of in accordance with the regulations in California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5 and CCR, Title 22, Division 4.5, which are more stringent than federal regulations.

Geologic Energy Management Division

State of California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM, previously known as the Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources Regulatory Program [DOGGR]), supervises the drilling, operation, maintenance, and abandonment of oil, gas, and geothermal wells throughout the State. The regulatory program set forth by CalGEM for the management of these resources emphasizes the appropriate development of oil, natural gas, and geothermal resources in the State through sound engineering practices that protect the environment, prevent pollution, and ensure public safety.

California Coastal Act

The California Coastal Act, enacted in 1976, establishes procedures for the review of proposed developments in the Coastal Zone and policies for the protection of coastal resources and public access to the coastline. The project site is located in the Coastal Zone, therefore, the following Coastal Act regulation in the Public Resources Code pertains to the project:

> Section 30232: Protection against the spillage of crude oil, gas, petroleum products, or hazardous substances shall be provided in relation to any development or transportation of such materials. Effective containment and cleanup facilities and procedures shall be provided for accidental spills that do occur.

c. Local Regulations

Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requires local governments to prepare and maintain a Hazard Mitigation Plan. The County of Santa Barbara and cities of Buellton, Carpinteria, Goleta, Guadalupe, Lompoc, Santa Barbara, Santa Maria, and Solvang, in coordination with the State of California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) and FEMA, developed the 2017 Santa Barbara County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. This plan guides disaster preparedness in the county and cities and specifies the actions that the jurisdictions plan to follow to reduce vulnerability and exposure to hazards.

Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan

ALUPs serve as tools for ALUCs to review land use or development plans within Airport Influence Areas. The basic function of ALUPs is to promote compatibility between airports and the land uses that surround them. With limited exception, California law requires preparation of ALUPs for each public-use and military airport in the state.

In Santa Barbara County, the ALUC function rests with the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). Because the project application was deemed complete prior to approval of the January 2023 Santa Barbara Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, the project is subject to the requirements of the previous 1993 Santa Barbara County ALUP (per Section 2.2.2[b] of the 2023 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan). The Santa Barbara County ALUP is the fundamental tool used by the SBCAG, acting in its capacity as the Santa Barbara County ALUC, in fulfilling its purpose of promoting airport land use compatibility. Specifically, the ALUP provides for the orderly growth of the Santa Barbara Airport and the surrounding area, and safeguards the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the Airport and the public in general. Additionally, the Santa Barbara County ALUP provides compatibility policies and criteria applicable to local agencies in their preparation or amendment of general plans and to landowners in their design of new development.

Goleta General Plan

According to the City of Goleta's Safety Element of the General Plan (2006), hazardous materials in Goleta are governed by regulations that require proper storage, handling, employee/public noticing, spill contingency planning, business management plans, and other emergency response measures necessary to ensure public safety and to minimize the risk of accidental releases or environmental impacts. In Goleta, the administering agencies are the Santa Barbara County Fire Prevention Division and the Santa Barbara County Office of Emergency Services. The City of Goleta's Safety Element outlines several goals and policies related to hazardous materials and facilities. Goals and polices that are relevant to the project include:

- **Goal SE 1: Safety in General.** Objective: To avoid siting of development or land use activities in hazardous areas, and where this is infeasible, require appropriate mitigation to lessen or minimize exposure to hazards.
- **Policy SE 1.6: Enforcement of Building Codes.** Enforcement of Building Codes. [GP] The City shall ensure through effective enforcement measures that all new construction in the city is built according to the adopted building and fire codes.
- **Goal SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards.** Objective: To minimize the risk of potential hazards associated with aircraft operations at the Santa Barbara Airport.
- **Policy SE 9.1: Clear Zone and Airport Approach Zone Regulations.** The City will maintain and enforce through appropriate zoning measures the Clear Zone and Airport Approach Zone regulations pursuant to the plans and policies of the Santa Barbara County ALUC. The City may also require, as a condition of approval of development applications, dedication of avigation easements for areas within the Airport Clear Zones and Airport Approach Zones**.**
- **Policy SE 9.2: Height Restrictions.** The City shall ensure that the heights of proposed buildings, other structures, and landscaping conform to airport operational requirements to minimize the risk of aircraft accidents. The City shall establish and maintain standards in its zoning ordinance for building and structure height restrictions for development in proximity to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. To ensure compliance with height restrictions, proposed development or uses that require ALUC review pursuant to the Airport Land Use Plan shall be referred to the ALUC for review.
- **Policy SE 9.3: Limitations on Development and Uses.** The City shall establish and maintain standards in its zoning ordinance for use restrictions for development near the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. These standards should identify uses that may be compatible in each zone. Proposed development or uses that require ALUC review pursuant to the Airport Land Use Plan shall be referred to the ALUC for review.

- **Policy SE 9.5: Limitations on Density.** The City shall establish and maintain standards in its zoning ordinance for density limitations for development near the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. These standards should comply with the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan and should specify the density considered compatible in each zone. Proposed developments that require ALUC review pursuant to the Airport Land Use Plan shall be referred to the ALUC for review.
- **Goal SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities.** Objective: To minimize injuries, illnesses, loss of life and property, and economic and social disruption due to potential upsets associated with the storage, use, handling, and transport of hazardous materials, and to ensure proper oversight of hazardous waste sites within the city.
- **Policy SE 10.2: Compliance with Law**. The storage, handling, and disposal of any hazardous material shall be done only in strict compliance with applicable City, state, and federal law.

Goleta Zoning Ordinance

The project is subject to the requirements of the City's previous zoning code, rather than the current zoning code, because the project application was deemed complete prior to the effective date of the new zoning code in April 2020. The southern two-thirds of the site is zoned Light Industry (M-1) and the northern third of the site is zoned Service Industrial-Goleta (M-S-GOL). Therefore, Sections 35-84A and 35-85 of the City's Coastal Zoning Ordinance would apply to the project.

Section 35-84A of the City's previous Coastal Zoning Ordinance provides development standards for M-S-GOL zone, including permitted uses, setback sizes, height limits, and performance standards. The following performance standard from Section 35-84A.7 would apply to the project:

- Open storage of equipment and materials shall be permitted only in areas screened from view of surrounding lots.

Section 35-85 of the City's previous Coastal Zoning Ordinance provides development standards for the M-1 zone, including permitted uses, setback sizes, height limits, building coverage limits, and performance standards. The following performance standards from Section 35-85.7 would apply to the project:

- No offensive odors or fumes, noxious gases, or liquids, heat, glare, or radiation generated by or resulting from any use, other than motor vehicles or lighting fumes, operated on any lot shall be detectable at any point along the boundary of or outside of the lot upon which such use is located.
- Except for that associated with the heating of buildings, there shall be no smoke or dust generated by or resulting from any use, other than motor vehicles, located upon the lot.
- All activities shall be conducted in such a manner so as not to be injurious to the health, safety, or welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood by reason of danger to life or property.

4.8.3 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds

Methodology

A Phase I ESA was conducted for the project site by Rincon Consultants, Inc. in accordance with ASTM E1527-13 and E1527-21 standards. The Phase I ESA included review of geology and hydrology, past and present land uses, and aerial photographs of the project site; interviews of individuals familiar with the property; site reconnaissance; and review of federal, State, regional, and local databases. Refer to the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, included as Appendix I of this report.

Significance Thresholds

As described in more detail in Section 4.0, *Environmental Impact Analysis,* the following thresholds are based on the County's 2021 *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* and Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines contains a checklist of environmental factors to be assessed to determine the potential for significant impacts. Based on this checklist, the Project's impact would be significant if it exceeds the following thresholds.

1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
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.
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.
4. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
5. Result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area for a project 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.
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

The County of Santa Barbara's 2021 *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* (refer to Section 4.0, *Environmental Impact Analysis*) contains thresholds for assessing the significance of impacts to public safety resulting from the involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. The manual establishes categories for identifying potential significant impacts to public safety including transportation of hazardous materials, as well as potentially significant impacts to non-hazardous land uses proposed in proximity to existing hazardous facilities. The manual specifically identifies a potentially significant impact to all development proposed in proximity to one or more existing hazardous facilities.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

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?

Impact HAZ-1 **PROJECT CONSTRUCTION WOULD INVOLVE MINIMAL ROUTINE TRANSPORT, USE, AND DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. PROJECT OPERATION WOULD CONSIST OF AN INDUSTRIAL WAREHOUSE BUILDING AND COULD INVOLVE MINIMAL ROUTINE TRANSPORT, USE, OR DISPOSAL OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. HOWEVER, ALL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS WOULD BE TRANSPORTED, HANDLED, AND DISPOSED OF IN COMPLIANCE WITH EXISTING FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL REGULATIONS. PROJECT IMPACTS WOULD BE CLASS III, *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*.**

Construction

Construction of the proposed project would temporarily increase the regional transport, use, and disposal of construction-related hazardous materials and petroleum products (e.g., diesel fuel, lubricants, paints and solvents, and cement products containing strong basic or acidic chemicals). These materials are commonly used at construction sites, and project construction activities would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations established by the U.S. EPA, the State of California, the County of Santa Barbara, and the City of Goleta for proper transport, use, storage, and disposal of excess hazardous materials and hazardous construction waste. Additionally, compliance with the Construction General Permit (refer to Section 4.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*) requires implementation of Good Housekeeping Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce potential impacts to water quality due to spills or runoff from hazardous materials used during construction.

During site reconnaissance, various containers of hazardous substances and petroleum products, including floor finish, spray paint, tractor hydraulic fluid, gear/transmission oil, chlorinating tablets, and waste oil, were observed on the northwestern side of the concessions building on the project site. Project construction would remove existing hazardous materials and waste from the project site; removal and disposal of on-site hazardous materials would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, which would minimize potential impacts associated with the transport and disposal of these substances.

With compliance with existing regulations governing transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction would be less than significant.

Operation

Project operation would consist of an industrial warehouse building used for a variety of conforming uses allowed with the project site's M-S-GOL and M-1 zones, including industrial warehousing and storage, wholesaling and distribution, and construction and materials storage. The proposed industrial building could be leased to multiple tenants, whose operations could involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials for routine maintenance. While the specific industrial use of the project is unknown, quantities of hazardous materials may be transported, used, or stored during operation of the project. However, all hazardous material transport, use, or disposal associated with the proposed industrial warehouse and office space would comply with existing hazardous materials regulations established by the U.S. EPA, the State of California, the County of Santa Barbara, and the City of Goleta. These regulations prescribe measures for the safe transport, use, storage, and disposal

of hazardous materials to reduce risk of spills. With compliance with existing regulations governing transport, use, disposal of hazardous materials, impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during operation would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

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?

Impact HAZ-2 **PROJECT CONSTRUCTION COULD RESULT IN THE ACCIDENTAL RELEASE OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS THROUGH DEMOLITION OF EXISTING STRUCTURES OR DISTURBANCE OF PROJECT SITE SOILS. HOWEVER, IMPLEMENTATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES HAZ-1 THROUGH HAZ-5 WOULD REDUCE IMPACTS TO CLASS II, *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED.***

Construction

The existing buildings on the project site were constructed in approximately 1967, and consequently, asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paints (LBPs) may be present in structures on the project site, according to the Phase I ESA (Appendix I). Considering that project construction would result in demolition of the existing concessions stand and associated structures, project construction activities have the potential to result in accidental release of ACMs or LBPs, which would create a potentially significant hazard to both construction workers and the environment. However, demolition and construction activities would be required to adhere to Cal/OSHA regulations regarding asbestos and lead-based paint materials. The California Code of Regulations (CCR) requires testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials (CCR Title 8, Section 1532.1) and asbestos (CCR Title 8, Section 15129).

The Phase I ESA determined that the project site is underlain by approximately 4 feet of fill soils of unknown origin (Appendix I). Although the *Environmental Soils Analysis* found that constituents of concern were not detected in project site soil samples at concentrations that exceed regulatory thresholds (Appendix O), there remains a potential that surficial soils to the west of the existing concessions stand could contain hazardous materials, should they exist in project site fill. The *Environmental Soils Analysis* concluded that the soil contamination is limited to the upper few inches in this location.

Project construction would include grading and earth-moving activities that could potentially disturb hazardous materials in surficial soil to the west of the existing concession stand, leading to an accidental release of hazardous materials that could impact both construction workers and the environment. Furthermore, adjacent properties to the north of the project site have handled or generated hazardous waste, with one property located at 891 South Kellogg Avenue (approximately 100 feet north of the project site) associated with two closed Cleanup Program cases (Appendix I). Past hazardous material releases from adjacent properties may have resulted in contaminated groundwater on the project site. As discussed in Section 4.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, based on the depth to groundwater, it is reasonable to assume that groundwater could be encountered during grading activities and groundwater dewatering would be required during construction of the proposed drainage basin and underground utility lines. The extraction of contaminated groundwater could result in an accidental release of hazardous materials. Depending on the quality of groundwater,

groundwater dewatering would be required to comply with an individual National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, waste discharge, or Limited Threat Discharge Permit, to ensure proper treatment and disposal. Given the potential for exposure to contamination on-site, the project to have a potentially significant impact involving hazardous materials releases and mitigation is required.

Operation

As stated above under Impact HAZ-1, project operational activities would involve the minimal transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials used for routine maintenance. Quantities of hazardous materials may be transported, used, or stored. However, the project's operational activities would comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, which prescribe measures for the safe transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials to reduce the risk of accidental spills.

Mitigation Measures

HAZ-1 Asbestos Containing Materials Abatement

Prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit, the project applicant/Permittee shall prepare an asbestos abatement plan addressing the items/topics listed below. The asbestos abatement plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee. During project construction and demolition activities, the project applicant shall follow the measures outlined in the asbestos abatement plan and shall be undertaken by properly trained and licensed asbestos contractors currently registered with Cal/OSHA and/or OSHA (herein referred to as "abatement contractors"). Abatement contractors shall be selected and vetted by the project applicant, and reviewed by the Director of Planning and Environmental Review or Designee. Project-specific requirements to be addressed in the asbestos abatement plan include the following:

- Disturbance activities shall be performed only by abatement contractors using appropriate controls to prevent fiber emissions during the removal process. This may include, but is not limited to, the use of wet methods (water mist), negative pressure containment, high efficiency particulate air (HEPA) filtration, and other engineering controls, as deemed appropriate, to keep fibers from being dispersed in accordance with current federal, State, and local regulations. Presumed asbestos containing roofing materials shall be sampled by abatement contractors prior to demolition to determine proper handling and disposal requirements.
- Windows with trace (defined as less than 1 percent) asbestos in putty shall be removed intact to avoid disturbance of the putty, if possible. Other materials with trace asbestos shall be point counted to determine the asbestos concentrations; if asbestos concentrations are not determined, these materials shall be managed as ACMs.
- Workers performing removal shall be properly protected to prevent exposure, including the use of respiratory protection with HEPA filtration, protective suits, or other protective equipment deemed necessary by abatement contractors. Disturbance of greater than 100 square feet of any ACMs or asbestos-containing construction materials (ACCMs) must be performed by trained and licensed abatement contractors.
- Asbestos containing waste materials must be properly contained and transported for off-site disposal at a permitted landfill or disposal facility. Friable asbestos with greater than 1 percent asbestos content is considered hazardous waste per current federal and State regulations and

must be transported and disposed using proper manifest documentation. Non-friable asbestos is categorized as non-hazardous, asbestos containing waste and can typically be disposed to the local Class III landfill with prior approval from landfill operators. As noted, materials with less than 1 percent total asbestos can be disposed of as construction debris if proper lab analysis is provided.

- The abatement contractor shall be responsible for complying with local, State, and federal standards for worker protection and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulations regarding asbestos fiber emissions. Proper removal techniques must be followed to prevent the dissemination of asbestos fibers. All required notification and permitting shall be administered by the abatement contractor, and proper completion shall be verified by the City's Director of Planning and Environmental Review.
- There is the potential suspect materials previously unidentified could be discovered during site renovation/demolition work. This could include suspect materials located inside walls, under floors, above ceilings, and in other areas. If suspect materials are found during site work, the area shall be isolated, and any suspect materials tested to confirm or deny the presence of asbestos, lead, or other hazards, as determined appropriate by the abatement contractor.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The project applicant shall prepare the asbestos abatement plan and contract with an abatement contractor prior to the issuance of the Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit.

Monitoring. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review or Designee shall approve the asbestos abatement plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance and then spot-check during demolition activities and verify compliance documentation following the project's demolition activities.

HAZ-2 Lead-Based Paint Abatement

Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit, the project applicant/Permittee shall prepare a lead based paint abatement plan. This plan can be combined with the plan required in Mitigation Measure HAZ-1. The lead based paint plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee. During project construction and demolition activities, the project applicant shall follow the measures outlined in the lead based paint abatement plan. specific requirements related to lead-based paint. These requirements shall be undertaken by properly trained contractors that utilize lead-safe work practices (or "abatement contractors"). Abatement contractors shall be selected and vetted by the project applicant and reviewed by the City of Goleta. Project-specific requirements of the plan include the following:

- Any disturbance by abatement contractors that might generate dust or create a lead exposure hazard shall be performed by lead-trained workers using lead-safe work practices. Lead safe work practices include appropriate containment, wet methods, and use of hand tools or similar methods that will minimize the generation of airborne dust emissions and potential lead hazards.
- To prevent lead exposure hazard due to the generation of lead dust and debris, lead painted components (e.g., windows, doors, baseboards) or similar lead containing items shall be removed intact and segregated from the overall waste stream by abatement contractors.
- Lead containing waste shall be properly disposed of by abatement contractors in accordance with local, State, and federal regulations. Lead containing waste is classified as Hazardous Waste if

total lead concentration exceeds 1,000 milligrams per kilogram (or parts per million) or if soluble lead concentration exceeds 5.0 milligrams per liter. Proper waste characterization testing or waste profiling shall be conducted prior to disposal of lead containing waste. If practicable, lead wastes shall be segregated to minimize the volume of possible hazardous waste. If lead-containing and non-lead waste materials are comingled during demolition, composite samples of representative waste shall be analyzed by a certified lab to determine proper disposal requirements.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The project applicant shall prepare the lead-based pain abatement plan and contract with an abatement contractor prior to the issuance of the Zoning Clearance associated with the demolition permit.

Monitoring. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review or Designee shall approve the lead based paint abatement plan prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance and then check the abatement contractor's monitoring log to ensure project-specific recommendations are enacted during project demolition activities.

HAZ- 3 Groundwater Investigation and Disposal

Prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for construction or grading, the project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (Professional Geologist [PG] or Professional Engineer [PE]) to conduct a groundwater investigation of groundwater at the project site for potential contaminants of concern. The PG or PE shall prepare a groundwater investigation report, which shall be submitted to the City's Director of Planning and Environmental Review for review and approval prior to the issuance of the Zoning Clearance associated with grading permits. As part of the groundwater investigation, analytical results shall be screened against the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) environmental screening levels. These environmental screening levels are risk-based screening levels for direct exposure of a construction worker and commercial/ industrial land use. The groundwater investigation report shall include recommendations to address identified hazards and indicate when to apply those recommended actions in relation to project activities.

If contaminants are detected in groundwater at the project site, the project applicant shall implement the recommendations specified in the groundwater investigation report to protect site workers during project construction.

If disposal of contaminated groundwater is required during construction of the project, the Central Coast RWQCB and/or the City shall be consulted to determine if the treated groundwater can be disposed of through one of their waste discharge permit options. Based on the concentrations of chemical constituents of contaminated groundwater, the Central Coast RWQCB may require that an individual National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and/or waste discharge requirements be obtained for dewatering activities.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant to conduct the groundwater investigation prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with the issuance of grading permits.

Monitoring. Following submittal of the subsurface investigation report, the Director of Planning and Environmental Review or Designee shall review project construction plans to ensure applicable recommendations from the groundwater investigation report are integrated into construction plans.

HAZ-4 Soil Remediation

The 15-foot diameter area that is to the west of the existing concessions stand and encompasses soil sample location SS-1, as defined in the *Environmental Soils Analysis* (Appendix O), shall be sequestered for further analysis to determine if the soils can be reused on site or if should be disposed of off-site. If the soil testing results indicate that the soils exceed environmental screening levels, then the soils shall not be reused on site. The City shall retain a qualified consultant (Professional Geologist or Professional Engineer) to properly sample, delineate, and remove and/or dispose of the contaminated soil. The qualified consultant shall utilize the project site analytical results for waste characterization purposes to determine the appropriate methods for off-site transportation and disposal of potentially impacted soils. The qualified consultant shall provide disposal recommendations and arrange for proper disposal of the waste soils and/or provide recommendations for remedial engineering controls, if appropriate. The City's Director of Planning and Environmental Review or Designee shall review and approve the disposal recommendations for regulated waste prior to transportation of impacted soils off-site, and review and approve remedial engineering controls prior to construction.

Subsequently, the project applicant shall review and implement the project site disposal recommendations for regulated waste prior to transportation of impacted soils off-site, and review and implement remedial engineering controls, prior to the start of grading.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant to sequester, sample, and dispose of contaminated soil prior to the issuance of grading permits.

Monitoring. The Director of Planning and Environmental Review or Designee shall review contaminated soil disposal recommendations prior to transportation of impacted soils off-site.

HAZ-5 Site Management Plan

The project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant (Professional Geologist or Professional Engineer) to prepare a Site Management Plan (SMP) prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance associated with grading permit. The SMP, or equivalent document, shall be prepared to address on-site handling or management of impacted soils or groundwater if such soils or impacted wastes are encountered during the groundwater investigation or soil remediation, and reduce hazards to construction workers and offsite receptors during construction. The project applicant shall submit the SMP to the City's Director of Planning and Environmental Review, who shall review the SMP prior to issuance of Zoning Clearance for grading permits.

The SMP shall establish remedial measures and/or soil or groundwater management practices to ensure construction worker safety, the health of future workers and visitors, and the prevention of offsite migration of contamination from the project site. These measures and practices may include, but are not limited to:

- Stockpile management including stormwater pollution prevention and the installation of Best Management Practices (BMPs)
- Collection of groundwater samples during dewatering
- Proper disposal procedures of impacted materials
- Monitoring and reporting

- A health and safety plan for contractors working at the project site that addresses the safety and health hazards of each phase of project site construction activities with the requirements and procedures for employee protection.
- The health and safety plan shall outline proper soil and groundwater handling procedures and health and safety requirements to minimize worker and public exposure to hazardous materials during construction.
- Proper handling procedures for unexpected contamination, such as halt-work and avoidance protocols, and City and contractor notifications

The SMP shall also specify the procedures to be implemented in the event unexpected hazardous materials are encountered during construction. If unexpected odorous or visually stained soils, other indications of hydrocarbon piping or equipment, or debris are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the construction contractor shall halt work in the immediate area and a qualified environmental consultant (PG or PE) shall be contacted immediately to evaluate the situation. The qualified environmental consultant shall evaluate the material and recommend the appropriate testing, removal, and disposal methods. The construction contractor shall ensure hazardous materials are removed or remediated in accordance with the requirements of the qualified environmental consultant and the SMP. Construction work may continue on other parts of the project while soil investigation and/or remediation takes place. The construction contractor shall not resume work until approved by the qualified environmental consultant and the City.

Plan Requirements and Timing. The project applicant shall retain a qualified environmental consultant to prepare the SMP prior to the issuance of Zoning Clearance and provide it to the Planning and Environmental Review Director or designee for approval prior to the issuance of the Zoning Clearance associated with grading permits.

Monitoring. Following approval of the SMP, the Director of Planning and Environmental Review or Designee shall review project construction plans to ensure applicable recommendations from the SMP are integrated into construction plans provided for approval of the Zoning Clearance for construction.

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-5 prior to and during construction would reduce potential hazardous material impacts associated with accidental releases to a less-than-significant level.

Threshold 3:	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?

Impact HAZ-3 THE CLOSEST SCHOOL TO THE PROJECT SITE IS THE RAINBOW SCHOOL, LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 0.5 MILE NORTH OF THE PROJECT SITE. THE PROJECT WOULD HAVE NO IMPACT REGARDING HAZARDOUS MATERIAL EMISSIONS WITHIN 0.25 MILE OF AN EXISTING OR PROPOSED SCHOOL.

The nearest school to the project site is the Rainbow School, a kindergarten located approximately 0.5 mile north of the project site. The Goleta Union School District is not planning on constructing future schools within 0.25 mile of the project site. The project site is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school, and therefore would have no impact associated with emissions of hazardous materials, substances, or wastes within 0.25 mile of a school.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

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

Impact HAZ-4 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS WERE HISTORICALLY USED AT THE PROJECT SITE FOR AGRICULTURE. THE PROJECT SITE IS NOT INCLUDED ON A LIST OF HAZARDOUS MATERIAL SITES COMPILED PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65962.5, AND THE PROJECT WOULD NOT CREATE A SIGNIFICANT HAZARD TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT. THE PROJECT WOULD HAVE NO IMPACT.

Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to develop an updated Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, also known as the Cortese List. The DTSC is responsible for a portion of the information contained in the Cortese List; other state and local government agencies are also required to provide additional hazardous material release information for the Cortese List. The analysis for this section included a review of the following resources on March 6, 2023, to provide hazardous material release information:

- SWRCB GeoTracker database (SWRCB 2023)
- DTSC EnviroStor database (DTSC 2023)

Based upon review of these databases, there are no active hazardous material sites mapped within the project site. As such, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment due to listed cleanup sites. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact regarding hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Threshold 5:	For a project 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, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

Impact HAZ-5 THE PROJECT SITE WOULD BE LOCATED WITHIN SAFETY ZONES AND THE AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREA FOR THE SANTA BARBARA MUNICIPAL AIRPORT. HOWEVER, COMPLIANCE WITH EXISTING FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION REGULATIONS ENSURE THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD NOT RESULT IN A SAFETY HAZARDS FOR PEOPLE RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE PROJECT AREA. IMPACTS WOULD BE CLASS II, *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*.

The Santa Barbara Municipal Airport is located approximately 0.25 mile west of the project site. The northern portion of the project site is located within the Clear Zone of the Santa Barbara Airport. As the entire project site is located within the Airport Influence Area (ALUC 1993), 1993 Santa Barbara County ALUP standards would apply to the proposed development. Additionally, considering the project site is located within 20,000 feet of an airport, the project site falls within the 20,000-foot FAR Part 77 Notification Area for the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.

According to the 1993 Santa Barbara County ALUP, the project site is located within Airport Safety Zone II within the Airport Influence Area. The northern portion of the project site is located within Safety Area 1 (Clear Zone) and the southern half of the project site is located within Safety Area 3 (General Traffic Pattern Zone). The more restrictive development standards of Safety Area 1 apply to the project. Therefore, the ALUP development standard of a maximum intensity of 25 people per acre, as a site-wide average, would apply to the project. The proposed industrial building would employ 75 people daily, and would occupy approximately 1.62 acres of the total 11.77-acre project site, which represents an intensity of 6.37 people per acre. Therefore, development under the proposed project would comply with the standard specified in the 1993 Santa Barbara County ALUP. The project site is located in the 60-65 dB CNEL noise contour for Santa Barbara Airport. Industrial land uses are identified as compatible within this contour in the 1993 Santa Barbara County ALUP (ALUC 1993). Therefore, the project would not conflict with the 1993 Santa Barbara County ALUP.

Height limitations are imposed on projects within an airport hazard area so that structures or trees do not obstruct the airspace required for the flight of aircraft in landing or taking off at an airport, or is otherwise hazardous to the landing or taking off of aircraft. The 1993 Santa Barbara County ALUP does not specify a maximum height for structures in Safety Area 1, and states that objects should be limited in height consistent with airspace protection surfaces defined by FAR Part 77. The proposed industrial building would have a maximum height of approximately 35 feet from finished grade, and would have a maximum height of approximately 39 to 41 feet. Although the proposed project would increase building height on the project site, and would be built at a height taller than existing development in the area, the project would be consistent with the City's development standards and zoning code that existed prior to 2020, which considered proximity to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport.

The City engaged with SBCAG, in their capacity as the ALUC, in August 2023. SBCAG determined that the project would not be required to undergo ALUC review as the previous zoning ordinance and General Plan were found consistent with the 1993 Santa Barbara County ALUP and the project does not require any amendments to either. Project design, including building height, would be subject to FAR Part 77, which requires projects that may affect navigable airspace to submit a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration to FAA for review and approval. If a proposed development is identified as a presumed hazard, the FAA may require further aeronautical study or allow the project to be revised. The project applicant would be required to file a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration with the FAA regional office at least 30 days prior to construction. Based on project design, the FAA would then determine whether the project poses a hazard to air navigation and could request changes to project design to minimize those hazards. The FAA would evaluate the project against FAR Part 77 Section 77.17, which provides height standards to ensure the project would not obstruct navigable airspace. Additionally, the FAA would provide lighting recommendations under FAR Part 77 Section 77.21 (d) [4]. The proposed project would comply with existing FAA regulations related to airport hazards and safety. Following compliance with these existing regulations, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Threshold 6:	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Impact HAZ-6 PROJECT CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION WOULD NOT RESULT IN IMPAIRMENT OR INTERFERENCE WITHIN EMERGENCY RESPONSE OR EVACUATION PLANS. IMPACTS WOULD BE CLASS III, *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*.

The City of Goleta, in cooperation with FEMA, the County of Santa Barbara, and State Offices of Emergency Services, is responsible for emergency preparedness and response. Components of emergency preparedness and response include identification of evacuation routes and secondary emergency accesses, as well as provision of information to the community regarding appropriate individual actions in the event of various types of emergencies.

The City's General Plan does not identify roadways adjacent to the project site as major evacuation routes. Project construction would not impair implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, as construction staging and construction worker parking would occur on-site and would not impede existing roadway traffic. Operation of the project would consist of an industrial warehouse building used for office space, materials storage, wholesaling, distribution, and other permitted uses in accordance with the project site's M-S-GOL and M-1 zones. Operation of the project would not introduce activities that could impede or interfere with emergency plans or emergency evacuations.

Therefore, project construction and operation would not result in impaired implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Threshold 7:	Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

Impact HAZ-7 THE PROJECT SITE IS NOT LOCATED IN A FIRE HAZARD AREA, AND PROJECT CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION WOULD NOT EXPOSE PEOPLE OR STRUCTURES TO A SIGNIFICANT RISK OF LOSS, INJURY, OR DEATH INVOLVING WILDLAND FIRES. IMPACTS WOULD BE CLASS III, *LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT*.

The project site is not within a State Responsibility Area (SRA), or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ) (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection [CAL FIRE] 2022). The nearest VHFHSZ is located approximately 1.95 miles north of the project site. Existing residential development, commercial development, and U.S. 101 separate the project site from the VHFHSZ.

The proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the California Fire Code, which are implemented to minimize the potential for fire to occur. Additionally, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department's (SBCFD) development standards, which include requirements for egress on private driveways, fire hydrant spacing and flow rates, automatic fire sprinkler systems, and automatic alarm systems (SBCFD 2022). Adherence to State and local regulations would ensure project construction and operation would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death

involving wildland fires. Impacts would be less than significant. Please refer to Section 4.15, *Effects Found Not to be Significant*, under "Wildfire" for further discussion related to wildfire impacts.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

4.8.4 Cumulative Impacts

Generally, hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with individual developments are site-specific in nature and must be addressed on a case-by-case basis. As such, the geographic scope for hazardous materials impacts is the project site and immediately surrounding parcels. Since hazards and hazardous materials are required to be examined as part of the permit application and environmental review process, potential impacts associated with individual projects will be adequately addressed prior to permit approval.

Cumulative projects proposed in and around Goleta would have the potential to expose future area residents, employees, and visitors to hazards by developing and redeveloping areas that may have previously been contaminated. The magnitude of hazards for individual projects would depend upon the location, type, and size of development and the specific hazards associated with individual sites. If lead-based paints or asbestos-containing materials are found to be present in buildings planned for demolition or renovation, or in the case that soil and groundwater contamination are found to be present on sites of planned and future development, these conditions would be required to comply with existing applicable local, State, and federal regulations. Hazard evaluations would be completed on a case-by-case basis for future development. Compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, including remedial action on contaminated sites, would address impacts related to these hazards and hazardous materials associated with future development in the City. Cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant and the project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable—the project would not use, transport, or dispose of large quantities of hazardous materials, would not be located on a hazardous material site, and would reduce the risk of hazardous material accidental releases through implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-5.

The geographic scope for cumulative safety hazards impacts is inclusive of projects within the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Influence Area. Several cumulative projects listed within Table 3-1 in Section 3, *Environmental Setting,* are within the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Influence Area, thereby potentially exposing persons to risk of airport safety hazards. However, these projects are subject to review of airport-related hazards during the environmental review process and by the FAA and ALUC, which would ensure that development does not impose an aviation-related hazard on structures or people. Therefore, cumulative airport safety impacts would be less than significant. Potential safety hazards associated with the proposed project include building height and lighting. However, the project would be reviewed by the FAA, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the incremental increase in airport safety hazards at the project site would be negligible and would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to safety hazards.

This page intentionally left blank.