

4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the Project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely-hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.9.1 Environmental Setting

Hazardous materials, as defined by the CCR, are substances with certain physical properties that could pose a substantial present or future hazard to human health or the environment when improperly handled, disposed, or otherwise managed. Hazardous materials are grouped into the following four categories, based on their properties:

- Toxic: causes human health effects
- Ignitable: has the ability to burn
- Corrosive: causes severe burns or damage to materials
- Reactive: causes explosions or generates toxic gases

Hazardous waste is any hazardous material that is discarded, abandoned, or slated to be recycled. The criteria that define a material as hazardous also define a waste as hazardous. If improperly handled, hazardous materials and hazardous waste can result in public health hazards if released into the soil or groundwater or through airborne

releases in vapors, fumes, or dust. Soil and groundwater having concentrations of hazardous constituents higher than specific regulatory levels must be handled and disposed of as hazardous waste when excavated or pumped from an aquifer. The California Government Code, Title 22, Sections 66261.20–24 contains technical descriptions of toxic characteristics that could cause soil or groundwater to be classified as hazardous waste.

California Government Code, Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) to compile, maintain, and update specified lists of hazardous material release sites. The CEQA (PRC Section 21092.6) requires the lead agency to consult the lists compiled pursuant to California Government Code, Section 65962.5 to determine whether the proposed project and any alternatives are identified on a federal or state listing database. The required lists of hazardous material release sites are commonly referred to as the “Cortese List” after the State Assembly member who sponsored the legislation. Since the statute was enacted more than 20 years ago, some of the provisions refer to agency activities that were conducted many years ago and are no longer being implemented and, in some cases, the information required in the Cortese List does not exist. Those requesting a copy of the Cortese List are now referred directly to the appropriate information resources contained on internet websites hosted by the boards or departments referenced in the statute, including the online EnviroStor database from the DTSC and the online GeoTracker database offered by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These two databases include hazardous material release sites, along with other categories of sites or facilities specific to each agency’s jurisdiction. A search of the online databases in July of 2019 revealed that the Midway Village area is a military evaluation cleanup site, and the existing Bayshore Park is listed as a state response cleanup site (DTSC 2019a, SWRCB 2019).

As noted in Section 2.2 above, a manufactured gas plant operated on what is today the PG&E Martin Service Center property from approximately 1906 to 1916. The operations of the plant resulted in a waste material called lampblack that contained polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). During World War II the federal government obtained parts of the PG&E property, including the project site, to build Navy housing. When land for this housing was graded, contaminated soils containing PAHs was used to fill low-lying areas prior to construction of the housing, as the health effects were unknown at the time. Various site investigations including testing of the soils and groundwater in and around the Midway Village area occurred in the early 1990s. As noted in Section 2.2 above, until recently, investigative activities were concentrated on PAHs and metals in shallow and semi-shallow soil. Other parameters in soil have also been evaluated to a lesser extent, including volatile organic compounds (VOCs), metals, cyanide, and phenols. In accordance with Engineering/Remediation Resources Group’s (ERRG’s) *Midway Village/Bayshore Park Remediation Project Workplan* dated 5 September 2002, PAH-contaminated soil that exceeded clean up levels at depth was removed from portions of Midway Village in the area north of Midway Drive (Village North) and Bayshore Park.

A durable cover consisting of two to five feet of clean soil, landscaping with a minimum of two feet of clean soil, or hardscapes including concrete building pads, concrete or asphalt walkways, patios, and roadways (cap) was placed over areas of remaining contamination, generally consisting of the entire Bayshore Park and isolated locations in the vicinity of Buildings 22 through 24, 28, 29, and 31 through 35 (ERRG, 2002). Analytical data for five sources of backfill were provided to DTSC for approval prior to cap placement (ERRG, 2002). The site was remediated, and no further action has been required since August 21, 2015, following certification by DTSC (DTSC 2019b).

Multiple Village North parcels and Bayshore Park are subject to three DTSC Land Use Covenants (LUCs), recorded on September 24, 1998 (1998 LUC),⁶ October 17, 2002 (2002 LUC),⁷ and November 23, 2010 (2010 LUC),⁸ together with the 1998 LUC and 2002 LUC, the Existing LUCs) to prevent human direct contact with soil without agency oversight. The portion of Midway Village located south of Midway Drive (Village South), and some parcels on Village North are not subject to Existing LUCs. The areas covered by the Existing LUCs (i.e., Midway Village North parcels and Bayshore Park) are subject to requirements of Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Agreements with the DTSC. The O&M Agreements outline requirements for the cap inspection, maintenance, and reporting (SCS Engineers, 2017). The 2002 LUC is recorded on the land underlying Bayshore Park and contains a prohibition on residential use. Neither the 1998 LUC nor the 2010 LUC contain this restriction.

Since December of 2018, 3 soil gas sampling events have been conducted at the project site under the oversight of the DTSC. In December of 2018, soil gas testing was performed at the Village North portion of the project site under a Soil Gas Sampling Work Plan approved by the DTSC via email dated November 9, 2018. This sampling event detected elevated concentrations of VOCs in soil gas, including benzene, chloroform, ethylbenzene, naphthalene, xylenes, and 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene (1,2,4-TMB) (Langan, 2019). Additional testing was conducted at Village North in April 2019, during which testing elevated levels of the following VOCs were detected in soil gas: benzene, bromomethane, carbon tetrachloride, chloroethane, chloroform, chloromethane, 1,4-DCB, dichlorodifluoromethane, ethylbenzene, naphthalene, PCE, styrene, toluene, trichlorofluoromethane, trichlorotrifluoroethane, 1,2,4-TMB, 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene, vinyl chloride and xylenes (Langan, 2019). Soil gas testing was performed at Village South in November of 2019 and revealed elevated concentrations of VOCs, including benzene, chloroform, ethylbenzene, naphthalene, tetrachloroethene (PCE), vinyl chloride, and xylenes (Langan, 2020). The Project Applicant, County and the City are working with the DTSC to ensure that site conditions will be maintained in a manner protective of human health and the environment, including future Site users. This will include site mitigation and/or remedial activities, such as the development and approval of Response Plans and Soil Management Plans (SMPs) under the jurisdiction of the DTSC and/or other environmental agencies of applicable jurisdiction. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for each phase of the Project, the Project Applicant shall document that the applicable regulatory agency has approved the necessary SMPs and/or environmental response plan documents addressing constituents of concern within the respective development phase. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy or operating permit, the developer shall document the applicable regulatory agency's approval that the Site may be used for its anticipated use.

As noted in Section 2.1 above, the current Bayshore Park is proposed for residential development and the park will be relocated to an area currently zoned for residential development. As such, the 2002 LUC will require a variance to allow for the residential use. To facilitate this, the Bayshore Park area will be made safe for residential use through site mitigation and remedial approaches. Appropriate techniques and approaches may include, among others, consolidation of impacted soil, engineering controls to separate impacted soil from human contact, excavation and appropriate management or removal. In addition to the significant portions of the Site that will be composed of durable covers, including building foundations, roads, engineered paths, and other hardscaped areas, landscaped areas will be covered with a clean soil cap composed of soil either presently available onsite or imported for construction mass grading purposes. This will require the use of approximately 21,500 CY of soil, including approximately 15,200 CY of imported clean fill and approximately 6,300 CY of clean soil from onsite. Impacts,

⁶ The land subject to the 1998 LUC consists of APNs 005-330-250, 005-330-260, 005-330-270, 005-330-340, 005-330-350, 005-330-360, 005-330-370, and 005-330-380.

⁷ The land subject to the 2002 LUC consists of APNs 005-330-330 and 005-330-390.

⁸ The land subject to the 2010 LUC consists of APNs 005-330-280, 005-330-290, 005-330-300, and 005-330-310.

including impacts from truck trips such as greenhouse gas emissions, air toxicity, traffic, and circulation, have been evaluated in the Sections 4.3 (Air Quality), 4.8 (Greenhouse Gases), and 4.17 (Transportation) of this SCEA.

Additionally, vapor mitigation measures will be used to protect future Site users from soil gas, which could potentially enter the buildings and structures at locations where the structure overlays soil gas concentrations in excess of site-specific screening levels established by DTSC to be protective of human health. Such vapor mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to, vapor barriers, sub-slab venting or depressurization systems, or intrinsically safe designed foundations or structures. The foreseeable impacts from any vapor mitigation measures will be less than significant; the limited concentrations of VOCs released will either be vented from rooftop risers where it will quickly dissipate or will pass through filters, in the event that sub-slab depressurization is required.

In addition, institutional controls, including LUCs will be, will be put in place to protect future site users and the environment by ensuring the maintenance and efficacy of engineering controls and prohibiting land uses and activities that are not compatible with site mitigation activities.

The public airport nearest to the project site is San Francisco International Airport, which is located 5.4 miles to the south. There are no private airstrips located within 2 miles of the project site; however, the project site is within the boundaries of the Airport Influence Area (AIA) and would be subject to a determination of consistency from the Airport Land Use Commission to ensure that the proposed project is compatible with the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (CALUCP) for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport, dated July 2012 (Jacobs Consultancy Clarion Associates 2012), in accordance with Public Utility Code Section 21676.5(a). Additionally, the only school within 0.25 mile of the project site is Bayshore Elementary School, which is located approximately 320 feet north of the northernmost portion of the project site.

Federal regulations and regulations adopted by the BAAQMD apply to the identification and treatment of hazardous materials during demolition and construction activities. Failure to comply with the regulations respecting asbestos and dust control may result in a Notice of Violation being issued by the BAAQMD, civil penalties under state and/or federal law, and possible action by the EPA under federal law. Federal law covers a number of different activities involving asbestos, including demolition and renovation of structures (40 CFR § 61.145).

There are no wildlands located within the City. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) evaluates fire hazard severity risks according to areas of responsibility (i.e., federal, state, and local). According to CAL FIRE, there are not any very high fire hazard severity zones within the Local Responsibility Area on or near proximity to the project site. Likewise, there are no moderate, high, or very high fire hazard severity zones in the State Responsibility Areas in the vicinity of the project site (CAL FIRE 2008).

4.9.2 Previous Environmental Analysis

City of Daly City General Plan EIR Summary

Chapter 3.7 of the General Plan EIR discusses impacts related to hazardous materials, emergency response, and aircraft hazards. The General Plan EIR identified potentially significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. However, compliance with existing federal, state, and local laws, as well as policies contained in the General Plan would reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

The following General Plan policies are applicable to the proposed project:

Policy SE-5.4: Utilize emergency evacuation routes as determined by the Police Department. The evacuation routes will follow the major roadways as set forth in the Circulation Element.

Plan Bay Area EIR Summary

The following summarizes the potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials discussed in Chapter 2.13 of the Plan Bay Area EIR and includes the complete text of mitigation measures previously identified by the Plan Bay Area EIR that are applicable to the proposed project.

Impact 2.13-1: Routine Transport or Disposal of Hazardous Materials. The Plan Bay Area EIR determined future land use and transportation projects could increase the routine transport, use, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes in the region. However, compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations and oversight would effectively reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. No mitigation measures were identified.

Impact 2.13-2: Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment. The Plan Bay Area EIR determined future land use and transportation projects could increase the potential for unintentional upset and accident conditions. However, compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations and oversight would effectively reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. No mitigation measures were identified.

Impact 2.13-3: Emit or Handle Hazardous Materials Near Schools. The Plan Bay Area EIR determined all projects would comply with federal and state regulations that are designed to reduce the potential for the release of large quantities of hazardous materials and wastes into the environment to an acceptable level, and in particular to protect schools. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified.

Impact 2.13-4: Hazardous Materials List Pursuant to California Government Code, Section 65962.5. The Plan Bay Area EIR determined that potential for encountering hazardous materials or wastes would be dependent on site-specific conditions. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure 2.13-4 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level (Refer to Impact HAZ-4 in Section 4.9.3, Project-Specific Analysis).

***PBA EIR MM 2.13-4:** Implementing agencies and/or project sponsors shall implement measures, where feasible and necessary based on project- and site-specific considerations that include, but are not limited to:*

- If the project is located on or near a hazardous materials and/or waste site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or has the potential for residual hazardous materials and/or waste as a result of location and/or prior uses, the project sponsor shall prepare a Phase I ESA in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials' E-1527-05 standard. For work requiring any demolition or renovation, the Phase I ESA shall make recommendations for any hazardous building materials survey work that shall be done. All recommendations included in a Phase I ESA prepared for a site shall be implemented. If a Phase I ESA indicates the presence or likely presence of contamination, the implementing agency shall require a Phase II ESA, and recommendations of the Phase II ESA shall be fully implemented.*

Impact 2.13-5 and 2.13-6: Airport Land Use Plan or Vicinity of a Private Airstrip. The Plan Bay Area EIR analyzed the potential impacts related to the safety hazard for people residing or working within 2 miles of a public airport or in the vicinity of private airstrip. The Plan Bay Area EIR determined compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level, and no mitigation measures were identified.

Impact 2.13-7: Emergency Response or Evacuation Plan. The Plan Bay Area EIR analyzed the potential impacts related to interference with emergency response and evacuation plans and determined that the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified.

Impact 2.13-8: Wildland Fires. The Pan Bay Area EIR analyzed the potential impacts related to wildland fires and determined that the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures were identified.

4.9.3 Project-Specific Analysis

Impact HAZ-1 Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

AND

Impact HAZ-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?

Impact Analysis

The proposed project would involve demolition of existing structures and construction of a mixed-use development that would include residential units, parking spaces, a child-care facility, a community center, office space, a revised street system, and recreational facilities. Residential uses are not typically associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and do not present a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials. Any hazardous materials associated with the residential uses would primarily consist of typical household cleaning products and fertilizers. These items would be used in small quantities and in accordance with label instructions, which are based on federal and/or state health and safety regulations. Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through the release of hazardous materials through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.

During construction, small quantities of potentially toxic substances (e.g., petroleum and other chemicals used to operate and maintain construction equipment) would be used and transported to and from the site as needed. Accidental releases of small quantities of these substances could contaminate soils and degrade the quality of surface water and groundwater, resulting in a public safety hazard; however, contractors would be required to transport, store, and handle hazardous materials required for construction in a manner consistent with relevant regulations and guidelines, including California Health and Safety Codes and City ordinances. Regulatory requirements for the transport of hazardous wastes in California are specified in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 4.5, Chapters 13 and 29. In accordance with these regulations, transport of hazardous materials must comply with the California Vehicle Code, California Highway Patrol regulations (contained in Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations); the California State Fire Marshal regulations (contained in Title 19 of the California Code of Regulations); Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations (Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations); and EPA regulations (contained in Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations). The use of hazardous materials is regulated by the DTSC (Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Code of Regulations).

According to the Geotechnical Investigation, groundwater at the project site varies from 1 to 12 feet bgs, but for design purposes it is recommended to assume groundwater may be encountered at about 4 bgs (Rockridge Geotechnical 2020). Project construction activities are anticipated to excavate the project site to 26 feet, and therefore may encounter groundwater. As discussed in Impact GEO-3, the proposed project would be required to

implement Mitigation Measure GEO-2 and prepare a dewatering plan in accordance with the San Francisco Bay Area RWQCB construction dewatering permit requirements. Discharged groundwater could potentially be contaminated due to the presence of contaminated soils onsite, from construction equipment, or sediments from excavation. Discharge of water resulting from dewatering operations would require an NPDES Permit, or a waiver (exemption) from the San Francisco RWQCB, which would establish discharge limitations for specific chemicals (if they occur in the dewatering flows). As discussed further in Impact HAZ-4, the proposed project would also implement Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 to modify, amend, or rescind the 2002 LUC for the project site. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 also requires implementation of an environmental response document, to be approved by the applicable regulatory agency, as well as compliance with a Soil Management Plan to address the movement of onsite contaminated soils and groundwater. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to the routine transport, use, disposal, or accidental release of hazardous materials with implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-2 and HAZ-1.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially Significant Impact.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures GEO-2 and HAZ-1 are required.

MM HAZ-1 Modification, Amendment, or Rescindment of Deed Restriction and Consultation with an Applicable Regulatory Agency and Development of a Worker Environmental Protection Program (WEAP). As a condition of approval of the proposed project, the Applicant shall consult with DTSC regarding the Existing LUCs on the site. A modification, amendment, or rescindment to one or more of the Existing LUCs will be required for the site since the 2002 LUC does not allow for residential development on the Bayshore Park portion of the site. The Applicant will enter into an agreement with the applicable regulatory agency on the appropriate actions to take regarding the potentially contaminated soils on the project site. As a condition of the agreement, an environmental response document will be required for the proposed project, which will include but is not limited to:

- Testing of soils and groundwater prior to the start of construction to identify contaminated soils and/or groundwater in the area;
- Removal and disposal of any contaminated soils or groundwater;
- Removal of any hazardous building materials in existing structures prior to demolition (e.g., asbestos, tile, lead-based paint, mercury switches and light fixtures, light fixtures with PCB transformers and ballast transformers);
- Capping of any soil that will not be covered by structural improvements (i.e., landscaped areas or exposed soils in the park area);
- Implementation of an SMP for the site;
- Approval and implementation of a Worker Environmental Protection Program; and
- Procedures to be followed in the event of discovery of unknown environmental conditions which may exist at the Site, such as subsurface structures, underground tanks and piping.

Consultation with the applicable regulatory agency and implementation of the environmental response document will include the general steps that will be taken to remediate the project site and reduce potential impacts to human health and the environment from the potentially contaminated soil and groundwater in the area.

Additionally, development and participation in a Worker Environmental Protection Program shall be required to ensure that all construction workers onsite are appropriately trained on the conditions of the site soils and the potentially hazardous conditions of these soils. The Applicant and the contractor are responsible for ensuring that all onsite personnel attend the WEAP presentation, receive a summary handout, and sign a training attendance acknowledgement form to indicate that the contents of the program are understood and to provide proof of attendance. Each participant of the WEAP presentation shall be responsible for maintaining their copy of the WEAP reference materials and making sure other onsite personnel are complying with the recommended precautions. The contractor shall keep the sign in sheet onsite and submit copies of the WEAP sign-in sheet to the Applicant's project manager who shall keep it on file at their offices.

A building permit cannot be issued, and thus, the proposed project cannot begin construction, until the 2002 LUC is either modified, amended, or rescinded.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.

Impact HAZ-3 Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Impact Analysis

The project site is adjacent to Bayshore Elementary School, which is located approximately 320 feet north of the project site. As explained in Impact HAZ-1 and Impact HAZ-2, the proposed project would not involve the use of significant quantities of hazardous materials, however construction of the proposed project has the potential to result in emissions of TACs/hazardous air pollutants in the form of DPM emissions from the operation of diesel-fueled internal combustion engines. Additionally, other potentially hazardous materials present within soils could be disturbed during construction activities and could become airborne and adversely affect nearby schools. Mitigation Measure AIR-1 (PBA EIR MM 2.2-2), would be required during construction to reduce construction-related dust and the potential for hazardous airborne particles to be released. Mitigation Measure AIR-1 (PBA EIR MM 2.2-2) would include specific instruction for handling construction equipment, such as limiting idling times, which would limit the amount of TACs released into the air near Bayshore Elementary School and the onsite daycare facility. Other emission reducing requirements would be included in Mitigation Measure AIR-1 (Mitigation Measure EIR MM 2.2-2), which could include the use of late model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, and other options as they become available.

Hazardous materials used during construction would be typical of common construction activities and are discussed in Impact HAZ-1 and Impact HAZ-2 above. They would be handled by the contractor in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations for hazardous substances as well as the requirements of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1. Additionally, the amount of these materials needed for onsite equipment maintenance would not be enough to cause a significant hazard to the public, or the nearby school, if released, since the quantity of these hazardous materials onsite at any one given time would only amount to a refueling truck and the construction equipment.

Further, PRC Section 21151.4 requires that projects located within 0.25 mile of a school that might reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous air emissions or that would handle an extremely hazardous substance or a mixture containing extremely hazardous substances (in a quantity equal to or greater than the state threshold quantity specified pursuant to subdivision (j) of Section 25532 of the Health and Safety Code), would either need to consult with the school or give written notification to the school. The Applicant would comply with PRC Section 21151.4 and would notify the appropriate personnel at Bayshore Elementary School if construction activities would require work with hazardous materials or emissions within 0.25 mile of the school as well as by following applicable rules and regulations governing transport and use of hazardous materials as discussed herein. Therefore, the construction of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to schools and would be in compliance with PRC Section 21151.4.

Therefore, the overall impact related to hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of Bayshore School and the onsite daycare would be less than significant with Mitigation Measures AIR-1 (PBA EIR MM 2.2-2) and HAZ-1 incorporated.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially Significant Impact.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures AIR-1 (PBA EIR MM 2.2-2) and HAZ-1 are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.

Impact HAZ-4 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, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Impact Analysis

As stated in Section 4.9.1, Environmental Setting, the project site is located on two identified hazardous cleanup sites, pursuant to California Government Code, Section 65962.5, associated with the current Midway Village area and Bayshore Park (DTSC 2019a). Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 (PBA EIR MM 2.13-4) requires that a Phase I ESA be completed for any project that has the potential for residual hazardous materials and/or waste as a result of location and/or prior uses. A Phase I ESA was completed for the project area on April 14, 2017 (SCS Engineers 2017). The Phase I ESA discusses the listed sites and concludes that site development activities would be required to comply with the Existing LUCs. As such Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would be required to either modify (amend) or lift (rescind) the 2002 LUC as well as require the development and participation in a Worker Environmental Protection Program (WEAP), to educate and inform construction workers of the potential hazards present of the project site.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 (PBA EIR MM 2.13.4) would ensure that the existing Cortese-listed site within the project area would not create a significant hazard to the public or future residents on the site during construction and operation of the proposed project. All potentially contaminated soils would be remediated to a level protective of human health and the environment and thus would not result in a significant impact to the public. The impact would be less than significant with Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 and Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 (PBA EIR MM 2.13-4).

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Potentially Significant Impact.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 and Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 (PBA EIR MM 2.13-4).

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.

Impact HAZ-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 Analysis

The project site is located within the boundaries of the AIA of the San Francisco International Airport and would be subject to a determination of consistency from the airport land use commission to ensure that the proposed project is compatible with the CALUCP in accordance with Public Utilities Code Section 21676.5(a). The proposed project is not located in the "Outer Boundary of the Safety Field" or the "Noise Contour Zone," both of which could influence the project design. Under state law, local governments may submit development proposals to the airport land use commission for non-binding advisory review. The CALUCP encourages local governments to submit the following types of development proposals within Area B of the AIA to the airport land use commission for advisory review if the proposed project includes the following:

- Commercial or mixed-use development of more than 100,000 sf of gross building area;
- Residential or mixed-use development that includes more than 50 dwelling units;
- Public or private schools;
- Hospitals or other inpatient medical care facilities;
- Libraries; and
- Places of public assembly.

As discussed in Section 2, Project Description, the proposed project includes 555 dwelling units; however, review of the airport land use commission is only required for entitlements that require a policy change (e.g., General Plan amendment, rezoning, etc.). A General Plan amendment has been requested to relocate the location of the park on the project site. The current Bayshore Park area is proposed as a housing development, while the area that is proposed to have the new Bayshore Park is now designated as residential. These designations must be switched under a General Plan amendment and is therefore still consistent with the General Plan. Therefore, given that the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and the airport land use commission has found the General Plan consistent with the CALUCP, any potential incompatibility impacts resulting in safety hazards for individuals residing or working in the project area would be considered a less than significant impact.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact HAZ-6 Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Impact Analysis

The proposed project would not alter the existing street system besides minor improvements to the streets within the

existing Midway Village area, and the limited construction activities associated with the proposed project improvements would not result in temporary blockage of any roadways. As a result, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with any emergency response or evacuation plan, and a less than significant impact would occur.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact HAZ-7 Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?

Impact Analysis

The primary threat related to wildland fire is due to open grasslands abutting residential developments. The project site is surrounded by urban development on all sides with predominantly impervious surfaces. As such, the proposed project is not located near any open grassland. With implementation of the proposed project, the site would remain a developed area constructed with predominantly impervious surfaces. Further, the proposed project is not located in a State Responsibility Areas (SRA) or a very high fire hazard severity zone as documented by the California Department of Forestry and Fire protection (CAL FIRE) (CAL FIRE 2008). Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable fire safety standards set forth by the City regarding fire protection during construction including placement of new fire hydrants within the site; therefore, the proposed project would have no impact with respect to exposing people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Level of Significance Before Mitigation

No Impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

No Impact.

This page left intentionally blank.