## 3.1.3 Hazards and Hazardous Wastes

The 1981 Sycamore Springs EIR did not discuss hazards and hazardous materials. The 1983 EIR identified the handling and storage of chemicals associated with the Hewlett Packard development to be less than significant due to appropriate handling procedures. The two types of hazardous materials identified in the 1983 Hewlett Packard EIR would have included raw chemicals used for processes and plant maintenance and waste from plant operations. Since the previous EIRs were certified, there have been changes in the circumstances under which the Project was undertaken related to hazards. The Project site is located within the declared Urban-Wildland interface (UWI) area. Additionally, considering the major fires that have affected the County, the EIR analyzes the potential risk to future development from wildfire. In addition, a potential public safety risk exists due to the potential exposure to pesticides and herbicides, which may have accumulated in the soil due to past agricultural operations. As agriculture has occurred on the property, the potential for this public safety risk must be addressed.

These issues lead to the need for new subsequent analysis to hazards and hazardous materials. The reader is referred to text below for a new evaluation of hazards and hazardous materials for the Project.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report (ESA) was prepared for the Proposed Project by Leighton and Associates, Inc. in 2009, with a focused update to that report and Limited Phase II ESA completed in 2012 (Leighton 2012a and 2012b). The reports assess the potential for "recognized environmental conditions" (RECs) to occur at the Proposed Project site through site reconnaissance, examination of databases and government document sources, review of historical records, and property owner interviews. Additionally, a Fire Protection Plan (FPP; Firewise 2000, Inc. 2013) was prepared for the Project. These studies are summarized below, with the complete reports included in Appendices J and K, respectively of this EIR.

### 3.1.3.1 *Existing Conditions*

Hazardous Materials

Site Reconnaissance

A site reconnaissance was conducted on August 18, 2009 to observe and document existing property conditions and the nature of the neighboring property development within 0.25 mile of the property. Hazardous substances and other chemical containers observed on the southern portion of the property north of SR-76, including a polyacrylamide emulsion container, and one empty unlabelled 55-gallon drum. Trash and debris on the western parcel south of SR-76 contained chemical resistant gloves and goggles, empty 5-gallon buckets, and empty household cleaning bottles. No other hazardous substances or chemical containers were observed on the property. No evidence of underground storage tanks (USTs; such as vent lines, fill or overfill ports) or aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) was observed on the property. An additional visit was conducted on October 1, 2012 during the above-noted limited Phase II ESA activities at the site. Neither the polyacrylamide emulsion container, nor the unlabelled 55-gallon drum, was

present at that time. As the 55-gallon drum had been empty, and polyacrylamide is non-toxic, neither location is considered an REC. A material safety data sheet for polyacrylamide is included in Appendix J to this EIR.

Also during the additional October site reconnaissance, Leighton was granted access to the three storage containers on the property. Food, a barbeque and associated propane tanks, approximately five gallons of glow fuel, and remote-controlled planes and helicopters were observed in the storage container south of the airstrip. Glow fuel is used as fuel for the recreational planes and helicopters. The storage of small amounts of glow fuel at the subject site is not considered a REC because it is composed primarily of methanol. A material safety data sheet (MSDS) for glow fuel is included in Appendix J.

Two of the storage containers are located adjacent to the west of main dirt road that accesses the northern portion of the subject site, on a concrete slab with a service pit trench. A lawnmower, less than five gallons of paint, and canopy polls and spare parts for canopy assembly were observed in the western container. A tractor was observed in the eastern container. The tractor was observed to be leaking oil. Cat litter was spread over the bottom of the storage container, beneath the tractor to absorb the oil; no cracks or signs of corrosion were observed on the storage container floor.

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) were once used as industrial chemicals whose high stability contributed to both their commercial usefulness and their long-term deleterious environmental and health effects. PCBs can be present in coolants or lubricating oils used in older electrical transformers, hydraulic systems, and other similar equipment. In 1979, USEPA generally prohibited the domestic use of PCBs in electrical capacitors, electrical transformers, vacuum pumps, hydraulic pumps and gas turbines. Three pole-mounted transformers were observed in the northern portion of the property, although it is not known if the transformers contain PCBs.

While wetlands are known to exist on site, evidence of pits, ponds, lagoons, septic systems, wastewater, cisterns and sumps were not observed. One runoff drain was observed in the northern portion of the subject property. Abandoned piping and a possible drain were observed in the northern portion of the property.

Pesticides were not observed on the property; however, records on file at the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health (DEH) indicate that the adjacent property to the east was historically used for citrus farming, and pesticide use was identified on that property. Similarly, the Proposed Project property has historically been used for citrus grove farming and pesticides were likely used on the property. Due to the historical citrus farming, historical horse facilities, and the presence of irrigation plumbing throughout the farmed area, water wells may exist within the property boundaries, although no wells of any kind (oil, gas production, groundwater monitoring or water wells) were observed or reported at or adjacent to the property.

No other potential indicators of hazardous substances on site, including stained, discolored and/or corroded soils, stressed vegetation, or unusual odors were observed.

During the October 2012 site visit, 15 soil borings were made and 28 soil samples were collected in areas planned for residential and mixed use core development in order to check for possible presence of herbicides, pesticides and/or rodenticides. Results of the testing are described in Section 3.1.3.2 of this subchapter, below.

Database and Document Review

A series of federal, state, local, Tribal, proprietary, and regulatory agency data sources were reviewed to determine the presence of hazardous materials sites in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. Database listings were reviewed within the specified radii established by the ASTM. Five of these sources identified a total of three risk sites around the Project site.

The EPA maintains lists of information pertaining to reported leaking underground storage tanks (LUSTs) in the state. The database search identified one LUST facility within 0.5 mile of the property. This site was also identified in the California RWQCB SLIC database. Mobile Station 18-034, located at 4730 Highway 76 (at the corner of Pala Road and Old Highway 395), is a San Diego DEH LUST case and is undergoing quarterly monitoring as of 2012 (Leighton 2012c: pers.comm.). Responsible parties have been identified, and there are no concerns that the site will not be properly addressed to the satisfaction of regulatory agencies. Further review of documents from GeoTracker public database indicates that groundwater in the immediate vicinity below the site was affected with petroleum. Campus Park West is 0.5 mile east of the Mobile site and the groundwater gradient at the site is to the southwest. As a result, the groundwater is flowing away from the Project and **no impacts** would be anticipated.

The Historical UST Registered Database search identified one Historical UST facility at 4775 Via Belmonte (the Pala Mesa Market) within 0.25 mile of the property. The facility historically had three USTs which were removed according to the San Diego DEH Hazardous Materials website. Based on the distance from the property (0.25 mile), and the fact that there is no open case with the DEH, there is low potential for this facility to adversely impact the property. This site was also identified in the SWEEPS UST database.

Files from the DEH describe activities related to a Voluntary Assistance Program cleanup for parcel 108-120-47-00, located to the north of the Project site, which was used for citrus tree farming. This parcel has been subsumed by the northern portion of the Campus Park development, and is more than 0.25 mile from the Campus Park West Project northernmost boundary. Soil samples collected in 2006 revealed the presence of DDT, and an additional work plan for additional assessment was submitted to the DEH. The survey involved collection of eight on-site soil samples collected from existing earth materials. Based on a list of 18 Hazardous Agricultural Substances generated by the County DEH, sample chemical testing included testing for the following substances:

- Chlorinated pesticides
- Organophosphorous pesticides
- Chlorinated herbicides
- Total organic lead

- Total petroleum hydrocarbons
- pH (measure of acidity or alkalinity)

Concentrations of chlorinated pesticides – DDT/DDD/DDE (i.e., $DDT_{(Total)}$) – were detected in laboratory tests in six of the samples, ranging from 0.0024 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) to 0.894 mg/kg. For comparison purposes, the regulatory action level for hazardous waste criteria for $DDT_{(Total)}$ is 1.0 mg/kg.

Laboratory test results were reported as "less than detection levels" for organophosphorus pesticides, chlorinated herbicides, total organic lead, and total petroleum hydrocarbons. Laboratory test results for pH indicated that the soils were slightly acidic to slightly basic (pH of 6.5 to 8.0).

Historical Land Use

A summary of historical land use is provided in Table 3.1.3-1, Historical Land Use, based on historical records. Aerial photographs were reviewed for the years 1939, 1946, 1953, 1963, 1974, 1989, 1994, 2002, and 2005 for information regarding past subject property uses. Historical topographic maps were reviewed for the years 1901, 1904, 1942, 1949 and 1968. The property has historically been used for dry farming and citrus grove farming, and more recently as a remote control model airplane airfield.

Interviews

The current property owner was interviewed to gather first-hand historical data about the Project site. The owner noted that past property use was raw land, agricultural, and a model airplane flying club. The owner is not aware of any hazardous materials concerns associated with the subject property.

Wildland Fire Hazards

An FPP was prepared for the Proposed Project to evaluate the potential adverse effects to the Project that could result from a wildland fire that occurs on or adjacent to the Project, as well as the positive environmental effects that may occur by developing this particular property. The FPP addresses water supply, access, structural ignitability and fire resistive building features, fire protection systems and equipment, impacts to existing emergency services, defensible space, and vegetation management.

The Proposed Project is located within areas served by the North County Fire Protection District (NCFPD). NCFPD's capacity to provide fire protection services to the Proposed Project is discussed in Section 3.1.8, Public Services, of this subchapter.

The Project area is located in a moderately high fire hazard severity zone. Several characteristics of the Project location, including topography, vegetation, and climate zone contribute to risk of fire at the site. Data from the California Fire Alliance Fire Planning and Mapping Tools were

used to determine the fire history of wildland fire in the vicinity of the Project. Several large fires of over 100 acres have occurred on or near the Project.

### 3.1.3.2 *Analysis of Project Effects and Determination as to Significance*

Excluding the issue of wildfire, hazards information and impacts are the same for both **Scenario 1** and **Scenario 2** of the Proposed Project.

Release of Existing Hazardous Substances

Guideline for the Determination of Significance

A significant impact to public safety or the environment would occur if:

1. The Proposed Project is located on or within one-quarter mile from a site identified in one of the regulatory databases compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 or is otherwise known to have been the subject of a release of hazardous substances, and as a result the Project may result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

*Guideline Source*

This guideline is based on County Guidelines for Determining Significance – Hazardous Materials and Existing Contamination (July 30, 2007).

Analysis

*On-site Resources*

As stated above, the search of government records databases in July 2009 (Leighton 2009a) identified a total of three risk sites around the Project site. Two of these sites (the Mobile Station located at the corner of Pala Road and Old Highway 395, and the Pala Mesa Market at 4775 Via Belmonte), were determined to have a low potential to adversely impact the Project. These conclusions were based on the status of the cases and the distance of the sites from the Project (more than one-quarter mile distant). The third site involved a record of DDT found in soil samples collected in 2006 on a parcel located north of the Project site in the northern Campus Park property. This site is also more than one-quarter mile distant from the Project (also more than one-quarter mile distant).

As noted above for the Campus Park development, testing was conducted in 2002 and 2009 on water and soil to address this issue. Total DDT levels detected in the soil samples were less than the regulatory action level of 1.0 mg/kg for hazardous waste criteria. Levels of organophosphorus pesticides, chlorinated herbicides, total organic lead, and total petroleum hydrocarbons were reported as “less than detection levels.” The results of the 2002 water sample test indicated that observed levels of organophosphorus pesticides, chlorinated pesticides/herbicides, petroleum hydrocarbons, and lead were all below detection limits.

Regarding the three pole-mounted transformers observed in the northern portion of the property, such facilities are not likely to contain high concentrations of PCBs, and should any leaks from these transformers develop, SDG&E would be responsible for site cleanup.

In consideration of the field reconnaissance, review of government documents and databases, and results of testing on the adjacent Campus Park property, it is anticipated that hazards impacts to and from the Project site related to pesticide residue in soils would be **less than significant**.

*Off-site Effects*

Pipelines would be installed as part of the Project, as would potential pump stations. The pipelines would be located within disturbed road bed, with engineered soils. **No impact** would occur as those soils have already been disturbed and treated as necessary. With regard to the adjacent Campus Park pump station, no hazardous materials issues were documented for that site during environmental review completed as part of the certified EIR (County 2011a). The locations of the potential small RMWD pump stations are in existing disturbed areas with no known history of active agriculture or gas stations, etc. Potential impacts are assessed as **less than significant.**

Human or Environmental Exposures to Hazardous Materials

Guideline for the Determination of Significance

A significant impact to public safety or the environment would occur if:

2. The Proposed Project could result in human or environmental exposure to soils or groundwater that exceed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 Preliminary Remediation Goals, California Environmental Protection Agency California Human Health Screening Levels, or Primary State or Federal Maximum Contaminant Levels for applicable contaminants and the exposure would represent a hazard to the public or the environment.

*Guideline Source*

This guideline is based on County Guidelines for Determining Significance – Hazardous Materials and Existing Contamination (July 30, 2007).

Analysis

*On-site Effects*

The Proposed Project would not result in human or environmental exposure to soils or groundwater that exceeds the USEPA Region 9 Preliminary Remediation Goals, California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) California Human Health Screening Levels, or Primary State or Federal Maximum Contaminant Levels for applicable contaminants.

Specific businesses occupying the proposed commercial, limited-impact industrial or office professional buildings are unknown at this time. These uses could include automotive and equipment cleaning, customer manufacturing, laundries, etc., and swimming pools could be associated with residential uses. It is possible that future commercial/industrial/office uses and HOA-maintained swimming pool uses would require the use, storage, transport, and/or disposal of potentially hazardous materials. Should such uses be proposed, they would be subject to a number of regulatory requirements governing the handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials used on site. For such uses, a risk assessment in conformance with all pertinent agency regulations, as listed in Table 3.1.3-2, Summary of Regulations Potentially Applicable to Campus Park West Commercial/Industrial/Office Professional and Wastewater Treatment Uses, would be required. Applicable permits also would have to be obtained from regulatory agencies (i.e., DEH, USEPA and CalEPA). The permitting process would involve design review to ensure proper materials handling and containment facilities for normal operations and potential emergency release conditions would be provided. Acquisition of applicable permits and compliance with applicable regulatory standards would avoid potentially significant hazardous materials impacts associated with proposed commercial/industrial/office professional or wastewater treatment uses, and **no impacts** would occur.

Regarding potential exposure to pesticides, herbicides and rodenticides in soils, the limited residue survey for the adjacent Campus Park development identified no exceedances of allowed concentrations. Similar findings resulted from the on-site soil tests.

No organochlorine pesticides were detected in 20 of the 28 soil samples collected and analyzed and no reportable concentrations of organochlorine pesticides were detected in the soil samples collected from 9 of the 14 soil borings. Low concentrations of 4,4'-DDD, Dieldrin and/or chlordane were detected at 5 of the 14 borings. Detected concentrations of all organochlorine pesticides were below their respective CalEPA California Human Health Screening Levels for residential use in all the samples collected with the exception of Dieldrin in two soil samples (B-4 and B-10), which slightly exceeded the residential use CHHSL. The low number of locations with slightly elevated the residential use CHHSL relative to the total number of samples, however, indicates that Dieldrin level at the subject site is not of concern overall. Following statistical review, there is 95 percent upper confidence level that all site soils as a whole would be below residential CHHSLs for Dieldrin. The organochlorine pesticide results are summarized in Tables 1 and 2 of Appendix J to this EIR, Phase II report. A copy of the Associated Laboratories analytical report on this testing is provided in Appendix B to that report, and the statistical analysis regarding Dieldrin is provided in Appendix C to that report.

Two soil samples were tested for Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons carbon chain identification (TPHccid). Detected concentrations of TPH are below the California RWQCB – San Francisco Bay Region's (SFRWQCB) Environmental Screening Levels (ESLs). The TPH results are summarized in Table 1 of Appendix J, Phase II report, with a copy of the Associated Laboratories analytical report on this testing is provided in Appendix B to that report.

In summary, regarding potential exposure to pesticides, herbicides and rodenticides in soils, the limited Phase II tests at Campus Park West identified either no exceedances, or exceedances that were within statistically safe percentages of allowed concentrations. Furthermore, the Project

would incorporate a design feature requiring further testing to determine contamination of Dieldrin if proposed grading at the residential site (corresponding to Bore Site B-4) requires a cut of two feet or more. If soil removal is required based on the outcome of this testing, it would be completed according to USEPA and/or DTSC standards. Potential impacts are identified as **less than significant.**

As described in Section 3.1.3.1, above, a tractor leaking oil was noted during site reconnaissance. Although located within a storage unit with a concrete floor and subject to some level of control (kitty litter to absorb the dripping), the tractor was noted as having potential to impact the subject property and was therefore identified as a potential REC. The RC Flyers Club is being notified to either repair the tractor so that it is not leaking oil or remove it from the premises as a matter of Project design. Project impacts are therefore identified as **less than significant**.

If hazardous materials were identified, for example during detailed geotechnical investigations for future project development activities, conformance with all pertinent agency regulations listed in Table 3.1.3-2 would be required thereby avoiding human or environmental exposure, and **no impacts** would occur.

*Off-site Effects*

Pipelines would be installed as part of the Project, as would potential pump stations. The pipelines would be located within disturbed road bed, with engineered soils. **No impact** would occur as those soils have already been disturbed and treated as necessary. With regard to the adjacent Campus Park pump station, no contaminated soils issues were documented for that site during environmental review completed as part of the certified EIR (County 2011a). The locations of the potential small RMWD pump stations are in existing disturbed areas with no known history of active agriculture. Potential impacts are assessed as **less than significant.**

Demolition of Structures that May Contain ACM, LBP, and/or Other Hazardous Materials

Guideline for the Determination of Significance

A significant impact to public safety or the environment would occur if:

3. The Proposed Project would involve the demolition of commercial, industrial or residential structures that may contain asbestos containing materials (ACM), lead based paint (LBP) and/or other hazardous materials and as a result, the Project would represent a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

*Guideline Source*

This guideline is based on County Guidelines for Determining Significance – Hazardous Materials and Existing Contamination (July 30, 2007).

Analysis

*On- and Off-site Resources*

Asbestos was used extensively in the United States, especially from the 1940s until the late 1970s. The material was used in buildings for fireproofing, acoustical insulation, condensation control, and decoration. It can be found in products such as asphalt roofing products, insulation inside fuse boxes and old wire insulation, shingles and siding, and floor tile. Its use was largely discontinued after 1980. Lead based paint was used up until 1978 in paint and other products, and is found on the walls, woodwork, windows and doors of many older structures. Stained soils, pitted concrete, and leaking containers/drums on sites can indicate the presence of other sources of contamination.

The only structures remaining on site include recent shade structures and portable/temporary storage units. Demolition of these structures would simply require dismantling. They are not anticipated to contain any hazardous materials that would require conformance to applicable federal, state and local regulations enacted to prevent or reduce damage to public health and safety and the environment. No structures are located where Project-evaluated pipelines or sewage pump stations would be placed. **No impacts** would occur.

Wildland Fire Hazards

Guideline for the Determination of Significance

A significant impact to public safety or the environment would occur if:

4. The Proposed Project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires if it would:

    a. Be unable to demonstrate compliance with the following fire regulations: California Fire Code, CCRs, County Fire Code, and the County Consolidated Fire Code.
    b. Require the preparation of a comprehensive FPP and the Project is inconsistent with its recommendations including fuel modification.

*Guideline Source*

This guideline is based on County Guidelines for Determining Significance – Wildland Fire and Fire Protection (December 19, 2008).

Analysis

*On-site Resources*

A comprehensive FPP was prepared for the Project (Appendix K). The report found that the Project complies with all applicable fire regulations, including the County Consolidated Fire

Code and the fire requirements of the NCFPD. The comprehensive FPP and the Project are consistent with the County recommendations, including fuel modification.

In the FPP, several scenarios were developed to determine the potential fire behavior of a wildland fire that might occur in the vicinity of the Project. Fire Behavior Calculations were used to determine clearance requirements, allowable distances of vegetation and maintenance requirements. Design measures that would minimize the risk from wildland fires are discussed below. In addition, the reader is referred to Section 3.1.8, Public Services, of this subchapter for a discussion of wildfire impacts as they relate to fire protection services (e.g., station locations, capacities, response times, etc.).

Fuel Modification Zones. In most cases, there are two fuel modification zones required, each one 50 feet in width, for a total of 100 feet of fuel treatment around each building. A minimum of 100 feet of fuel treatment generally would be placed around all structures that abut flammable native vegetation located north and east of the Project. The first 50 feet from a structure would be landscaped and irrigated, with an additional 50 feet of fuel treatment (non-irrigated thinning zone). Adjacent to the I-15 corridor, 50 feet of Zone 1 fuel treatment and 25 feet of Zone 2 would provide fire protection and reduce the fire threat to less than significant levels. In addition, a six-foot fire wall would be constructed generally along the southwestern and southern boundary of the northern portion of the site (north of SR-76), and, for **Scenario 1**, along the northern boundary of PA 5 (south of SR-76). Under **Scenario 2**, the fire wall at the northern extent of PA 5 would not be built—the lot would extend further to the north and proximity to a four-lane paved road would support fire suppression. These fuel modification zones would be established prior to bringing potentially combustible building materials on site.

Below are the definitions and required treatments for fuel modification zones. In addition, the edge of each driveway and along roadways would be fuel treated to significantly reduce ignition starts. It would simultaneously provide relatively safe ingress and egress should a wildfire occur for both residents and emergency responders. Each of these zones is discussed below and described in greater detail in Appendix K.

- Zone 1. This zone comprises the first 50 feet around a structure (front, back and side yards) and is commonly called the defensible space zone. It is an irrigated zone, free of combustible construction and materials.

- Zone 2. Fuel Modification Zone 2 is the area beginning at the outer edge of Zone 1, 50 feet from each structure. It is a non-irrigated thinning zone, typically 50 feet in width and including all natural and manufactured slopes. Thinning zones are utilized to reduce the fuel load of a wildland area adjacent to urban developments, thereby reducing the radiant and convective heat of wildland fires. The intent is to achieve and maintain an overall 50 percent reduction of the canopy cover spacing and a 50 percent reduction of the original fuel loading by reducing the fuel in each remaining shrub or tree without substantially decreasing the canopy cover or the removal of tree holding root systems. In addition, all dead and dying plant material is removed. Combustible construction (i.e., gazebos, trellises, shade covers etc.) is not allowed in Zone 2.

- Roadways. Clearance of brush or vegetative growth along new and existing on- and off-site roadways would comply with the Consolidated Fire Code. The requirements were amended and became effective on October 28, 2011, and permit the fire authority with jurisdiction to require a property owner to engage in fuel modification in the area 20 feet from each side of the driveway, public street or private road adjacent to the property.

Proposed Plant Species. Only plant species listed in the County PDS Approved Plant List would be used. Other recommended plant species meeting the criteria for fire-resistive plant characteristic may be planted within any fuel treatment zone only after these plants have been certified by the Applicant's landscape architect and fire consultant in conjunction with the NCFPD fire marshal.

Building Setbacks. Per the Fire Code Amendments of January 28, 2008, all buildings and structures would be set back a minimum of 30 feet from the property line unless the County Zoning Ordinance requires a greater minimum. When the property line abuts a roadway, the setback would be measured from the centerline of the roadway. All buildings located along the western Project boundary would be set back from the boundary a minimum of 75 feet to allow space for fuel treatment as discussed above. All buildings would be located outside of fuel treatment zones.

Building Heights. Buildings would be no more than 35 feet in height above grade, unless otherwise approved by NCFPD. Architectural projections may extend above the cited height restriction, subject to NCFPD review and approval. Unless NCFPD acquires upgraded facilities/equipment or otherwise determines greater heights may be safely allowed, residential structures with pitched roofs would be limited to a top of fascia height of 24 feet and a topmost ridgeline of 35 feet, and non-residential buildings with flat roofs over 24 feet would require an exterior ladder at that point in order to reach the roof.

Building Materials. All newly constructed structures would be built to "Enhanced" building requirements, as specified in the FPP. The installation of automatic interior sprinkler systems (National Fire Protection Association – NFPA Standard 13R - Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems in Residential Occupancies up to and Including Four Stories in Height) would be required. Tempered glass would be used in at least one panel of all windows and openings in the outer walls.

Continued Maintenance. Each lot owner would be individually responsible for fuel treatment on property lots, including all measures included in the FPP. Property owners would be members of a legally constituted HOA which would support the maintenance of common areas (including roadsides) in perpetuity. Please refer to Appendix K for specific requirements for the ongoing fuel modification maintenance.

Other Design Measures. Additional features of the Proposed Project that would reduce risks from wildland fires include minimum street widths and turning radii for streets and cul-de-sacs, all-weather road paving capable of supporting fire apparatus, fire access roadways throughout the development free of speed control devices, clear street signs and marking, a lighted directory map at

each driveway entrance, minimum setbacks if gates are proposed, and a continuous water supply. Furthermore, the Project road improvements provide for rapid ingress and egress by residents, workers, and emergency responders on the two primary roads into the Campus Park West development; Pala Mesa Drive and Pankey Road provide access to either the Old Highway 395 or SR-76, respectively.

*Off-site Resources*

Project-related pipelines would be subsurface following installation and would not be subject to substantial impacts related to wildfire. Potential pump station structures would be treated similarly to on-site elements and also would be easily served by the adjacent fire station. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

*FPP Conclusions*

The FPP concluded that any wind- or topography-driven wildfire burning under a northeastern (Santa Ana) wind pattern from the north, northeast or east would create a moderate-to-high wildland fire hazard. Also, a "rare event" strong southwest wind of 30 mph fire day would create a low-to-moderate wildland wildfire hazard depending on the particular vegetation type burning. The fuel modification treatments, "firewise" landscaping, and the use of "enhanced" fire resistive building construction standards proposed for the Project were identified as measures that would reduce the wildfire threat to less than significant levels. As a result, the potential for loss of any building due to direct fire impingement, wind driven embers, or radiant heat was concluded to be extremely low. The FPP also found that the Project's proposed features would assist the NCFPD in their wildland firefighting mission by providing a break in native fuel continuity, constructing additional emergency vehicle access, and obtaining a water supply that would be available during a potential wildland fire. Further, the Project would specify maintenance requirements to provide fire safety.

Based on the above-noted Project design features and considerations, impacts associated with wildland fire hazards would be **less than significant**.

### 3.1.3.3 *Cumulative Impact Analysis*

No impacts were identified for the issues of potential groundwater contamination or asbestos-containing structures. As a result, there is no potential for a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative conditions and these issues are not further addressed. Also as noted, the Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to hazardous materials or wildland fire hazards. The less than significant potential impacts identified for hazardous materials and wildfire do have a potential to combine with other projects' impacts for these issues. These public interest issues, however, are strictly regulated and reviewed. As with the Proposed Project, any future projects in the site vicinity noted in Table 1-4 of this EIR would be required to implement, as appropriate, similar site-specific measures to address potential impacts from hazardous materials or wildfires. Based on these requirements and the less than considerable contribution associated with the Proposed Project, cumulative impacts from hazardous materials or wildfire hazards would be **less than significant**.

### 3.1.3.4 *Significance of Impacts*

Based on the analysis provided above, impacts related to hazardous materials or wildfire hazards would be **less than significant**.

### 3.1.3.5 *Conclusion*

Based on the field reconnaissance, review of government documents and databases, and results of adjacent site testing, it can be concluded that hazards impacts to and from the Project site would be less than significant. Potentially significant hazardous materials impacts associated with proposed and currently undefined commercial/industrial/office professional or wastewater treatment uses (as well as potential hazardous materials in existing structures to be demolished) would be avoided through conformance with all pertinent agency regulations, as cited on Table 3.1.3-2. Conformance would be demonstrated during the permitting processes required to allow handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials, if such uses would be proposed. The recommendations and requirements included in the FPP have been incorporated into Project design to ensure that Project implementation would result in less than significant impacts relating to wildfire hazards. As all impacts associated with hazards were identified as **less than significant,** no mitigation measures are necessary.

**Table 3.1.3-1**
**HISTORICAL LAND USE**

| Time Period | Land Usage | Source |
|---|---|---|
| Prior to 1939 | Unknown; site and surrounding land appear to be undeveloped | Aerial Photographs and Topographic Maps |
| Approximately 1939 to prior to 1949 | At least one structure and up to five structures, possible dry farming, horse racing track and corrals | Aerial Photographs and Topographic Maps |
| Prior to 1949 to prior to 1963 | At least three structures, dry farming, track removed | Aerial Photographs and Topographic Maps |
| Prior to 1963 to prior to 2002 | At least three structures, citrus grove farming | Aerial Photographs and Topographic Maps |
| Prior to 2002 to present | One structure, remote control airplane airfield | Aerial Photographs and Topographic Maps, and Site reconnaissance |

Source: Leighton 2009

**Table 3.1.3-2**
**SUMMARY OF REGULATIONS POTENTIALLY APPLICABLE TO CAMPUS PARK WEST COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL/OFFICE PROFESSIONAL AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT USES**

| Regulation | Administering Agency | Requirements/ Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| **Federal Jurisdiction** | | |
| CERCLA ("Superfund") 42 USC 9601 et seq. As amended by SARA, Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (SARA Title III) 42 USC §11001 et seq.; 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 350, 355, and 370 | USEPA Region IX, National Response Center, and San Diego County Environmental Health Division | CERCLA – release notification requirements; SARA Title III – requirements for emergency planning and community right-to-know for storage, handling, or production of significant quantities of hazardous or acutely toxic substances |
| Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA); 42 USC §6901 et seq.; 40 CFR Parts 260-272 | USEPA Region IX, California DTSC | Sets forth standards for the generation and management of solid waste; requires application to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) for an USEPA identification number in the event occupants are hazardous waste generators |
| 29 USC §651, 29 CFR § 1910 et seq., and §1926 et seq. | California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) | Meet requirements for equipment used to store and handle hazardous materials to protect workers |

**Table 3.1.3-2 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF REGULATIONS POTENTIALLY APPLICABLE TO CAMPUS PARK WEST COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL/OFFICE PROFESSIONAL AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT USES**

| Regulation | Administering Agency | Requirements/ Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| **Federal Jurisdiction (cont.)** | | |
| 40 CFR, Parts 172, 173, and 179 | U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), California Highway Patrol, Department of Motor Vehicles, and Caltrans | Meet standards for labels, placards, and markings on hazardous materials and hazardous waste shipments |
| Federal Atomic Energy Act 40 USC 2021 | Nuclear Regulatory Commission and California Department of Health Services | Meet requirements for handling of radioactive materials and radioactive materials licensing |
| 40 CFR, Part 68 | Federal Risk Management Plan | Requires a Risk Management Plan for facilities handling acutely hazardous materials in amounts over the threshold planning quantity for that material |
| **State/Regional/Local Jurisdiction** | | |
| 8 CCR §339, §3200 et seq., 5139 et seq., and 5160 et seq. | Cal-OSHA | Addresses control of hazardous substances in the workplace |
| California Water Code §§13260-13269; 23 CCR §2S10 Article 9 et seq. | RWQCB | Addresses waste discharge requirements and will apply to any storage or disposal or solid and liquid wastes to the extent that such action may affect the quality of the waters of the state |
| Hazardous Waste Control Act of 1972 as amended; California Health & Safety Code §25100 et seq.; 22 CCR § 25100 et seq. | USEPA Region IX, DTSC, and San Diego County Hazardous Materials Division (HMD) | Addresses the generation, storage, and preparation for shipment of hazardous wastes, if generated by tenants |
| California Health and Safety Code §§ 25500-25543.3, CCR §2720-2734 | San Diego County HMD | Requires preparation of Hazardous Materials Business Plan |
| California Code of Regulations, Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 4.5 | San Diego County HMD | Requires preparation of a California Accidental Release Prevention Program (including a Risk Management and Prevention Program) for hazardous chemicals stored or used on site in excess of the state threshold quantities |

**Table 3.1.3-2 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF REGULATIONS POTENTIALLY APPLICABLE TO CAMPUS PARK WEST COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL/OFFICE PROFESSIONAL AND WASTEWATER TREATMENT USES**

| Regulation | Administering Agency | Requirements/ Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| **State/Regional/Local Jurisdiction (cont.)** | | |
| Uniform Fire Code and California Fire Code, Article 80, 79, 4 | San Diego County Fire Department | Meet requirements for the storage and handling of hazardous materials (Article 80) and flammable and combustible liquids (Article 79) |
| California Building Code | California Building Standards Commission | Meet requirements for building construction for facilities handling hazardous materials and/or biohazards |
| California Health and Safety Code §25800 et seq. | California Department of Health Services | California Radiation Control Law requires compliance with requirements for handling radioactive materials and limits exposures to emissions from radioactive materials use |
| California Environmental Quality Act Statutes PRC §21154.4 | Office of Planning and Research (OPR) | Requires notification of schools within 0.25 mile of all facilities containing hazardous materials or waste |

# FUEL TREATMENT LOCATION
For
# CAMPUS PARK WEST - SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

**LOT FRONT, SIDE AND BACK YARDS.** Each individual land owrer will be responsible for establishing and maintaining their lotparcel to the North County Fire Protection District's Irrigated Zone 1 criteria. When the area is located within an multi-family residential common area, the H.O.A. shall perform the required maintenance. Alternatively, the area shall be kept clear of all combustible vegetation unless erosion is a concern.

**FUEL MODIFICATION ZONE 1/LIMITED BUILDING ZONE (H.O.A. MAINTAINED).** Common areas where the H.O.A. is responsible for maintenance of the landscape to Irrigated Zone 1 criteria and the area is designated as a Limited Building Zone (LBZ). Zone 1 shall extend 50 feet from a building. All native plants shall be removed and replaced with plants from the custom San Diego County approved plant list found in the Campus Park West Fire Protection Plan. The area shall be provided with a permanent irrigation system. No combustible structures shall be built within this zone.

**FUEL MODIFICATION ZONE 2/LIMITED BUILDING ZONE (H.O.A. MAINTAINED).** Areas where prohibited wildland vegetation has been cleared and replaced with plants from the approved plant list and maintained to Zone 2 criteria. The zone is 25 feet in width along the western and south boundary and 50 feet in width on the northern and eastern boundary. The H.O.A. shall maintain these areas. Access to these areas will be provided and maintained by the H.O.A.

**ROADWAYS (H.O.A. MAINTAINED).** An area along a road located within the project where the vegetation shall be maintained to Irrigated Zone 1 criteria. All roads shall be maintained within 20 feet of the roadway edge.

**SPECIAL FIRE PROTECTION FEATURE** - Non-combustible solid wall, six feet in height installed at the locations shown. The wall may contain a view wall in the upper half where tempered glass is installed as long as the wall remains solid and non-combustible.

**November 28, 2008, Revised May 20, 2010 and August 21, 2012**


**Prepared For:** Pappas Investments
2020 L Street, 5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Firewise 2000, Inc.
26337 Sky Drive · Escondido, CA · 92026 · Telephone: 760-745-3947


OPTION 2 - CALTRANS DECERTIFICATION AREA ALTERNATIVE

Source: PDC 2012

I:\ArcGIS\P\PIN-01 CampusParkWest\Map\ENV\EIR\Fig3-1-3-1_Fuel_Treatment.indd -JP

## Fuel Modification Location Plan

CAMPUS PARK WEST

Figure 3.1.3-1

HELIX Environmental Planning