

4.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The following section addresses potential hazards and hazardous materials that could affect development of the proposed Forrester Creek Industrial Park Project. This section of the EIR is based on the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Northwest Corner of Weld Boulevard and Cuyamaca Street, El Cajon, California* prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) in April 2008 and the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Addendum* prepared by Rincon in November 2008. The purpose of these reports is to identify recognized environmental conditions on the site related to hazardous materials. The reports are provided in Appendix H of this EIR.

4.7.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Project site conditions were identified during the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) performed by Rincon. The Phase I ESA consisted of an on-site reconnaissance of conditions, observation of nearby properties from public streets, a search of environmental database listings, historical map and photograph reviews, and an interview with the property owner.

4.7.1.1 HISTORICAL USE

Based on a review of aerial photographs, topographic maps, and City directories, the site was vacant land from at least 1901 to 1975. The site was developed with small square-shaped structures and objects similar to those existing today by 1989, likely associated with the Fletcher Hills Golf Range (1756 Weld Boulevard) that appeared in the City directories from at least 1980 to 2006. No former uses other than the golf range facility were apparent for the project site or adjacent properties.

4.7.1.2 CURRENT SITE CONDITIONS AND USES

The following site conditions were observed during the site reconnaissance conducted by Rincon.

Storage Tanks and Containment Sources

During the site reconnaissance, no storage tanks were identified on site. No unidentified substance containers or unidentified containers, drums, or above ground or underground storage tanks (USTs) that might contain hazardous substances were identified. In addition, no evidence of petroleum hydrocarbon contamination was observed.

Polychlorinated Biphenyl Containing Equipment

During the site reconnaissance, one single pole-mounted transformer identified as No. 875127 was observed on site. No stains or leaks were observed in the vicinity of the transformer.

Other Concerns

None of the following site conditions that could indicate hazardous materials were identified on the project site: heating/cooling systems; corrosion; pits, ponds, or lagoons; clarifiers, and sumps; stained soil or stained pavement; stressed vegetation; solid water, debris, or fill material; waste water; wells; or a septic systems or effluent disposal system. No strong, pungent, or noxious odors were present or pools of liquid were observed on site. However, some standing water was observed in a drainage ditch at the southeast corner of the site near a drainage culvert.

4.7.1.3 RECORDS REVIEW

A record search of public lists of sites that generate, store, treat, or dispose of hazardous materials, or sites for which a hazardous materials release or incident has occurred, was carried out for the project site and surrounding area. The data search included federal, state, and local lists. No listings were found on the project site. Several leaking underground storage tank (LUST) and leaking underground fuel tank (LUFT) listings were found within one mile of the project site, but are not considered to be potential hazards, as summarized below. One listing located within 1/8 mile (660 feet) of the project site, and one listing located 1.5 miles from the site, are discussed further in Section 4.7.1.4, Listed Properties Warranting Further Discussion.

El Cajon Flying Service, located between one-quarter to one-half mile southeast of the project site, with a physical address of 1825 North Marshall Avenue, was listed on the LUST and LUFT databases. Reportedly, this facility had an unauthorized release of aviation gasoline and additives to groundwater on March 8, 1989 and Case No. 9UT1439 was opened with San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A groundwater flow direction was reported to be toward the northwest at this site. The site is reportedly listed as a closed case. Based on the reported distance of this site from the project site, El Cajon Flying Service does not appear to pose an environmental concern to the project site.

An additional property, Gillespie Field, located between one-half to one mile east of the project site, was listed on the LUST database. Reportedly, this facility had an unauthorized release of diesel and gasoline to groundwater on February 17, 1989. Contaminated soil was excavated and disposed of at an approved site. Reportedly, the site is listed as case closed. Based on the reported distance of this site from the project site and a regional groundwater flow direction toward the northwest, Gillespie Field does not appear to pose an environmental concern to the project site.

Golden State Aviation, located between one-half to one mile southeast and upgradient of the project site at 1987 N. Marshall Avenue, was listed on the LUFT database. Specifically, this facility reportedly had an unauthorized release of unleaded gasoline to groundwater from USTs on September 3, 1991. Case No. 9UT3732 was opened with San Diego RWQCB. Total petroleum hydrocarbons as gasoline (TPHg) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) were detected in groundwater monitoring wells at this site. Two groundwater monitoring wells (MW), MW-7 and MW-2, located farthest downgradient on this site and closest to the project site, had no detectable concentrations of benzene or methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE). A groundwater flow direction was also reported to be toward the northwest at this site. The site is listed in remediation plan status. Based on the distance of this site from the project site and no detectable concentrations of benzene and MTBE in the two groundwater monitoring wells closest to the project site, Golden State Aviation does not appear to pose an environmental concern to the project site.

The Woodruffs Trenching property, 9735 Prospect Avenue, is located within 1/8-mile downgradient of the project site and is listed on the Hazardous Waste Information System (HAZNET), Hazardous Substance Storage Container (HIST UST), RCRAInfo – small quantity generators (RCRA-SQG), San Diego County Site Assessment and Mitigation Program (SAM), Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System (SWEEPS) UST, and UST databases. USTs, hazardous materials, and generators are listed on this site; however, the listings for these facilities do not indicate that a release has occurred. Therefore, this listing does not appear to pose a significant impact to the proposed project site.

7-Eleven Food Store No. 20611, located less than 1/8 mile northeast of the project site, was listed on the LUST database search. Reportedly, this facility had an unauthorized release of unleaded gasoline to groundwater on October 22, 1998 and Case No. 9UT3841 was opened with San Diego RWQCB and County Case No. H20830-002 was opened with the San Diego Local Oversight Program (LOP). The

groundwater flow direction was reported to be toward the northwest at this site. The site is listed in remediation status. Based on the reported distance of this site from the project site, and a groundwater flow direction away from the project site to the northwest, the 7-Eleven does not appear to pose an environmental concern to the project site.

The property at 1940-1980 Gillespie Way is located within 1/8-mile upgradient of the project site and is listed on the HAZNET, HIST UST, RCRA-SQG, SAN DIEGO COUNTY SAM, SWEEPS UST, and UST databases. USTs, hazardous materials, and generators are indicated on this site; however, the listings for this facility do not indicate that a release has occurred. Therefore, this listing does not appear to pose a significant impact to the proposed project site.

4.7.1.4 LISTED PROPERTIES WARRANTING FURTHER DISCUSSION

The following two properties are discussed in greater detail because of their potential to impact the proposed project site.

County of San Diego Fleet Service (1840 Weld Avenue)

The southwestern adjacent property, County of San Diego Fleet Service (also referred to as the County Maintenance Yard), located at 1840 Weld Avenue, was listed in the LUFT and LUST databases. Reportedly, this facility had an unauthorized release of unleaded gasoline to groundwater on August 26, 1998 and Case No. 9UT3732 was opened with San Diego RWQCB. A 1998 report for this site indicated that on August 26, 1998, two 6,000-gallon gasoline USTs, one 300-gallon waste oil UST, a waste oil sump within a maintenance pit and associated piping were removed from this site.

Confirmation soil samples collected below the former gasoline dispensers had detectable concentrations of TPHg and total petroleum hydrocarbons as diesel (TPHd). TPHg was also detected in two piping samples. Total Recoverable Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TRPH) was also detected below the sump. Impacted soil was removed off site and a 12,000-gallon gasoline UST was installed in the former UST excavation and backfilled with non-impacted soil.

To evaluate the vertical and horizontal extent of petroleum hydrocarbons in the former fuel dispenser area and beneath the former waste oil sump, Burns & McDonnell (1999) prepared a work plan for this site. The work plan was approved by the County of San Diego in May, 2000. In October and November of 2000, three soil borings and three groundwater monitoring wells were installed at this site. According to the report, groundwater samples collected from the groundwater monitoring wells had detectable concentrations of Benzene, MTBE, and VOCs. However, concentrations were reported to continually decrease over time in all wells.

In September of 2003, the County issued a letter indicating that the screened interval for the three groundwater monitoring wells was screened below the water table and needed to be reinstalled. On May 17 and 18, 2004, three new groundwater monitoring wells were installed. TPHg, TPHd, benzene, MTBE, and VOCs were detected in groundwater samples at concentrations above those detected during the previous monitoring event. Groundwater flow during the May 7, 2004 monitoring event was interpreted to flow towards the east, which varies from the northerly direction from the March 10, 2003 monitoring event.

A January 2006 document from the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH), addressed to the County of Public Works located at 1840 Weld Boulevard, indicated that installation of a downgradient groundwater monitoring well was required by the DEH and groundwater monitoring/sampling must be conducted in existing wells. Additionally, the site location maps in

subsequent maps must also illustrate the area topography. A groundwater flow direction to the east and north was monitored for the site in 2004 and 2005, respectively. At this time, the downgradient extent of the gasoline in groundwater towards the proposed project site was not defined.

A 2007 workplan prepared for the County of San Diego Fleet Service site by Ninyo & Moore proposed the installation of two additional groundwater monitoring wells to conduct groundwater monitoring in the two new wells and three existing wells on site. The two new groundwater monitoring wells were proposed to be installed upgradient and downgradient of the UST release area. The collection and analysis of soil and groundwater samples was proposed for TPH, VOCs and oxygenates, and lead. The County of San Diego DEH approved the workplan submitted by Ninyo & Moore on October 16, 2007.

Groundwater monitoring was conducted at this site in 2008. On April 2, 2008, three groundwater monitoring wells were installed approximately 195 to 250 feet west of the proposed project site boundary. The wells were sampled by Ninyo & Moore on April 22, 2008, and analyzed for TPHg, TPHd, benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, total xylenes, (BTEX), MTBE, VOCs, and lead. Groundwater samples from the monitoring well located closest to the project site boundary (195 feet) did not have detectable concentrations of TPHg, BTEX, MTBE, tertbutyl alcohol (TBA), or other VOCs. Low levels of benzene, toluene, and xylenes were reported in the remaining two groundwater monitoring wells. The reported benzene concentrations in these two groundwater monitoring wells were slightly higher than the benzene Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of 1.0 µg/L. All other constituents were either below the laboratory detection limit or below established MCLs.

Based on the results of the most recent groundwater sampling, Ninyo & Moore concluded that the lateral extent of hydrocarbon-impacted groundwater to the north has been delineated but the hydrocarbon-impacted groundwater to the east, west, and south has not been delineated. This indicates that there is the potential for the contaminated groundwater plume to extend further to the east and, therefore, the property located at 1840 Weld Boulevard poses a potentially significant hazard to the proposed project site.

Former Ketema Aerospace and Electronics (A&E) (790 Greenfield Drive)

The former Ketema A&E site is located over 1.5 miles southeast of the project site. A 2004 report prepared by Geomatrix Consultants indicates that the former Ketema A&E site had been operating as an aerospace and electronics manufacturing facility since the late 1940s until it was sold to Senior Flexonics in 1998/1999. Historical site activity included the use of chlorinated solvents that resulted in VOC-impacted soil and groundwater. The highest reported concentration of VOCs was near the location of a former sump on site which received rinse water containing solvents. The sump and approximately 190 cubic yards of impacted soil were removed from the site in late 1987. Since that time, trichloroethylene (TCE) primarily, and other VOCs have been found in groundwater downgradient of the facility.

Groundwater investigations at the facility began in 1988. Results for the 2003 monitoring event indicate that low concentrations of TCE were detected in all perimeter wells located along Joe Crosson Drive and on Gillespie Field property. According to the report, the TCE plume was interpreted to extend downgradient onto the southeast portion of Gillespie Field Airport in the vicinity of MW-23, which is located approximately one mile southwest of the project site. Additionally, the report indicated that TCE concentrations reported for 2003 samples on site and downgradient generally have decreased or are in historic ranges since the previous sampling event. A 2008 report prepared by Ametek, Inc and Schutte & Koerting, Inc indicates that 28 groundwater monitoring wells were statistically analyzed to determine if VOCs in them were increasing, decreasing, or stable. Statistical data indicates that there are increasing, decreasing, and stable concentration of VOCs in various groundwater monitoring wells for the December 2007 groundwater sampling event.

It appears that the farthest groundwater monitoring well downgradient and closest to the project site (located between 0.5 to 1 mile southwest of the site) has a TCE concentration of 8.8 micrograms per liter (ug/L). Based on a regional groundwater flow direction to the northwest and toward the project site, the Ketema plume could impact the proposed project site.

4.7.1.5 EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND EVACUATION PLANS

The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan for San Diego County (Unified Disaster Council 2004) was developed with the participation of all jurisdictions in the County of San Diego including every incorporated city, including El Cajon, and the unincorporated County. The plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego.

The City of El Cajon has an Emergency Operations Plan that was adopted in January 2004. In addition, the City has an Evacuation Plan, signed in April 2008, that was prepared based on the San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, Annex Q, Evacuation (April 2007). Annex Q is intended to be used as a template for the development of other jurisdictional evacuation plans and to support or supplement the evacuation plans prepared and maintained by each local jurisdiction.

The City of El Cajon Fire and Police Department are the City's emergency response agencies. The City offers the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) program, a disaster preparedness class encouraged in the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. The program educates people about disaster preparedness and the hazards that may impact the area they live. These lessons train participants in basic disaster response skills, such as fire safety, light search and rescue, team organization, and disaster medical operations. CERT participants are prepared to better assist others in their neighborhood or workplace following a disaster or other unexpected event when professional responders are not immediately available.

4.7.1.6 GILLESPIE FIELD AIRPORT

The proposed project is located within the Airport Influence Area of Gillespie Field Airport. The airport includes 775 acres, three runways with lengths up to 5,431 feet, a tower, a terminal, and many airport-related businesses. Two of the three runways are lighted. In 2002 there were 183,145 flight operations at the airport and 821 aircraft based at Gillespie Field. The vast majority of flight operations are single engine aircraft. Aircraft flight operations at the airport are expected to increase to approximately 280,000 by 2010 (SANDAG 2004). A small portion of the project site is located in the western Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) of the airport. In addition, the proposed project site is subject to overflight from aircraft taking off on the runway directly east of the project site.

According to the National Transportation Safety Board (2008), there have been 72 accidents at Gillespie Field since 1964. In the last five years there have been 15 accidents, three of which were fatal. Two of the accidents in the last five years occurred outside the airport boundaries. One accident involved an airplane that crashed into mountainous terrain in the City of El Cajon; the other involved two planes which collided in mid-air over Harry Griffen Park in La Mesa. No aircraft accidents have occurred on the project site or surrounding residential and industrial developments. Most incidents are non-fatal and generally occur at the airport. The airport has an average of less than two accidents each year.

4.7.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

4.7.2.1 FEDERAL

A number of federal laws and regulations govern the generation, handling, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials. Federal agencies that regulate hazardous materials include the EPA and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Fed/OSHA). Federal hazardous waste laws are generally promulgated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA), as amended by the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984. These laws provide for the “cradle to grave” regulation of hazardous wastes. Any business, institution, or other entity that generates hazardous waste is required to identify and track its hazardous waste from the point of generation until it is recycled, reused, or disposed.

In addition, FAR Part 77, *Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace*, (14 C.F.R Section 77.1, *et seq.*), established imaginary surfaces for airports and runways as a means to identify objects that are obstructions to air navigation. Airport vicinity height limitations are required to protect public safety, health, and welfare by ensuring that aircraft can safely fly in the airspace around an airport.

4.7.2.2 STATE

At the state level, agencies such as California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC), California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA), and the Office of Emergency Services govern the use of hazardous materials. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has the primary responsibility for implementing RCRA; however, individual states are encouraged to seek authorization to implement some or all of RCRA provisions. California received authority to implement the RCRA program in August 1992. The DTSC is responsible for implementing the RCRA program as well as California’s own hazardous waste laws, which are collectively known as the Hazardous Waste Control Law. Under the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) program, DTSC has in turn delegated enforcement authority to the County of San Diego.

Additionally, Section 25503.5 of Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code, the Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Act, requires facilities that use, produce, store, generate, or have a change in business inventory of hazardous substances in quantities above certain limits to establish and implement a Hazardous Materials Management Plan (HMMP) or Business Plan. The plan must disclose the type, quantity, and storage location of materials. The law also requires a site-specific emergency response plan, employee training, and designation of emergency contact personnel.

4.7.2.3 LOCAL

In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health (DEH) is the regional agency generally entrusted with the monitoring and enforcement of various laws and regulations governing the handling, use, transportation, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials. County DEH regulates establishments which use hazardous materials, dispose of hazardous wastes, have USTs, and/or generate medical waste. Any business in the county that generates hazardous waste, handles hazardous waste, or uses USTs must apply for a Unified Program Facility Permit and may be subject to various hazardous materials requirements.

4.7.3 IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

Based on the significance criteria applicable to the proposed project in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the Forrester Creek Industrial Park project would have a significant environmental impact if it would:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials;
- 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;
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;
- Result in a safety hazard for people working in the area due to proximity to an airport or private airstrip;
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

4.7.4 ISSUES 1, 2, AND 3 – HAZARDS TO PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT

Would implementation of the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Would implementation of the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials?

Would the proposed project 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?

4.7.4.1 IMPACT ANALYSIS

Transport, Use, Disposal, or Release of Hazardous Materials

The proposed project is an industrial park development that may involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials as part of everyday operations. Examples may include the use of chemicals for industrial operations, fuels associated with delivery trucks, and typical household cleaners for general cleaning and maintenance activities. However, building tenants would be required to comply with all federal, state, and local regulations relating to hazardous materials, including the preparation of a hazardous materials business plan, as required by the Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Act. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the transport, use, disposal, or release of hazardous materials.

Release of Hazardous Materials

The proposed project is an industrial park development that may involve the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials as part of everyday operations that could result in an accidental release of hazardous materials. However, building tenants would be required to comply with all federal, state, and local regulations relating to hazardous materials that would avoid reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through a reasonably foreseeable release of hazardous materials.

On-Site Environmental Conditions

No environmental concerns were observed on the project site during the on-site reconnaissance. No evidence of USTs or ASTs, wells, pits, ponds, or sumps was identified on the project site that may pose a hazardous risk to the proposed project. However, two properties were identified in the vicinity of the project site that may result in a significant hazard to the project site, as described above.

Historical use of the former Ketema A&E site (790 Greenfield Drive), located over 1.5 miles southeast of the project site, included the use of chlorinated solvents that resulted in VOC-impacted soil and groundwater. Most recent groundwater monitoring indicates that the farthest groundwater monitoring well downgradient and closest to the project site (between 0.5 to 1 mile southwest of the project site) has a TCE concentration of 8.8 micrograms per liter (ug/L). This monitoring well contains a TCS concentration that is much lower than monitoring wells located upgradient and in the vicinity of where the Ketema plume originates. Monitoring wells located where the Ketema plume originates contain reported TCE concentration ranging from 96 to 37,000 ug/L, which exceed the maximum contaminant level (MCL) of 5 ug/L for TCE. Therefore, based on the distance of the plume from the project site and reported low TCE concentration in the monitoring well nearest the project site, the site located at 790 Greenfield Drive is not considered to be a significant hazard to the project site.

The western adjacent property, County of San Diego Fleet Service, located at 1840 Weld Boulevard was listed in the LUFT and LUST database. This property was the subject of the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Addendum* prepared by Rincon Consultants in November 2008. Reportedly, this facility had an unauthorized release of unleaded gasoline to groundwater on August 26, 1998 which resulted in soil and groundwater contamination. TPHg, TPHd, benzene, MTBE, and VOCs were detected in groundwater. Groundwater monitoring was conducted at this site in 2004, 2005, and 2008. The most recent groundwater monitoring conducted in April 2008 involved the installation of three new wells approximately 195 to 250 feet west of the proposed project site boundary. According to Rincon's report, the wells were sampled and analyzed for TPHg, TPHd, benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, total xylenes, (BTEX), MTBE, VOCs, and lead by Ninyo & Moore Geotechnical and Environmental Sciences Consultants. Groundwater samples from the monitoring well located closest to the project site boundary (195 feet) did not have detectable concentrations of TPHg, BTEX, MTBE, tertbutyl alcohol (TBA), or other VOCs. Low levels of benzene, toluene, and xylenes were reported in the remaining two groundwater monitoring wells, and the benzene concentration in these two wells was slightly higher than the benzene Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) of 1.0 µg/L. All other constituents were either below the laboratory detection limit or below established MCLs.

Based on the results of the most recent groundwater sampling, Ninyo & Moore concluded that the lateral extent of hydrocarbon-impacted groundwater to the north has been delineated but the hydrocarbon-impacted groundwater to the east, west, and south has not been delineated.

While the extent of the soil and groundwater plumes at 1840 Weld Boulevard has not been fully delineated, it is the professional opinion of Rincon Consultants (2008) that it is unlikely that the release at

1840 Weld Boulevard has impacted the proposed project site. Based on the non-detect concentrations in the groundwater monitoring well closest to the proposed project site, the distance from the source area to the property line (approximately 300 feet), and the diminishing concentrations of benzene, toluene, and xylenes found in the two other groundwater monitoring wells located 40 to 50 feet from the source and 250 feet from the proposed project property line, it is unlikely that impacted soil or groundwater is present beneath the project site at concentrations that would require remediation. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

4.7.4.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT

Based on the analysis provided above, the proposed project would not result in any of the following: 1) create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use, transport or disposal of hazardous materials; 2) create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials; or 3) 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.7.4.3 MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING

Because the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to hazards to the public or environment, no mitigation measures are provided.

4.7.5 ISSUE 4 – EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND EVACUATION

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

4.7.5.1 IMPACT ANALYSIS

The proposed project site does not contain any through streets that would be part of an emergency response or evacuation route. Site access would require the construction of the northern leg of the Gillespie Way/Weld Boulevard intersection. This road has not yet been constructed; therefore, it is not included on any emergency response or evacuation route.

The proposed project would construct 463,000 SF of industrial building space on the project site. The project site would be accessed from the Gillespie Way extension off Weld Boulevard. The project site would not contain a through street or access routes that would be part of an emergency route. Therefore, the project would have no effect on the implementation of an adopted emergency response or evacuation plans.

4.7.5.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT

The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impact would occur.

4.7.5.3 MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING

Because the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to emergency access and evacuation, no mitigation measures are provided.

4.7.6 ISSUE 5 –AIRPORT HAZARDS

Would the proposed project result in a safety hazard for people working in the area due to proximity to an airport or private airstrip?

4.7.6.1 IMPACT ANALYSIS

The proposed project is located adjacent to the Gillespie Field Airport and is located in the Airport Influence Area. The airport includes 775 acres, three runways, a tower, a terminal, and many airport-related businesses. In 2002 there were 183,145 flight operations at the airport and 821 aircraft based at Gillespie Field. Aircraft flight operations at the airport are expected to increase to approximately 280,000 by 2010 (SANDAG 2004).

The Airport Influence Area is generally the area in which current and future airport-related noise, overflight, safety and/or airspace protection may restrict land use. Airport related noise is addressed in Section 4.10, Noise. A portion of the proposed project site is located in the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ), which includes land use restrictions for safety issues. A RPZ is an area of risk resulting from aircraft takeoff and landing. The only land uses considered to be compatible with the restrictions required of the RPZs are: vacant land, natural park and recreational areas or habitat and special preservations areas; public rights-of-way; agriculture, except livestock, and sand and gravel extraction; storage facilities, not including flammables, explosives and corrosives, and low intensity land uses characterized by a low number of employees and customers per square foot of building area. The RPZ that extends onto the project site is located in an area on the east side of the project site that includes open space and a large underground detention basin. No proposed project buildings would be located within the RPZ. In addition, light industrial is considered to be a low intensity land use because it is characterized by a low number of employees per square foot, as compared to higher intensity land uses with high numbers of employees per square foot such as office buildings or hotels. Industrial uses typically do not generate customer business because buildings are typically used for manufacturing and storage and do not include customer-serving uses such as retail stores. Additionally, areas immediately adjacent to the airport are zoned with height limits of 35-50 feet. All proposed project buildings would have a maximum building height of 35 feet. The proposed project would be compatible with land use restrictions for an RPZ and would not exceed the allowable height limit of the site. The FAA agrees with this determination and issued a Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation in September 2008 for all four proposed buildings (FAA Aeronautical Study Nos. 2008-AWP-524-NRA, 2008-AWP-525-NRA, 2008-AWP-526-NRA, and 2008-AWP-527-NRA). Therefore, operation of the proposed project would not result in a significant safety hazard. However, as indicated in a letter from Caltrans Division of Aeronautics dated October 30, 2008 (provided in Appendix J), during project construction, the use of cranes or other construction equipment that may extend higher than 35 feet above the ground would pose a potential hazard to aircraft operations. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

As described above, according to the National Transportation Safety Board (2008), there have been 72 accidents at Gillespie Field since 1964. No aircraft accidents have occurred on the project site or surrounding residential and industrial developments. Most incidents are non-fatal and generally occur at the airport. The airport has an average of less than two accidents each year. Therefore, Gillespie Field does not present a significant risk to the operation of the proposed project.

4.7.6.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT

Operation of the proposed project would not result in a significant safety hazard for people working in the area due to proximity to the Gillespie Field Airport. However, construction of the proposed project would

have the potential to result in a hazard to aircraft operations. This is considered to be a potentially significant impact.

4.7.6.3 MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING

Potentially significant airport-related hazards would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the following mitigation measure.

Haz-1 At least two weeks prior to the start of construction-related activities on the project site, and on a bi-weekly basis throughout the construction period, the construction contractor shall coordinate with the Gillespie Field Airport Manager to ensure that appropriate actions are taken so that construction activities at the project site do not pose a hazard to air navigation. Such actions may include the issuance of a Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) with sufficient lead time to notify pilots of potentially hazardous flight conditions at or around the proposed project site.

4.7.7 ISSUE 6 – HAZARDS TO SCHOOLS

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

4.7.7.1 IMPACT ANALYSIS

The proposed project is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. The closest school is Prospect Avenue School, which is located at 9303 Prospect Avenue in Santee, approximately 0.35 miles from the project site. Additionally, as described above, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the transport, use, disposal, or release of hazardous materials.

4.7.7.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT

The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

4.7.7.3 MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING

Because the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to nearby schools, no mitigation measures are provided.

4.7.8 ISSUE 7 – WILDLAND FIRES

Would the proposed project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

4.7.8.1 IMPACT ANALYSIS

Both the City of El Cajon and the City of Santee contain areas that have a high wildfire risk; however, the proposed project site is not located adjacent to any open space areas that would be susceptible to wildland fires. The proposed project is located in a developed area of the City of El Cajon on the boundary of a developed area in the City of Santee. In accordance with PRC 4201-4204 and Government Code 51175-89, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) released draft Fire Hazard Severity Zone maps indicating areas of significant fire hazard based on potential fuels, expected fire behavior,

expected burn possibilities and development patterns over a 30-50 year time horizon. Draft maps for the City of El Cajon and the City of Santee were released by CDF in September 2007 (CDF 2007). According to these maps, the proposed project site is not located within a very high, high, or moderate fire hazard severity zone. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving wildland fires.

4.7.8.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT

The proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

4.7.8.3 MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING

Because the proposed project would not result in significant impacts related to wildland fires, no mitigation measures are provided.