



5.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section of the EIR evaluates impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, including potential human health effects on people living and working at, or in the vicinity of, the project site. The analysis presented in this section is based on information contained in the Phase I Environmental Assessment Shoreline Gateway Project (Phase I) (August 2005), prepared by SCS Engineers; refer to [Appendix 15.7, Phase I Environmental Assessment](#). The Phase I addresses potential impacts related to the physical condition of the project site and adjacent areas due to past activities and uses. The analysis includes a review of historic and existing on-site land uses and their associated activities.

5.6.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following describes the physical setting of the project site, based, in part, on information contained in the Phase I report.

Land Uses

The project site is comprised of approximately 2.2 acres and is occupied by a mix of office, retail, restaurant and multi-family residential buildings and parking lots.

Physiographic Setting

According to U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) maps, the project site is located at an elevation of approximately 35 feet above mean sea level (msl), approximately 0.2 miles north of San Pedro Bay. The regional topography shows the area as relatively flat, with a gentle slope to the south toward the ocean.

Geology and Soils

Geologic maps indicate that surface soils in the area are part of the Late Pleistocene Lakewood Formation, continental and/or marine sediments consisting of gravel, sand, sandy silt, silt and clay with shale pebbles. The Lakewood Formation extends up to 100 feet below grade. The Lakewood Formation is underlain by at least several thousand feet of mostly marine sediments of the Late Pleistocene San Pedro Formation. In the area of the project site, surface deposits are primarily fine-grained sediments comprised of sands, silts and clays.

Groundwater

The project site is located in the southeastern portion of the West Coast Groundwater Basin. Groundwater in the vicinity of the project site is approximately 30 to 50 feet below grade. There are no known regional groundwater contamination problems in the area. However, groundwater has been impacted locally by saltwater intrusion and is not used as a drinking water source. Groundwater in the area is anticipated to flow southerly.



Radon

According to California's Department of Health Service's October 2002 report (Radon Database for California), screening in the area of the site found no locations where buildings had radon levels in excess of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) action level. The alluvial geology of the coastal Long Beach area is not normally associated with elevated radon levels. Elevated radon gas is not expected in the area of the project site.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The Phase I (August 2005) was prepared to evaluate the potential presence of hazardous materials and the expected nature of the materials that may be on the subject properties. Based on the observations during the review of historical topographical maps, historical photographs, fire insurance maps, review of governmental agency file information and site reconnaissance, the following environmental conditions were determined to occur.

Historical Site Usage

According to the historical topographic map issued by the USGS (1964, photorevised 1981), the project site is depicted as urban development with no landmark buildings shown.

Historical aerial photographs of the project site identify development activities that have occurred in the past. A 1945 aerial photograph illustrates a number of buildings of unknown uses. Buildings also occupied current parking lot locations. Aerial photographs from 1953, 1958 and 1963 indicate no appreciable change when compared to the previous photographs. Buildings identified on earlier photographs were no longer visible in 1972 aerial photography. A 1989 aerial photograph shows most of the site matching its current configuration, with the exception of the eastern portion of the project site. A 1997 aerial photograph illustrates the project site in its current configuration. A 2004 aerial photograph indicates no change to the project site when compared to the 1997 aerial photograph.

Sanborn fire insurance maps were also reviewed to obtain additional information regarding development activities that have occurred in the past. The 1898 map illustrates the western portion of the site, which was predominantly vacant with the exception of a dwelling located on the lot at 40 Atlantic Avenue (previously 78-79 Atlantic Avenue). The 1902 map illustrates the western portion of the project site with vacant lots and dwellings and the eastern portion of the site with a vacant lot (with the exception of a small shed) bisected by railroad tracks. The 1905 map illustrates the project site as unchanged from the 1902 map with the exception of an additional dwelling within the eastern portion of the site. Uses illustrated in the 1908 map remained unchanged from the 1905 map. The 1914 map illustrates similar uses on the eastern portion of the site to those viewed in the 1908 map. However, several dwellings and apartment buildings occupied the western portion of the site. The apartment at the corner of Lime Avenue and Ocean Boulevard appears to be similar to the apartment building currently at that location. The 1949 map illustrates the eastern portion of the site with a restaurant and auto service facility. Additionally, the



railroad tracks are no longer present. Apartments and stores occupy the western portion of the site. The buildings at 40 Atlantic Avenue and 635 and 645 Ocean Boulevard appear to match the buildings currently at those addresses. The 1950 map illustrates similar uses to those viewed in the 1949 map. The 1969 map illustrates similar uses on the western portion of the site, to those viewed in the 1950 map.

In addition to the historic aerial photographs and maps identified above, building permit information from the Long Beach Department of Building and Safety and City directories for various years between 1926 and 1968 were reviewed. The following provides a summary of the historical uses based on these records:

- 40 Atlantic Avenue (APN 7281-023-011). This portion of the project site was occupied by a dwelling from at least 1898 through 1914. In 1921, an auto storage garage (for the Artaban apartments) was constructed on the lot. The garage remained through at least 1932. From 1940 through 1945, the site appears to have been vacant, although there may have been a store on the lot in early 1940. The office building currently occupying the lot was constructed in 1945 to 1946.
- 19-39 Lime Avenue (APNs 7281-023-010, 016 and 017). In 1898, these parcels were vacant. From at least 1902 through 1908, a dwelling occupied the lot and in 1914 the lot was vacant. By 1926, a market had been constructed on the lot and remained in business through at least 1968. The lot appeared to be vacant by 1972 and is currently a parking lot.
- 615, 619, 635 and 645 East Ocean Boulevard (APNs 7281-023-013, 014 and 015). The lots on Ocean Boulevard between Atlantic and Lime Avenues were vacant or occupied by individual dwellings from at least 1898 through 1908. By 1914, several apartment buildings were present on these parcels. From 1914 through the 1960s, various apartment buildings were located at 615, 619, 621, 635 and 645 Ocean Boulevard. At some point between 1945 and 1949 and 1908 and 1914, the existing apartment buildings located at 635 and 645 Ocean Boulevard, respectively, were constructed. The existing Long Beach Café building was constructed in 1970.
- 725-777 East Ocean Boulevard (APN 7281-022-901). This parcel was essentially undeveloped through 1902. By 1905, one dwelling had been constructed and occupied the site through at least 1914. By 1926, a service station had been constructed on the parcel and remained in operation through at least 1969. By 1948, a restaurant had also been constructed on the parcel (adjoining the west side of the service station). The restaurant was in operation through at least 1969. In 1974, a temporary bank building was erected on the parcel, with a permanent bank building constructed in 1976. The existing video store occupies this former bank building.

Regulatory Records Review

Local regulatory agencies and other sources were contacted in an effort to identify any known or suspected contamination sites or incidents of hazardous waste storage



or disposal which might have resulted in soil or groundwater contamination within a one-mile radius of the project site. The Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD) delegates hazardous materials responsibilities to two departments: The LBFD and the City of Long Beach Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). The LBFD oversees the Hazardous Materials Inspection/Business Plan Program, the Underground Storage Tank Program (tank monitoring, install and removals) and the Aboveground Storage Tank Spill Prevention Program. The Long Beach DHHS oversees the Hazardous Waste Generator Inspection Program, the Underground Storage Tank Program (site mitigation), the California Accidental Risk Prevention (CalARP) Program and the Aboveground Storage Tank Spill Prevention Program. Files may also be maintained by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The DTSC maintains files for sites in which the DTSC regulated hazardous waste and conducted and oversaw cleanup. The U.S. EPA authorizes the DTSC to implement the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Program in California, in which the main focus is to ensure the safe storage, treatment, transportation and disposal of hazardous waste. However, if a property has impacted groundwater, the RWQCB generally becomes the lead agency for contamination characterization and cleanup.

Long Beach Fire Department

Due to the historical site review, which identified a former service station at 725 East Ocean Boulevard (the current video store site at the corner of Ocean Boulevard and Alamitos Avenue), a search was made of the LBFD files. The file index indicates that in January 1972, four underground storage tanks (USTs) (two 6,000 gallon tanks, one 4,000 gallon tank and a 550 gallon waste oil tank) were removed from a Standard Oil facility at the address. However, the LBFD has no further records for this location. The index also indicated that there was no information on the original installation. State and county regulatory agencies, which were contacted as part of the assessment, could not provide additional files for this address.

Regulatory Database Sites

A database search for sites listed on various Federal and State databases within one mile of the project site was obtained from Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR); refer to [Appendix 15.7, *Phase I Environmental Assessment*](#).

The purpose of this research was to determine if sites are located within the project site boundaries or within a 0.25-mile radius that have been reported as contaminated or that generate hazardous materials. A summary description of the databases searched within the corresponding search radii is provided below.

Federal Listings - EPA

- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS). The CERCLIS database contains data on potentially hazardous waste sites that have been reported to the U.S. EPA by states, municipalities, private companies and private persons pursuant to Section 103 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA).



CERCLIS contains sites which are either proposed to or on the National Priorities List (NPL) and sites that are in the screening and assessment phase for possible inclusion on the NPL.

- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS/NFRAP). As of February 1995, CERCLIS sites designated "No Further Remedial Action Planned" (NFRAP) have been removed from CERCLIS. NFRAP sites may be sites where, following an initial investigation, no contamination was found, contamination was removed quickly without the need for the site to be placed on the NPL or the contamination was not serious enough to require Federal superfund action of NPL consideration. EPA has removed approximately 25,000 NFRAP sites to lift the unintended barriers to the redevelopment of these properties and has archived them as historical records so the EPA does not needlessly repeat the investigations in the future. This policy change is part of the EPA's Brownfields Redevelopment Program to help cities, states, private investors and affect citizens to promote economic redevelopment of unproductive urban sites.
- Delisted NPL. This is a database of sites that may be deleted from the National Priorities List when no further response is appropriate. The criterion used by the EPA to delete sites from the NPL is established by the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan.
- Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS). ERNS records and stores information on reported releases of oil and hazardous substances.
- Facility Index System/Facility Identification Initiative Program Summary Report (FINDS). The FINDS database contains both facility information and 'pointers' to other sources that contain more detail. The following FINDS databases are included in the report: PCS (Permit Compliance System), AIRS (Aerometric Information Retrieval System), DOCKET (Enforcement Docket use to manage and track information on civil judicial enforcement cases for all environmental statutes), FURS (Federal Underground Injection Control), C-Docket (Criminal Docket System used to track criminal enforcement actions for all environmental statutes), FFIS (Federal Facilities Information System), STATE (State Environmental Laws and Statutes) and PADS (PCB Activity Data System).
- Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide ACT (FIFRA)/Toxic Substances Control ACT (TSCA) Tracking System (FTTS INSP). This database tracks administrative cases and pesticide enforcement actions and compliance activities related to FIFRA, TSCA and EPCRA (Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act).
- Federal Superfund Liens (NPL Liens). Under the authority granted the USEPS by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980, the USEPA has the authority to file liens against real property in order to recover remedial action expenditures or



when the property owner receives notification of potential liability. USEPA compiles a listing of filed notices of Superfund Liens.

- Hazardous Material Information Reporting System (HMIRS). HMIRS contains hazardous material spill incidents reported to DOT.
- Material Licensing Tracking System (MLTS). The MLTS database is maintained by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and contains a list of approximately 8,100 sites which possess or use radioactive materials and which are subject to NRC licensing requirements.
- Mines Master Index File (MINES). This database is maintained by the Department of Labor, Mine Safety and Health Administration.
- National Priorities List (NPL). The National Priorities List (NPL) is the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) database of uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites identified for priority remedial actions under the Superfund program. A site must meet or surpass a predetermined hazard ranking system score, be chosen as a state's top priority site, or meet three specific criteria set jointly by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the USEPA in order to become an NPL site.
- PCB Activity Database System (PADS). The database identifies generators, transporters, commercial storers and/or brokers and disposers of PCB's who are required to notify the EPA of such activities.
- Proposed National Priorities List (Proposed NPL). This database, maintained by the EPA, lists all proposed national priority list sites. A national priority site is an uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste site identified for priority remedial actions under the Superfund program. A site must meet or surpass a predetermined hazard ranking system score, be chosen as a state's top priority site or meet three specific criteria set jointly by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the USEPA in order to become an NPL site.
- RCRA Administrative Action Tracking System (RAATS). This database contains records based on enforcement actions issued under RCRA pertaining to major violators and includes administrative and civil actions brought by the EPA. For administration actions after September 30, 1995, data entry in the RAATS database was discontinued. The EPA will retain a copy of the database for historical records. It was necessary to terminate RAATS because a decrease in agency resources made it impossible to continue to update the information contained in the database.
- RCRA Corrective Action Report (CORRACTS). The USEPA maintains this database of Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) facilities that are undergoing "corrective action." A "corrective action order" is issued pursuant to RCRA Section 3008(h) when there has been a release of hazardous waste or constituents into the environment from a RCRA facility. Corrective actions may be required beyond the facility's boundary and can be required regardless of when the release occurred, even if it predated RCRA.



- RCRA Registered Small or Large Generators of Hazardous Waste (GNRTR). The RCRA Large and Small Quantity Generators database is a compilation by the USEPA of facilities, which report generation, storage, transportation, treatment or disposal of hazardous waste.
- Records of Decision (ROD). ROD documents mandate a permanent remedy at an NPL (Superfund) site containing technical and health information to aid in the cleanup.
- Superfund (CERCLA) Consent Decrees (CONSENT). These are major legal settlements that establish responsibility and standards for cleanup at NPL (Superfund) sites. They are released periodically by United States District Courts after settlement by parties to litigation matters.
- Toxic Release Inventory System (TRIS). All facilities that manufacture, process or import toxic chemicals in quantities in excess of 25,000 pounds per year are required to register with the USEPA under Section 313 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA Title III) of 1986. Data contained in the Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) system covers approximately 20,000 sites and 75,000 chemical releases.
- Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). This database identifies manufacturers and importers of chemical substances included on the TSCA Chemical Substance Inventory list. It includes data on the production volume of these substances by plant site.

State of California Listings

- Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tank Facilities (AST). This is a database of registered aboveground storage tanks. It is maintained by the State Water Resources Control Board.
- Annual Workplan Sites (AWP). California DTSC's Annual Workplan identifies known hazardous substance sites targeted for cleanup. The source of this database is the California Environmental Protection Agency.
- Cal-Sites. This database contains both confirmed and potential hazardous substance release properties.
- California Hazardous Material Incident Reports System (CHMIRS). CHMIRS contains information on reported hazardous material incidents (accidental releases or spills).
- California Facility Inventory Database (CA FID UST). The Facility Inventory Database (FID) contains a historical listing of active and inactive underground storage tank locations for the State Water Resource Control Board. Refer to local/county sources for current data.
- CA UST. This database contains information gathered from the local regulatory agencies on active UST facilities



- California Waste Discharge System (CA WDS). This database lists sites that have been issued waste discharge requirements.
- “Cortese” California Hazardous Material Incident Report System (CORTESE). The California Environmental Protection Agency/Office of Emergency Information maintains this database. CORTESE sites are identified public drinking water wells with detectable levels of contamination, hazardous substance sites selected for remedial action, sites with known toxic material identified through the abandoned site assessment program, sites with USTs having a reportable release and all solid waste disposal facilities from which there is known migration.
- Cleaners. This is a list of dry cleaning related facilities that have EPA ID numbers. These are facilities with certain SIC codes: power laundries, family and commercial, garment pressing and cleaners’ agents, linen supply, coin-operated laundries and cleaning, dry cleaning plants except rugs, carpet and upholstery cleaning, industrial launderers, laundry and garment services.
- Hazardous Waste Information System (HAZNET). The database contains notification of facility and manifest data. The data is extracted from the copies of hazardous waste manifests received each year by the DTSC. Data are from the manifests submitted without correction and, therefore, many contain some invalid values for data elements such as generator ID, TSD ID, waste category and disposal method.
- Historical Underground Storage Tanks (HIST UST). This is a database of historical listings of underground storage tanks. Refer to local/county source for current data.
- Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST). This database is provided by the California Environmental Protection Agency.
- Proposition 65 Records (Notify 65). This database contains facility notifications about any release that could impact drinking water and thereby expose the public to a potential health risks.
- Solid Waste Information System SWL/LF (SWIS). This database typically contains an inventory of solid waste disposal facilities or landfills. These may be active or inactive facilities or open dumps that failed to meet RCRA Section 4004 criteria for solid waste landfills or disposal sites.
- Toxic Pits. This database identifies sites suspected of containing hazardous substances where cleanup has not yet been completed.
- Underground Storage Tank (UST). This database contains information on active underground storage tanks facilities. The information is gathered from the local regulatory agencies.
- Waste Management Unit Database (WMUDS/SWAT). The WMUDS is used by the State Water Resources Control Board staff and the Regional Water



Quality Control Boards for program tracking and inventory of waste management units. WMUDS is composed of the following databases: Facility Information, Schedules Inspections Information, Waste Management Unit Information, SWAT Program Information, SWAT Report Summary Information, SWAT Report Summary Data, Chapter 15 Information, Chapter 15 Monitoring Parameters, TPCA Program Information, Closure Information and Interested Parties Information.

Public Records

ON-SITE

Public records identified one listed regulatory site within the project site.

- 725 East Ocean Boulevard.

OFF-SITE

Public records identified six regulatory sites within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site.

- 10 Atlantic Avenue;
- 805 East Ocean Boulevard;
- 200 Alamitos Avenue;
- 740 East Broadway;
- 210 Alamitos Avenue; and
- 125 Elm Avenue.

Over 40 unmappable sites were identified according to the zip code. Unmappable sites cannot be plotted due to inaccurate or incomplete addresses. Based upon review of the data, including the estimated locations of the unmappable sites in relation to the project site, it is unlikely that the unmappable sites have adversely affected the project site.

Site Reconnaissance

On August 2, 2005, SCS Engineers conducted a site reconnaissance, to visually observe the area and surrounding properties. The objective of the site reconnaissance was to obtain information indicating the likelihood of identifying a Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) in connection with the property. A REC is defined as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release or a material threat of a release into structures or into the ground, groundwater or surface water on the property.

The eastern portion of the project site is occupied by a video store and associated parking. The western portion of the project site is occupied by a single-story brick office building, a single story restaurant, two multi-story apartment buildings and associated parking lots. With the exception of small areas of landscaping, the project site is entirely paved. Two alleys, Broadway Court and Bronze Way, traverse



the western portion of the site. Runoff from the site drains to the surrounding streets. No obvious RECs were observed in any of the outside areas. Building interiors were not accessible for inspection.

No hazardous substances were observed in any exterior areas. As noted, building interiors were not inspected, however, the types of land uses observed are not typically associated with extensive hazardous material usage. No obvious signs of past hazardous material use (i.e., stained or degraded paving, etc.) or evidence of USTs (i.e., vent pipes, patches in asphalt, fill ports, etc.) were observed on the project site. No monitoring or water supply wells or any evidence of borings were observed on the site. Additionally, no above ground transformers or other electrical equipment were observed.

OTHER POTENTIAL SOURCES OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Asbestos-Containing Building Materials

Asbestos is a strong, incombustible and corrosion-resistant material that was used in many commercial products, beginning before the 1940s and continuing until the early 1970s. Asbestos Containing Building Materials (ACBMs) are building materials containing more than one percent asbestos. Although the manufacture of most ACBMs ended in the late 1970s, existing inventories of products could still be used. Additionally, a few (ACBMs) are still being manufactured (i.e., certain roofing materials, cement-asbestos pipe, etc.). In general, buildings constructed prior to 1985 have the greatest potential for friable and non-friable ACBMs. If inhaled, asbestos fibers can result in serious health problems. The existing buildings within the project site were constructed prior to 1985. Therefore, the potential for ACBMs to be found at the site (i.e., in roofing felt, vinyl flooring, dry wall mud, transit sheet or pipe, etc.) is considered likely.

Lead-Based Paints

Until 1978, when the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) phased out the sale and distribution of residential paint containing lead, many homes were treated with paint containing some amount of lead. It is estimated that over 80 percent of all housing built prior to 1978 contains some lead-based paint (LBP). The mere presence of lead in paint may not make a material to be considered hazardous. In fact, if in good condition (no flaking or peeling), most intact LBP is not considered to be a hazardous material. In poor condition, LBPs can create a potential health hazard for building occupants, especially children. The existing buildings within the project site were constructed prior to 1978. Therefore, the potential for lead-based paints (LBPs) to be found within the project site is considered likely.

ADJACENT PROPERTIES

No obvious RECs were observed on any of the immediately adjoining properties. However, a service station with USTs is located east of the project site, at the northeast corner of Alamitos Avenue and Ocean Boulevard.



5.6.2 SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLD CRITERIA

Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines* contains the Initial Study Environmental Checklist form, which includes questions relating to hazards and hazardous materials. The criteria presented in the Initial Study Environmental Checklist have been utilized as thresholds of significance in this section. Accordingly, a project may create a significant environmental impact if it would:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials;
- 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;
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter miles of an existing or proposed school (refer to Section 10.0, *Effects Found Not To Be Significant*);
- Be located on a site that 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;
- Be 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, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area (refer to Section 10.0, *Effects Found Not To Be Significant*);
- Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and/or result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area (refer to Section 10.0, *Effects Found Not To Be Significant*);
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan (refer to Section 10.0, *Effects Found Not To Be Significant*); or
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized study areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands (refer to Section 10.0, *Effects Found Not To Be Significant*).

Based on these standards, the effects of the proposed project have been categorized as either a “less than significant impact” or a “potentially significant impact.” Mitigation measures are recommended for potentially significant impacts. If a potentially significant impact cannot be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of mitigation, it is categorized as a significant and unavoidable impact.



5.6.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – HISTORIC AND EXISTING USES

- **DEVELOPMENT OF THE SHORELINE GATEWAY PROJECT COULD CREATE A RISK TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT ASSOCIATED WITH EXISTING CONTAMINATION, LISTED HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SITES OR HAZARDOUS MATERIALS RELEASES.**

Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation: Potentially Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: The following is a summary of the findings of the Phase I Environmental Assessment and the environmental conditions that were determined to occur:

Historical Site Usage

Based upon an evaluation of the documented land uses on the project site (i.e., a former service station located at 725 East Ocean Boulevard), the potential that adverse environmental conditions were created by previous uses is considered high.

Records Search

Public records identified one listed regulatory site within the project site and six regulatory sites within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site.

The property located at 725 East Ocean Boulevard is identified as a UST site. As noted, a service station was formerly located on this site. With the exception of a notation in a LBFD index, there are no records associated with the removal of USTs from the site. Implementation of recommended mitigation measures to verify any releases that may have occurred from these tanks and to identify and comply with appropriate remediation, if applicable, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The following six sites were identified as sites of potential concern within 0.25 miles of the project site:

- 10 Atlantic Avenue – The Artaban apartment building, located adjacent to the western portion of the project site, is identified as a UST site. The apartment building has a tank for an emergency generator. However, there have been no reports of releases from the tank and no impacts to the project site are anticipated from the tank.
- 805 East Ocean Boulevard – The Unocal station, located east of the project site at the northeast corner of Alamitos Avenue and Ocean Boulevard, is identified as a leaking underground storage tanks (LUST) and Cortese site. A release of gasoline from a UST at this property was reported in 1988. The release impacted soils and groundwater. A vapor extraction system was installed to remove the gasoline and the case was closed in 1997. A gasoline release reported in 2000 is currently under investigation. These releases



could have impacted soil vapor or groundwater beneath the eastern portion of the project site, resulting in a potentially significant impact.

- 200 Alamitos Avenue – This site (approximately 0.15 miles northeast of the project site) is identified as a LUST site. Soils were impacted as a result of a release from a UST at this site. The contaminated soil was removed and the case was closed in 1986. Because of the limited impact and the status of the case, no impacts to the project site are anticipated from this release.
- 740 East Broadway – This site (approximately 0.15 miles north/northeast of the project site) is identified as a voluntary cleanup program site. The site was occupied by a manufactured gas plant in 1902. The site has been investigated and contaminated soils have been removed. A “no further action” status was given to the site in 1997. Because of the nature of the contaminants typically found at former manufactured gas plants (i.e., polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons), the distance from the project site and the regulatory status, no impacts to the project site are anticipated from this site.
- 210 Alamitos Avenue – This site (approximately 0.15 miles north/northwest) is identified as a LUST and Cortese site. In 1993, a release of gasoline from a UST was reported at this site. A vapor extraction system was implemented and the site is currently in a monitoring phase. Due to the distance from the project site, no impacts are anticipated from this release.
- 125 Elm Avenue – This site (approximately 0.25 miles northwest of the project site) is identified as a LUST and Cortese site. A release of gasoline from a UST at this site was reported in 1988. Both soils and groundwater were impacted. Contaminated soils were excavated and removed from the site and the case was closed in 1998. Because of the distance from the project site and the status of the case, no impacts to the project site are anticipated from this release.

The service station located at 805 East Ocean Boulevard has experienced several releases from USTs that have impacted soils and groundwater beneath the site. Due to the proximity of this service station to the project site, soil vapor and groundwater beneath the site may have been impacted by these releases. Implementation of recommended mitigation measures including review of files by a qualified hazardous materials consultant to delineate the vertical and lateral extent of contamination relevant to the project site would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Site Reconnaissance

Residential, retail, office, restaurant and parking uses are located within the project site. No hazardous substances were observed in any exterior area. As noted, building interiors were not inspected, however, the types of land uses observed are not typically associated with extensive hazardous material usage. No obvious signs of past hazardous material use (i.e., stained or degraded paving, etc.) or evidence of USTs (i.e., vent pipes, patches in asphalt, fill ports, etc.) were observed on the



project site. No monitoring or water supply wells or any evidence of borings were observed on the site. Additionally, no aboveground transformers or other electrical equipment were observed.

Asbestos-Containing Building Materials (ACBMs)

Given the age of the buildings within the project site, it is likely that they could contain ACBMs. The National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) mandates that building owners conduct an asbestos survey to determine the presence of ACBMs prior to the commencement of any remedial work, including demolition. If ACBMs are found, abatement of asbestos would be required prior to any demolition activities. Compliance with mitigation requiring an asbestos survey and asbestos abatement, as well as compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1403, would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Lead Based Paint

Lead-based paint would likely be found in existing buildings constructed prior to 1978. If, during demolition of the structures, paint is separated from the building material (chemically or physically), a potential health hazard could occur for building occupants. This potential impact is considered significant unless mitigated. Following compliance with mitigation requiring an independent evaluation and paint abatement, as well as compliance with CCR Title 8, Section 1532.1, potential impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures:

- HAZ-1 The interior of individual on-site structures shall be visually inspected prior to any demolition or construction activities. Should hazardous materials be encountered within the project site, the materials shall be tested and properly disposed of in accordance with State and Federal regulatory requirements. Any stained soils or surfaces underneath the removed materials shall be sampled. Results of the sampling shall indicate the appropriate level of remediation efforts that may be required.
- HAZ-2 Prior to construction activities, the presence or absence of the reported historic on-site underground storage tanks (USTs) shall be verified. If on-site, the USTs shall be removed and properly disposed of at an approved landfill facility. Once the tanks are removed, a visual inspection of the areas beneath and around the removed USTs shall be performed. Any stained soils observed underneath the USTs shall be sampled. Results of the sampling (if necessary) would indicate the level of remediation efforts that may be required.
- HAZ-3 Prior to construction activities, a qualified hazardous materials consultant with Phase II and Phase III experience shall review files for the adjacent service station property across the street, which has reported subsurface releases. The file review shall delineate the vertical and lateral extent of contamination relevant to the project site.



- HAZ-4 If unknown wastes or suspect materials are discovered during construction by the contractor, which he/she believes may involve hazardous waste/materials, the contractor shall:
- Immediately stop work in the vicinity of the suspected contaminant and remove workers and the public from the area;
 - Notify the Project Engineer of the implementing Agency;
 - Secure the areas as directed by the Project Engineer; and
 - Notify the implementing agency's Hazardous Waste/Materials Coordinator.
- HAZ-5 Prior to demolition work, an asbestos survey shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of asbestos. The results of the survey shall be submitted to the City of Long Beach.
- HAZ-6 If ACBMs are located, abatement of asbestos shall be completed prior to any demolition activities that would disturb ACBMs or create an airborne asbestos hazard. Any demolition of the existing buildings shall comply with State law, which requires a certified contractor, where there is asbestos-related work involving 100 square feet or more of ACBMs, and that certain procedures regarding the removal of asbestos be followed.
- HAZ-7 If during demolition of the structures, paint is separated from the building material (e.g., chemically or physically), the paint waste shall be evaluated independently from the building material to determine its proper management. According to the Department of Substances Control, if paint is not removed from the building material during demolition (and is not chipping or peeling), the material could be disposed of as construction debris (a non-hazardous waste). The landfill operator shall be contacted in advance to determine any specific requirements they may have regarding the disposal of lead-based paint materials.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant Impact.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – PROPOSED USES

- **OPERATION OF THE SHORELINE GATEWAY PROJECT COULD CREATE A RISK TO THE PUBLIC OR THE ENVIRONMENT THROUGH CONDITIONS INVOLVING HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (I.E., ROUTINE USE/TRANSPORT OR ACCIDENT CONDITIONS) ASSOCIATED WITH PROPOSED USES.**

Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation: Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: The proposed project would involve development of residential and retail uses within the project site. Operation of the proposed project is not anticipated to involve the routine use, storage, disposal or transportation of acutely hazardous materials. However, secondary activities that would occur on-site (i.e., building and landscape maintenance) would involve the use of hazardous materials, such as cleaning and degreasing solvents, fertilizers, pesticides and other materials used in the regular maintenance of buildings and landscaping. Such use of



hazardous materials, although not expected to pose a risk to people residing or working in the area, could result in potentially significant impacts if not properly used, stored, transported or disposed. Title 8, *Health and Safety*, of the City's *Municipal Code*, identifies standards and regulations regarding the storage, handling, use and disposal of hazardous materials. Any storage, handling, use and disposal of hazardous materials would be subject to City, State and Federal regulatory requirements for the proper disposal of wastes. Therefore, impacts associated with the routine use of hazardous materials are considered less than significant following compliance with the City's *Municipal Code* provisions and compliance with City, State and Federal regulatory requirements.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are recommended.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Not applicable.

5.6.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

- **DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND OTHER RELATED CUMULATIVE PROJECTS WOULD NOT RESULT IN CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS IMPACTS.**

Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation: Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: Because hazards and hazardous materials impacts are site-specific, the potential for cumulative impacts is remote. Impacts on the public and the environment from on-site hazards would be limited to those occurring on-site and would not be compounded or exacerbated by hazards created by development of related cumulative projects in and around the City of Long Beach. Possible exceptions, however, include potential toxic air contaminant emissions, transportation of hazardous materials and waste disposal. The need to respond to hazardous materials emergencies could also increase as a result of cumulative development.

Toxic Air Contaminant Emissions. Cumulative development could increase the overall concentrations of toxic air contaminants in the City of Long Beach, and project-related stationary and mobile emissions sources could contribute to this increase. Cumulative issues related to toxic air emissions are discussed in Section 5.4, Air Quality.

Emergency Response. The City of Long Beach has a Hazardous Materials Management Program that prevents employee, public and environmental exposure to hazardous material and chemicals. The Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) program is a Joint Powers Agency, which combines both Fire Department and Health Department programs related to hazardous material management into one Agency function that serves Long Beach. The project and future development in Long Beach could cumulatively increase demands for hazardous materials emergency response services. However, as stated in Section 5.8, Public Services and Utilities, cumulative development would not be expected to interfere with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans, as the City of Long



Beach, LBFD and LBPD would review site specific development plans to ensure that access by fire and emergency service vehicles and equipment is provided and meets applicable standards.

Additionally, the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan outlines procedures that would be followed in response to anticipated emergencies in Long Beach. The City's plan describes how the City would respond in the event of, but not limited to, a state of war emergency, natural emergency situations (earthquakes, fires, floods and storms) and man-made emergency situations (pollution spills, civil disturbances, aircraft accidents industrial accidents, explosions and radiological incidents).

Transportation. Hazardous materials are transported on virtually all public roads, particularly since all motor vehicles contain hazardous materials (e.g., fuel) in addition to any hazardous cargo that may be on board. The project would contribute little to cumulative transportation hazards. The cumulative effects of transporting hazardous materials would continue to be addressed by regulatory requirements. Packaging requirements for hazardous materials and wastes established by DOT, USPS and EPA minimize the potential consequences of possible accidents during transport. Therefore, the cumulative impact of potential transportation-related accidents would be less than significant.

Hazardous Waste Disposal. As cumulative development occurs in Long Beach and at the State and regional levels, more hazardous wastes will be generated. Project-related hazardous waste generation would contribute to cumulative increases in hazardous waste generation. The incremental environmental effects of expected increases in hazardous waste generation and off-site hazardous waste recycling, treatment and disposal would also contribute to cumulative effects. Hazardous waste disposal affects the environment by releasing contaminants to land, air and/or water. Cumulative increases in waste generation could also contribute to the potential for some wastes to be mismanaged at any point in the disposal process in a manner that poses potential hazards to people, or to animal and plant populations. Since the project's contribution to this cumulative impact would be a small increment, the project's contribution would be less than cumulatively considerable and, therefore, less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are recommended.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Not applicable.

5.6.5 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

With implementation of project-specific mitigation measures, as discussed above, impacts resulting from the proposed project would be reduced to a less than significant level. No significant unavoidable impacts would result from project implementation.