

---

## IV.G HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

---

### 1. Introduction

This section provides an analysis of potential impacts that would occur relative to hazards and hazardous materials through implementation of the proposed project. The analysis is based largely on four Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (Phase I ESAs) and methane gas investigations prepared for various properties within the Grand Park Specific Plan area, and correspondence received from the State Department of Toxic Substances Control. Three Phase I ESA reports were prepared by GeoKinetics and one Phase I ESA report was prepared by LGC Inland. Four subsurface methane gas investigations were prepared by GeoKinetics. A Natural Hazards Disclosure Report was prepared by First American Natural Hazard Disclosure Report. These reports are located in Appendix G.

### 2. Environmental Setting

#### a) Regulatory Framework

##### 1) Hazardous Materials Management

The use and storage of hazardous materials are subject to local, State, and Federal regulations. At the local level, the Ontario Fire Department (OFD) monitors the storage of hazardous materials for compliance with the local requirements. Specifically, businesses and facilities, which store more than threshold quantities of hazardous materials as defined in Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code are required to file an Accidental Risk Prevention Program with the OFD. This program includes information such as emergency contacts, phone numbers, facility information, chemical inventory, and hazardous materials handling and storage locations. In addition, employees and employees of contractors that handle hazardous wastes or are potentially exposed to hazardous wastes, are required under Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) (29 C.F.R. §1910.120) and State OSHA (Cal-OSHA) regulations to be trained and certified to handle hazardous waste and materials.

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) regulates hazardous waste, oversees cleanup of existing contamination, and looks for ways to reduce the hazardous waste produced in California. DTSC operates programs to accomplish the following: (1) deal with the aftermath of improper hazardous waste management by overseeing site cleanups; (2) prevent releases of hazardous waste by ensuring that those who generate, handle, transport, store, and dispose of wastes do so properly; and (3) evaluate soil, water, and air samples taken at sites.

The storage of hazardous materials in underground storage tanks (USTs) is regulated by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), which has delegated authority to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and typically on the local level, to the fire department. The OFD administers and enforces Federal and State laws and local ordinances for USTs at the project site. Plans for the construction/installation, modification, upgrade, and removal of USTs are reviewed by OFD Inspectors.

## **2) Asbestos Containing Materials**

Asbestos, which is made up of microscopic fibers, is a naturally occurring mineral. Asbestos has unique qualities, which include its strength, fire resistance, resistance to chemical corrosion, poor conduction of heat, noise, and electricity, and low cost. Asbestos has been widely used in the building industry for a variety of uses, including acoustic and thermal insulation and fireproofing. It is often found in ceiling and floor tiles, linoleum, and pipes, as well as on structural beams and asphalt. Despite its useful qualities, asbestos is associated with lung diseases caused by inhalation of airborne asbestos fibers. Asbestos becomes a hazard if the fibers separate and become airborne. Any building, structure, surface asphalt driveway, or parking lot constructed prior to 1981 could contain asbestos containing materials (ACM).

In California, any facility known to contain asbestos is required to have a written asbestos management plan (also known as an Operations and Maintenance Program [O&M Program]). Removal of ACM must be conducted in accordance with the requirements of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1403. Rule 1403 regulations require that the following actions be taken: (1) a survey of the facility prior to issuance of a permit by SCAQMD; (2) notification of SCAQMD prior to construction activity; (3) asbestos removal in accordance with prescribed procedures; (4) placement of collected asbestos in leak-tight containers or wrapping; and (5) proper disposal.

## **3) Lead-Based Paint**

Lead is a naturally occurring element and heavy metal that was widely used as a major ingredient in most interior and exterior oil-based paints prior to 1950. Lead compounds continued to be used as corrosion inhibitors, pigments, and drying agents from the early 1950s to 1972, when the Consumer Products Safety Commission specified limits on lead content in such products. While adults can be affected by excessive exposure to lead, the primary concern is the adverse health effects on children. The most common paths of lead exposure in humans are through ingestion and inhalation. Lead-based paint is of concern both as a source of exposure and as a major contributor to lead in interior dust and exterior soil.

Cal-OSHA has established limits of exposure to lead contained in dusts and fumes. Specifically, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 8, Section 1532.1 provides for exposure limits, exposure monitoring, and respiratory protection, and mandates good working practices by workers exposed to lead.

**b) Historical Conditions**

The Specific Plan area has been historically utilized for agricultural production, including dairy operations, since the early 1900s. The project area was initially used for row crops and citrus production, with on-site dairy operations beginning in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Dairy-related uses now occupy the majority of the Specific Plan area. Since the start of agricultural operations on-site, the project area has been subsequently improved with residential structures associated with farming and dairy activities, irrigation piping and wells, shade and storage structures, septic systems and wastewater sumps, corrals, power poles and overhead lines, livestock feed and water containers, dairy runoff retention ponds, and other agriculture-related equipment.

**c) Existing Conditions - Project Site**

As previously noted, several Phase I ESA and methane gas investigation reports were prepared for various properties within the Specific Plan area, comprising approximately 220 acres of the site. Although an approximately 100-acre portion of the area has not yet been evaluated as part of a Phase I ESA or methane study, given the similarity in physical site characteristics and current land uses occurring on all on-site properties, including row crops and dairy operations, it is anticipated that site conditions are comparable across the entire project site. Nonetheless, Phase I ESA and soil gas investigations for these portions of the site would be required prior to any grading or site development activities, in order to characterize any potential on-site risks and address them, as necessary. Neither a Phase I ESA nor a methane gas investigation has been performed for Property B (Lee Property) or Property F (Morris Property).

The Phase I ESAs prepared for the site were performed in substantial conformance with the requirements of ASTM Standard E 1527-00 (Standard On Environmental Site Assessments For Commercial Real Estate), and specifically, the purpose of the ESAs is to perform an evaluation of the presence of hazardous and/or toxic materials (otherwise known as “Recognized Environmental Conditions”) within the subject areas. The Phase I ESAs include information gained from site reconnaissance, review of relevant historical information regarding the site and surrounding area, including historic aerial photographs, topographic maps, interviews, geologic maps and reports, fire insurance maps, and other government records databases. Site conditions with regard to hazards and hazardous materials are described below, and any RECs are identified, based on the conclusions of the Phase I ESAs and methane investigation reports (Table IV.G-1).

**Table IV.G-1: Summary of On-site Properties**

<b>Property</b>	<b>Property Name</b>	<b>Assessor's Parcel Number(s)</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Phase I ESA Completed?</b>	<b>Methane Study Completed?</b>
A	Van Meeteren Property	0218-241-06	~ 80 acres	Yes	Yes
B	Lee Property	0218-241-15 & 16	~ 80 acres	No	No
C	Aspen/Martin Property <sup>a</sup>	0218-241-10, 11, 13, 14, & 17	~ 80 acres	Yes	Yes <sup>b</sup>
D	Bosma Property	0218-241-19	~ 40 acres	Yes	Yes
E	Schone-Tevelde Property	0218-241-22	~ 20 acres	Yes	Yes
F	Morris Property	0218-241-20	~ 20 acres	No	No
<sup>a</sup> A small portion of the Aspen/Martin Dairy Property (APN 0218-241-18) is under the same ownership as the Lee Property. <sup>b</sup> A Methane Investigation was done by GeoKinetics in May 2003 for APNs 0218-241-10, 11, 13, 14 (for the "Martin and Sleger Dairies," which with the exception of APN 0218-241-17, are the same as the APNs for the "Aspen/Martin Property." Source: Michael Brandman Associates, 2012					

### **1) Property A (Van Meeteren Property)**

#### ***Underground Storage Tanks/Aboveground Storage Tanks (USTs/ASTs)***

Several aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) and underground storage tanks (USTs) have been noted within the Specific Plan area, utilized for various materials including water, gasoline, diesel fuel, livestock grain feed, agricultural chemicals, and other substances related to agricultural activities. Such tanks, both known and undiscovered, may pose a health risk due to leakage or mismanagement of materials stored in the containers. Review of available information regarding Property A from the San Bernardino County Fire Department (SBCFD) and interviews with current property owners/representatives indicated that no existing or historic USTs are located on the site. However, during site reconnaissance, one approximately 7,000-gallon water storage AST was observed near the milking barn.

#### ***Organic Soil Content***

The historic use of the project site for agricultural and dairy operations has resulted in the deposition of substantial quantities of manure and other organic materials in on-site soils. Although manure and other animal waste currently is transported off-site by a private organic waste hauler, prior to the 1990s such waste was applied as fertilizer to on-site crops or deposited in on-site percolation ponds, or "dairy ponds." Particularly in the dairy ponds,

manure and other organics are found in relatively high concentrations in surficial soils, which may pose a health risk. High organic content in soils can lead to the generation of soil gases, including methane and hydrogen sulfide.

#### ***Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste***

Interviews with farm personnel indicate that pesticides are not currently used or stored on-site, and there was no knowledge of them ever being used or stored on-site. However, this does not preclude historical use or storage of such materials.

Two 55-gallon drums containing diesel fuel were observed near the milking barn. The drums were placed on asphalt pavement without secondary containment. Minor staining of the pavement was observed adjacent to one of the drums.

#### ***Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs)***

The interiors of the on-site structures were not accessible during site reconnaissance. Review of historic topographic maps and aerial photographs indicate that buildings at the site were constructed in the early 1970s. The people interviewed as part of the Phase I ESA for this property indicated no knowledge of ACMs being present in any of the on-site structures. Structures constructed prior to 1987 may contain ACMs, and therefore further characterization would be required prior to any future demolition to confirm the presence or absence of such materials.

#### ***Lead-Based Paint (LBP)***

The interiors of on-site structures were not accessible at the time of the site reconnaissance, but review of historic topographic maps and aerial photographs indicate that buildings at the site were constructed in the early 1970s. The people interviewed as part of the Phase I ESA for this property indicated no knowledge of LBP being present in any on-site buildings. Paints applied prior to 1978 may contain lead, and therefore further characterization would be required prior to any future demolition to confirm the presence or absence of such materials.

#### ***Solid Waste Disposal***

The current Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) permit for the dairy operations requires the off-site disposal of animal waste. Interviews with the current site operator indicate that animal waste is currently removed from the site in accordance with the permit requirements on a semi-annual basis. Available waste manifests support this assertion. Domestic waste/refuse is removed weekly by a local private waste hauler. No stockpiled manure was observed during the site reconnaissance. A minor amount of concrete debris was observed at two locations within this property.

#### ***Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)***

Power poles, power lines, and transformers are present around and throughout the Specific Plan area, which serve on-site residences, agricultural and dairy structures, and water well

pumps. Transformers on the utility poles may contain varying amount of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), which are considered carcinogenic compounds. Additionally, fluorescent light fixtures found throughout the project site, both in structures and outdoors, may contain PCBs in their ballasts. Due to the potential for the presence of PCBs in transformers and light ballasts, a potential health risk could exist on the project site from these materials.

One utility pole with three pole-mounted transformers (which may contain PCBs) was observed during the site reconnaissance. To the knowledge of persons interviewed at part of the Phase I ESA, no transformers or hydraulic equipment containing PCBs are used or stored on-site. The site reconnaissance for this property was limited to exterior areas. As such, an evaluation of interior areas for fluorescent light ballasts (which may contain PCBs) would need to be conducted to determine whether such materials are present inside on-site structures.

### ***Radon Gas***

A California State Radon Survey was conducted by the California Department of Health Services (DHS) in conjunction with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The California survey is part of an ongoing program by the EPA to measure levels of radon in all states in the nation. In this report, California was organized into nine sampling regions using general geology, climate, and existing radon distribution knowledge. The geographically distributed results were later weighted for population distribution by EPA. The project site is located in Region 9, which includes Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, Orange, Imperial, and San Diego Counties. The results of the survey indicate that over 99 percent of all homes in this Region have radon concentrations below 4 picocuries per liter of air (pCi/L). The average radon levels for Region 9 were 0.7 pCi/L, which is well below the EPA action limit of 4 pCi/L. Due to the low concentrations of radon in the project area, it is unlikely that radon is a potential health risk to on-site residents.

### ***Septic Systems***

Due to the relatively rural nature of the project area and the age of existing development, wastewater is currently disposed of on-site through existing septic systems. As such, several septic tanks, leach fields, a wastewater collection sump, and associated piping are found on-site. It is assumed that septic tanks, leach fields, and associated piping and components are found within Property A.

### ***Active and Abandoned Water Wells***

Given the historical and current use of the site for active agricultural and dairy operations, several active and abandoned water wells are located on-site. These wells, along with piping and electric infrastructure to power well pumps, are located at various locations throughout the site. Given that no municipal water service is currently provided to the Specific Plan area, water wells are located throughout the site.

### *Former Structures*

Several structures that were once actively occupied or otherwise utilized on-site have since been demolished or otherwise removed by the property owners. Remnants of these structures still exist on-site that may have the potential to contain hazardous materials.

### *Listed Hazardous Materials Sites*

Given the generally rural nature of the project site and its surroundings, there are relatively few listed hazardous material sites found in the project vicinity. However, some sites are present within the search radii of records reviews conducted as part of the Phase I ESA process. Based on the results of the government records searches, the majority of the listed sites in the area are included due to the use and handling of agriculture-related chemicals and other materials, for the presence of ASTs, or for agriculture-related wastewater discharges. The records search for Property A resulted in no listings for the site itself, but produced five listed sites in the surrounding area within the specified search radii. The five surrounding sites are summarized below:

**CORTESE:** The CORTESE database identifies properties with public drinking water wells containing 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. The list is maintained by the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA). Two nearby properties were identified within the one-mile search radius. One of the listed properties, the John Schoneveld Dairy, is located across the intersection of Archibald Avenue and Edison Avenue from Property A at an equal or higher elevation. The property is listed due to waste discharges associated with dairy farming operations. The other listed property is located down-gradient from Property A and is therefore unlikely to present a risk to the project site.

**UST:** The Underground Storage Tank (UST) database contains registered USTs and is regulated under Subtitle I of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The list is maintained by the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB's) Hazardous Substances Storage Container Database. The same property located across the intersection of Archibald Avenue and Edison Avenue discussed above, the John Schoneveld Dairy, is also listed in the UST database, but is located at an equal or higher elevation than Property A of the Specific Plan area. The records indicate that this facility operates a 500-gallon unleaded gasoline UST that was installed in 1983.

**CA FID:** The Facility Inventory database contains active and inactive UST locations and is maintained by the RWQCB. The John Schoneveld Dairy was identified within the 0.25-mile search radius. As indicated previously, the site operates a 500-gallon unleaded gasoline UST, and therefore is included in the CA FID database as well.

**HIST UST:** The Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database is a historical listing of UST sites and is maintained by the SWRCB. The John Schoneveld Dairy was also identified in this database due to the operation of the 500-gallon unleaded gasoline UST.

**HAZNET:** The HAZNET database is comprised of data copied from hazardous waste manifests and is maintained by the Cal EPA's Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). One nearby property is within the 0.25-mile search radius. The property is located down-gradient from Property A and therefore has a low potential for environmental effects on the property.

**San Bernardino County Permit:** The County of San Bernardino Fire Department's Hazardous Materials Division maintains a list of properties that have a hazardous materials permit. The listing includes USTs, medical waste handlers/generators, hazardous materials handlers, hazardous waste generators, and waste oil generators/handlers. The John Schoneveld Dairy and Southern California Edison substation (located north of Property A across Edison Avenue) were identified within the 0.25-mile search radius, along with one other property. The Schoneveld Dairy and third listed property are at an equal or lower elevation than Property A and therefore pose little or no risk to the site, but the SCE substation is located up-gradient from the property and therefore may pose a risk to the westernmost portion of the Specific Plan area.

### *Methane Gas*

There are no known active or abandoned oil or gas wells located within the Specific Plan area, and the project site is not located within an area known to contain substantial amounts of soil gas; however, due to high organics content in on-site soils, there exists the potential for methane in shallow soils.

The methane gas investigation performed for Property A by GeoKinetics (2002) included 75 soil gas samples at 25 different locations throughout the property, each sampled three times for a total of 225 samples. Of all the samples, only one location showed concentrations above 0.5 percent (or 5,000 parts per million) methane. This sampling location is located in the north-central portion of Property A at a depth of 5 feet below ground surface (bgs), and had concentrations above 0.5 percent on each of the three sampling dates. Specifically, the results were 1.1 percent (11,000 ppm), 1.1 percent (11,000 ppm), and 0.9 percent (9,000 ppm). Such concentrations are not considered substantially hazardous, but the methane investigation report includes recommendations to reduce potential risks from on-site soil gas.

## **2) Property B (Lee Property)**

As previously discussed, no Phase I ESA or methane gas investigation has been performed for the 80-acre Lee Property within the Specific Plan area. As such, no formal listing of on-site RECs is available for this portion of the Specific Plan area. However, it is anticipated that given the nature of the past and current site activities and land uses, and the fact that records searches conducted for adjacent properties cover Property B in their search radii, the RECs that may be found within Property B are deemed to be similar to those within other

properties, therefore representing a “worst case” condition, and can be addressed in a similar fashion.

### **3) Property C (Aspen/Martin Property)**

#### ***Underground Storage Tanks/Aboveground Storage Tanks (USTs/ASTs)***

A total of four ASTs containing petroleum products, including one 1,000-gallon AST and two 5,000-gallon ASTs containing diesel fuel and one 1,000-gallon AST containing gasoline, were observed stored outdoors within Property C during the site reconnaissance conducted as part of the Phase I ESA process. According to information provided by the SBCFD, the ASTs are not required to be registered or permitted since the property is agricultural land and exempt. The ASTs were not observed to be surrounded with secondary containment, but were observed to be in good condition and no spills, stains, or leaks were observed in the vicinity of the ASTs at the time of the site reconnaissance. Additionally, two abandoned diesel fuel tanks and one abandoned gasoline tank were observed on-site.

No evidence of any current or previously existing USTs was observed within Property C during the site reconnaissance, the area was not listed as a UST or LUST site in government records searches (discussed below), and no records of USTs were on file for the property at the RWQCB. However, according to records from the SBCFD, an agricultural hazardous material inventory on file for the Martin Dairy indicated that a 2,000-gallon UST containing gasoline and a 5,000-gallon UST containing diesel fuel are located on the site. The information provided as part of the Phase I ESA indicates, however, that the observed 2,000-gallon and 5,000-gallon ASTs currently located on-site may have been either incorrectly identified as USTs, or may be former USTs that were improperly removed from their underground locations and are being utilized as ASTs.

#### ***Organic Soil Content***

As previously discussed, dairy operations in the area, including within Property C, have resulted in the deposition of substantial amounts of organic material in on-site soils. Depending on soil conditions, such organics can lead to the production of methane, carbon dioxide, and hydrogen sulfide, among other gases.

#### ***Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste***

One emergency generator with an AST (built-in day tank) containing diesel fuel was observed at the Aspen Dairy portion of Property C, which was observed to be in fair condition with surficial staining observed at the back wall of the dairy barn in the vicinity of the generator. Another such generator with diesel fuel AST had previously been observed on the Martin Dairy portion of Property C during a past Phase I ESA, but was not found on-site during the most recent site reconnaissance. Nonetheless, surficial staining was noted at the back wall of the Martin Dairy barn in the vicinity of where the generator had been observed during the prior investigation.

Aside from the petroleum products (diesel fuel, gasoline, and hydraulic tractor oil), chemicals observed to be stored within Property C were limited to agricultural products and small quantities of common cleaning and maintenance supplies. Most of the agricultural products, cleaning supplies, and maintenance supplies were observed to be properly labeled and stored on the site during the site reconnaissance. One of the containers of hydraulic tractor oil was observed to be improperly stored with some spillage and staining on the ground surface beneath the container. Also, some 50 gallon bags of unidentifiable agricultural products were observed to be in poor condition with spillage of the products onto the ground surface beneath the bags. No other hazardous substances or petroleum products were observed to be stored on the subject property at the time of the site reconnaissance.

Additionally, records from the SBCFD indicate that a clandestine drug lab used to illegally produce methamphetamine exploded within the Martin Dairy and resulted in three injuries and possible chemical contamination.

#### ***Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs)***

As previously discussed, structures constructed prior to 1987 may contain ACMs. As part of the Phase I ESA process for Property C, an ACM screening was conducted and found that yellow linoleum floor mastic contains asbestos. Although it is considered to be a non-friable ACM and observed to be in good condition, removal of this or any other ACMs is required to be carried out by qualified individuals prior to demolition of affected structures.

#### ***Lead-Based Paint (LBP)***

The interiors of on-site structures were not accessible at the time of the site reconnaissance, but review of historic topographic maps and aerial photographs indicate that buildings at the site were constructed in the early 1970s. Paints applied prior to 1978 may contain lead, and therefore further characterization would be required prior to any future demolition to confirm the presence or absence of such materials.

#### ***Solid Waste Disposal***

The current Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) permit for the dairy operations requires the off-site disposal of animal waste. Small amounts of debris and old farm equipment were observed to be discarded throughout Property C, including empty five-gallon buckets, several empty 55-gallon drums, some old propane tanks, and several old car batteries.

#### ***Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)***

Several Southern California Edison (SCE)-owned pole-mounted power transformers were observed along Edison Avenue to the north of Property C and along Eucalyptus Avenue to the south of the property during the site reconnaissance. According to SCE, it is unlikely that the transformers contain PCBs and SCE assumes responsibility for the cleanup and repairs of the transformers in the event of a leak or spill regardless of PCB content. The pole-mounted transformers were observed to be in good condition during the site reconnaissance and no

spills, stains, or leaks were observed in the vicinity of the transformers at the site of the site assessment.

Some fluorescent light fixtures were observed on the property, but due to access limitations, ballasts were not inspected for labels identifying their PCB content. The light fixtures were observed to be in good condition during the site assessment and no leaks associated with the ballasts were identified. Due to the date of construction of the buildings (i.e., ~1965 to 1983), it is possible that PCB-containing fluorescent light ballasts may be located on the property.

### ***Radon Gas***

As previously discussed, the radon potential in the vicinity of the Specific Plan area is considered low, and therefore radon gas is not considered a potential health risk within Property C.

### ***Septic Systems***

Due to the relatively rural nature of the project area and the age of existing development, wastewater is currently disposed of on-site through existing septic systems. As such, several septic tanks, leach fields, a wastewater collection sump, and associated piping are found within the Specific Plan area. It is assumed that septic tanks, leach fields, and associated piping and components are found within Property C.

### ***Active and Abandoned Water Wells***

Given the historical and current use of the site for active agricultural and dairy operations, several active and abandoned water wells are located on-site. These wells, along with piping and electric infrastructure to power well pumps, are located at various locations throughout the site. Given that no municipal water service is currently provided to the Specific Plan area, water wells are located throughout the site.

### ***Listed Hazardous Materials Sites***

Two sites within Property C were included in government hazardous materials databases, which are described individually below:

**CA WDS:** The Waste Discharge System database is listed for the property for discharging agricultural wastewater from the Martin Dairy portion of the property. According to the database records, Martin's Dairy is an active WDS site that is considered to be a moderate threat to water quality. No other information was reported by the database for this site. The dairy's on-site agricultural operations are not expected to have negatively impacted the site.

**CA CDL:** The Clandestine Drug Lab database lists known illegal drug labs, which typically utilize and store various hazardous chemicals and substances. Property C was listed in the CA CDL database for having an illegal drug lab on the property, which was reported on February 5, 2001. No other information for the site was provided by this database.

The government database records search for Property C also included sites listed on adjacent surrounding properties, some of which may have the potential to affect Property C. These are summarized as follows:

**CA WDS:** Five adjacent properties were identified in the database as CA WDS sites for discharging agricultural wastewater from the properties, as is common in the area. As was the case with the Martin Dairy, these properties are considered a moderate threat to water quality and are not expected to have negatively impacted Property C.

**San Bernardino County Permit:** Five surrounding properties were also identified in the database as San Bernardino County Hazardous Materials Permit sites for having active hazardous materials (hazmat) handler permits to handle and store agricultural materials. The on-site agricultural operations of these sites are not expected to have negatively affected Property C.

**CORTESE:** One adjacent property was also identified in the database as a Cortese (Hazardous Waste Substance) site with no other information reported. Given that this site is down-gradient from Property C, it is not expected to have impacted the property.

**LUST:** One Leaking Underground Storage Tank site was listed within one-mile of Property C. Due to the distance of the listed site from Property C, and cross-gradient location, it is not expected to have affected the property.

**RCRA-SQG:** One Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Small Quantity Generator was identified within ¾-mile of Property C. Due to the distance of the listed site from Property C, the cross-gradient location of the site, and the absence of reported violations, the site is not expected to have negatively impacted the property.

**SCH:** One School Property Evaluation Program site was identified within a ¾-mile radius of the property. This site is listed as an SCH site for being a proposed school site property that is being evaluated by DTSC for possible hazardous materials contamination. According to the database, the current status date is October 13, 2004 and the current status of the site is a Voluntary Cleanup Program. DTSC entered into an Environmental Oversight Agreement with the Chaffey Joint Union School District to provide oversight for a Preliminary Endangerment Assessment for the proposed Chaffey High School No. 10. Due to the distance of the listed site from Property C, it is not expected to have negatively affected the property.

### *Methane Gas*

There are no known active or abandoned oil or gas wells located within the Specific Plan area, and the project site is not located within an area known to contain substantial amounts of soil gas. In May 2003 GeoKinetics prepared a Subsurface Methane Gas Investigation for the “Martin and Sleger Dairies,” with APNs 0218-241-10, 11, 13, 14 on Property C. The soil gas investigation sampled twelve gas probes at each property for a total of twenty-four locations at three different depths (5, 10, and 15 feet below ground surface) on three separate

days. The results were that methane gas was not detected at any of the twenty-four installations on-site. As such, the potential risks associated with methane within Property C are considered negligible.

#### **4) Property D (Bosma Property)**

##### ***Underground Storage Tanks/Aboveground Storage Tanks (USTs/ASTs)***

The property owner indicated during interviews that two unpermitted 2,000-gallon USTs were installed in 1987 and removed in 1990. One UST reportedly contained diesel fuel and the other contained unleaded gasoline.

Domestic water for the property is obtained from an on-site groundwater well located near the milking barn, and is stored in a 1,500-gallon capacity AST located next to the well. The water from this well is also stored in a 5,000-gallon capacity storage tank located next to the milking barn. One additional 500-gallon AST containing diesel fuel is located on a concrete pad south of the milking barn. A small amount of standing diesel fuel, approximately one-half gallon, and associated stained concrete was observed beneath the tank. One five-ton grain silo and two 20-ton grain silos are also present within Property D.

##### ***Organic Soil Content***

The historic use of the site as a dairy farm has resulted in a relatively high organic content in on-site soils, which may create hazards due to soil gas generation, as is the case with similar properties in the area.

##### ***Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste***

There is a truck repair business located within Property D at the northeastern corner of the Specific Plan area. There was evidence of improper waste disposal observed at this facility during the site reconnaissance. An open concrete sump containing waste oil and an adjacent 55-gallon drum with waste oil were also observed in this area. Numerous tires and truck/auto parts were scattered throughout the facility as well. Petroleum and solvent odors, pools of liquids, stained soil/pavement, and other improper waste practices are evident in this area.

##### ***Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs)***

The interiors of the on-site structures were not accessible during site reconnaissance. Review of historic topographic maps and aerial photographs indicate that buildings at the site were constructed in the early 1970s. The people interviewed as part of the Phase I ESA for this property indicated no knowledge of ACMs being present in any of the on-site structures. Structures constructed prior to 1987 may contain ACMs, and therefore further characterization would be required prior to any future demolition to confirm the presence or absence of such materials.

##### ***Lead-Based Paint (LBP)***

The interiors of on-site structures were not accessible at the time of the site reconnaissance, but review of historic topographic maps and aerial photographs indicate that buildings at the

site were constructed in the early 1970s. The people interviewed as part of the Phase I ESA for this property indicated no knowledge of LBP being present in any on-site buildings. Paints applied prior to 1978 may contain lead, and therefore further characterization would be required prior to any future demolition to confirm the presence or absence of such materials.

### ***Solid Waste Disposal***

As is the case with other properties within the Specific Plan area, manure was previously used as a soil amendment or disposed of on-site. Currently animal waste is hauled off-site by a private hauler, and municipal solid waste is transported to local landfills by a private residential waste hauler.

### ***Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)***

While there were no surface transformers observed within Property D during the site reconnaissance, there were pole-mounted transformers on-site. One power pole along Edison Avenue in front of the milking barn has two transformers mounted on it. Two other power poles with transformers are located at the southern perimeter of Property D, each with two transformers on them. Interiors of structures that may contain fluorescent lights were not accessible and therefore it is not known whether PCB-containing ballasts exist within the buildings.

### ***Radon Gas***

As previously discussed, the radon potential in the vicinity of the Specific Plan area is considered low, and therefore radon gas is not considered a potential health risk within Property D.

### ***Septic Systems***

Due to the relatively rural nature of the project area and the age of existing development, wastewater is currently disposed of on-site through existing septic systems. As such, several septic tanks, leach fields, a wastewater collection sump, and associated piping are found within the Specific Plan area. It is assumed that septic tanks, leach fields, and associated piping and components are found within Property D.

### ***Former Structures***

At least one structure that was once actively occupied or otherwise utilized on-site has since been destroyed by fire. Remnants of this and potentially other structures may exist on-site, which could have the potential to contain hazardous materials.

### ***Active and Abandoned Water Wells***

Two active water wells are known to exist on-site, which are used to provide water for agricultural and domestic uses.

---

### *Listed Hazardous Materials Sites*

Two sites within Property D were included in government hazardous materials databases, which are described individually below:

**CA WDS:** The Waste Discharge System database is listed for the property for discharging agricultural wastewater from the Bosma Dairy. Property D is listed in this database as a result of the permits that have been obtained in conjunction with the dairy and livestock operations on the property.

**San Bernardino County Permit:** The County of San Bernardino Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division maintains a list of properties that have a hazardous materials permit issued. The listing includes USTs, medical waste handlers/generators, hazardous materials handlers, hazardous waste generators, and waste oil generators/handlers. Property D has the following three permits issued: Agricultural Hazardous Material Handler, Special Handler, and Special Generator.

The government database records search for Property D also included sites listed on adjacent surrounding properties, some of which may have the potential to affect Property D. These are summarized as follows:

**UST:** The Underground Storage Tank (UST) database contains registered USTs and is regulated under Subtitle I of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The list is maintained by the SWRCB's Hazardous Substances Storage Container Database. The Vander Dussen Dairy located approximately 1,300 feet east-northeast of Property D reportedly has one UST on-site.

**CA FID:** The Facility Inventory database contains active and inactive UST locations and is maintained by the RWQCB. The Vander Dussen Dairy is listed due to the on-site UST, and the Drifty Farms Dairy located approximately 3,800 feet south of Property D is also listed in this database.

**HIST UST:** The Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database is a historical listing of UST sites and is maintained by the SWRCB. The Vander Dussen Dairy is listed in this database as having two USTs on-site. The first is reportedly a waste tank of unspecified capacity which was installed in 1978 and the second is a 10,000-gallon tank which contains diesel fuel that was installed in 1980. The Drifty Farms Dairy is reported to have two USTs on-site: a 5,000-gallon unleaded gasoline tank with an unreported installation date, and a 10,000-gallon capacity tank that contains diesel fuel and an unreported installation date.

**CA WDS:** Five adjacent properties were identified in the database as CA WDS sites for discharging agricultural wastewater from the properties, as is common in the area. The John Schoneveld Dairy, Aspen Dairy, Dick Dykstra Dairy, and Drifty Farms Dairy are all listed in this database for agricultural wastewater discharges.

**San Bernardino County Permit:** Five surrounding properties were also identified in the database as San Bernardino County Hazardous Materials Permit sites for having active hazardous materials (hazmat) handler permits to handle and store agricultural materials. The Dick Dykstra Dairy is permitted for Special Handler, State Mandated Facility Service Fee, and Special Generator. The Simon Koolhaas Dairy, approximately 1,400 feet to the south of Property D, is permitted for USTs, UST State Fee, Hazardous Material Handler, Underground Tank Only, and State Mandated Facility Service Fee. The Martin Dairy, approximately 1,600 feet east of the property, is permitted for Agricultural Hazardous Material Handler and State Mandated Facility Service Fee. The AG-Kroes Dairy, located approximately 600 feet to the south-southeast, is permitted for Special Handler and State Mandated Facility Service Fee. The AG-Jongs Egg Ranch, approximately 1,200 feet to the east-northeast, is permitted for Special Handler, State Mandated Facility Service Fee, and Special Generator. The Vander Dussen Dairy is permitted for USTs, UST State Fee, Hazardous Material Handler, Underground Tank Only, and State Mandated Facility Service Fee.

**CORTESE:** Five nearby properties were also identified in the database as Cortese (Hazardous Waste Substance) sites, and are listed due to Cleanup and Abatement Orders issued by the California EPA for discharges of dairy-related wastes. The JA Schoneveld Dairy, Drifty Farms Dairy, Simon Koolhaas Dairy, Martin Dairy, and Aspen Dairy are listed on this database.

**FINDS:** The Facility Index System/Facility Identification Initiative Program Summary report, maintained by the U.S. EPA, includes one property in the vicinity of Property D. Drifty Farms Dairy is listed in this database.

**RCRA-SQG:** One Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Small Quantity Generator was identified in the vicinity of Property D. The Drifty Farms Dairy, approximately 3,800 feet to the south of Property D, is listed with no violations noted.

**LUST:** One Leaking Underground Storage Tank site, the Drifty Farms Dairy, was listed in the vicinity of Property D. Due to the distance of the listed site from Property D, and down-gradient location, it is not expected to have affected the property.

### *Methane Gas*

A methane gas investigation was conducted for Property D by GeoKinetics, Inc. (2002) to assess the potential for risks associated with soil gases resulting from the decomposition of organics in on-site soils. The soil gas investigation sampled twenty locations at three different depths (5, 10, and 15 feet below ground surface) on three separate days. The results indicated no measurable methane concentrations in soils within Property D. As such, the potential risks associated with methane within Property D are considered negligible.

## **5) Property E (Schone-Tevelde Property)**

### ***Underground Storage Tanks/Aboveground Storage Tanks (USTs/ASTs)***

Property E is not listed on any databases as ever having had USTs operating on-site. Currently there are a total of five ASTs at the site. There is one milk storage tank located within the milking barn. This AST has a capacity of approximately 8,000 gallons. One 550-gallon diesel fuel tank is located near the southeast corner of the milking barn and is used to refuel farm equipment. One approximately 10,000-gallon water tank is located at the southeast corner of the milking barn, and is used to store water pumped from the on-site well, which is then used to wash pens and for dairy operations. An emergency generator is located in the southwest corner of the milking barn and is equipped with its own internal fuel tank of unknown capacity. A 2,000-gallon pressurized water tank is located along the west side of the milking barn adjacent to the water well. Another 10,000-gallon tank is located adjacent to the feed barn in the southeast portion of Property E, and is used to store liquid whey that is added to cow feed.

### ***Organic Soil Content***

The historic use of the site as a dairy farm has resulted in a relatively high organic content in on-site soils, which may create hazards due to soil gas generation, as is the case with similar dairy properties in the area.

### ***Hazardous Materials/Hazardous Waste***

According to property owners, no hazardous materials or wastes are known to have ever been used or stored within the property.

### ***Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACMs)***

The interiors of the on-site structures were not accessible during site reconnaissance. Review of historic topographic maps and aerial photographs indicate that buildings at the site were constructed in the early 1970s. The people interviewed as part of the Phase I ESA for this property indicated no knowledge of ACMs being present in any of the on-site structures. Structures constructed prior to 1987 may contain ACMs, and therefore further characterization would be required prior to any future demolition to confirm the presence or absence of such materials.

### ***Lead-Based Paint (LBP)***

The interiors of on-site structures were not accessible at the time of the site reconnaissance, but review of historic topographic maps and aerial photographs indicate that buildings at the site were constructed in the early 1970s. The people interviewed as part of the Phase I ESA for this property indicated no knowledge of LBP being present in any on-site buildings. Paints applied prior to 1978 may contain lead, and therefore further characterization would be required prior to any future demolition to confirm the presence or absence of such materials.

### ***Solid Waste Disposal***

As is the case with other properties within the Specific Plan area, manure was previously used as a soil amendment or disposed of on-site. Currently animal waste is hauled off-site by a private hauler, and municipal solid waste is transported to local landfills by a private residential waste hauler.

### ***Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs)***

Four power poles with one to three pole-mounted transformers (which could contain PCBs) were observed along the southern boundary of Property E. The transformers appear to be in good condition with no sign of leakage. Fluorescent lights were observed in the milking barn. According to the occupants, no transformers or hydraulic equipment containing PCBs were ever used or stored on the property.

### ***Radon Gas***

As previously discussed, the radon potential in the vicinity of the Specific Plan area is considered low, and therefore radon gas is not considered a potential health risk within Property E.

### ***Septic Systems***

Due to the relatively rural nature of the project area and the age of existing development, wastewater is currently disposed of on-site through existing septic systems. As such, several septic tanks, leach fields, a wastewater collection sump, and associated piping are found within the Specific Plan area. It is assumed that septic tanks, leach fields, and associated piping and components are found within Property E.

### ***Active and Abandoned Water Wells***

One active water wells is on-site adjacent to the milking barn, which is used to provide water for agricultural and domestic uses.

### ***Listed Hazardous Materials Sites***

Two sites within Property E were included in government hazardous materials databases, which are described individually below:

**CA WDS:** The Waste Discharge System database is listed for the property for discharging agricultural wastewater from dairy operations. The Bill Idsinga Dairy and Hillco Dairy were listed on this database.

**San Bernardino County Permit:** The County of San Bernardino Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division maintains a list of properties that have a hazardous materials permit issued. The listing includes USTs, medical waste handlers/generators, hazardous materials handlers, hazardous waste generators, and waste oil generators/handlers. The AG-Countryside Dairy was entered into the Hazardous Materials Division's automated systems to be surveyed for use of hazardous materials because of the facility's operation as a dairy,

but for which no inspection or survey has been conducted. No permits have been applied for, and no file has been created for the property.

The government database records search for Property E also included sites listed on adjacent surrounding properties, some of which may have the potential to affect Property E. These are summarized as follows:

**CORTESE:** Four nearby properties were also identified in the database as Cortese (Hazardous Waste Substance) sites, and are listed due to off-site discharges of agricultural wastewater. These properties include the Simon Koolhaas Dairy, Aspen Dairy, Martin Dairy, and J.A. Schoneveld Dairy.

**CA FID:** The Facility Inventory database contains active and inactive UST locations and is maintained by the RWQCB. The Simon Koolhaas Dairy is listed due to the presence of USTs on-site.

**HIST UST:** The Hazardous Substance Storage Container Database is a historical listing of UST sites and is maintained by the SWRCB. The Simon Koolhaas Dairy is listed due to the presence of USTs containing gasoline and diesel fuel on-site.

**San Bernardino County Permit:** One nearby property was also identified in the database as San Bernardino County Hazardous Materials Permit sites for being permitted as an Agricultural, Hazardous Materials Handler with a UST permit. The UST permit expired in 1988.

### *Methane Gas*

The methane gas investigation performed for Property E by GeoKinetics (2003) included 33 soil gas samples at 11 different locations throughout the property, each sampled three times for a total of 99 samples. Of all the samples, only one location showed concentrations above 0.5 percent (or 5,000 parts per million) methane. This sampling location is located in the northeastern portion of Property E at a depth of 15 feet below ground surface (bgs), and had concentrations above 0.5 percent on each of the three sampling dates. Specifically, the results were 0.7 percent (7,000 ppm), 0.8 percent (8,000 ppm), and 1.2 percent (12,000 ppm). Such concentrations are not considered substantially hazardous, but the methane investigation report includes recommendations to reduce potential risks from on-site soil gas.

## **6) Property F (Morris Property)**

No Phase I ESA or methane gas investigation has been prepared for this portion of the Specific Plan area. However, given the similarity in site characteristics, the nature of existing uses, and the types of agricultural operations, RECs on this property are anticipated to be similar to those identified on adjacent properties for which investigations have been performed, thereby representing a “worst-case” condition.

**d) Existing Conditions - Airport Operations****1) Ontario Airport**

The project site is located more than three miles from Ontario International Airport (ONT) and is located within the Airport Influence Area (AIA). Aircraft approach ONT from the east and depart to the west, and do not fly over the general project area. All development proposals or specific plan amendments are required to be consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Ontario International Airport. The Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for ONT was adopted in April 2011. The project site is located outside the noise and safety impact zones.

**2) Chino Airport**

The Chino Airport located approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the project site. The western portion of the project site is located within the Chino Airport Influence Area (AIA). The most recent ALUCP for Chino Airport was completed by the County of Riverside Airport Land Use Commission in 2008 and is being used by the City as a guide for development around Chino Airport. The project site is located within Zone E, which does not place land use restrictions on the property, but due to flight patterns, the height of any structure cannot exceed 100 feet without FAA approval. If a structure were to 100 feet in height or has the potential to be a hazard to flight due to visual glare or electronic interference, the project applicant would be required to notify the FAA by electronically filing a 7460-1 Form.

**3. Project Impacts****a) Methodology**

To assist in evaluating potential impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials that would occur from construction and/or operation of future land uses within the Specific Plan area, several Phase I ESAs and methane gas investigations were conducted at the project site. The Phase I ESAs and methane reports are intended to identify the likelihood of past, present, or potential releases of hazardous materials at a site. The characterization is based on readily ascertainable information and site observations.

Based on the results of the above-mentioned reports, the potential for construction and/or operation of the proposed project to result in significant impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials was evaluated.

Impacts associated with emergency response and evacuations are discussed in Section IV.K.1, Fire Protection, of this EIR.

**b) Significance Thresholds**

The following thresholds are utilized in this analysis for consideration on a case-by-case basis in making a determination of significance. A significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in any of the following:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials;
- Create a hazard to the public or 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 mile of an existing or proposed school;
- 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, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment;
- For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;
- For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands; or
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The Initial Study concluded that no impacts were related to hazards from proximity to a private airstrip, interference with an emergency evacuation plan, or exposure from wildland fires. Refer to Appendix A-2 for a discussion related to these thresholds.

### **c) Analysis of Project Impacts**

#### **1) Historical Use of Project Site**

As previously discussed, the project area has been utilized for agricultural operations, including dairies, for several decades. Such agricultural activities on the project site have resulted in several potential Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) on the site, which may pose a risk to people living or working in the area. A discussion of each of these RECs, the potential impacts associated with each, and recommendations to address potential impacts is provided below.

#### **2) Short-Term Construction Impacts**

In the short term, the proposed project will involve storing limited quantities of petroleum products on-site during construction-related activities. Given the mandatory compliance with the City's Environmental Performance Standards (City of Ontario 2000), the proposed project will not create a health hazard or use, produce, or dispose of materials that pose a

hazard to human, animal, or plant populations within the project area. The Environmental Performance Standards are contained in the City's Municipal Code, Article 33, Section 9-1.3300. No impact from the temporary storage of hazardous materials during the construction phase is anticipated.

Based on known RECs within the Specific Plan area, there is the potential for the discovery of previously unknown contamination. Should suspected contamination be encountered during site demolition and grading activities, the hazardous materials would be addressed through remediation, as applicable, to the satisfaction of affected regulatory agencies. With adherence to the characterization and remediation requirements of affected agencies, existing contamination would not pose a risk during construction activities, and therefore impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

### **3) Long-Term Operational Impacts - Project Site**

The proposed project introduces new land uses within the project area: residential, educational, and recreational. Hazardous materials commonly associated with these uses include household cleaning and janitorial products, herbicides, insecticides, and solvents. Residential handling and disposal of hazardous materials is regulated at the federal, state, and local levels.

Generation and use of hazardous materials by residential, educational, and recreational uses within the project area is considered to have a less than significant impact due to the mandatory compliance with the City's Environmental Performance Standards (City of Ontario 2000). The Environmental Performance Standards are contained in the City's Municipal Code, Article 33, Section 9-1.3300.

#### ***Emergency Access and Evacuation Routes***

The project will introduce a new on-site population that would be subject to emergency evacuation or response in the event of a major disaster. However, the proposed project will not result in the impairment or interference with the implementation of the City's emergency evacuation and support services procedures in the event of a natural disaster or other major emergency. Both the residential component and educational component provide adequate emergency vehicular access to and through the project site. Project impacts regarding an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan are considered less than significant.

#### ***Vector Control***

Implementation of the proposed project will, over time, systemically reduce the volume of standing water and other sources associated with the dairies where breeding by mosquitoes can occur. With the amount of organics in soil and the presence of standing water in ponds, these populations may continue to breed during the dairy transition to urban uses, and buildout of the Chino/Ontario areas. Control of these populations can be achieved with non-chemical methods (i.e. mechanical methods) and the use of pesticides. With proper vector control practices, health and safety impacts are not expected to be significant. Past and

present uses of pesticides and herbicides in agricultural operations can leave measurable residues in soils. The Phase 1 ESA and Phase II ESI for the dairy property addressed the possible presence of chemical residues in the soil. Soil sampling on the dairy property detected no residual pesticide contamination within project soils. Future uses of the project site should not be adversely affected by past agricultural use. Hazard impacts on the project site from vectors and past agricultural use are considered less than significant.

#### ***Listed Hazardous Materials Sites***

As previously discussed, several properties within and adjacent to the Specific Plan area are listed in government hazardous materials databases, and therefore may have the potential to affect future on-site uses. However, based on the location of both on- and off-site listed sites relative to proposed uses, the nature of any reported hazardous materials releases, and ongoing remedial actions (as necessary), such listed sites are generally not expected to result in risks to people working or residing on-site. In specific instances where residual contamination is known or suspected to exist, appropriate remedial actions will be taken as required by affected regulatory agencies. Mitigation measures, including a requirement to remediate any known or previously undiscovered hazardous materials prior to issuance of grading permits, would reduce potential health risks to acceptable levels, which are included as Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-7. As such, with implementation of applicable mitigation measures, impacts related to listed hazardous materials sites would be less than significant.

#### ***Asbestos Containing Materials***

Because the majority, if not all, of the existing buildings located on the project site were constructed prior to 1980, it is likely that asbestos is present in some of the building materials (i.e., floor tiles and mastic, ceiling tiles, and piping insulation wrap) in structures on the site. In fact, asbestos has been found to exist in floor mastic of at least one on-site structure. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would demolish and remove the existing buildings located on the project site. The demolition of these buildings would have the potential to release asbestos fibers into the atmosphere if they are not properly stabilized or removed prior to demolition or renovation activities. The removal of asbestos is regulated by SCAQMD Rule 1403 and therefore would be removed by a certified asbestos containment contractor in accordance with applicable regulations prior to demolition or renovation. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-4 below, impacts related to asbestos would be reduced to a less than significant level.

#### ***Lead-Based Paint***

Due to the time frame in which the buildings located at the project site were constructed, it is possible that lead-based paint is present. No lead-based paint sampling has been conducted at the project site. Since the project proposes to demolish and/or renovate the existing buildings located on the project site, the potential for lead exposure exists. However, with the implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-5 below, potential impacts from lead exposure would be reduced to a less than significant level.

### *Methane Gas*

According to available government records, no oil wells are located within the project area. However, prior soil gas investigations conducted for the majority of the on-site properties indicated some areas within the Specific Plan with elevated methane levels in soil gas. While these elevated methane levels do not present a substantial risk, the organic-rich soil on-site could generate methane that could accumulate under or within structures following implementation of the Specific Plan. Accumulation of methane could pose a risk to people or structures on-site. As such, the soil gas reports contain recommendations for grading and construction activities to address organics in soil and the potential for soil gas generation, which are included as Mitigation Measures HAZ-6 through HAZ-7 below. With implementation of applicable mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

#### **4) Long-Term Operational Impacts - Airport Operations**

##### *Ontario Airport*

The Ontario Airport (ONT) is not located within two miles of the project site. The TOP discusses current and future operations at ONT and describes impacts associated with those operations. Examination of this information reveals that the project site does not directly lie within the flight path of ONT and that no impacts are anticipated related to penetrations of air space, safety zones, or other protection areas.

The only anticipated impact from ONT would be sporadic occurrences of aircraft flying over the general area in a southeasterly direction away from the Airport. The ALUCP for ONT identifies the site as being located within the Real Estate Transaction Disclosure zone due to overflight. The Business and Professions Code Section 11010 and Civil Code Sections 11.2.6, 11.3.4, and 1353 require that, as part of many residential real estate transactions, information be disclosed regarding whether the property is situated within an Airport Influence Area (AIA). The Business and Professions Code applies the disclosure requirement to the sale or lease of newly subdivided lands and condominium conversions and to the sale of certain existing residential property. The Civil Code applies the disclosure requirement to existing residential property transfers only when certain natural conditions (earthquake, fire, or flood hazards) warrant disclosure. State Law provides the following disclosure language:

**NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY:** This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you.

The project will comply with Code disclosure requirements and no significant impact would occur.

Given the proposed project distance from ONT, the maximum heights of the proposed structures would not penetrate any of the building height restrictions contained in the Federal Aviations Administration's Part 77 regulations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

### ***Chino Airport***

Mandatory coordination with the airport authority for the Chino Airport would determine appropriate land uses, maximum population density, maximum site coverage, height restrictions, and required notification/disclosure areas based upon the noise contours and runway protection, approach, and FAA Part 77 zones. The project site is located within Chino Airport Influence Area (AIA) Zone E of the Chino Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). This zone does not place land use restrictions on the property, but due to flight patterns, the height of any structure cannot exceed 100 feet without FAA approval. The proposed project does not include any buildings or structures that would exceed this height. Development would therefore be consistent with the conditions and regulations of Chino Airport because of the required development review process of the Chino Airport Influence Area (AIA) zones, and impacts would be less than significant.

## **4. Cumulative Impacts**

Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan will provide for a variety of residential, educational, and recreational uses. In general, the proposed allowable uses would not result in the generation of substantial quantities of hazardous wastes or toxic materials.

Compliance with federal, state, and local regulations regarding the handling, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Because hazards impacts are generally site-specific, and the fact that any related projects in the vicinity of the Specific Plan area will be required to mitigate their own impacts, no significant cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials are anticipated. With implementation of project-specific mitigation to address potential hazards as part of each related project, as well as the proposed Specific Plan, impacts would be reduced to less than significant. No significant cumulative impact is anticipated.

## **5. Mitigation Measures**

**HAZ-1** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the Project Applicant shall hire a qualified environmental consultant to excavate and dispose of contaminated soils, or treat in-situ (in place), in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. If during grading activities additional contamination is discovered, grading within such an area shall be temporarily halted and redirected around the area until the appropriate evaluation and follow-up

---

measures are implemented so as to render the area suitable for grading activities to resume.

- HAZ-2** Prior to demolition and/or renovation activities, all fluorescent light ballasts and pole-mounted transformers shall be inspected for PCBs. Any PCB-containing fluorescent light ballasts and/or transformers shall be disposed of in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.
- HAZ-3** During removal of on-site gasoline and diesel USTs, soil sampling shall be conducted below and in the immediate vicinity of the UST and associated piping. The Project Applicant shall submit the results of the soil survey to the City of Ontario (City) Building Department. If soil contamination is found, it shall be removed or remediated in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.
- HAZ-4** Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Project Applicant shall submit verification to the City Building Department that an asbestos survey has been conducted at all existing buildings located on the project site. If asbestos is found, the Project Applicant shall follow all procedural requirements and regulations of South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1403.
- HAZ-5** Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Project Applicant shall submit verification to the City Building Department that a lead-based paint survey has been conducted at all existing buildings located on the project site. If lead-based paint is found, the Project Applicant shall follow all procedural requirements and regulations for proper removal and disposal of the lead-based paint.
- HAZ-6** Prior to issuance of grading or building permits, the Project Applicant shall hire a qualified environmental consultant to perform a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and methane gas survey for the Lee Property (Property B) and the Morris Property (Property F) not previously accessible for investigation. The results shall be provided to the City of Ontario. The applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City that all applicable recommendations in the Phase I and methane reports are adhered to and implemented to address any potential hazards in these portions of the project area.
- HAZ-7** The Project Applicant shall implement all applicable recommendations for grading activities contained in the methane soil gas reports prepared for the properties within proposed Specific Plan area to the satisfaction of the City Building Department. This shall include a post-construction soil gas investigation and installation of methane mitigation systems where post-grading methane levels exceed 5,000 ppm (0.5 percent), should any such levels occur.

## **6. Level of Significance After Mitigation**

All potentially significant project-specific and cumulative impacts would be less than significant with implementation of the mitigation measures outlined above. As such, no significant unavoidable hazards and hazardous material impacts would result from project implementation.

