

---

---

**IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**  
**G. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**  
**1. ENVIRONMENTAL SITE ASSESSMENT**

---

---

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA) for the proposed project was prepared by Padre Associates, Inc., in February of 2004. A summary of the Phase I ESA with respect to potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts is set forth below. The Phase I ESA, which is incorporated herein by this reference, is included in its entirety as Appendix I-1 to this Draft EIR. A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Phase II ESA) was also prepared for the proposed project by Padre Associates, Inc., on March 15, 2004. Findings of the Phase II ESA are included as part of the impacts analysis below. The Phase II ESA is included in its entirety as Appendix I-2 to this Draft EIR.

The objective of the Phase I ESA was to evaluate whether current or previous land uses, or practices, at or adjacent to the site may have resulted in the presence of a recognized environmental condition (REC) at the project site. A REC is defined by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E1527-00 as “the presence of 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 of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, groundwater or surface water of the property. The term includes hazardous substances and/or petroleum products even under conditions in compliance with laws. The term does not include de minimus conditions that generally do not present a material risk of harm to public health or the environmental and that generally would not be the subject of an enforcement action if brought to the attention of appropriate governmental agencies.”

The objective of the Phase II ESA was to evaluate RECs identified by the Phase I ESA performed for the project site. RECs identified by the Phase I ESA are discussed below.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

### **Project Site**

The project site consists of approximately 60 acres. Twenty five of the acres are developed as a golf course facility that includes an 18 hole, par three, golf course; driving range; pro shop; business offices; snack bar; two parking lots; and a greens maintenance facility. The remaining area of the project site encompassing approximately 35 acres is undeveloped land providing natural habitat for oak trees, wildlife, and native chaparral. The maintenance shed on the northern portion of the project site and the pro shop/snack bar, located on the southern portion of the site are both single story wood framed structures.

The project site is bound to the north and west by undeveloped land, to the south by La Tuna Canyon Road, vacant land and the San Fernando Freeway, and to the east by the Blanchard Canyon Drainage Channel, Tujunga Canyon Boulevard, and residential neighborhoods.

## **Topography**

The elevation of the site ranges from a high of approximately 1,800 feet above mean sea level, to a low of approximately 1,650 feet above mean sea level. Surface drainage flows to the south/southwest toward La Tuna Canyon Road and parallel with Tujunga Canyon Boulevard. Surface water enters the Blanchard Canyon Boulevard drainage channel and flow southeast.

## **Geology and Hydrogeology**

A review of the USGS Geologic Map of Sunland – Burbank Quadrangle, dated 1966 photorevised in 1988, indicated the golf course, driving range, and maintenance areas of the project site are located on alluvial fan gravel and sand derived from the San Gabriel Mountains. The San Gabriel Mountains, in the area of the site, are comprised of hard coherent biotite-quartz-feldspar gneiss and quartz diorite with gneissic properties.

Three public water supply wells were identified within an approximate 0.5 mile radius of the project site. The first two wells are located within approximately one-half mile east, hydrogeologically down/cross-gradient of the site. Based upon the site location at the foot of coherent rock outcrops, within an alluvial fan deposit, and adjacent to the Blanchard Creek Drainage, groundwater underflow toward the drainage is located to the south/southeast.

## **Historical Use Information on the Project Site**

The Phase I ESA included the review of the available historical information on the project site. These references were reviewed for evidence of activities that would suggest the potential presence of hazardous substances at the project site and to evaluate the potential for the project site to be impacted by offsite sources of contamination.

### ***Aerial Photographs***

Historical aerial photographs were reviewed for information regarding past project site uses. Aerial photographs were reviewed for the following years: 1928, 1952, 1976, 1989, and 2002.

**1928** The 1928 photograph is of poor quality, but does show that the project site is partially developed with agricultural fields on its western boundary. The portions of the property to the north, east, and south appear to be undeveloped and in its natural state. A dirt access road appears to be carved into the landscape south of the site.

**1952** The 1952 photograph shows the agricultural area in the 1928 photograph to be overgrown with trees. The site appears to be developed with approximately seven long and narrow rectangular structures north of the dirt road shown in the 1928 photograph and west of Tujunga Canyon Road which is visible to the east of the site.

- 1965** The 1965 photograph shows the site developed with an 18 hole golf course and driving range. A small building and parking lot is located near the southern boundary of the site and a small building is also located on the northern corner of the property near a drainage channel. The dirt road located south of the site has been paved and widened (La Tuna Canyon Road).
- 1976** The 1976 photograph shows the site developed similarly as show in the 1965 photograph. Interstate 210 appears south of the site, parallel to La Tuna Canyon Road.
- 1989** The 1989 photograph shows the site to be developed similarly as shown in the 1976 photograph.
- 1994** The 1994 photograph shows the site to be developed similarly to the 1989 photograph. A dirt access road is carved into the hillside directly north of the driving range and west of the small building identified on the northern portion of the site.
- 2002** The 2002 photograph shows the site to be developed similarly to the 1994 photograph. The dirt access road carved into the hillside on the northern portion of the site has been lengthened to span the approximate north, northwest, and western boundary of the golf course with vegetated hillside.

### ***Sanborn Maps***

As part of the historical review, Padre Associates Inc. obtained historical Topographic Maps from EDR-Sanborn Company from 1902, 1915, 1966, 1972, and 1994. based on a review of available topographic maps, the golf course and two structures have been present onsite since at least 1966. Between at least 1902 and 1915, the site was undeveloped. By 1966 and until at least 1994 the site was occupied by a golf course and La Tuna Canyon Road lined the southern boundary of the site.

### ***City of Los Angeles Fire Department***

As part of the historical review, Padre Associates Inc. reviewed the City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) records for the project site. LAFD inspection records were on file from 1987 through 2003. The documents reviewed consisted of hazardous materials inventories for the site. Based on the information reviewed, an underground storage tank (UST), was utilized by the Verdugo Hills Golf Course to store regular gasoline. Diesel fuel and motor oil as well as fungicides, herbicides and insecticides are also stored and utilized onsite. The diesel fuel and motor oil are stored in 55 gallon drums. No information concerning the status of the UST was identified in the LAFD inspection records. The latest records indicate that the site is in compliance (as of 2003).

### ***Japanese-American Internment Camp***

Although not found in the historical information reviewed for the Phase I ESA, a Japanese-American Internment Camp was located on the project site between the years of 1941 to 1946. For more information on this subject see Section IV.F.1, Historical Resources.

### **Site Reconnaissance**

On February 12, 2004, an associate of Padre Associates Inc. conducted a site reconnaissance visit.

The maintenance facility is a storage location for gasoline, diesel fuel, motor oil, pesticides, fungicides, herbicides, insecticides, lawn trimming machinery, spraying equipment, golf course transportation, and a maintenance shop. The ground surface at the maintenance facility consists of a combination of asphalt, concrete pavement, and soil. Diesel fuel, and volatile petroleum hydrocarbon distillates are stored in a hazardous materials locker onsite. Gasoline is stored in a fenced in, Con-Vault, above ground storage tank (AST) with secondary containment located in the maintenance yard. Used motor oil is stored in 55-gallon drums located within secondary containment in the vicinity of the pesticide, herbicide, fungicide and insecticide materials storage container located on the northwest corner of the maintenance yard.

During the site visit, 96 linear feet of 4-inch to a 6-inch, pipeline was being stored in approximately 12 foot sections behind the AST onsite, was observed. Based upon visual observation, it was concluded that these sections of pipeline may contain asbestos.

Surface staining in the parking area north of the maintenance shed, where a tractor and sprayer are parked, was observed. It was concluded that leaks from the equipment appear to have stained the asphalt surface.

No pits, ponds, or lagoons were noted at the site. Concrete and rip-rap drainage channels were identified in low lying areas of the golf course to channel surface water to the main Blanchard Canyon Drainage Channel located southeast of the site. The oak trees on site appeared unhealthy and branches were breaking from some of the trees. The maintenance supervisor, Mr. Howard Thompson attributed the condition of the trees from being over watered while trying to keep the fairway and greens grasses alive. No evidence of dumping of hazardous substances or solid waste on the site with the exception of an area located north of the maintenance shed and along the Blanchard Canyon Drainage Channel that appeared to be an unpaved turnabout. The turnabout contained remnants of rubble piles containing rebar reinforced concrete wood debris. The origin of the rubble and debris was not identified.

A concrete patched area was identified in the parking area of the maintenance facility on the site. According to Mr. Thompson, the concrete patch marks the location of the former gasoline UST and excavation area. According to the available documentation from the Air Quality Management District (AQMD), the UST passed AQMD pressure testing in August 25, 2003.

Based on the site inspection, three locations of RECs at the maintenance yard were identified: The north side of the maintenance shed (repair shop) in the area of equipment parking where the asphalt surface below the equipment appeared to be deteriorated and petroleum hydrocarbon stained; the gravel lined equipment wash rack located south of the southwest corner of the repair shop; and the former UST located approximately 15 feet southeast of the repair shop.

Neither an asbestos containing materials (ACM) survey, or lead-based paint survey (LBP) survey were performed on the project site. However, based upon visual observation, pipeline sections being stored in the golf course maintenance area may contain asbestos.

### **Environmental Agency Listing Review**

As part of the Phase I ESA, environmental agency listings database information for the project site and for properties within a one mile radius of the project site were obtained. The purpose of the environmental agency listings database review is to evaluate whether the site or adjacent sites have been listed on local, state or federal government database listings regarding current and/or past usage that could potentially pertain to RECs. Only those databases on which the project site or surrounding properties are listed are discussed below. For a complete list of all agencies queried please see the Phase I ESA located in Appendix I-1 of this Draft EIR.

#### ***HAZNET Database***

The HAZNET database maintains a record of hazardous waste manifests compiled by the EPA's Department of Toxic Substances Control on an annual basis. The HAZNET database lists hazardous waste generators, the waste category, and the waste disposal method. The project site was listed on the HAZNET database as the generator of approximately one half-ton of mixed and waste oils sent to a transfer station for disposal.

#### ***CA FID UST Database***

The CA FID UST database maintains a record of historical active and inactive USTs and their locations compiled by the EPA from State Water Resources Control Board files. The project site was listed on the CA FID UST database as the location of an inactive UST since at least 1993.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

### **Thresholds of Significance**

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project would have a significant impact on the environment related to hazards and hazardous materials if it would:

- (a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;

- (b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- (c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
- (d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment;
- (e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;
- (f) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airport strip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;
- (g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;
- (h) 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.

As discussed in Section IV.A Impacts Found To Be Less Than Significant, the project would have a less than significant impact with regards to thresholds (c), (e), (f) and (g). Therefore, a discussion of these thresholds is not included below.

## **Project Impacts**

### ***Project Site***

#### *Underground Storage Tank (UST)*

The site formerly contained a gasoline UST that was installed in approximately 1960. Upon removal of the UST in 1986, a portion of the contents were spilled into the UST excavation. According to persons familiar with the removal of the UST at the project site, the soil was remediated by excavation. However, no written documentation regarding the date or site conditions at the time of removal of the UST and subsequent remedial soil excavation was available for review. It was concluded that the former use and removal of the UST and the undocumented remedial soil excavation represents a REC.

As part of the Phase II ESA, soil samples were taken by a hollow-stem auger drill to test for soil contamination caused by the UST. Three soil samples were taken at and around the site of the former

UST, to depths ranging between 10 to 30 feet. The soil samples were analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons. All three soil sample did not contain detectable amounts of petroleum hydrocarbons. Therefore no further remediation measures are required and the site of the former UST would not cause any significant impacts.

### *Pesticides*

Pesticides have historically been stored and mixed in the golf course maintenance area and sprayed at the project site. No written documentation is available concerning the use of pesticides on the site. However, pesticides were likely used at the site since being developed as a golf course in the late 1950s or early 1960s. The Phase I ESA concluded that there is the potential that organochloride pesticides were historically stored or used on the project site and represent a REC. Several areas where persistent pesticides may have accumulated in near surface soils were identified during the site reconnaissance. These area include locations adjacent to the pesticide storage container and in the vicinity of the sprayer parking area on the northern portion of the maintenance shed, in the area located southwest of the maintenance shed and utilized as a vehicle wash rack, and on the golf course.

As part of the Phase II ESA, soil samples were taken by a hand auger drill to test for soil contamination caused by the use of pesticides. Four soil samples were taken in the areas identified by the Phase I ESA to have potential for pesticide contamination. Another four samples were taken at random locations around the golf course. Soil samples were taken to depths between one to three feet. All eight soil samples were tested for organochloride pesticides using the EPA method 8081A. The soil samples collected did not contain concentration of organochloride pesticides that exceeded the U.S. EPA Region 9 preliminary remedial goals for residential or commercial soil. Based upon the chemical analytical results no further soil assessment or remediation for pesticides is recommended for the project site. Therefore impacts related to historical use of pesticides on the project site are less than significant.

### *Petroleum Hydrocarbon Surface Staining*

Petroleum hydrocarbon surface staining was observed at the area north of the maintenance shed utilized as the prayer and tractor parking. As the staining was considered an REC the Phase II ESA sought further testing to evaluate whether or not soil contamination had occurred.

A total of three soil samples, ranging from a depth of one to three feet, were taken from two locations in the vicinity of the maintenance area where surface staining was observed. Analysis for petroleum hydrocarbons was performed on the soil samples. Based on the chemical laboratory analytical data, one of the soil samples contained detectable concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons. This sample was taken approximately eight feet south of the northern-most boundary of the maintenance area, in an area of surface staining, north of the maintenance shed used by the golf course to store a diesel fuel powered tractor. It is recommended that the visibly stained soils present in the tractor parking area be excavated and properly disposed. Upon completion of the removal of these soils, soil samples should be collected to verify that no significant concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons remain present in the soil at this

location. With removal of the contaminated soils impacts with regards to the observed petroleum hydrocarbon surface staining would be less than significant.

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

An asbestos containing materials (ACM) survey was not performed on the project site. However, based upon visual observation, pipeline sections being stored in the golf course maintenance area may contain asbestos. In addition, due to the age of construction of the some of the buildings on the project site, there exists a potential for asbestos containing materials to be present at the project site. Prior to demolition, a comprehensive asbestos survey should be conducted. This activity is required by the USEPA National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) regulation and the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD's) Rule 1403. Bulk samples of all materials which are suspected of containing asbestos shall be collected and analyzed for asbestos content. Asbestos removal is stringently controlled by Federal Regulations and SCAQMD Rule 1403.

In accordance with the EPA's NESHAP regulation and SCAQMD's Rule 1403, all materials, which are identified as ACMs shall be removed by a trained and licensed asbestos abatement contractor. The asbestos removal operations shall be conducted in accordance with CAL-OSHA Asbestos for the Construction Industry Standard, SCAQMD and EPA rules and regulations and industry standards. As onsite ACMs shall be removed in accordance with all applicable regulations, the potential for ACM exposure would no longer exist. Therefore impacts with regards to ACMs would be less than significant.

#### *Lead-Based Paints (LBPs)*

A lead-based paint survey was not conducted for the project site. However, given the age of some of the existing structures on the project site, lead based paint is conservatively assumed to be present, and the safe handling of such material is required to prevent adverse impacts. The demolitions of buildings containing lead based paint are subject to a comprehensive set of California regulations. Construction workers are protected pursuant to Construction Safety Orders Section 1532.1 of Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations. Lead-contaminated debris and other wastes must be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable provisions of the California Health and Safety Code. With compliance with all applicable rules and regulations, hazardous materials impacts relative to exposure to lead-based paint would be less than significant.

#### *Offsite*

The project site and surrounding area currently and historically include undeveloped land and residential properties.

A search of selected government databases was conducted for the Phase I ESA. The database was reviewed for local, State, and federal listings for properties within the project site vicinity. Regulatory database lists were reviewed for cases pertaining to leaking USTs and ASTs, hazardous waste sites, and

abandoned sites within the specified radii established by the ASTM. The report did not identify any facilities that represent a potential source of migration of hazardous substances to soil or groundwater beneath the project site.

There are no known properties within a one-mile radius of the project site with known or documented releases of potentially hazardous materials. In addition, no recognized environmental conditions associated with any offsite properties were observed during the site reconnaissance.

### ***Operational Impacts of the Proposed Project***

The proposed project consists of single-family homes. Therefore, there would be no use, storage, or transportation of significant amounts of hazardous materials. Minor amounts of hazardous materials may be used by future residents, including motor oil, grease, paints and solvents. Potential impacts associated with the use of such hazardous materials would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels through compliance with the California Health and Safety Code and the LAMC. In addition, as discussed in Section IV.O.3 (Solid Waste), residents of the City may participate in City and County-sponsored household hazardous waste pick-up days that are held in various locations throughout the City and County.

The closest existing or proposed school to the project site is located approximately 2.4 miles away (see Section IV.L.3 Schools). Due to this distance, the proposed project would not emit or handle hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of a school.

The proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts associated with hazardous materials because of the following reasons:

- The proposed project would not routinely transport, use or dispose of hazardous materials;
- The proposed project would not result in reasonably foreseeable conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; and
- The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, with the exception of the UST listed on the HAZMAT and CA FID UST. However, impacts associated with the UST have been discussed above and are less than significant.

## **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Development of the proposed project in combination with the related projects has the potential to increase the use, storage, transport, and/or accidental release of hazardous materials during construction and

operation. However, impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials are generally site specific. With respect to the related projects, each of the related projects would require evaluation for potential threats to public safety, including those associated with routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment; hazardous emissions in proximity to an existing or proposed school; hazardous materials site listing; and interference with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Because hazardous materials and risk of upset conditions are largely site-specific, this would occur for each individual project affected, in conjunction with the development proposals on these properties. Further, local municipalities are required to follow local, state, and federal laws regarding hazardous materials and other hazards. Therefore, with compliance with local, state, and federal laws pertaining to hazards and hazardous materials, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures are recommended to ensure that potential impacts with respect to hazardous materials remain less than significant:

### *Contaminated Soils*

- G-1** It is recommended that the visibly stained soils present in the tractor parking area be excavated and properly disposed at a regulated disposal facility. Upon completion of the removal of these soils, soil samples should be collected to verify that no significant concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons remain present in the soil at this location.

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

- G-2** Prior to the issuance of the demolition/renovation permits, the applicant shall provide a letter to the Department of Building and Safety from a qualified asbestos abatement consultant that no ACMs are present in the buildings. If ACMs are found to be present, they shall be abated in compliance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1403, as well as other state and federal regulations. Specific requirements of Rule 1403 include:
- Implementation of a thorough survey of the affected facility prior to issuance of permits for any demolition or renovation activity, including inspection, identification, and quantification of all friable and certain non-friable asbestos-containing materials.
  - Surveys which include collection and analyses of representative asbestos building material samples, and quantification of these materials for asbestos abatement purposes prior to or during demolition/renovation.
  - Notification of the SCAQMD of the intent to demolish or renovate any facility at least ten days prior to commencing with the activity.

- Removal of all asbestos-containing materials prior to any demolition or renovation activity that would break up, dislodge, or similarly disturb the material.
- Use of legally required procedures when removing asbestos-containing materials.
- Placement of all collected asbestos-containing materials in leak-tight containers or wrapping.
- Disposal of asbestos-containing materials as required by applicable regulations.

*Lead-Based Paint (LBP)*

**G-3** Prior to issuance of permits for any demolition/renovation activity involving a particular structure, a lead-based paint assessment of each existing structure shall be conducted. Lead-based paint found in any buildings shall be removed and disposed of as a hazardous waste in accordance with all applicable regulations. Such regulations that would be followed during demolition include Construction Safety Orders 1532.1 (pertaining to lead) from Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, and lead exposure guidelines provided by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

**LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION**

With implementation of the above mitigation measures impacts from hazards or hazardous materials would be less than significant.