
4.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section discusses the existing hazards and hazardous materials setting of the Project Site and assesses potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

4.8.1 SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

MND for the Pacific Place Project

The MND first determined that, although the Prior Project would require the transport and use of standard construction equipment and materials, some of which that may include a hazardous component such as transport and storage of fuels, the Prior Project activities would be conducted in compliance with existing federal, State, and local regulations. Additionally, the Project uses would restrict storage and transport of hazardous materials and training on proper containment and cleanup of small spills of hazardous materials would be provided to all onsite workers following State guidelines. The MND determined that development of the Project would not cause significant hazards through accidental release of hazardous materials or create a significant hazard to the public through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Although one school is located within 0.25 miles of the Project Site, the MND determined that the Prior Project would not emit hazardous emissions as the handling or storage of hazardous materials would be restricted to common materials associated with vehicles and vehicle maintenance and all remediation, construction, and operation-related activities would follow all proper federal, State and local regulations. The MND determined that, as part of the Prior Project, the school occupants would not be exposed to substantial health risks.

The MND determined that potential impacts could occur associated with the presence of hazardous substances or materials in or on the Project Site due to its historical use for oil sumps, oil wells onsite, and offsite historical oil development in the vicinity. However, with implementation of mitigation, potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The MND determined that the Project Site is not included on the California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) Hazardous Waste and Substances List, or Cortese List; however, the Project Site has undergone several assessments to evaluate the presence of hazardous materials, and there are adjoining properties and properties within the site vicinity that occur on the regulatory databases. As such, the Prior Project would incorporate MM HAZ-1 through HAZ-5 to ensure that impacts related to hazardous materials would be remediated to the satisfaction of the DTSC. The MND concluded the Prior Project would not create a significant hazard to the public with mitigation incorporated.

The MND found that the Project Site is not located within an adopted Airport Land Use Plan and, although the Long Beach Airport was located approximately two miles east of the Project Site, the Prior Project would be located outside of the Long Beach Airport influence area. Therefore, the MND determined that the Prior Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area.

The MND also determined that because the Prior Project would not impede the use of I-405 or I-710 as disaster routes or block access to nearby properties via Pacific Place, it would not interfere with the implementation of the City's Hazard Mitigation Plan (City of Long Beach 2017) or the LA County Department of Public Works' (LACDPW) designation of the I-405 and I-710 as

disaster routes. Therefore, the MND determined that the Prior Project would not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The MND determined that the Project Site is not located within a Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) or in a Wildland-Urban Interface area. Therefore, the MND determined the Prior Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

MND Mitigation Measures

The MND required implementation of the following mitigation measures regarding hazards to reduce potential impacts associated with implementation of the Prior Project to less than significant levels.

MM HAZ-1 Before issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant for the Artesia parcels shall have a qualified environmental professional prepare a Response Plan (RP) outlining site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site. Engineering controls reduce exposures of hazardous materials to future occupants; examples are vapor barriers and sub-slab venting systems. Administrative controls restrict future land uses and activities onsite to limit exposures to future occupants; for instance, land use covenants prohibiting residential, school, and day care uses.

MM HAZ-2 Before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by the City of Long Beach, the Owner or Developer of the McDonald Trust Parcels shall have a qualified environmental professional conduct a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the McDonald Trust parcels in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) E1527-13 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process and 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 312 Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries.

MM HAZ-3 If the Phase I ESA required under Mitigation Measure HAZ-2 identifies recognized environmental conditions on or affecting the McDonald Trust parcels, then, before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by the City of Long Beach, the Owner or Developer of the McDonald Trust Parcels shall have a qualified environmental professional conduct a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment consisting of soil and soil vapor sampling and testing; in addition to groundwater sampling and testing, if recommended by the Phase I ESA; and a human health hazard assessment.

MM HAZ-4 If the Phase II ESA identifies contaminants in soil and/or soil vapor exceeding environmental screening levels for commercial use, then, before issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by the City of Long Beach, the Owner or Developer of the McDonald Trust Parcels shall have a qualified environmental professional prepare and implement a Remedial Action Plan (RAP), a Removal Action Workplan (RAW) or a Response Plan (RP) specifying site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and/or administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site. For each contaminant the Response Plan shall specify how some combination of hazardous materials remediation, engineering controls, operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and/or administrative controls would reduce exposures to Project construction

workers and Project operational workers to below concentrations specified in regulatory action levels for each respective contaminant.

- MM HAZ-5** The City shall not issue a Certificate of Occupancy for development on the McDonald Trust parcels until any regulatory agency involved has issued a document approving that the Remedial Action Plan (RAP), a Removal Action Workplan (RAW) or a Response Plan (RP), as the case may be, has been implemented in conformance with that agency's requirements (for instance, a No Further Action determination by the Department of Toxic Substances Control).

As set forth below, the DEIR analysis confirms that there are no new impacts and no increase in the severity of previously identified impacts beyond those identified in the MND. HAZ-2, HAZ-3, HAZ-4, and HAZ-5 from the MND pertained only to the McDonald Trust Parcels which are no longer a part of the Project; therefore, they are not applicable to the Project and not included in any form in the DEIR. The actions required by HAZ-1 in the MND do pertain to the Project and are included in the DEIR, though in a modified and more expanded form to provide greater clarification.

4.8.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The information in this section is based on the following technical studies and documents, all of which are available as Appendix I-1 through Appendix I-17, as detailed below:

- *Standard Agreement, California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act, Docket No. HAS-FY 19/20-044* dated October 23, 2019 and prepared by the DTSC. (DTSC 2019a). (Appendix I-1).
- *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach, California* dated August 30, 2019 and prepared by Roux Associates, Inc. (Roux 2019). (Appendix I-2)
- *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Acceptance Email for the Long Beach Industrial Park/Former Oil Operators Site* dated December 11, 2019 and prepared by the DTSC. (DTSC 2019b). (Appendix I-3)
- *Final Site Assessment Plan and Report of Findings, Long Beach Industrial Park Site (a.k.a. Former Oil Operators), 3701 North Pacific Place, Long Beach, California* dated March 13, 2020, and prepared by Roux Associates, Inc. (Roux 2020a). (Appendix I-4).
- *Final Site Assessment Plan Acceptance Letter for the Long Beach Industrial Park/Former Oil Operators Site [Site Assessment Plan dated 2019, December 11]* dated March 12, 2020 and prepared by the DTSC. (DTSC 2020a). (Appendix I-5).
- *Final Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Parcel-025, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach, California* dated April 20, 2020 and prepared by Roux Associates, Inc. (Roux 2020b). (Appendix I-6).
- *Site Assessment Plan and Report of Findings Addendum, 3701 Pacific Place Tookey Parcel, Long Beach California*, April 10, 2020, revised on May 18, 2020 and prepared by Roux Associates, Inc. (Roux 2020c). (Appendix I-7).
- *Site Assessment Plan and Report of Findings DTSC Approval Letter, 3701 Pacific Place Tookey Parcel, Long Beach California*, dated June 4, 2020 and prepared by the DTSC. (DTSC 2020b). (Appendix I-8).
- *California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act Agreement and Amendment Transmittal, 3701 Pacific Place Tookey Parcel, Long Beach California* dated June 16, 2020 and prepared by the DTSC. (DTSC 2020c). (Appendix I-9).

- *Response Plan, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach California* dated March 10, 2021 and prepared by Roux and Associates, Inc. (Roux 2021). (Appendix I-10).
- *Master Response, Draft Response Plan, Long Beach Industrial Park* dated April 6, 2021 and prepared by DTSC (DTSC 2021a). (Appendix I-11).
- *Final Response Plan Approval, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach California* dated September 23, 2021 and prepared by the DTSC. (DTSC 2021b). (Appendix I-12).
- *Remedial Design and Implementation Plan, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach California* dated January 11, 2022 and prepared by Roux and Associated, Inc. (Roux 2022). (Appendix I-13).
- *Remedial Design and Implementation Plan Approval, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach California* dated January 13, 2022 and prepared by DTSC. (DTSC 2022). (Appendix I-14).
- *DRAFT Response Plan, Long Beach Industrial Park, 3701 North Pacific Place, Long Beach, California* dated March 12, 2024 and revised June 3, 2024, prepared by Roux and Associates, Inc., including an Excavation Management Plan (EMP), 3701 North Pacific Place, Long Beach California, dated September 14, 2021 and revised May 28, 2024 attached as an appendix. (Roux 2024). (Appendix I-15).
- *Soil Management Plan Long Beach Industrial Park, 3701 North Pacific Place, Long Beach, California* dated August 20, 2020 and prepared by Roux and Associates, Inc., including the Site Specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) Long Beach Industrial Park, 3701 North Pacific Place, Long Beach, California dated August 13, 2020 attached as Appendix C. (Roux 2020d). (Appendix I-16).
- *Ambient Air Monitoring Plan Long Beach Industrial Park, 3701 North Pacific Place, Long Beach, California* dated August 17, 2020 and prepared by Roux and Associates, Inc. (Roux 2020e). (Appendix I-17).

A. Existing Conditions

Existing and Previous Uses of the Project Site

The Project Site was undeveloped until at least 1896. By 1926, the Site was occupied by Oil Operators, Inc. (Oil Operators), which operated an oil brine water treatment facility, and the majority of the Project Site was used as a treatment sump/pond. Oil brine was pumped to evaporation and treatment ponds (sumps) on the Project Site. Water was then allowed to evaporate from the brine or seep into the subsurface below the sumps leaving behind an oily sludge. Following evaporation, the remaining sludge was left in the sumps or dumped elsewhere. Evaporation operations ceased at the Project Site in the mid-1950s. (Roux 2021)

According to CalGEM records, six oil wells were historically located onsite, and five of the six wells produced oil. The wells were reportedly drilled between 1937 and 1981. All six wells were abandoned between 1981 and 2014, conforming with CalGEM standards when they were abandoned. (Roux 2019)

In the 1970s, a partial cleanup/treatment of the Project Site was conducted. The partial cleanup included removal, treatment, and replacement of a portion of the sump materials. However, detailed records describing the cleanup activities were not available for review. (Roux 2021)

In the late 1980s, approximately 80,000 cubic yards (cy) of sandy soil were imported to the Project Site reportedly from nearby Los Angeles River dredging activities. The sandy soil was spread throughout the Project Site at a reported thickness of between two and eight feet and completely covered the oily sludge. The Project Site was developed as a golf learning facility in 1996. The

golf learning facility ceased operations in 2016, and the structures associated with the driving range were removed in 2017. The Project Site has been vacant since. (Roux 2021)

Key Environmental Investigations and Documents

CLRRRA Agreement

DTSC and the Project Applicant entered into an agreement pursuant to the California Land Use and Revitalization Act of 2004 (CLRRRA) on October 23, 2019 (DTSC 2019a) for the purpose of addressing the Project Site's environmental history. The purpose of CLRRRA is to encourage cleanup and redevelopment of polluted urban sites by providing certain benefits to qualifying buyers of property, such as legal immunities to damages and response claims. DTSC is one of three agencies that can supervise a project under CLRRRA. CLRRRA requires a specific set of procedural steps prior to a property owner's qualification for CLRRRA for these immunities. (DTSC 2024)

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Parcels -019, -032, and -033) dated August 30, 2019

The August 30, 2019 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for part of the Project Site¹ pursuant to the American Society for Testing Materials (ASTM) Standards. Submission of a Phase I ESA is often required by an overseeing agency under CLRRRA, as CLRRRA applicants must prove that they have made "all appropriate inquiries" pursuant to California Health & Safety Code Section 25395.80. The Phase I ESA identified Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) and other environmental features (OEFs) in connection with the site, as discussed below. (Roux 2019)

Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC)

A REC is the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substance or petroleum products in, on, or at a property due to release to the environment; under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. The Phase I ESA identified the following RECs for the portion of the Project Site covered by the August 30, 2019 Phase I ESA.

- **REC-1: Former Oil Sumps.** The site was formerly used as an oil brine water treatment facility beginning in 1926 for nearby and onsite oil development activities. Oil brine was pumped to evaporation and treatment ponds (sumps) on the site; the majority of the site was used as a treatment sump. Water was allowed to evaporate from the brine or seep into the subsurface below the sumps leaving behind a sludge. Following evaporation, the remaining sludge was left in the sumps or dumped elsewhere. Evaporation operations reportedly ceased at the site in the mid-1950s. No information was found indicating how the sumps were abandoned and whether fill was imported. Although numerous investigations and limited land farming activities have been conducted at the site, no large-scale remediation has been completed as of this report date. Petroleum hydrocarbon and metals (arsenic and lead) impacts have been identified across the site in soil in addition to limited semi-volatile organic compound (SVOC) impacts. In soil vapor, perchloroethylene (PCE), trichloroethylene (TCE), benzene, and methane were detected across the site. (Roux 2019)

¹ The portion of the Project Site covered by the August 30, 2019 Phase I ESA was identified at the time as Los Angeles Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 7140-014-019, 7140-014-032 and 7140-014-033 (Parcels 1 through 3, respectively).

- **REC-2: Former Oil Wells.** According to CalGEM records, six oil wells were historically located onsite, and five of the six wells produced oil. The wells were reportedly drilled between 1937 and 1981. All six wells were abandoned between 1981 and 2014 conforming with CalGEM standards when they were abandoned. Drilling of wells such as this are known to generate drill cuttings and drilling mud that could be impacted by hydrocarbons encountered in the subsurface. Operation of oil wells is also known to cause near-surface hydrocarbon impacts to soil and soil vapor. (Roux 2019)
- **REC-3: Nearby Offsite Historical Oil Development.** The site vicinity, including adjoining properties, has been historically used for oil development activities including oil production wells, evaporation and treatment ponds (sumps), and ASTs. The oil development operations in the site vicinity are likely to have produced hydrocarbon impacts to the subsurface with the potential to migrate onsite and comingle with impacts originating onsite. Regional groundwater in the area has been degraded at least in part due to the historical oil development activities in the vicinity of the site. Total dissolved solids (TDS) impacts have been identified in the Gaspar aquifer, approximately 50 to 70 feet below ground surface (bgs), in the site vicinity. (Roux 2019)

Other Environmental Features

OEFs are environmental conditions that do not meet the definition of an REC, but which still warranted mention in a comprehensive Phase I ESA. The Phase I ESA identified the following OEFs in connection with the site.

- **OEF-4: Commercial Pesticide and Herbicide Use.** The former driving range / golf learning center operations may have involved the use of pesticides and herbicides to control and optimize vegetation typical of golf course facilities. No documentation was found confirming the use of pesticides or herbicides on site. (Roux 2019)
- **OEF-5: Pressurized Pipelines.** Based on the National Pipeline Mapping System (NPMS) Public View database, it is possible that two active crude pipelines are located within 50 feet of the site and may cross the southeastern corner of the site but are outside of the building footprint. Two additional petroleum/crude pipelines were identified within 1,000 feet of the site. No indication of a release from any of the pipelines was identified by Roux in the preparation of the Phase I ESA. (Roux 2019)
- **OEF-6: Adjoining Off-Site Railroad Tracks.** According to historical topographic maps, the northeastern adjoining railroad was constructed by 1924. Although the rail is currently used as a Los Angeles Metro passenger rail line, historical topographic maps identified the railroad as a Pacific Electric line in 1924 and later as a Southern Pacific line through 1987. The materials transported along the railroad historically is unknown. Both the presence of these railroad lines and the materials transported along the railroad lines may have potentially impacted the subsurface at the site. Railroad ties have historically been and continue to be treated with copper arsenate, creosote (which contains polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, or PAHs), Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), pentachlorophenol (which also contains dioxins), and copper naphthalene. In addition to these chemicals, railway transportation is associated with heavy metals, herbicides, pesticides, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and petroleum product impacts. No evidence of a likely release associated with the rail lines was identified during the course of the Phase I ESA. (Roux 2019)
- **OEF-7: Adjoining Off-Site Interstate Freeway.** The site is bordered to the south by the I-405 San Diego Freeway, the off-ramp of which adjoins the site. It is not uncommon for near-surface soils at properties in close proximity to freeways that operated in the era of

leaded gasoline to be impacted by aerially deposited lead. No documentation of lead contamination in the area adjoining I-405 was identified during the course of the Phase I ESA. (Roux 2019)

- **OEF-8: On-Site and Nearby Transient Activity.** Transient encampments were observed along the adjoining Los Angeles River and according to the site personnel, transient activity was recently observed on the site. Some of the domestic refuse observed on-site may be associated with the reported transient activity. Although not observed during site reconnaissance, used and discarded hypodermic needles are often present in areas with high transient activity. (Roux 2019)
- **OEF-9: Unknown Fill material.** According to an interview with a prior owner of the Project Site, soil was imported to fill the onsite oil sumps in or around the 1950s and the fill may have originated from a nearby California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) freeway project. Subsequently, approximately 80,000 cy of sandy soil was imported from dredging operations at the Los Angeles River. Finally, another prior site owner, Steve Sukut, indicated that additional fill material was imported to the site to facilitate grading for the golf learning facility. It is possible that the fill materials may be impacted, particularly with heavy metals or total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH). (Roux 2019)

Adjoining Properties

Adjoining properties were identified on several databases searched as part of the August 30, 2019 Phase I ESA.

Oil Operators, Inc. (south) Facility – 712 – 714 West Baker Street

An Oil Operators, Inc. facility was present on the south side of the I-405 Freeway, approximately 500 feet to the south of the site and is listed on the Cleanup Program Site – Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanups (CPS-SLIC), ENVIROSTOR, California Hazardous Materials Reporting System (CHMIRS), CERS, SWEEPS UST, CA FID UST, EMI, Historical Underground Storage Tank (HIST UST), Superfund Enterprise Management System (SEMS)-ARCHIVE, and Underground Storage Tank (UST) databases. The CPS-SLIC, ENVIROSTOR, and California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) database listings refer to an open (site assessment) cleanup case. According to the Phase I ESA, it appears that the Oil Operators, Inc. (south) facility was once connected with the Oil Operators operations on the Project Site. Onsite and offsite oilfield related activities have contributed to overall poor regional groundwater quality. The Oil Operators, Inc. (south) facility is considered to be addressed by the former oilfield operations RECs identified previously. (Roux 2019)

Caltrans Long Beach, West LA River #2

The Caltrans Long Beach, West LA River #2 facility adjoins the site to the north-northwest, across the Los Angeles River. The facility is listed on the Solid Waste Facilities/Landfill Facilities (SWF/LF) and CERS databases. The database listings refer to the facility as a closed solid waste disposal site. Considering the closed operational status and the Los Angeles River intervening between the facility and the site, it is considered unlikely that the former disposal operations at the Caltrans facility would have adversely impacted subsurface conditions at the site. (Roux 2019)

Site Vicinity

The Phase I ESA identified six sites within one mile of the Project Site where releases of hazardous materials occurred with the potential to affect subsurface conditions at the Project Site, including the BP Pipeline/Arco facility (Golden Avenue), Store for Less facility (1012 West

Carson), Bixby Land Company facility (1101 Wardlow Street), Raytheon Systems Company facility (1500 Hughes Way), Long Beach USD-Board Building facility (1515 Hughes Way), and the South Region High School #4 facility (West Carson Street/Santa Fe Avenue). (Roux 2019)

DTSC Acceptance

The DTSC issued an acceptance email regarding the Phase I ESA on December 11, 2019, confirming that the Phase I ESA meets the requirements of eligibility for CLRRRA.

Final Site Assessment Plan and Report of Findings dated March 13, 2020

As required by CLRRRA, Roux prepared a Final Site Assessment Plan and Report of Findings (SAP/ROF) in March 2020 for Parcels 1 through 3, which included soil and soil vapor samples; testing; and a human health hazard assessment. (Roux 2020a) As part of the SAP/ROF, prior environmental investigations were reviewed to help characterize the site condition and determine data gaps that might require further investigation. The site has been the subject of several environmental investigations beginning in 1983. A Remedial Investigation (RI) report published by LFR Inc. (LFR) in 2009 provides a detailed description of the historical onsite investigations, which are set forth in detail in the LFR RI, as well as in the March 2020 SAP/ROF. Historical investigations documented that former sump operations resulted in subsurface impacts to soil and soil vapor. Groundwater quality beneath the site is also degraded, but impacts are regional and caused by numerous complex interactions of natural dynamics, including saltwater intrusion, with historical releases related to industrial and oilfield operations in the area. (Roux 2020a). Between 2003 and 2007, LFR advanced nine soil borings to depths of up to 50 feet bgs and collected soil samples from depths between 10 to 50 feet to evaluate the subsurface conditions. In addition, LFR also installed 26 soil vapor probes at depths from 5 to 10 feet bgs and three groundwater monitoring wells. Soil samples were also collected during installation of one of the groundwater monitoring wells from depths between 15 to 35 feet bgs and from shallower depths between 0.5 and 10 feet bgs during soil vapor probe installation. Soil samples collected during the investigations, at depths from 0.5 to 50 feet bgs, were analyzed for one or more of the following analytes: metals, VOCs, SVOCs, total petroleum hydrocarbon chain range (TPH-cc), organochlorine pesticides, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs); and soil vapor samples were analyzed in the laboratory for VOCs and methane (LFR, 2009). (Roux 2019)

Following review of the prior environmental investigations, Roux conducted its own subsurface investigation in 2019 to characterize existing cover soils (upper 5 to 17 feet bgs); confirm whether the site conditions are similar to those documented in the 2009 LFR RI report for soil vapor and groundwater; establish and confirm site contaminants of potential concern (CPOCs) in soil, soil vapor, and groundwater; and locate and identify the known onsite abandoned oil wells. (Roux 2020a)

Roux collected and analyzed 142 soil samples from 41 borings at depths ranging from 0–17 feet bgs and 27 soil vapor samples from 15 locations at depths from 3–10 feet bgs. Three borings were drilled to obtain groundwater samples 60-62 feet bgs, and a sample was obtained from one pre-existing onsite groundwater monitoring well MW-7, the bottom of which was tagged at 60.5 feet bgs. (Roux 2020a)

The extensive soil, soil vapor, and groundwater sampling conducted throughout the historical environmental investigations of the Project Site and Roux's subsurface sampling work in 2019 are graphically depicted in Figure 4 of the Revised Response Plan dated March 12, 2024, which is discussed below. (Roux 2024)

Based on these investigations, the SAP/ROF determined that the Project Site was capped with up to 10 feet of fill prior to the 2000s (the cover soil). The sump materials from the prior oil activities were found in areas ranging from 1 to 17 feet bgs. (Roux 2020a)

The Final Site Assessment Plan made the following conclusions:

- **Existing Sump Materials/Impacted Soil.** Based on the prior investigations and Roux's 2019 subsurface investigation, the sump materials/impacted soils on the Project Site have been delineated, both laterally and vertically, and characterized. COCs identified in the sump materials consist of total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH), heavy metals, and polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). Project Site groundwater conditions were identified as degraded from natural and human activities over time, but historic activities on the Project Site are not likely to have been a major cause of groundwater degradation. The site's existing impacted materials do not appear to have significantly affected groundwater quality. (Roux 2020a)
- **Cover Soil.** Cover soils (the approximately top 10 feet of soil on the Project Site) have been adequately characterized and the approximate thickness determined over the site. Based on the cover soil characterization, either lead, arsenic or TPH concentrations in the soil samples exceeded their corresponding screening levels/action levels in 10 localized areas, shown as potential areas of elevated concentrations (AECs). Based on the characterization, the cover soil, excluding the AECs, appears to be environmentally suitable for use during grading and as a future soil cap. (Roux 2020a)
- **Soil Vapor.** Soil vapor has been adequately characterized and current concentrations consistent with and generally lower than those reported in the LFR RI. Elevated concentrations of benzene and methane were detected in soil vapor at nine locations onsite. (Roux 2020a)
- **Groundwater.** Recent groundwater samples indicate that the Project Site's groundwater conditions do not appear to differ significantly from the regional groundwater quality, as the groundwater in the area is degraded from numerous and complex interactions of nature as well as historical man-caused activities that date back numerous decades. As such, the site was likely part of these interactions but does not appear to be the sole or primary cause of groundwater degradation. Based on current and historical groundwater data, the SAP/ROF did not anticipate any active groundwater remediation. (Roux 2020a)
- **Future Risk to Receptors.** The cumulative risk to a future industrial worker or current construction worker is within the acceptable cancer target range. The cumulative risk to a future industrial worker also does not exceed the acceptable non-cancer target risk threshold; however, the cumulative risk to a current construction worker exceeds the non-cancer target threshold. Although the cumulative non-cancer target risk estimates exceeded the target threshold for the construction worker scenario, none of the soil exposure point concentrations (EPCs) associated with individual COPCs exceeded applicable regulatory screening levels. The non-cancer risk estimate was not driven by a single compound, but multiple (thallium, cobalt, and others). Moreover, none of the COPCs associated with historical Site operations (e.g., TPH) contributed significantly to the non-cancer risk estimate. (Roux 2020a)

The SAP/ROF ultimately recommended preparation of a Response Plan that would outline mitigation measures, engineering controls, future OM&M activities and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site. (Roux 2020a)

DTSC Acceptance

The DTSC issued a letter approving the SAP/ROF on March 12, 2020 and accepting the SAP/ROF conclusions that the site's soils, soil vapor, and cover soils had been adequately delineated and characterized, and that the groundwater conditions have not significantly changed since the prior historical investigations. (DTSC 2020a)

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Parcel -025) dated April 20, 2020

A Phase I ESA was prepared for Parcel 7140-014-025 (Parcel 4) on April 20, 2020 (Roux 2020b). This April 20, 2020 Phase I ESA covers the portion of the Project Site not covered by the August 30, 2019 Phase I ESA. The Project Applicant purchased this portion of the Project Site after conducting the August 30, 2019 Phase I ESA, which is why the evaluation of this parcel was conducted separately. The specified parcel, approximately 0.25 acre in area, is located in the southeast corner of the Project Site. (Roux 2020b)

The Phase I ESA for Parcel 4 identified one REC (REC-1), a nearby offsite historical oil development which was also evaluated in the 2019 Phase I ESA prepared for the other 3 parcels. The Phase I ESA identified several OEFs (OEF-2, OEF-3, OEF-4, OEF-5, OEF-6), identified either on the property or on adjacent parcels and that could affect Parcel 4, which are also consistent with the 2019 Phase I ESA including commercial pesticide and herbicide use, pressurized oil pipelines, adjoining offsite interstate freeway, onsite and nearby transient activity, and unknown fill material. (Roux 2020b)

The regulatory database search conducted as part of the Phase I ESA for Parcel 4 did not identify hazardous materials sites on Parcel 4. Regulatory database listings were identified on adjoining properties (3701 and 4021 North Pacific Place), however, neither property involved any indication of hazardous materials release. (Roux 2020b)

DTSC Acceptance

The DTSC issued an acceptance email regarding the April 20, 2020 Phase I ESA on April 29, 2020, confirming that the Phase I ESA meets the requirements of eligibility for CLRRA.

Site Assessment Plan and Report of Findings Addendum dated April 10, 2020 (Revised May 18, 2020)

A Site Assessment Plan and Report of Findings Addendum dated April 10, 2020 (SAP/ROF Addendum) was prepared per the DTSC's request to summarize the historical environmental investigations related to the Parcel 4 and evaluate the results of a subsurface investigation conducted for Parcel 4. The SAP/ROF Addendum was treated as an addendum to the March 13, 2020 SAP/ROF previously discussed. (Roux 2020c)

Roux conducted a limited subsurface investigation in November 2019 to collect soil, soil vapor, and groundwater samples in three borings up to 32 feet bgs. In February 2020, Roux performed a supplemental subsurface investigation, including collecting soil samples from three borings up to 5 feet bgs, to address data gaps identified in the Phase I ESA for Parcel -025. Roux did not encounter groundwater in the borings advanced in this parcel during the subsurface investigations. (Roux 2020c)

Based on a review of prior investigations and Roux's 2019 and 2020 subsurface investigations, the SAP/ROF Addendum made the following conclusions:

- **Sump Materials/Impacted Soil.** Sump materials that were found at the adjacent parcels evaluated in the March 13, 2020 SAP/ROF do not extend onto Parcel -025. (Roux 2020c)
- **Shallow Soils.** Based on shallow soil sampling, arsenic concentrations exceeded screening levels/action levels established in the March 13, 2020 SAP/ROF at two locations. Consistent with the March 13, 2020 SAP/ROF, these locations are considered areas of AECs, and based on the characterization, shallow soils, excluding the AECs, appear to be environmentally suitable for use as a future soil cap for the self-storage development. (Roux 2020c)
- **Soil Vapor.** Current concentrations of methane and VOCs are consistent with historical investigation results for the site as well as the results of the March 13, 2020 SAP/ROF. Methane was not reported above laboratory minimal risk levels (MRLs) at the site and all reported VOC constituents were below screening levels/action levels established in the March 13, 2020 SAP/ROF. (Roux 2020c)
- **Groundwater.** Groundwater was not encountered in the borings placed at the site during the investigations. However, groundwater samples collected as part of recent and historical investigations at 3701 North Pacific Place indicate that groundwater in the vicinity of the site is degraded from natural processes as well as historical oil field related activities that date back decades. (Roux 2020c)
- **Future Risk to Receptors.** The data presented in the SAP/ROF Addendum are not considered to alter the conclusions of the risk evaluation presented in the original SAP/ROF. (Roux 2020c)

The SAP/ROF Addendum recommended inclusion of the site into the 3701 North Pacific Place CLRRRA agreement, and preparation of a Response Plan to outline mitigation measure, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring activities and administrative control for all four site parcels. (Roux 2020c)

DTSC Acceptance

The DTSC issued a letter on June 4, 2020 accepting SAP/ROF Addendum and its conclusions and recommendations. (DTSC 2020b)

CLRRRA Amendment

The original CLRRRA Agreement was amended to include Parcel 4 and dated June 16, 2020. Under CLRRRA, supervising agencies required agreements must be amended when the site at issues changes. (DTSC 2020c)

Soil Management Plan, Ambient Air Monitoring Plan, Health and Safety Plan, and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan dated August and September 2020

Given the Project Site's environmental history, the Project Applicant coordinated with the DTSC during the planning and implementation phase of the project.

Prior to developing response actions for the Site and prior to conducting any earth-moving activities onsite, the Project Applicant prepared and submitted to the DTSC a Soil Management Plan (SMP), Ambient Air Monitoring Plan (AAMP), Health and Safety Plan (HASP), and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). These documents included undertaking a

Surcharge program in late 2020 through early 2021 to determine the type of building foundation that would be most suitable for the proposed development at the Project Site.

A SMP was submitted to the DTSC on August 20, 2020 and subsequently approved on September 21, 2020. The SMP includes guidance concerning the proper monitoring, handling, segregation, stockpiling, dust control, testing, transport, and disposal of potentially impacted soils which may be encountered during future development activities to minimize potential environmental risks. The SMP guides the implementation of both the response actions and earth-moving activities associated with the development. (Roux 2022, Roux 2020d)

An AAMP was submitted to the DTSC and approved on August 17, 2020. The purpose of the AAMP is to demonstrate that emissions related to environmental and remedial activities do not result in potentially unacceptable impacts to off-site populations. Additionally, the real-time monitoring specified in the AAMP will allow field personnel to implement mitigation measures in real time. The AAMP is implemented during both the response actions and earth-moving activities associated with the development. (Roux 2022, Roux 2020e)

A HASP was submitted to the DTSC on August 13, 2020 and subsequently approved by DTSC. The HASP approved by DTSC is provided as an appendix to the SMP which is available in Appendix I-16 (Roux 2020d). The HASP has been developed for the protection of on-Site workers during construction activities and covers all the activities associated with the implementation of the environmental components associated with the proposed Project. (Roux 2020d, Roux 2022)

The Project is anticipated to require in total approximately 18,000 cubic yards of import soil. Of this, approximately 12,000 cubic yards of clean import soil was used for the Surcharge program. The clean soil was obtained from a pre-characterized import soil source in accordance with DTSC's *Information Advisory for Clean Imported Fill Material* (Clean Fill Advisory; California Environmental Protection Agency [Cal/EPA], 2001). An additional 6,000 cubic yards of import soil remain to be imported to the Site. (Roux 2024)

Prior to commencing the Surcharge work, the two AECs identified in the SAP/ROF (SB-8 and SB-22) located within the areas of cut associated with the Surcharge activities were excavated, relocated, and buried onsite in accordance with the approved SMP. (Roux 2024)

A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) was prepared for the Project, dated August 13, 2020 and submitted to LARWQCB. It was revised in May 2022; an updated SWPPP was prepared on January 3, 2024. The SWPPP identified and described the sources of sediment and other pollutants that may affect the quality of storm water discharges; it also analyzes and requires implementation and maintenance of BMPs to reduce or eliminate sediment, pollutants adhering to sediment, and other non-sediment pollutants in storm water and non-storm water discharges. In accordance with the SWPPP, sediment basins, silt fences, check dams, fiber rolls, berms, and other structural BMPs were constructed onsite prior to commencing the Surcharge program to prevent stormwater from carrying sediment offsite and eroding onsite materials. As required by the SWPPP, prior grading work done directs the stormwater to the sediment basins, where it is collected by the sediment basins to ensure that water quality standards set by the Construction General Permit are met.

The SWPPP also set forth when and where water quality sampling must occur to confirm the discharge limits set by the NPDES permit are met and that Project construction activities do not impair or contribute to impairment of the beneficial uses of surface waters. Because the Surcharge pile remains onsite, the BMPs were required to be maintained and currently remain in place, and the non-structural BMPs, water quality monitoring, and other measures required by the SWPPP have continued to be implemented. (Truxaw 2022, Incompli 2024)

Response Plan dated March 10, 2021

Based on the SAP/ROF and SAP/ROF Addendum and in coordination with DTSC, a Response Plan (Original RP) for the project² was prepared and submitted to DTSC on March 10, 2021 (Roux 2021) to satisfy the requirements under CLRRRA. The Original RP presents a detailed narrative of the Project Site background and existing environmental conditions, and identifies the appropriate response actions for the Project Site that are protective of human health and the environment during and post-development. (Roux 2021)

Based on the planned use of the site and the results of the Screening Level Human Health Risk Evaluation, remedial action objectives (RAOs) were developed specific to various media identified as potentially posing unacceptable risk to the future Project Site occupants, construction workers, and off-Site receptors. The Original RP developed RAOs for onsite soils, soil vapor, and groundwater to guide remedial activities at the Project Site and to act as a framework for measuring key milestones. (Roux 2021)

The Original RP proposed response actions to be included in the Project, which collectively meet the defined RAOs and minimize potential risk of exposure to future on- and off-site receptors. DTSC determined that implementation of the response actions would result in a development project that is protective of human health and the environment during construction and post-development. (Roux 2021)

Public Review of Response Plan and DTSC Responses to Public Comments

DTSC published the draft RP for public review and comment from November 16, 2020 to January 7, 2021. On December 2, 2020, DTSC conducted a virtual community meeting on the proposed draft RP. DTSC also formally responded to nearly 200 comments received on the draft RP in the form of emails, letters, and written and verbal comments received at the Community Meeting. DTSC's responses are set forth in the *Master Response, Draft Response Plan, Long Beach Industrial Park* dated April 6, 2021. (DTSC 2021a)

DTSC Acceptance

The DTSC approved the Final Original RP on September 23, 2021 and issued a Notice of Determination that the MND adequately analyzed the potential impacts of the Project Site's remediation. (DTSC 2021b) DTSC determined it would revise and recirculate the Response Plan to incorporate new relevant information pertaining to changes from the Prior Project and from the EIR.

Court Order

In response to the Court's October 19, 2022 judgment (Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 21STCP01537), setting aside the MND, and the City's subsequent rescission of the Prior Project entitlements in compliance with the judgment, DTSC withdrew project approval and notified the State Clearinghouse on August 15, 2023, that approval of the Notice of Determination dated September 23, 2021, had been withdrawn. This notification letter is posted on the State Clearinghouse website. DTSC determined it would revise and recirculate the Response Plan to incorporate new relevant information pertaining to changes from the Prior Project and from the EIR.

² The Project at the time the 2021 RP was prepared was the Prior Project identified in the MND for the Artesia Parcels. As explained in DEIR Section 2 (Introduction), there is no substantive difference between the Prior Project and the Project for purposes of the RP.

Remedial Design and Implementation Plan (RDIP) dated October 13, 2021 (Revised December 3, 2021 and January 11, 2022)

A Response Plan is implemented through a RDIP, which sets forth the technical designs for the response actions required by the Response Plan. Prior to the issuance of the Court Ruling, a draft RDIP was prepared and submitted to DTSC on October 13, 2021, to implement the Original RP. The RDIP was subsequently updated and the current version, dated January 11, 2022 (Roux 2022), was prepared to present the design and implementation for environmental components related to the seven response actions described in the Original RP for the planned project. The RDIP was prepared setting forth the technical engineering details for the design and implementation for response actions described in the Original RP for the Prior Project, and include implementation of management of soils in areas of elevated concentrations, construction of an engineered cap to cover the site, requirement of methane/soil gas mitigation for under buildings and under parking areas, installation of perimeter soil gas probes, installation of groundwater monitoring wells, and institutional controls for exposures to impacted soils and sumps. (Roux 2022)

DTSC Acceptance

The DTSC approved the RDIP dated January 13, 2022. (DTSC 2022) However, a new RDIP will be required based on the Revised Response Plan submitted for the new Project.

Revised Response Plan dated March 12, 2024

As discussed previously, DTSC withdrew the Notice of Determination pertaining to the Original RP. Following the City's issuance of the Notice of Preparation indicating that the City intended to prepare an EIR in accordance with the Court Ruling, DTSC issued a Community Survey questionnaire in August 2023 and a Community Profile in October 2023 to solicit public input for a revised RP and provide the community information about the process. On March 13, 2024, the Project Applicant submitted a revised Draft RP dated March 12, 2024 (Revised RP), which is under DTSC review. Because the Project is not substantially different from the Prior Project³, the Revised RP is substantially similar to the Original RP approved by DTSC on September 23, 2021. Technical edits were made to reflect minor differences between the Project and Prior Project, the occurrence of the Surcharge activities in late 2020 through early 2021 (including relocating onsite two of the AECs in accordance with DTSC procedures prior to commencing the Surcharge work), and to include additional details of the response actions previously proposed in the RDIP, none of which change the recommended response actions or condition of the Project Site for purposes of the remediation. Similar to the Original RP, the Revised RP identifies response actions to address the identified environmental conditions on the Project Site, such that they met the defined RAOs and minimize potential risk of exposure to future on- and off-Site receptors. The RP actions include:

1. Management of Soils in Areas of Elevated Concentrations (AECs).
2. Construction of an Engineered Cap.
3. Methane/Soil Gas Mitigation Measures.
4. Installation of Groundwater Monitoring Wells.
5. Installation of Perimeter Soil Vapor Probes.

³ The Prior Project in this context is meant only to refer to the Prior Project as it relates to the Artesia Parcels in the MND. As previously discussed, the McDonald Parcels are no longer part of the Project and so are not considered part of the Prior Project for purposes of this discussion.

6. Institutional Controls- Land Use Covenant.
7. Operations and Maintenance & Monitoring Plan. (Roux 2024)

Fire Hazards

The Project Site is not located in a Fire Hazard Severity Zone in a State Responsibility Area (SRA) (CalFire 2024) or a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA). (CalFire 2011)

B. Regulatory Framework

Federal

Environmental Protection Agency

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is a federal agency tasked with implementing certain federal regulations. With respect to hazardous materials, these include the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous waste under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), as discussed below. These laws impose “cradle-to-grave” regulatory systems for handling hazardous waste in a manner that protects human health and the environment. The USEPA is also responsible for the Accidental Release Prevention Program and Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act. (EPA 2023)

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

The RCRA (42 United States Code [USC] Section 6901) is the public law that creates the framework for the proper management of hazardous and non-hazardous solid waste. The law describes the waste management program mandated by Congress that gave USEPA authority to develop the RCRA program. The term RCRA is often used interchangeably to refer to the law, regulations, and USEPA policy and guidance. Under RCRA, the USEPA established a comprehensive regulatory program to ensure that hazardous waste is managed safely from “cradle to grave,” meaning from 1) the time it is created; 2) while it is transported, treated, and stored; and 3) until it is disposed. (Cornell 2024a)

Toxic Substances Control Act

The TSCA of 1976 (15 USC Section 2601) gives the USEPA the ability to track 75,000 industrial chemicals currently produced in or imported into the United States. The USEPA repeatedly screens these chemicals and requires reporting or testing of those that may pose an environmental or human health hazard. The USEPA also has the ability to ban the manufacture and import of chemicals that pose an unreasonable risk. The USEPA tracks thousands of new chemicals that are developed each year with either unknown or dangerous characteristics. The production, importation, use, and disposal of these toxic substances is regulated by the USEPA, as necessary, to protect human health and the environment. For example, the USEPA prohibited the use of PCBs in the majority of new electrical equipment starting in 1979 and phased out a majority of the existing PCB-containing equipment. The inclusion of PCBs in electrical equipment is regulated by the provisions set forth in the TSCA. (Cornell 2024b)

Accidental Release Prevention Program

Title 40, Part 68, of the CFR is the federal Accidental Release Prevention Program that lists regulated toxic and flammable substances and sets requirements concerning the prevention of

accidental releases. It sets threshold quantities of regulated substances at which owners or operators of a stationary source are required to prepare Risk Management Plans. These Risk Management Plans must contain an assessment of the risks for accidental release, prevention measures, emergency response procedures, employee training, record keeping, and incident investigations. (Cornell 2024c)

Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act

The Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) of 1986 (42 USC Section 11001, *et seq.*) was created to help communities plan for chemical emergencies. It requires facilities to report on the storage, use, and releases of hazardous substances to federal, state, and local governments. The Community Right-to-Know provisions help increase the public's knowledge and access to information on chemicals at individual facilities, their uses, and releases into the environment. (Cornell 2024d)

State

California Health and Safety Code

“Hazardous waste” is any hazardous material that is abandoned, discarded or recycled, as defined by Sections 25117 and 25124 of the California Health and Safety Code (HSC). In addition, hazardous waste may occasionally be generated by actions that change the composition of previously nonhazardous materials. The criteria used to characterize a material as hazardous include ignitability, toxicity, corrosivity, reactivity, radioactivity, or bioactivity. (CDTFA 2024a, CDTFA 2024b)

California Occupational Safety and Health Administration

The California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA) is responsible for enforcing State health and safety standards and implementing federal OSHA regulations. CalOSHA has regulations to protect worker safety during potential exposure to lead and asbestos under Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 1529, Asbestos and Section 1532.1, Lead. Asbestos is regulated as a potential worker safety hazard under the authority of the CalOSHA. These rules and regulations prohibit emissions of asbestos from asbestos-related demolition or construction activities, require medical examinations and monitoring of employees engaged in activities that could disturb asbestos, specify precautions and safe work practices that must be followed to minimize the potential for release of asbestos fibers, and require notice to federal and local government agencies prior to beginning renovation or demolition that could disturb asbestos. Demolition that could result in the release of asbestos and lead must be conducted according to CalOSHA standards. These standards were developed to protect the general population and construction workers from respiratory and other hazards associated with exposure to these materials. Young children, the elderly, and people in poor health may be more susceptible to adverse health effects from exposure to asbestos released to the environment. (DIR 2024a, DIR 2024b, DIR 2024c)

California Hazardous Waste Control Act

The California Hazardous Waste Control Act (HWCA), California Health and Safety Code (see Division 20, Chapter 6.5, Article 2, Section 25100, *et seq.*), authorizes the California State DTSC and local Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPA) to regulate facilities that generate or treat hazardous waste. The HWCA authorizes CUPAs to perform the following actions:

- Conduct inspections of any factory, plant, construction site, waste disposal site, transfer station, establishment, or any other place or environment where hazardous wastes are stored, handled, processed, disposed of, or being treated to recover resources;
- Maintain records of compliance with the HWCA;
- Require hazardous waste generators as provided herein, to pay inspection and administration fees to cover the costs of administering the provisions in this Act. Fees may include but shall not be limited to the costs of inspection, document development and processing, recordkeeping, enforcement activities, and informational materials development and distribution;
- Issue authorization for on-site treatment of hazardous waste to persons eligible to operate pursuant to permit-by-rule, conditional authorization, or conditional exemption; and
- Enforce against violations of the HWCA. (CDTFA 2024c)

The City of Long Beach serves as the local CUPA for the City and the Project Site.

California Accidental Release Prevention Program

The California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CCR, Title 19, Division 2) merged the Federal Accidental Release Prevention Program and California Risk Management and Prevention Program to eliminate the need for two separate programs addressing the prevention of accidental releases of regulated toxic and flammable substances. Businesses using regulated substances exceeding a threshold quantity are evaluated under this program to determine the potential for and impacts of accidental releases. Depending on the potential hazards, business owners may be required to develop and submit a Risk Management Plan. (Cornell 2024e)

California Green Building Standards Code

The 2022 California Green Building Standards Code (24 CCR, Part 11), also known as the CALGreen code, contains mandatory requirements and voluntary measures for new residential and nonresidential buildings (including buildings for retail, office, public schools and hospitals) throughout California) (CALGreen 2024). The development of the CALGreen Code is intended to improve public health, safety, and general welfare by enhancing the design and construction of buildings through the following construction practices: (1) planning and design; (2) energy efficiency; (3) water efficiency and conservation; (4) material conservation and resource efficiency; and (5) environmental quality. In short, the code is established to reduce construction waste; make buildings more efficient in the use of materials and energy; and reduce environmental impact during and after construction. (CALGreen 2024)

California Environmental Protection Agency

The California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) was formed in 1991 as the State's primary environmental authority. CalEPA has a mission to ensure public health, environmental quality, and economic vitality while working to restore, protect, and enhance the environment. CalEPA oversees several state agencies, including these agencies that handle hazardous

materials: Air Resources Board (asbestos) and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (lead). (CalEPA 2024, DIR 2024a)

California Land Use Revitalization Act of 2004

The CLRRRA of 2004 aims to encourage cleanup and redevelopment of polluted urban sites by providing certain benefits, such as legal immunities to damages and response claims, to qualifying buyers of property who agree to take the steps required by DTSC to remediate their property. CLRRRA is codified within the California Health & Safety Code at Sections 25395.60 *et seq.* DTSC is one of three agencies that can supervise a project under CLRRRA. CLRRRA requires a specific set of procedural steps for a property owner to qualify for CLRRRA's benefits, including but not limited to a site assessment plan characterizing hazardous materials at the property, a report of findings to determine if a response action is needed, and if so, a response plan proposing actions necessary to prevent or eliminate any unreasonable risk posed the property's condition (Health & Saf. Code, §§ 25395.94, 25395.95, 25395.96). (Justia 2024b)

California Department of Transportation/California Highway Patrol

Hazardous materials are routinely transported in the region by truck or rail. The U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), Office of Hazardous Materials Safety prescribes strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials, as outlined in Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations and implemented by Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations. Transportation of hazardous materials along any city or state roadways within or near the Project Site is also subject to all hazardous materials transportation regulations established by the California Highway Patrol pursuant to the California Vehicle Code. In addition, universal waste handlers are subject to Title 22 of the CCR (Section 66273.30 through Section 66273.39 and Section 66273.70 through Section 66273.77), which identify standards for hazardous waste handlers and authorization requirements for universal waste handlers who treat hazardous wastes. (Casetext 2024a)

California Department of Public Health

The California Department of Public Health (CDPH) has a primary mission to protect the public's health. By statutory definition, biohazardous materials include biohazardous laboratory wastes and biologic specimens such as human or animal tissue, as defined by Section 117635 of the California Health and Safety Code. Biohazardous medical waste is generally regulated in the same manner as hazardous waste, except that special provisions apply to storage, disinfection, containment, and transportation. The Medical Waste Management Program of CDPH enforces the Medical Waste Management Act and regulations related to environmental health and laboratory services. (Justia 2024a)

Regional

South Coast Air Quality Management District

In the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), the SCAQMD is the agency responsible for protecting public health and welfare through the administration of federal and State air quality laws, regulations, and policies. Included in the SCAQMD's tasks are the monitoring of air pollution, the preparation of the AQMP for the SoCAB, and the promulgation of rules and regulations.

South Coast Air Quality Management District Rules

The Project would be required to comply with existing SCAQMD rules for the reduction of fugitive dust and criteria pollutant emissions. The following rules are most relevant to the potential impact of the Project from hazards and hazardous materials.

SCAQMD Rule 1166 establishes requirements to control the emission of Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) from excavating, grading, handling and treating VOC-contaminated soil as a result of leakage from storage or transfer operations, accidental spillage, or other deposition. This rule requires that an approved mitigation plan be obtained from SCAQMD prior to excavation of materials containing VOCs, handling or storage of VOC-contaminated soil, or treatment of VOC-contaminated soil.

SCAQMD Rule 1466 was established to minimize the amount of off-site fugitive dust emissions containing toxic air contaminants by reducing particulate emissions in the ambient air as a result of earth-moving activities, including from the removal of soil that contains applicable toxic air contaminants. This rule mandates ambient PM10 monitoring, dust control measures, notification, signage, and recordkeeping requirements.

Additional SCAQMD Rules applicable to the Project are discussed in detail in Section 4.2, Air Quality.

Local

Long Beach Emergency Operations Plan

The City of Long Beach Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) addresses the planned response by the City to extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, and national security emergencies. The plan was designed to be flexible enough to be used in all emergencies as well as facilitating response and short-term recovery activities. The EOP was developed to include the City as part of the California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and the National Incident Management System (NIMS). The purpose of the EOP is to guide the mitigation, response, and recovery efforts of the City of Long Beach before, during and after an emergency. Under the EOP, the Emergency Planning Team provides dedicated staff responsible for managing the City's Emergency Operations Center (EOC), which include personnel from City departments (e.g., Long Beach Fire Department and Long Beach Police Department), supporting allied agencies and community organizations that have been assigned primary functions or responsibilities within the EOP. (City of Long Beach 2015)

Long Beach Hazard Mitigation Plan

In 2023, the City Department of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Communications adopted the 2023 Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan in response to Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000, which requires state and local governments to prepare Mitigation Plans to document their Mitigation Planning process, and identify hazards, potential losses, mitigation needs, goals, and strategies. The Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 is intended to facilitate cooperation between state and local governments in pre-disaster planning and promotes sustainability in hazard mitigation. Through collaboration, mitigation needs can be identified before disasters strike, resulting in faster allocation of resources and more effective risk reduction projects. The City's Plan includes a hazard assessment, goals and objectives, and mitigation strategies for hazards, including earthquake, severe weather, flood, dam-failure, tsunami, climate change, drought, and hazard of interest. (City of Long Beach 2023)

City of Long Beach General Plan

The City of Long Beach General Plan is a policy document that establishes the goals, policies, and directions the City will take to achieve the vision of the community and guide the future development of the City. The City of Long Beach General Plan contains twelve elements including Land Use, Transportation (known as the Mobility Element), Housing, Conservation, Noise, Open Space, Safety, Air Quality, Historic Preservation, Seismic Safety, Local Coastal Program, and Urban Design. (City of Long Beach 2024)

Public Safety Element

The City of Long Beach Public Safety Element was adopted in 1975. The Public Safety Element contains goals and policies related to fire protection, law enforcement, schools, water, sewer, and storm drain systems as well as other utilities and services, disaster operations, and risk management. This element provides guidance for provision of new and expanded public facilities to support the continued growth of the City, as well as recommendations for both immediate and advance planning actions. Table 4.10-1 of Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, provides public services and safety related goals and policies of the Public Safety Element that are relevant to the Project and a project consistency analysis.

Seismic Safety Element

The City of Long Beach Seismic Safety Element was adopted in October 1988. The Seismic Safety Element provides a comprehensive analysis of seismic factors so as to reduce loss of life, injuries, damage to property, and social and economic impacts resulting from future earthquakes. To achieve maximum feasible safety from seismic risk, the Element focuses upon developmental policies as well as the allocation of future land uses. Table 4.10-1 of Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning, provides public services and safety related goals and policies of the Seismic Safety Element that are relevant to the Project and a project consistency analysis.

Long Beach Municipal Code

The following sections in Title 8 (Health and Safety) of the Long Beach Municipal Code address hazards, including:

- Chapter 8.27 (Community Lead Hazard Control/Abatement). This Chapter deals with the removal of lead hazards from any dwelling, dwelling unit, hotel, motel, guest room, child care facility, institution, yard, soil, or any premises or areas inhabited or frequented by children. In accordance with this Chapter, the property owner or responsible party shall be responsible for the removal or the control of any lead hazard. The extent of the removal or the control of the lead hazard shall be determined by the City Health Officer or his/her representative and completed in accordance with approved State or Federal methods.
- Chapter 8.86 (Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory): This Chapter details the administration of Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory, and delegates the Long Beach/Signal Hill CUPA as the administering agency for enforcement and regulation. This Chapter also grants authority to the Long Beach/Signal Hill CUPA to collect fees for violations related to Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory.
- Chapter 8.87 (Hazardous Waste Control): This Chapter designates the Long Beach CUPA as the administering agency for enforcement and regulation of hazardous waste. This Chapter also grants authority to the Long Beach CUPA to collect fees for violations related to Hazardous Waste Control.

- Chapter 8.88 (Hazardous Materials – Cleanup). This Chapter requires compliance with the hazardous waste control laws and implementation of proper cleanup methods and procedures for spills of hazardous materials. When a hazardous material spill has occurred, the spill is characterized and the property owner, applicant or other responsible party shall clean up the spill by complying with the remediation requirements of this Chapter.
- Chapter 18.78 (Construction in the Vicinity of Abandoned Oil Wells). This Chapter requires that all construction activities on a privately-owned parcel containing an abandoned oil/gas well or wells shall meet requirements set forth in the Chapter, including but not limited to well safety evaluation, well abandonment, long-term safety evaluation, above-well head mitigation, leak testing, installation of equipment, site clean-up, methane mitigation, exposure period, post construction protocols, and site restoration.
- Chapter 18.79 (Methane Gas Mitigation). This Chapter sets forth minimum requirements for the control of methane gas intrusion emanating from geologic formations. This Chapter governs methane gas mitigation systems for all buildings and structures by requiring methane gas system submittal documents for any project with a methane gas mitigation system; requiring methane gas mitigation inspection and plans examination fees; and requiring methane gas mitigation inspections for any project with a methane gas mitigation system.

4.8.3 PROJECT IMPACTS

A. Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a project would result in a significant impact related to hazards an hazardous materials if it would:

- Threshold 4.8a** *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*
- Threshold 4.8b** *Would the project 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?*
- Threshold 4.8c** *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*
- Threshold 4.8d** *Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*
- Threshold 4.8e** *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, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area?*

Threshold 4.8f *Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Threshold 4.8g *Would the project 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?*

B. Methodology

This Section evaluates the potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts related to the physical development of the proposed Project. The impacts analysis in this Section is based on the environmental investigations outlined previously. The investigations were conducted and the technical studies prepared to provide an overall general assessment of the Project Site, characterize the Project Site's historic uses specifically related to hazardous materials, identify existing or remaining hazardous materials and conditions, define appropriate remediation, and document the proposed response plan.

C. Standard Requirements

The following standard requirements are applicable to the Project.

SR HAZ-1 All construction activities shall be performed in compliance with all CalOSHA standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 8) to protect worker health and safety.

SR HAZ-2 Activities at the Project Site shall comply with existing federal, State, and local regulations regarding hazardous material use, storage, disposal, and transport. All on-site generated waste that meets hazardous waste criteria shall be stored, manifested, transported, and disposed of in accordance with the California Code of Regulations (Title 22) and in a manner to the satisfaction of the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA), as applicable.

All transport and transfer of hazardous materials shall be performed by a licensed hazardous waste hauler in compliance with all applicable State and federal requirements, including U.S. Department of Transportation regulations under Title 49 (Hazardous Materials Transportation Act) and Title 40, Section 263 (Subtitle C of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act) of the Code of Federal Regulations; California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) standards; and Division of Occupational Safety and Healthy (Cal/OSHA) standards.

D. Impact Analysis

Threshold 4.8a *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

The potential for the Project to create a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials is evaluated below for Project construction and operation.

Construction

The Project does not involve any export of soil from the Project Site, including any of the Project Site's impacted materials (the sump materials and AECs). The sump materials are not anticipated to be encountered during the majority of the development of the Project due to their depth and the proposed grading plan. (Roux 2022) Sump materials are only anticipated to be potentially encountered and excavated during construction of the stormwater detention systems, utilities, manholes and stormwater tie-ins. (Roux 2022) There are also 12 AECs at the Project Site within the existing cover soil, as shown on Exhibit 4.8-1, Location of Areas of Elevated Concentrations. (Roux 2020a) The Revised RP requires that, once the development grading plan is finalized and areas of cut and fill determined, AECs and sump materials may either be buried in place onsite (in areas of fill) or excavated and reconsolidated elsewhere onsite (in areas of cut) beneath the engineered cap in consultation with DTSC. Movement of impacted materials onsite from two AECs was conducted for the Surcharge Activities in accordance with the DTSC-approved SMP, the creation and implementation of which was required by the Original RP. Future Project construction activities that encounter AECs and sump materials would be conducted in accordance with a SMP and an Excavation Management Plan (EMP), both of which are required by the Revised RP. (Roux 2024, Roux 2022) The SMP sets required procedures for the proper monitoring, handling, segregation, stockpiling, dust control, testing, transport, and disposal of potentially impacted soils which may be encountered during development activities to minimize potential environmental risks. The EMP, which is an appendix to the Revised RP, was developed in general accordance with the SCAQMD Rule 1150, per DTSC request, even though SCAQMD determined that Rule 1150 does not apply to the Project or Project Site. (Roux 2024) The EMP is to be implemented during construction activities that disturb specifically sump materials. The EMP sets required procedures for proper monitoring, handling, segregation, and relocation and reconsolidation of sump materials to protect onsite workers and offsite receptors. (Roux 2024) Prior to commencing the Surcharge Activities, the two AECs identified in the SAP/ROF (SB-8 and SB-22) located within the areas of the Surcharge Activities were excavated, relocated, and buried onsite in accordance with the SMP dated August 20, 2020. (Roux 2024) The remaining AECs, and additional AECs identified during Project development, if any, would also be delineated and managed in the manner required by the SMP. Similarly, if sump materials are encountered during Project Site development, they would be managed onsite in accordance with the SMP and EMP. (Roux 2022, Roux 2024) Therefore, the Project has the potential to result in a significant impact related to creation of a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during Project construction, resulting in a potentially significant impact without the implementation of the aforementioned plans and procedures.

Project construction activities would also involve the use and handling of common hazardous materials, such as gasoline, oil, hydraulic fluid, diesel fuel, or other liquids associated with the operation and maintenance of construction equipment. The onsite temporary handling, storage, and usage of these materials would be subject to applicable local, State, and/or federal regulations, including Best Management Practices (BMPs) required by the City and CalOSHA requirements, as specified in **SR HAZ-1**. Any hazardous materials used or encountered during construction would be transported, used, stored, and disposed of according to applicable local, State, and/or federal regulations, as specified in **SR HAZ-2**. The Project would be required to comply with these standard requirements; therefore, construction impacts related to the transport, use or disposal of these materials would be less than significant.



EXPLANATION	
B1	LFR Boring
PT1	LFR CPT Location
MW-3	Groundwater Monitoring Well
GB1	Geofon Boring (Jaykim, 1998)
E1	Excavation Sample Location (JB, 1989)
C1	ETC CPT Location (ETC, 1983)
MW-2	Former Groundwater Monitoring Well (JB, 1995)
10'	Depth of Base of Sump Material
—	Profile Line (ETC, 1984)
---	Property Boundary
	Railroad Tracks

Source: LFR

Location of Areas of Elevated Concentrations

Exhibit 4.8-1

Pacific Place Project



Map not to scale



Operation

The proposed storage uses would restrict storage and transport of hazardous materials with the exception of common materials associated with vehicles and vehicle maintenance (i.e., fuel and oil). Further, all onsite workers would be trained on containment and cleanup of small spills of hazardous materials that might be encountered in the operation of a self-storage and RV storage site, such as gasoline or oil from vehicles, pursuant to State guidelines contained in the Cal/OSHA Title 8 regulations. Additionally, in the event of a hazardous materials release of amount and/or toxicity that workers could not safely contain and clean up, the site operator or manager would contact Long Beach Environmental Health, the CUPA for the City of Long Beach, immediately.

The proposed engineered cap to be implemented through the Revised RP as part of the long-term operations would provide a physical barrier to known hazardous materials historically existing on the Project Site, which would mean that these materials will not be transported, used, or disposed of during Project operations. Per the long-term OM&M Plan that will be prepared and submitted to DTSC for review and approval as part of the implementing of the Revised RP, this cap would be inspected on a routine basis, including after any major seismic activity, to ensure that it has maintained its integrity and to repair any damages that may have occurred. This engineered cap would be designed and built to current applicable Building Code and other requirements to meet seismic safety standards which will enable the cap to withstand seismic activity within the fault zone identified for this area. (Roux 2024)

Therefore, development of the proposed Project would not cause significant hazards through the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials during Project operations, and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant shall receive approval from DTSC of, and implement, a Response Plan (RP) prepared for the Project in accordance with CLRRA, which outlines site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

AECs and Sump Materials During Construction: Implementation of the Revised RP, including creation of the SMP and EMP, would be required pursuant to **MM HAZ-1**, which would reduce potential impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials during Project construction to a less than significant level by setting, in coordination with DTSC, procedures for the proper monitoring, handling, segregation, stockpiling, dust control, testing, transport, and disposal of AECs and sump materials that might be encountered during construction. Common Hazardous Materials During Construction: A less than significant impact would occur and therefore no mitigation is required.

Operation: A less than significant impact would occur and therefore no mitigation is required.

Impact Comparison Summary: The Project would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated. This impact would be the same when compared with the impact analyses in the MND.

Threshold 4.8b *Would the project 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?*

As previously stated, the Project Site was occupied by Oil Operators by 1926, where oil brine was pumped to sumps on the facility and water was allowed to evaporate from the brine or seep into the subsurface below the sumps leaving behind a sludge. Following evaporation, the remaining sludge was left in the sumps or dumped elsewhere. Additionally, six oil wells (five of them active) were located on the Project Site from the 1940s through 1964, and they were abandoned between 1981 and 2014. In the 1970s, a partial cleanup/treatment of the Project Site was conducted. The partial cleanup included removal, treatment, and replacement of a portion of the sump materials. In the late 1980s, approximately 80,000 cubic yards of sandy soil were imported to the Project Site reportedly from nearby Los Angeles River dredging activities, which was spread throughout the Site at a reported thickness of between two and eight feet and completely covered the oily sludge. Due to these hazardous historical uses on-site, the Project Site has undergone a series of subsurface investigations, remedial investigations, feasibility studies, and additional studies, as outlined further in the 2019 Phase I ESA and SAP/ROF. (Roux 2019)

Based on the 2019 Phase I ESA for Parcels 1 through 3 (Roux 2019) and the 2020 Phase I ESA for Parcel 4 (Roux 2020b), a number of RECs were determined to exist on-site, including former oil sumps, former oil wells, and nearby offsite historical oil development, as described in further detail above.

Subsequently, the SAP/ROF for Parcels 1 through 3 (Roux 2020a) and the SAP/ROF Addendum for Parcel 4 (Roux 2020c) were prepared and included soil, soil vapor samples, and groundwater testing and a human health hazard assessment. Ultimately, the SAP/ROF and SAP/ROF Addendum concluded:

- **Existing Sump Materials/Impacted Soil.** The sump materials/impacted soils on the Project Site have been delineated, both laterally and vertically, and characterized. Project Site groundwater conditions were identified as degraded from natural and human activities over time, but historic activities on the Project Site are not likely to have been a major cause of groundwater degradation. The site's existing impacted materials do not appear to have significantly affected groundwater quality.
- **Cover Soil.** Cover soils have been adequately characterized and the approximate thickness determined over the site. Based on the cover soil characterization, lead, arsenic and TPH concentrations in the soil samples exceeded their corresponding screening levels/action levels in 12 localized areas, shown as potential AECs. Based on the characterization, the cover soil, excluding the AECs, appears to be environmentally suitable to use during grading and as a future soil cap.
- **Soil Vapor.** Soil vapor has been adequately characterized and current concentrations consistent with and generally lower than those reported in the LFR RI. Elevated concentrations of benzene and methane were detected in soil vapor at nine locations onsite.
- **Groundwater.** Recent groundwater samples indicate that the Project Site's groundwater conditions do not appear to differ significantly from the regional groundwater quality, as the groundwater in the area is degraded from numerous and complex interactions of nature as well as historical man-caused activities that date back numerous decades. As such, the site was likely part of these interactions but does not appear to be the sole or

primary cause of groundwater degradation. Based on current and historical groundwater data, the SAP/ROF did not anticipate any active groundwater remediation.

- **Future Risk to Receptors.** The cumulative risk to a future industrial worker or current construction worker is within the acceptable cancer target range. The cumulative risk to a future industrial worker also does not exceed the acceptable non-cancer target risk threshold; however, the cumulative risk to a current construction worker exceeds the non-cancer target threshold. Although the non-cancer target risk estimates exceeded the target threshold for the construction worker scenario, none of the soil EPCs associated with individual COPCs exceeded applicable regulatory screening levels. The non-cancer risk estimate was not driven by a single compound, but multiple (thallium, cobalt, and others). Moreover, none of the COPCs associated with historical Site operations (e.g., TPH) contributed significantly to the non-cancer risk estimate. (Roux 2020a, Roux 2020c)

In light of the RECs and AECs identified onsite, the SAP/ROF and SAP/ROF Addendum recommended preparation and implementation of a Response Plan to ensure that the Project Site can be safely utilized for the Project. Accordingly, construction and operation of the Project would have the potential to result in a significant impact related to the creation of 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, absent implementation of the recommended response plan.

Surcharge Activities

Because part of the Project occurred from August 2020 to January 2021 (the Surcharge Activities), the discussion below evaluates the procedures that were implemented during the Surcharge Activities to address hazards that could have occurred to people or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The Project is anticipated to require in total approximately 18,000 cubic yards of import soil. Of this, approximately 12,000 cubic yards of clean import soil was used for the Surcharge Activities. The clean soil was obtained from a pre-characterized import soil source in accordance with the SMP and DTSC's *Information Advisory for Clean Imported Fill Material* (Clean Fill Advisory; California Environmental Protection Agency [Cal/EPA], 2001). (Roux 2024) An additional 6,000 cubic yards of DTSC-approved clean import soil would be imported in the future during proposed development grading activities. (Roux 2024, Roux 2020a)

Prior to commencing the Surcharge Activities, the two AECs identified in the SAP/ROF (SB-8 and SB-22) located within the areas of the Surcharge Activities were excavated, relocated, and buried onsite in accordance with the approved SMP and AAMP, which were required by the Original RP to be prepared and implemented. (Roux 2024, Roux 2020d, Roux 2020e) The SAP/ROF and SAP/ROF Addendum determined that, aside from the two AECs which were moved and secured prior to commencing the Surcharge Activities, the existing onsite cover soils used, including that used for the Surcharge Activities, was characterized and environmentally suitable for grading associated with the Project. (Roux 2020a, Roux 2020e)

Prior to commencing the Surcharge Activities, the Applicant notified the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) about upcoming earthmoving activities. The Applicant also prepared a Notice of Intent and SWPPP in accordance with the California Construction General Permit, which were submitted to and approved by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control (LARWQCB) and are available online in the LARWQCB's Storm Water Multiple Application & Reporting System (SMARTS) system (Waste Discharge Identification [WDID] number 4 19C391158). In August 2020, DTSC informed the surrounding community of the field work related to the Surcharge Activities through community mailers and a work notice, available

to the public on DTSC's online repository, ENVIROSTOR. As required by the AAMP, the Applicant performed baseline air monitoring in August 2020 to determine baseline conditions for PM10, meteorological conditions, noise, VOCs, methane, hydrogen sulfide, odor, and metals (arsenic and lead). (Roux 2020e)

Per the AAMP, the Applicant performed baseline air monitoring in August 2020 and began mobilizing for the earth-moving activities. The earth-moving activities associated with the Surcharge Activities were then conducted from September 2020 to January 2021. All earth-moving activities associated with the Surcharge Activities were conducted in accordance with SCAQMD requirements and the SWPPP, and pursuant to the site-specific SMP, AAMP, and HASP, which DTSC reviewed, commented on, and approved prior to commencing the Surcharge Activities and posted on ENVIROSTOR. (Roux 2020e)

Per the AAMP, the Project Applicant's consultants conducted real time monitoring of volatile organic compound (VOC), methane, and hydrogen sulfide emissions from soil (per SCAQMD Rule 1166), fugitive dust – PM10 (Per SCAQMD 401, 402, 403, and 1466), and air (per the Site's AAMP), and conducted discrete air sampling for metals and VOCs (per the Site's AAMP) during the Surcharge Activities. Generally, SCAQMD Rule 403 prohibits net PM10 (dust) levels from exceeding 50 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) between the upwind and downwind areas of the site. As requested by DTSC, a more stringent threshold of 25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (SCAQMD Rule 1466) was adhered to during Surcharge Activities. Air monitoring was conducted in real time during the Surcharge Activities using three monitoring stations along the Project Site perimeter in the approximate locations shown on Figure 4 in the AAMP. Two of the monitoring stations were located along the northern and eastern boundaries between the work activities and the residences and elementary school across the railway tracks. The Applicant also coordinated with SCAQMD throughout the earthwork activities, and dust suppression measures were implemented pursuant to SCAQMD requirements and the site-specific AAMP and SMP. The AAMP required that, if the air monitoring showed results exceeding the levels set by the AAMP, specified actions must be taken, such as ceasing the activity and implementing other measures until levels dropped back below the applicable threshold. (Roux 2020e)

The SMP included procedures for handling of AECs and sump materials if encountered onsite; operational controls for dust suppression during soil movement, including use of water or soil binders, speed limits, and limits on operating when wind speed exceeds designated levels; and contingency measures in the event dust is observed leaving the site during soil moving activities. (Roux 2020d)

Though the Surcharge Activities have already occurred, the SMP and AAMP implemented during the Surcharge Activities (which were reviewed, commented on and approved by DTSC prior to commencing the Surcharge Activities) are the same SMP and AAMP that are now part of the Revised RP, which are all part of **MM HAZ-1**. Accordingly, applicable portions of MM HAZ-1 were implemented during the Surcharge Activities.

In addition, before commencing the Surcharge Activities, as required by the Construction General Permit and the Project's SMP, the Applicant prepared and submitted to the SWRCB a Notice of Intent and SWPPP, which was approved by the SWRCB and is available online in the SWRCB's SMARTS system (Waste Discharge Identification [WDID] number 4 19C391158). The SWPPP was designed to address site-specific conditions related to Project construction. The SWPPP identified and described the sources of sediment and other pollutants that may affect the quality of storm water discharges; it also analyzes and requires implementation and maintenance of BMPs to reduce or eliminate sediment, pollutants adhering to sediment, and other non-sediment pollutants in storm water and non-storm water discharges. In accordance with the SWPPP, sediment basins, silt fences, check dams, fiber rolls, berms, and other structural BMPs were

constructed onsite prior to commencing the Surchage Activities to prevent stormwater from carrying sediment offsite and eroding onsite materials. As required by the SWPPP, prior grading work done directs the stormwater to the sediment basins, where it is collected by the sediment basins to ensure that water quality standards set by the Construction General Permit are met. The SWPPP also set forth when and where water quality sampling must occur to confirm the discharge limits set by the NPDES permit are met and that Project construction activities do not impair or contribute to impairment of the beneficial uses of surface waters. Because the Surchage Pile remains onsite, the BMPs were required to be maintained and currently remain in place, and the non-structural BMPs, water quality monitoring, and other measures required by the SWPPP have continued to be implemented.

Compliance with the Construction General Permit and the preparation of a SWPPP has ensured and would continue to ensure that any impacts to downstream waters resulting from construction activities on the Project Site would be less than significant. Erosion-control and treatment-control BMPs have been and would continue to be implemented per NPDES requirements. In addition to the requirements of the Construction General Permit, all areas of exposed soils would be re-vegetated and/or watered to reduce erosion. Coverage under the Construction General Permit is obtained by completing and filing a NOI with the SWRCB and preparing a SWPPP prior to any land disturbance. Therefore, by implementing the applicable portions of MM HAZ-1, as well as compliance with SCAQMD requirements and the SWPPP, Surchage Activities resulted in less than significant impacts related to the creation of 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.

Evaluation of Loading on a Storm Drain Line, Oil Wells, and Oil Pipelines

To further evaluate if impacts had occurred to utilities and facilities beneath the Surchage Pile as a result of the Surchage Activities, following construction of the Surchage Pile in October 2020, the *Addendum No. 3 to Geotechnical Exploration Report Evaluation of Loading on a Storm Drain Line, Oil Wells, and Oil Pipelines Proposed Self-Storage Facility 3701 North Pacific Place Long Beach, California 90806*, (Carl Kim Geo 2024) was prepared.

The existing 30-inch storm drain that traverses the Project Site from the southwest corner heading in a northeast direction was inspected by video and showed no distress or damage because the storm drain line is most likely supported on undisturbed natural soils, which is consistent with City, county, and building code requirements that would not have allowed construction of a storm drain line on sump materials. Prior to construction of the proposed self-storage building, the storm drain line would be backfilled with cement/sand slurry to further prevent potential damage. (Carl Kim Geo 2024)

Two abandoned oil wells on-Site were located and inspected for damage associated with the Surchage Activities. It was determined that the two oil wells were previously abandoned per State of California oil and gas well plugging and abandonment standards, which included plugging and sealing of the well bore and casing. Specifically, these wells have outer steel casings that are backfilled with cement. Based on the depth of sump materials at the oil wells, the maximum horizontal pressure post-stockpile construction is expected to be approximately 2,400 psf, which is substantially less than the 43,000 pounds per square foot (psf) minimum compressive strength of the cement backfill used to infill the oil wells. Further, the estimated maximum download load associated with sump material settlement would be fully accommodated by the combination of steel well casing and cement backfill. Therefore, it was determined that the abandoned oil wells are not subject to damage due to increased earth pressures induced by the Surchage Pile or settlement of surrounding ground. (Carl Kim Geo 2024)

According to the Geotechnical Exploration, the pressurized oil pipeline crosses the southeastern corner of the Project Site and is located outside of the areas underlain by sump materials. Similar to the storm drain line, the oil pipeline would not be impacted by compressible sump materials because it is located over undisturbed natural soils. The oil pipeline owner was informed that the estimated maximum settlement induced by the Surcharge Pile at the ground surface of the pipeline trench would be approximately two to three inches, and that the pipeline would be expected to settle less. The owner did not identify any objections to the Surcharge Activities and provided authorization to proceed with construction of the Surcharge Pile. (Carl Kim Geo 2024)

Mitigation Measures

MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant shall receive approval from DTSC of, and implement, a Response Plan (RP) prepared for the Project in accordance with CLRRRA, which outlines site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Construction (including Surcharge Activities) and Operation: **MM HAZ-1** requires preparation and implementation of a RP, which includes setting procedures for the proper monitoring, handling, segregation, stockpiling, dust control, testing, transport, and disposal of AECs and sump materials that might be encountered during construction, construction of a permanent engineered cap to cover the site, installation of methane/soil gas mitigation under buildings and under parking areas, installation of perimeter soil gas probes, installation of groundwater monitoring wells, and institutional controls for exposures to impacted soils and sumps. The required contents of the RP are discussed in more detail in Threshold 4.8d below. Implementation of MM HAZ-1 would ensure that all hazardous historical uses on the Project Site and potential resulting impacts related to sump materials, AECs in existing cover soil, and soil vapor would be less than significant. With mitigation incorporated, the Project would not 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. Therefore, with implementation of **MM HAZ-1**, impacts from Project construction and operation would be considered less than significant.

Impact Comparison Summary: The Project would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated. This impact would be greater than when compared with the impact analyses in the MND, which anticipated a less than significant impact.

Threshold 4.8c ***Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

One school is within 0.25 mile of the Project Site, Los Cerritos Elementary School at 515 West San Antonio Drive in the City of Long Beach. The analysis for Threshold 4.8b is the same as for Threshold 4.8c. During Project operations, the Project would not emit hazardous emissions, the self-storage facility would not permit storage of hazardous materials, and the occurrence of hazardous materials onsite would be restricted to common materials such as fuel within the vehicles onsite.

Because of the Project Site's historical contamination, as explained above in Existing Conditions and in Threshold 4.8b, Project construction and operation has the potential to cause significant impacts due to hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials,

substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school if the RP is not implemented. See Threshold 4.8b for a more detailed discussion of the potential impacts.

Mitigation Measures

MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant shall receive approval from DTSC of, and implement, a Response Plan (RP) prepared for the Project in accordance with CLRRA, which outlines site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

The Surcharge Activities, as well as future construction and operation of the Project, would be required to comply with site-specific mitigation set forth in **MM HAZ-1**, including the requirements detailed in the SMP, AAMP, EMP, and HASP, as well as the detailed contents of the RP discussed below in Threshold 4.8d. With implementation of **MM HAZ-1**, as well as compliance with SCAQMD regulatory requirements, the Construction General Permit, and the BMPs identified in the SWPPP, potential impacts related to the Project emitting hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school would be reduced to less than significant.

Impact Comparison Summary: The Project would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated. This impact would be greater than when compared with the impact analyses in the MND, which anticipated a less than significant impact.

Threshold 4.8d ***Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

The Project Site address associated with 3701 Pacific Place is located on a site associated with Government Code Section 65962.5 (“Cortese List”), including the Project Site, known as Long Beach Industrial Park (aka Former Oil Operators) on ENVIROSTOR and voluntary clean-up (VCP) databases. The databases state that there is an active voluntary cleanup case with petroleum hydrocarbons, methane, VOCs, SVOCs, and heavy metal (arsenic and lead) contamination in soil, soil gas, and groundwater due to former oil field waste treatment operations. In addition, the Project Site is located on other databases associated with C.R.G. Properties on HAZNET, which included a 2004 disposal off-specification, aged or surplus inorganics, with no indication of a release; and Long Beach Industrial Park on FINDS. (Roux 2019)

As stated above, adjoining properties were identified on several databases as a part of the Phase I ESA (Roux 2019), including an Oil Operators and Caltrans Long Beach facility. The Oil Operators facility is listed on the CPS-SLIC, ENVIROSTOR, CHMIRS, CERS, SWEEPS UST, CA FID UST, EMI, HIST UST, SEMS-ARCHIVE, and UST databases, and considered to be addressed by the former oilfield operations RECs identified in the Phase I ESA. Regarding the Caltrans Long Beach facility listed on the SWF/LF and CERS databases, considering the closed operational status and the Los Angeles River intervening between the facility and the site, it is considered unlikely that the former disposal operations at the Caltrans facility would have adversely impacted subsurface conditions at the site. (Roux 2019)

In addition, the Phase I ESA identified six sites within one mile of the Project Site where releases of hazardous materials occurred that could affect subsurface conditions at the Project Site,

including the BP Pipeline/Arco facility on Golden Avenue (listed on the CPS-SLIC and CERS databases), Store for Less facility at 1012 West Carson (listed on the SEMS-ARCHIVE and PRP databases), Bixby Land Company facility at 1101 Wardlow Street (listed on the CPS-SLIC database), Raytheon Systems Company facility at 1500 Hughes Way (listed on the SEMS, CORRACTS, RCRA-TSDF, RCRA-SQG, EMI, HWP, ENVIROSTOR, FINDS, EMI, CERS, SCH, and HAZNET databases), Long Beach USD-Board Building facility at 1515 Hughes Way (listed on the ENVIROSTOR, SCH, HAZNET, and CERS databases), and the South Region High School #4 facility at West Carson Street/Santa Fe Avenue (listed on the ENVIROSTOR and SCH databases) (Roux 2019). However, according to the Phase I ESA, it is considered unlikely that the releases at any of these sites would have adversely impacted subsurface conditions at the site (Roux 2019).

In light of the Project Site being included in the databases described above, the Project Site has been subject to numerous environmental investigations since the 1980s, which are set forth in more detail in the discussion above regarding Existing Conditions. The SAP/ROF and SAP/ROF Addendum evaluated these historical investigations and detailed additional contemporary investigations conducted in anticipation of the Project, and ultimately concluded that the sump materials, cover soil, soil vapor, groundwater, and future risk to receptors have now been adequately characterized and the extent of contamination known. Based on those conclusions, the SAP/ROF and SAP/ROF Addendum recommended preparation of a Response Plan that would outline mitigation measures, engineering controls, future OM&M activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the Project Site in a way that would be protective of human health and the environment in light of the Project Site's historical contamination.

As stated above, the Revised RP was prepared for the Project in coordination with DTSC and identifies the appropriate response actions for the Project Site that are protective of human health and the environment during and post-development to meet the Revised RP's identified RAOs and guide remedial/mitigation activities at the site. The Revised RP proposed seven response actions for the Project, which collectively meet the defined RAOs and minimize potential risk of exposure to future on- and off-Site receptors. (Roux 2021) These response actions include:

- Excavation and consolidation of soils with localized exceedances of risk-based and other applicable thresholds for lead and arsenic;
- Preparation of a SMP (to set required procedures regarding the proper monitoring, handling, segregation, stockpiling, dust control, testing, transport, and disposal of potentially impacted soils, which may be encountered during development activities), a AAMP (providing monitoring and mitigation measures to ensure emissions leaving the site during earth-moving activities are below required thresholds), an EMP (to set required procedures regarding the proper monitoring, handling, segregation, and relocation and reconsolidation of sump materials to protect onsite workers and offsite receptors during development activities) and a HASP (to protect onsite workers during construction activities). Such plans would be implementing during all Project development activities to ensure workers onsite and receptors offsite are not exposed to sump, AECs, or other impacted materials;
- Design and construction of an engineered surface cap to prevent exposure to former oily sump materials and other COPCs at the site, as well as to prevent surface water infiltration;
- Vapor probes with design and construction of a gas containment system below the surface cap to capture, treat (as necessary), and vent any volatile COPCs that may accumulate

beneath hardscaped surfaces, buildings, or other areas across the site and to prevent offsite migration of any such volatile COPCs;

- Vapor/methane intrusion mitigation system below the future onsite building foundations, which will include a vapor/methane barrier beneath the building slab with perforated piping and vent risers to allow ventilation of soil vapor from beneath the building to the atmosphere;
- Recording of a land use covenant (LUC) as an institutional control to require that any changes in conditions (i.e., modifications of building slabs, new construction, etc.) be communicated to the DTSC, and that mitigation measures and subsurface conditions be communicated to future buyers and occupants; and
- Preparation of an OM&M Plan and O&M Agreement to facilitate inspection and maintenance of the mitigation systems and regular sampling of shallow monitoring soil vapor probes and groundwater monitoring wells until such time as soil vapor COPC concentrations can be shown to be below conservative threshold criteria and groundwater concentrations are confirmed to be consistent with historical and regional conditions.

The Revised RP was submitted to DTSC on March 12, 2024 following DTSC's withdrawal of the Notice of Determination for the Original RP after the Court Ruling and is now under DTSC review. Because the Project is not substantially different from the Prior Project (for the parcels identified as Artesia parcels in the MND), the Revised RP is substantially similar to the Original RP approved by DTSC on September 23, 2021. Technical edits were made to reflect minor differences between the Project and Prior Project and the occurrence of the Surcharge activities in late 2020 through early 2021 (including relocating onsite two of the AECs in accordance with DTSC procedures prior to commencing the Surcharge Activities), neither of which change the recommended response actions or condition of the Project Site for purposes of the remediation. DTSC will review and provide comments to the Revised RP and once these are satisfactorily addressed, DTSC would release the Revised RP for public review and comment for a minimum of 30 days. After the public comment period ends and any public questions and concerns are addressed, DTSC would decide whether to make any further changes to the Revised RP based on public comments and to approve the Revised RP.

As detailed in the Revised RP, proposed response actions are identified that include implementation of management of soils in areas of elevated concentrations, construction of an engineered cap to cover the site, installation of methane/soil gas mitigation for under buildings and under parking areas, installation of perimeter soil gas probes, installation of groundwater monitoring wells, and institutional controls for exposures to impacted soils and sumps.

Project development would be required to be conducted in accordance with the new RDIP that will be required as part of the Revised RP submitted for the new project, including the SMP, AAMP, EMP and HASP, and the engineer of record for the new RDIP (or someone under their responsible charge) will be onsite for inspections during construction. After construction is completed, stamped as-builts will be prepared and submitted to DTSC, as part of a Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR). Upon completion of response actions under the Revised RP, a request for a certificate of completion (Certificate) will be presented to DTSC for approval. DTSC will review the RACR and the request for the Certificate and upon approval will certify that the Project Site has met the conditions of the Revised RP and new RDIP. In light of the Project Site's historical contamination and inclusion on hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the Project would have the potential to result in a significant impact related to creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment without implementation of a response plan.

Mitigation Measures

MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant shall receive approval from DTSC of, and implement, a Response Plan (RP) prepared for the Project in accordance with CLRRA, which outlines site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

MM HAZ-1 requires preparation and implementation of a RP, which includes setting procedures for the proper monitoring, handling, segregation, stockpiling, dust control, testing, transport, and disposal of AECs and sump materials that might be encountered during construction, construction of a permanent engineered cap to cover the site, installation of methane/soil gas mitigation under buildings and under parking areas, installation of perimeter soil gas probes, installation of groundwater monitoring wells, and institutional controls for exposures to impacted soils and sumps. Implementation of **MM HAZ-1** would ensure that all hazardous historical uses on the Project Site and potential resulting impacts related to sump materials, AECs in existing cover soil, and soil vapor would be less than significant. With mitigation incorporated, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment based on the Project Site's inclusion on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, with implementation of **MM HAZ-1**, impacts from Project construction and operation would be considered less than significant.

Impact Comparison Summary: The Project would result in less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated. This impact would be the same when compared with the impact analyses in the MND.

Threshold 4.8e *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, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area?*

The Project Site is not located within an adopted Airport Land Use Plan. The nearest airport is Long Beach Airport, located approximately two miles east of the Project Site. The Project would be located outside the Long Beach Airport influence area and would not expose people to safety hazards related to airport operations. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Impact Comparison Summary: The Project would result in no impact. This impact would be the same when compared with the impact analyses in the MND.

Threshold 4.8f ***Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

The City of Long Beach has prepared and adopted the City’s 2023 Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan for the protection of residents and properties (City of Long Beach 2023). The City’s Hazard Mitigation Plan includes a hazard assessment, goals and objectives, and mitigation strategies for hazards, including earthquake, severe weather, flood, dam-failure, tsunami, climate change, drought, and hazard of interest. In addition, the City has an EOP, which addresses the planned response by the City to extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, and national security emergencies (City of Long Beach 2015). As such, the City supports a high level of multi-jurisdictional cooperation and communication for emergency planning and response management.

Additionally, the I-405 and I-710 are designated disaster routes by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, and would be the main evacuation routes utilized in the event of an emergency. Disaster routes are used to bring in emergency personnel, equipment, and supplies to impacted areas in order to save lives, protect property, and minimize impact to the environment (LACPW 2024). Project development would not impede use of I-405 or I-710 as disaster routes. The Project Site is situated at the north end of Pacific Place and all Project construction staging would be conducted onsite, properly fenced to prevent unauthorized access, and would not block access to nearby properties via Pacific Place. Therefore, development of the Project would not interfere with the implementation of the City’s Hazard Mitigation Plan, EOP, or local emergency evacuation routes. No impacts related to the adopted emergency response or evacuation plans would occur.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

No impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Impact Comparison Summary: The Project would result in no impact. This impact would be the same when compared with the impact analyses in the MND.

Threshold 4.8g ***Would the project 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 previously stated, the Project Site is not located in a Fire Hazard Severity Zone in an SRA or a VHFHSZ in an LRA. The Project Site located within a developed area in the City, and although much of the site is vacant land, no substantial wildfire hazard exists onsite. Vacant land to the north is also sparsely vegetated and is surrounded by development and the Los Angeles River. Project development would involve construction of buildings and paved with landscaped areas, and thus development would not increase wildfire hazards onsite. Therefore, impacts related to wildfires would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

A less than significant impact would occur and no mitigation is required.

Impact Comparison Summary: The Project would result in a less than significant impact. This impact would be the same when compared with the impact analyses in the MND.

4.8.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Projects considered in the cumulative impact analysis consist of six projects within the City of Long Beach. These related projects are described in more detail in Table 4-1, Cumulative Projects List, which is provided in Section 4.0, Impact Analysis.

Cumulative projects within the Project vicinity would have the potential to expose area residents, school-aged children, employees, and visitors to hazardous materials through redevelopment of sites and structures that may be contaminated from either historic or ongoing uses. The severity of potential hazards for individual projects would depend upon the location, type, and size of development and the specific hazards associated with individual sites. Therefore, similar to the Project, other cumulative projects within the City would be required to undergo individual environmental review, including review of potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials that are applicable to that particular development site and proposed use. If lead and asbestos are found to be present in buildings planned for demolition or renovation by cumulative projects, these conditions would require appropriate mitigation to include implementation of standard regulatory conditions and remedial action of contaminated sites. It is assumed that all cumulative projects would be required to comply with all applicable local, State and federal codes and regulations, as well as applicable BMPs, related to the treatment, handling, and disposal of each hazardous material. Further, because restrictions on development or remediation requirements would be applied in the event that hazardous materials or waste posed a risk to safety, it is anticipated that cumulative impacts from exposure to hazards or hazardous materials or waste would be less than significant. Additionally, land use changes anticipated to occur under the Project would facilitate the safe removal of potentially hazardous building materials and the cleanup of contaminated properties, thus reducing the level of risk on a particular site in the nearby vicinity and within the Project area as a whole, compared to existing conditions. As detailed in Section 4.8.3, construction and operation of the Project could potentially result in impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials exposure, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative impact.

Mitigation Measures

MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant shall receive approval from DTSC of, and implement, a Response Plan (RP) prepared for the Project in accordance with CLRRRA, which outlines site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Cumulative Impacts: The Project's contribution of cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would not be significant because Project impacts would all be reduced to less than significant after implementation of mitigation measure **MM HAZ-1**. Therefore, with implementation of mitigation, the Project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable and therefore would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

4.8.5 REFERENCES

- California Department of Forestry and Fire Prevention (CALFire). 2024 (April 1, last updated). Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area. Sacramento, CA: CALFire. <https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=988d431a42b242b29d89597ab693d008>.
- . 2011 (September). Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA, Los Angeles County. Sacramento, CA: CALFire. <https://34c031f8-c9fd-4018-8c5a-4159cdff6b0d-cdn-endpoint.azureedge.net/-/media/osfm-website/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones/fire-hazard-severity-zones-map/upload-4/losangelescounty.pdf>.
- California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA). 2024a. Hazardous Waste. California HSC § 25117. Accessed 2024. <https://www.cdtfa.ca.gov/lawguides/vol4/hwf/hwf-25117.html>.
- . 2024b. Laws, Regulations and Annotations. California HSC § 25124. Accessed 2024. <https://www.cdtfa.ca.gov/lawguides/vol4/hwf/hwf-25124.html>.
- . 2024c. California Hazardous Waste Control Act (HWCA). California Health and Safety Code Division 20, Chapter 6.5, Article 2, § 25100, *et seq.* Accessed 2024. <https://www.cdtfa.ca.gov/lawguides/vol4/hwf/hwf-25100.html#:~:text=Section%2025100,-25100.&text=The%20Legislature%20finds%20that%3A,waste%20must%20provide%20safe%20disposal>.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2024 (April 12, access date). Sacramento, CA: DTSC. <https://dtsc.ca.gov/brownfields/california-land-reuse-and-revitalization-act-clrra-quick-reference-guide/>.
- . 2022 (January 13). Remedial Design and Implementation Plan Approval, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach California. Sacramento, CA: DTSC. (Appendix I-14).
- . 2021a (April 6). Master Response, Draft Response Plan, Long Beach Industrial Park. Sacramento, CA: DTSC. (Appendix I-11).
- . 2021b (September 23). Final Response Plan Approval, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach California. Sacramento, CA: DTSC. (Appendix I-12).
- . 2020a (March 12). Final Site Assessment Plan Acceptance Letter for the Long Beach Industrial Park/Former Oil Operators Site [Site Assessment Plan dated 2019, December 11]. Sacramento, CA: DTSC. (Appendix I-5).
- . 2020b (June 4). Site Assessment Plan and Report of Findings DTSC Approval Letter, 3701 Pacific Place Tookey Parcel, Long Beach California. Sacramento, CA: DTSC. (Appendix I-8).
- . 2020c (June 16). California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act Agreement and Amendment Transmittal, 3701 Pacific Place Tookey Parcel, Long Beach California. Sacramento, CA: DTSC. (Appendix I-9).

-
- . 2019a (October 23). Standard Agreement, California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act, Docket No. HAS-FY 19/20-044. Sacramento, CA: DTSC. (Appendix I-1).
- . 2019b (December 11). Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Acceptance Letter for the Long Beach Industrial Park/Former Oil Operators Site. Sacramento, CA: DTSC. (Appendix I-3).
- California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2024. History of the California Environmental Protection Agency. <https://calepa.ca.gov/about/history01/>
- California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen). 24 CCR Part 11. Accessed 2024. <https://www.dgs.ca.gov/BSC/CALGreen>.
- Casetext. 2024a. Hazardous Materials. 13 CCR §§ 1150 – 1197. Accessed 2024. <https://casetext.com/regulation/california-code-of-regulations/title-13-motor-vehicles/division-2-department-of-the-california-highway-patrol/chapter-6-hazardous-materials>.
- . 2024b. Standards for Universal Waste Management. 22 CCR §§ 66273.30 – 66273.39 and §§ 66273.70 – 66273.77. Accessed 2024. <https://casetext.com/regulation/california-code-of-regulations/title-22-social-security/division-45-environmental-health-standards-for-the-management-of-hazardous-waste/chapter-23-standards-for-universal-waste-management>.
- Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). 2024. Hazardous Materials and Oil Transportation. 49 USC § 110. Accessed 2024. <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-49>.
- Cornell Law School (Cornell). 2024a. Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. 42 USC § 6901. Accessed 2024. <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/6901>.
- . 2024b. Toxic Substances Control Act. 15 USC § 2601. Accessed 2024. <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/15/2601>.
- . 2024c. Accidental Release Prevention Program. 40 CFR Part 68. Accessed 2024. <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/40/part-68>
- . 2024d. Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA). 42 USC § 11001, *et seq.* Accessed 2024. <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/11001>.
- . 2024e. California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program. 19 CCR Division 2, Chapter 4.5. Accessed 2024. <https://www.law.cornell.edu/regulations/california/title-19/division-2/chapter-4.5>.
- Department of Industrial Relations (DIR). 2024a. Asbestos. 8 CCR § 1529. Accessed 2024. <https://www.dir.ca.gov/title8/1529.html>.
- . 2024b. Lead. 8 CCR § 1532.1. Accessed 2024b. https://www.dir.ca.gov/title8/1532_1.html.
- . 2024c. Cal/OSHA. Accessed 2024. <https://www.dir.ca.gov/dosh>.
- Justia. 2024a. Environmental Health. California HSC § 117635. Accessed 2024. <https://law.justia.com/codes/california/2011/hsc/division-104/117625-117780/117635>.

-
- . 2024b. California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act (CLRRRA). California HSC §§ 25395.60 – 25395.109. Accessed 2024. <https://law.justia.com/codes/california/code-hsc/division-20/chapter-6-82/>.
- Long Beach, City of. 2024. Long Beach General Plan. Long Beach, CA: City of. <https://www.longbeach.gov/lbcd/planning/advance/general-plan/>.
- . 2023 (March). Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan. Long Beach, CA: City of. <https://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/disaster-preparedness/media-library/documents/emergency-preparedness-plans/long-beach-natural-hazard-mitigation-plan-2023>.
- . 2015 (August). Emergency Operations Plan (EOP). Long Beach, CA: City of. <https://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/disaster-preparedness/media-library/documents/home/eop-volume-one--two-10252015>.
- . 1988 (October). Long Beach General Plan Program, Seismic Safety Element. Long Beach, CA: City of. https://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbcd/media-library/documents/planning/advance/general-plan/seismic-safety-element_reduced.
- . 1975 (May). Long Beach General Plan Program, Public Safety Element. Long Beach, CA: City of. <https://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbcd/media-library/documents/planning/advance/general-plan/public-safety>.
- Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACPW). 2024 (April 11, access date). Disaster Routes Map: Cities of Long Beach and Signal Hill. Los Angeles, CA: LACPW. <https://dpw.lacounty.gov/dsg/DisasterRoutes/map/Long%20Beach.pdf>.
- Roux and Associates, Inc. 2024 (March 12). Draft Response Plan, Long Beach Industrial Park 3701 North Pacific Place Long Beach, CA. Long Beach, CA: Roux. (Appendix I-15).
- . 2022 (January 11). Remedial Design and Implementation Plan, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach California. Long Beach, CA: Roux. (Appendix I-13).
- . 2021 (March 10). Response Plan, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach California. Long Beach, CA: Roux. (Appendix I-10).
- . 2020a (March 13). Final Site Assessment Plan and Report of Findings, Long Beach Industrial Park Site (a.k.a. Former Oil Operators), 3701 North Pacific Place, Long Beach, California. Long Beach, CA: Roux. (Appendix I-4).
- . 2020b (April 20). Final Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Parcel-025, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach, California. Long Beach, CA: Roux. (Appendix I-6).
- . 2020c (May 15). Site Assessment Plan and Report of Findings Addendum, 3701 Pacific Place Tookey Parcel, Long Beach California. Long Beach, CA: Roux. (Appendix I-7).
- . 2020f (August 13). Site-Specific Health and Safety Plan Long Beach Industrial Park, 3701 North Pacific Place, Long Beach, California. Long Beach, CA: Roux. (Appendix I-16).
- . 2020d (August 20). Soil Management Plan Long Beach Industrial Park, 3701 North Pacific Place, Long Beach, California. Long Beach, CA: Roux. (Appendix I-16).

- . 2020e (August 17). Ambient Air Monitoring Plan Long Beach Industrial Park, 3701 North Pacific Place, Long Beach, California. Long Beach, CA: Roux. (Appendix I-17).
 - . 2019 (August 30). Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 3701 Pacific Place, Long Beach, California. Long Beach, CA: Roux. (Appendix I-2).
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2021 (Amended). *Rule 1466 – Control of Particulate Emissions from Soils with Toxic Air Contaminants*. Diamond Bar, CA: SCAQMD. <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xiv/rule-1466.pdf?sfvrsn=25>.
- . 2007 (Amended). *Rule 1403 - Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities*. Sacramento, CA: SCAQMD. <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xiv/rule-1403.pdf>.
 - . 1982 (Adopted). *Rule 1150 – Excavation of Landfill Sites*. Diamond Bar, CA: SCAQMD. <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xi/rule-1150.pdf>.

This page intentionally left blank