4.6 HAZARDS

An Initial Study was prepared for the Revised Project (see Appendix A of this Draft Supplemental EIR). Based on the analysis contained in the Initial Study, it was determined the Revised Project would result in less-than-significant impacts for all but two of the significance thresholds related to hazards and hazardous materials:

- The Initial Study found that a significant impact would occur due to potential asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paints. This impact would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of mitigation in the Certified EIR; therefore, this impact is not further addressed in this analysis.
- At the time that the Initial Study was prepared, the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) had not yet reviewed the Revised Project site plan. Therefore, it was unknown whether the site plan would conflict with applicable standards needed to ensure adequate emergency access and evacuation, and the Initial Study found that a potential significant impact could therefore occur. This section describes the regulatory framework and existing conditions in the Revised Project area related to emergency response and evacuation, and the potential impacts of the Revised Project site plan.

4.6.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

4.6.1.1 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

This section summarizes existing federal, State, and local agencies' policies and regulations that are applicable to hazards and hazardous materials potentially associated with this Project.

State Regulations

Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps

California law requires the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE) to identify areas based on the severity of fire hazard that is expected to prevail there. These areas, or "zones," are based on factors such as fuel (material that can burn), slope and fire weather. There are three zones, based on increasing fire hazard, classified as medium, high and very high. In November 2007, the CALFIRE adopted Fire Hazard Severity Zone maps for State Responsibility Areas where the State has financial responsibility for wildland fire protection.

In the mid-1990s, Government Code Section 51175 called for the CALFIRE Director to evaluate fire hazard severity in Local Responsibility Area and to make a recommendation to the local jurisdiction where very high Fire Hazard Severity Zones exist. In 2008, CALFIRE provided recommended maps for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas. Local responsibility areas include incorporated cities, cultivated agriculture lands, and portions of the desert. Local responsibility area fire protection is typically provided by city fire departments, fire protection districts, counties, and by CALFIRE under contract to local government.¹

California Building Code

The California Building Code (CBC) is Part 2 of California Code of Regulations Title 24. The CBC is based upon the International Building Code and contains building requirements to minimize risks to life safety. ² Chapter 74-2.002 of the Contra Costa Building Code and Title 3, Chapter 3-304 of the Lafayette Municipal Code adopt the CBC as the building code of the County and City respectively.

Local Regulations

City of Lafayette General Plan Safety Element

The Safety Element, Chapter VI, of the City's General Plan addresses the protection of the community from unreasonable risks associated with natural and manmade hazards. Lafayette's General Plan contains goals and policies within its Safety Element that relate to hazardous materials and emergency response. In particular, the goals and policies relating to the hazardous materials and wildfire hazards on the Project site are contained in Table 4.6-1.

City of Lafayette Municipal Code

The City of Lafayette's Municipal Code Chapter 8-3 contains ordinances relating the planning and management of the City's emergency preparedness.

4.6.1.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS

This section includes information about emergency preparedness in the Revised Project area.

4.6-2 JANUARY 29, 2015

¹ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention_wildland.php, accessed on January 19, 2012.

² California Building Standards Commission, Frequently Asked Questions, http://www.bsc.ca.gov/cd_qustns/cq_faqs.htm#q1, accessed November 18, 2011.

TABLE 4.6-1 GENERAL PLAN GOALS AND POLICIES RELEVANT TO HAZARDS

Goal/Policy Number	Goal/Policy Content
Goal LU-5	Reduce the hazards of the storage, transportation, and disposal of hazardous materials.
Policy S-4.2	Take measures to reduce fire risks from new and existing development as well as natural fire hazards.
Goal S-8	Provide adequate response and support services in the event of a major emergency or natural disaster.
Policy S-8.1	Periodically review the Emergency Operations Plan to assure that it meets current needs in the event of a major disaster.
Policy S-8.2	Cooperate with Contra Costa County's Emergency Preparedness Plan.
Policy S-8.3	Ensure that Lafayette has an adequate and well equipped Emergency Operations Center (EOC).
Policy S-8.4	Make information available to residents on methods to reduce the dangers from natural hazards, fire, and crime, and encourage neighborhood groups to become involved in prevention and emergency response programs.
Policy S-8.5	Identify and publicize evacuation routes to be used in emergencies.
Goal S-9	Maintain an effective medical emergency response system.
Policy S-9.1	Work to improve emergency medical response service in Lafayette.

Source: Lafayette General Plan, 2002, http://www.ci.lafayette.ca.us, accessed on October 11, 2011.

Emergency Preparedness

Lafayette's General Plan, as indicated in Table 4.6-1, aspires to provide adequate major and natural disaster emergency response and support services and to maintain effective medical emergency response. A variety of strategies and tools are in place to ensure these goals are met, including a City Emergency Operations Plan, coordination and compliance with the County Emergency Preparedness Plan, a City Emergency Preparedness Commission, and a City Emergency Operations Center.

4.6.2 CHANGES IN THE REVISED PROJECT RELATED TO HAZARDS

Whereas the Certified EIR involved development of the Project site with apartment buildings that would be accessed by three driveways (two on Deer Hill Road and one on Pleasant Hill Road), the site plan for the Revised Project shows that the single-family residences on the western portion of the Project site would be accessed by a driveway on Deer Hill Road at an intersection controlled by a proposed roundabout. On the eastern portion of the Project site, a community park would be accessed by two driveways on Deer Hill Road and one driveway on Pleasant Hill Road. A dog park on the north side of Deer Hill Road would be accessed by the proposed roundabout.

4.6.3 STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Revised Project would result in a significant hazards and hazardous materials impact if it would:

1. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

An Initial Study was prepared for the Revised Project (see Appendix A of this Draft Supplemental EIR). Based on the analysis contained in the Initial Study, it was determined the Revised Project would result in a less-than-significant impact for the following significance criteria. These criteria are, therefore, not discussed in this chapter:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials.
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

Based on the analysis contained in the Initial Study, it was determined the Revised Project would result in a potential significant impact for the following significance criterion. This impact would be mitigated to less-than-significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures in the Certified EIR. These mitigation measures are listed in Section 4.6.6 below, and in Table 1-1 of Section 1, Executive Summary, of this Supplemental EIR. This criterion is, therefore, not discussed in this chapter:

 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.

4.6-4 JANUARY 29, 2015

4.6.4 IMPACT DISCUSSION

This section analyzes potential project-specific and cumulative impacts to hazards and hazardous materials.

HAZ-1 The Revised Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The Revised Project would create a significant impact if the Project would not allow for adequate emergency access to the Revised Project site, or adequate emergency evacuation from the Revised Project site in the event of an emergency. The Revised Project's internal roadway system provides residential and emergency access. Vehicles would circulate through the residential area using the internal roadway system, and would access the Project site via four access points — three on Deer Hill Road, and one on Pleasant Hill Road. The dog park would be accessed via a proposed driveway, and a new roundabout on Deer Hill Road would be provided to allow for access to both the dog park and residences. In the event of an emergency, residents would exit the Project site at the proposed roundabout on Deer Hill Road, and would have access to both westbound and eastbound Deer Hill Road, and could therefore access either the Pleasant Hill Road or Deer Hill Road/First Street on-ramps for State Route 24.

The CCCFPD has reviewed the Revised Project site plan to evaluate whether it meets requirements for adequate emergency vehicle access. The CCCFPD's comments are included in Appendix J of this Draft Supplemental EIR. Based on the site plan shown in Figure 3-6 of this Draft Supplemental EIR, the CCCFPD has commented that adjustments would be needed to provide adequate roadway access. As discussed in Section 4.9, Transportation and Traffic, after mitigation (see Mitigation Measure TRAF-3) to ensure that adequate emergency vehicle access is provided on-site, no project or cumulative impacts to fire protection services would occur when considering the Revised Project's fire safety features.

Section 4.9, Transportation and Traffic, evaluates the Revised Project's potential traffic impacts that would impact emergency vehicle circulation and finds that Mitigation Measure TRAF-1 would be needed to address the Revised Project's contribution to congestion at the Deer Hill Road/Brown Avenue intersection. Under this mitigation measure, prior to Project completion the Project applicant would coordinate with the City to contribute a fair share of the cost, including an in-lieu payment, to install a traffic signal at this intersection that would include an emergency vehicle preemption system (Opticom), which would allow emergency response vehicles approaching the signalized intersection to activate a green signal for their travel direction. With this new signal, the Revised Project would not impair emergency vehicle circulation in the Project site vicinity.

The final site plan would be reviewed by the CCCFPD and City prior to Project approval to ensure consistency with applicable safety and emergency standards and regulations, and the Project site plan would be revised consistent with Mitigation Measure TRAF-3 to ensure adequate emergency vehicle access. Therefore, the Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the *City of Lafayette's*

Emergency Operations Plan, which addresses the City's responsibilities in emergencies associated with natural disasters, including wildfires, and associated impacts would be *less than significant*.

4.6.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

HAZ-2 Implementation of the Revised Project, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts with respect to land use and planning

The Certified EIR found that cumulative hazards impacts would be less than significant. The Revised Project would not result in any new hazards impacts that could affect the cumulative setting, and does not include any new cumulatively considerable components related to hazards. Potential cumulative traffic impacts that could affect emergency evacuation are addressed in Section 4.9, Transportation and Traffic, of this Supplemental Draft EIR. The significant impact from the inadequate emergency vehicle access was mitigated to a less-than-significant level by contributing toward the cost of either a traffic signal or roundabout at the Deer Hill Road/Brown Avenue intersection (Mitigation Measure TRAF-6). Therefore, the cumulative impact would be *less than significant*.

Significance Before Mitigation: Less than significant.

4.6.6 SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The Revised Project would not result in any new significant project-specific or cumulative impacts to hazards or hazardous materials and therefore no new mitigation measures are required. However, an Initial Study was prepared for the Revised Project (see Appendix A of this Draft Supplemental EIR) that determined the Revised Project would result in the following potential significant impact. This impact would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of the following mitigation measure included in the Certified EIR. Modifications to the Certified EIR mitigation measures are identified in strikeout text to indicate deletions.

HAZ-1: If asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) or lead-based paints (LBPs) are found to be present on the Project site, the demolition of these structures creates a potentially *significant* impact related to release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1a: Hire the services of a CalOSHA certified qualified asbestos abatement consultant to conduct a pre-construction assessment for asbestos containing materials. Prior

4.6-6

JANUARY 29, 2015

to the issuance of the demolition permit, the applicant shall provide a letter to the City Planning & Building Services Division from a qualified asbestos abatement consultant that no ACMs are present in the buildings. If ACMs are found to be present, the hazardous materials shall be properly removed and disposed prior to demolition of buildings on the Project site in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, such as the U.S. EPA's NESHAP regulation, BAAQMD Regulation 11, Title 8 of the California Codes of Regulations, the Unified Program, and the City's General Plan Policies, as described in Section A.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1b: Hire the services of a qualified lead paint abatement consultant to conduct a pre-construction assessment of lead based paints. Prior to the issuance of the demolition permit, the applicant shall provide a letter to the City Planning & Building Services Division from a qualified lead paint abatement consultant that no lead paint is present in onsite buildings. If lead paint is found to be present on buildings to be demolished or renovated, the hazardous materials shall be properly removed and disposed in compliance with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, including the U.S. EPA's NESHAP regulation, Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 8 of the California Codes of Regulations, the Unified Program, and the City's General Plan Policies, as described in Section A.

Significance after Mitigation: Less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank.

4.6-8 JANUARY 29, 2015