

## ***4.0 - Cumulative Impacts***

DRAFT

## **4.0 - Cumulative Impacts**

### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15142), an EIR must identify other projects (both public and private) that, together with the proposed project, could cumulatively affect the environment of the region. Cumulative impacts could occur to the extent that impacts related to the proposed project could combine with impacts from other new and/or ongoing projects in the vicinity of the Romic facility.

### **4.2 AREA DEVELOPMENT**

The City of East Palo Alto Revitalization Plan (August 2000) is designed to implement the City's goal to develop sites for new investment within the City. The plan proposes the creation of mixed-use districts within the City to provide the following:

- Jobs, housing and amenities
- Efficient reuse of underutilized property
- Identifiable districts with distinctive characteristics
- Areas and facilities for community activities
- Establishment of missing services and facilities
- Quality of life

The Revitalization Plan identifies four districts within the City: University Avenue Corridor, Four Corners/Bay Road, Ravenswood Business District and Weeks Neighborhood. The Romic facility is located in the Ravenswood Business District (Figure 3.6-1, Land Use Chapter). A brief description of the districts is as follows:

University; Avenue Corridor – Currently has a hodgepodge of uses. Plan is for a wide boulevard effect with clustered retail, a supermarket, and residential. Residential uses

are preferred along the corridor with high density housing as a transition between single-family housing and University Avenue.

Four Corners/Bay Road – a downtown type district with a dense pattern of mixed-use development containing a concentration of public buildings and public open spaces. Will contain retail businesses, restaurants, private service use businesses, and public buildings and community services. An undeveloped six-acre site has been designated as the location of the Town Center Plaza, the core of the Heart of the City.

Ravenswood Business District – This district totals approximately 130 acres, 23 of which are currently in industrial use and likely to remain so. The district consists of five, land-use planning areas. The workplace core areas are reserved for office space and other uses that maximize the number of employees per acre. The district center area is reserved for retail shops, restaurants, and business services. The residential transition areas are reserved for high-density residential occupation with a minimum of 30 units per acre, and the industrial areas consist primarily of the two existing, ongoing industrial facilities, one of which is Romic.

Weeks Neighborhood – The area will consist primarily of single-family residences with multi-family, high density housing to transition to industrial areas and high traffic boulevards.

The cumulative impact analysis in the Draft EIR for the Ravenswood Business District (RBD Draft EIR, June 18, 2003), is based on a cumulative growth scenario that incorporates both reasonably foreseeable future development projects in the City of East Palo Alto, and forecasts of regional employment and population growth developed by the Association of Bay Area Governments.

Reasonably foreseeable future projects were identified in the Traffic, Transportation, Circulation and Parking section of the RBD Draft EIR. Some of these, such as the Ikea furniture store, and University Place (an office building) have been completed. Others

are in the planning stage. One project not considered in the RBD Draft EIR, is a technology building that is planned to be located at University Avenue and Runnymede Street (City of East Palo Alto, telephone conversation with City Planning Manager, December 23, 2003). All projects except the technology building were taken into account in the traffic projections used in the RBD Draft EIR.

The RBD Draft EIR found that the Ravenswood Business District project would have cumulative impacts in the areas of jobs, population and housing, traffic, public services, and public utilities. The cumulative impacts of increased jobs, population and housing in the City of East Palo Alto was found to have a beneficial impact and no mitigation was required. Cumulative impacts to traffic during peak periods at intersections along University Avenue in East Palo Alto were found to be significant and unavoidable. This includes a number of intersections that are located on the commute routes to the Romic facility such as University Avenue/Runnymede Street, and University Avenue/Bay Road. The cumulative impact to police and fire services in the City of East Palo Alto was found to be less than significant after mitigation, as was the cumulative impact to the City of East Palo Alto water supply.

### **4.3 PROJECT CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

#### **Air Resources**

Emissions of criteria pollutants (NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, and PM<sub>10</sub>) from the proposed project were found to be well below threshold quantities and therefore would have an insignificant impact on air quality. The City of East Palo Alto General Plan Final EIR (November 23, 1999) concluded that implementation of the General Plan would result in significant, unavoidable impacts to air quality even after implementation of available mitigation measures. However, the RBD Draft EIR concluded that there would be no significant impact to air quality after Transportation Control Measures as recommended by the BAAQMD were implemented. The RBD Draft EIR was completed in 2003 whereas the General Plan Final EIR was completed in 1999.

Since the RBD Draft EIR amends the General Plan and is more current, the conclusions reached in it would seem to be more relevant. Since the projected growth and future projects incorporated into the RBD Draft EIR will not cause a significant impact to air quality, addition of the small quantities of NOx, ROG, and PM10 produced by the project will not cumulatively cause a significant impact.

The traffic projections used in the RBD Draft EIR were used to assess the impact of carbon monoxide (CO) emissions from project traffic on air quality at a key intersection. The resulting CO concentration was well below both state and federal standards. Since reasonably known future traffic was included in the calculated CO emissions, the cumulative impact from the project on CO concentrations would be less than significant. In addition, the RBD Draft EIR also analyzed CO levels at the most impacted intersections and found that they were well within air quality standards (Draft EIR Amendment to General Plan, June 18, 2003, Table IV.L-5).

### **Transportation & Traffic**

The City of East Palo Alto General Plan Final EIR (November 23, 1999) considered impacts on public services from implementation of the general plan. The general plan assumed that there would be growth and development in the City and analyzed the cumulative impacts of that growth. The Final EIR concluded that implementation of the General Plan would result in significant, unavoidable impacts to traffic and circulation even after implementation of available mitigation measures. The RBD Draft EIR (June 18, 2003) concluded that implementation of amendments to the General Plan for the Ravenswood Business District would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to several intersections along University Avenue and to SR 84 even after available mitigation measures were implemented. Commute routes to the project include SR 84 and intersections along University Avenue.

As described in Chapter 3.0 - 3.3.11 Transportation and Traffic, the proposed project is expected to generate an additional 32 truck/ employee vehicle trips/ day associated with increased solid waste processing activities and short-term construction related-activities. Of this total, approximately 12 truck/ employee vehicle trips/ day would occur during peak traffic hours. However, this increase in traffic during peak hours is not considered to be substantial in relation to the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact finding made by the City of East Palo Alto as it relates to traffic load and capacity impacts of the street system on U.S. 101, and on State Route 84 for southwest bound traffic in the morning and northeast bound traffic in the afternoon resulting with approval of the Ravenswood Business District.

### **Public Services**

The City of East Palo Alto General Plan Final EIR (November 23, 1999) considered impacts on public services from implementation of the general plan. The general plan assumed that there would be growth and development in the City and analyzed the cumulative impacts of that growth. The Final EIR concluded that after mitigation measures were implemented, environmental impacts on fire protection, police protection, emergency medical response, and schools, parks and other public facilities would be reduced to a less than significant level. The RBD Draft EIR (June 18, 2003) also concluded that after mitigation, the impact on public services would be less than significant. Analysis shows that the proposed project would not have a significant impact on existing public services. Since future development, projects, and growth will not have a significant impact on public services, there is no cumulative impact from the proposed project and future projects that would cause a significant environmental impact.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

The City of East Palo Alto General Plan Final Program EIR (November 23, 1999) considered impacts on utilities and service systems from implementation of the general

plan. The general plan assumed that there would be growth and development in the City and analyzed the cumulative impacts of that growth. The Final EIR concluded that after mitigation measures were implemented, environmental impacts on water supply, sewage, electric power, natural gas, and waste disposal and other public facilities would be reduced to a less than significant level. The RBD Draft EIR (June 18, 2003) also concluded that after mitigation, the impact on utilities and service systems would be less than significant. Analysis shows that the proposed project would not have a significant impact on existing utilities and service systems. Since future development, projects and growth will not have a significant impact on utilities and service systems, there is no cumulative impact from the proposed project and future projects that would cause a significant environmental impact.

#### **4.4 CONCLUSIONS**

While the increase in traffic during peak hours of the proposed project is not considered to be substantial, the proposed project will, nonetheless, add a de minimis amount of additional traffic trips to the project area that is projected to be cumulatively significant and unavoidable by the City of East Palo Alto for the proposed Ravenswood Business District.

## **REFERENCES**

1. The East Palo Alto Revitalization Plan, District Formation-Land Use & Development Policies-Capital Improvements. Prepared for the City of East Palo Alto by Freedman Tung & Bottomley, Preliminary Draft, August 2000.
2. Amendments to the East Palo Alto General Plan and Zoning Ordinance and Infrastructure Improvements in the Ravenswood Business District, City of East Palo Alto Draft Environmental Impact Report, State Clearinghouse No.2003012113, June 18, 2003.
3. Telephone conversation with Maria Banico, City Planning Manager, City of East Palo Alto, December 23, 2003. Telephone number: (650) 853-3189.
4. General Plan, Final Program Environmental Impact Report, City of East Palo Alto, Cotton/Beland/Associates, November 23, 1999.

**5.0 - OTHER CEQA  
CONSIDERATIONS**

DRAFT

## **5.0 - OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS**

### **5.1 INTRODUCTION**

This Chapter provides a discussion of other categories of environmental impact required to be evaluated in an EIR in addition to those addressed in Chapter 3.0 Environmental Impact Analysis. This discussion is required by CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15126.2).

### **5.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

As described in Chapter 3.0, Section 3.3.11, Transportation and Traffic, the proposed project is expected to generate an additional 32 truck/ employee vehicle trips/ day that is associated with increased solid waste processing capabilities and short-term construction related-activities during peak traffic hours. While the increase in traffic during peak hours of the proposed project is not considered to be substantial, the proposed project will nonetheless add a de minimis amount of additional traffic trips to the project area that is projected to be cumulatively significant and unavoidable by the City of East Palo Alto for the proposed Ravenswood Business District (see Chapter 4.0, Cumulative Impacts). This is the only aspect of the project that was found to create impact that would be considered “significant”.

### **5.3 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED**

The proposed project has the potential to add a de minimis amount of additional traffic trips to the project area that is projected to be cumulatively significant and unavoidable by the City of East Palo Alto for the proposed Ravenswood Business District. While the impact is not considered significant, it is the only potential impact of the project that is considered “unavoidable”.

### **5.4 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES**

The additional traffic trips generated by the proposed project will contribute to an overall cumulatively significant and unavoidable impact. While the impact is not considered significant, it is the only potential impact of the project that is considered “irreversible”.

## **5.5 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS**

The proposed project does not involve activities that would result in increases in housing needs, recreational facilities, infrastructure development, or other factors activities that would result in increased growth. Consequently, the proposed project will not create growth-inducing impacts.

DRAFT

## ***6.0 - Project Alternatives Analysis***

DRAFT

## **6.0 - Project Alternatives Analysis**

### **6.1 INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15126.6(a)), an EIR must consider alternatives to the proposed project if significant impacts are found that cannot be mitigated. As described in Chapter 3.0, Section 3.3.11, Transportation and Traffic, the proposed project is expected to generate an additional 32 truck/ employee vehicle trips/ day as a result of increased solid waste processing activities and short-term construction related activities. Of this total, approximately 12 trips/ day would occur during peak traffic hours. While the increase in traffic during peak hours of the proposed project is not considered to be substantial, the proposed project will nonetheless add a de minimis amount of trips to the project area that is projected to be cumulatively significant and unavoidable by the City of East Palo Alto for the proposed Ravenswood Business District (see Chapter 4.0, Cumulative Impacts). Therefore, this dEIR provides an analysis of alternatives to the proposed project.

The EIR must describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain all or most of the basic objectives of the project and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the potentially significant environmental impacts of the project (see Project Objectives below). The alternatives should be evaluated based on their comparative merits. CEQA also requires that a “No Project” alternative be evaluated and compared to the proposed project.

Key provisions of the CEQA Guidelines pertaining to the alternatives analysis are:

- The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant impacts of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.

- The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to allow a reasoned choice. The alternatives must be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project.
- An EIR needs not consider an alternative whose impacts cannot reasonably be determined, whose implementation is remote and speculative, or if it would not achieve the basic project objectives.
- If the “No Project” alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

## **6.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

As stated above, pursuant to CEQA, one of the criteria for defining alternatives to the proposed project is the potential for the alternatives to meet the *project objectives*. The objectives of the proposed Romic facility Permit Modification and Renewal, as outlined in Chapter 2.0, Project Description, are as follows:

Objective A: To ensure that Romic can continue to provide a viable service for the safe and effective storage and treatment of hazardous wastes generated by businesses within and outside the State of California.

Objective B: To ensure that Romic can conduct necessary modifications to its facility to meet ever-changing market demands.

Objective C: To continue to provide a regional treatment, storage, recycling and transfer facility for the California generators for processing certain identified hazardous waste, most of which currently are authorized to be accepted at the Romic facility under existing permit conditions.

### **6.3 POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES**

The following were identified as potential alternatives that may avoid or substantially lessen the significant cumulative traffic impacts of the proposed project. These potential alternatives were identified as those whose impacts could reasonably be determined, and where implementation is possible and not speculative.

#### **Alternative #1: No Project**

Under this alternative, DTSC would not grant the permit renewal and Romic would operate the facility as an exempt transfer and 10-day storage facility. In this case, proposed project upgrades and modifications would not be implemented. Romic would continue to handle hazardous wastes at the facility, but without a permit from the DTSC. This type of operation would allow Romic to use the facility as a hazardous waste transfer station, but there could be no on-site treatment and recycling of hazardous wastes. Hazardous wastes brought to the facility would have to be removed within ten days.

The purpose of the transfer station would be to collect wastes from the surrounding area and transfer them into larger trucks for transport to distant treatment and disposal facilities. The transfer station would most likely include a fleet of smaller enclosed van trucks and stake bed trucks that would collect wastes from customer sites and transport them back to the Romic facility for transfer to the larger trucks. The facility would operate Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Under this alternative, Romic would be required to submit an amended Closure Plan. Prior to approval of the amended Closure Plan, an analysis of potential impacts from proposed closure activities would be required.

This alternative would also include implementation of Romic's (amended) Closure Plan with decontamination of the site and possible demolition of a few existing structures. Existing warehouses, offices, and parking areas would be used for the transfer station. Construction of new facilities would probably not be required.

*Ability to Meet Most of the Objectives: 2 of 3*

Objective A:

This alternative would ensure that Romic could continue to provide a viable service for the safe and effective storage of hazardous wastes generated by businesses within and outside the State of California; however, the company would not be able continue treatment related activities.

Objective B:

This alternative would not allow Romic to conduct necessary modifications to its facility to meet ever-changing market demands.

Objective C:

This alternative would allow Romic to continue to provide a regional transfer facility for California generators but would not allow for treatment, recycling or processing certain identified hazardous waste, most of which currently are authorized to be accepted at the Romic facility under existing permit conditions.

**Alternative #2: Continuation of Existing Permitted Facility**

This alternative consists of a permit renewal for continuance of existing operations, with no new proposed upgrades, limited expansions, or modifications to the facility allowed.

The existing Part B application would have to be revised to remove the requested upgrades, limited expansions, and modifications to the facility and resubmitted to the DTSC with information concerning only the existing facility. The facility would operate Monday through Sunday, 24 hours/ day.

*Ability to Meet Most of the Objectives: 2 of 3*

Objective A:

This alternative would ensure that Romic could continue to provide a viable service for the safe and effective storage and treatment of hazardous wastes generated by businesses within and outside the State of California.

Objective B:

This alternative would not allow Romic to conduct necessary modifications to its facility to meet ever-changing market demands.

Objective C:

This alternative would allow Romic to continue to provide a regional treatment, storage, recycling and transfer facility for the California generators for processing certain identified hazardous waste, most of which currently are authorized to be accepted at the Romic facility under existing permit conditions.

**Alternative #3: Facility Closure**

This alternative consists of all hazardous waste treatment and transfer operations ceasing, including exempt transfer facility activities. Romic would initiate closure activities consistent with the Closure Plan.

*Ability to Meet Most of the Objectives: 0 of 3*

Objective A:

This alternative would not allow Romic to continue to provide a viable service for the safe and effective storage and treatment of hazardous wastes generated by businesses within and outside the State of California.

Objective B:

This alternative would not allow Romic to conduct necessary modifications to facility to meet ever-changing market demands.

Objective C:

This alternative would not allow Romic to continue to provide a regional treatment, storage, recycling and transfer facility for the California generators for processing certain identified hazardous waste, most of which currently are authorized to be accepted at the Romic facility under existing permit conditions.

#### **6.4 ALTERNATIVES ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION**

Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant impacts. Alternative #3, Facility Closure, was eliminated from further consideration because it does not meet any of the project objectives. In addition, Alternative #3 is not feasible as Romic can legally operate as an exempt transfer operation without authorization from DTSC.

#### **6.5 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

The EIR must include sufficient information about each alternative to allow for meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. If an

alternative would cause one or more significant impacts in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant impacts of the alternative must be discussed.

Alternative #1: No Project and Alternative #2, Continuation of Existing Permitted Facility were evaluated and compared with the Proposed Project to determine: 1) if they would cause significant additional impacts; and 2) if they would avoid or substantially lessen the potential cumulative transportation and traffic impacts related to the proposed project.

### **Alternative #1: No Project**

An analysis of this alternative found that it would result in a reduction of approximately 172 trucks/ employee vehicle trips/ day over the proposed project. However, this alternative would result in a net increase of approximately 61 truck/ employee vehicle trips/day during peak traffic hours. .

### **Alternative #2: Continuation of Existing Permitted Facility**

An analysis of this alternative found that continuation of existing permitted facility operations, would result in a decrease of approximately 32 truck/ employee vehicle trips/ day than the proposed project. Continued operations would also result in a decrease of approximately 12 truck/ employee trips/ day during peak traffic hours.

Table 6.1 provides a summary of the analysis and comparison of these alternatives.

## **6.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**

The main purpose of evaluating alternatives is to determine whether an alternative to the project would substantially meet the project objectives while reducing or eliminating significant environmental impacts. An EIR must identify an environmentally superior

alternative. If the No Project alternative is chosen as the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other evaluated alternatives.

In evaluating the alternatives, Alternative #2: Continuation of Existing Permitted Facility is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative because it would have less of a cumulative transportation/ traffic impact than Alternative #1: No Project.

**TABLE 6-1  
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES AND PROPOSED PROJECT**

<b>Environmental Resource Area</b>	<b>Project Impact</b>	<b>#1 No Project</b>	<b>#2 Existing Facility</b>
Geology and Soils	Less than significant	Similar (Less than Significant)	Reduced (No Impact)
Air Quality			
Construction	Less than Significant	Reduced <sup>1</sup> (Less than Significant) <sup>2</sup>	Reduced (No Impact)
Operation	Less than Significant	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than significant	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Biological Resources	Less than Significant	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Land Use and Planning	Less than Significant	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Hazardous & Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Transportation and Traffic (see Cumulative)	Less than Significant	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Public Services	Less than Significant	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Utilities and Service Systems	Less than Significant	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Noise	Less than Significant	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)
Cultural Resources	Less than Significant	Reduced (No Impact)	Reduced (No Impact)
Aesthetics	Less than Significant	Similar (Less than Significant)	Similar (Less than Significant)
Cumulative	Significant	Reduced (Less than Significant)	Reduced (Less than Significant)

<sup>1</sup> The first item indicates the relative impact of the alternative as compared to the proposed project.

<sup>2</sup> The second item indicates whether the impacts of the alternative would be significant.

# ***7.0 Persons and Organizations Consulted***

## ***7.0 – Persons and Organizations Consulted***

### **7.1 Persons and Organizations Consulted/EIR Preparers**

#### City of East Palo Alto

B. Fellman  
Maria Banico  
Ron Sibley  
Dennis Aquirre  
Fernando Bravo

#### San Mateo County Airports

F. Achondoa  
J. Bennett  
Brian Fisher – Palo Alto A/P

#### Romic Corporation

Wayne Kiso  
Kevin Martin

#### Menlo Park Fire Protection District

Ron Keefer

#### California Department of Fish and Game

D. McGriff

#### Bay Area Air Quality Management District

Brian Bateman  
Ed Boehmer  
Barry Young

#### U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Ron Leach  
Sherry Nikzal  
Lily Lee

**7.2 EIR Preparers**

California Environmental Protection Agency  
Department of Toxic Substances Control  
Standardized Permits and Corrective Action Branch  
700 Heinz Avenue, Suite 300  
Berkeley, CA 94710-2721  
Phone (510) 540-3959

Mohinder Sandhu.....Branch Chief  
Wei Wei Chui.....Section Chief  
Evelia Rodriguez.....Hazardous Substances Engineer

Environmental Analysis Regulations Audits Branch  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95812-0806  
Phone (916) 322-8955

Guenther Moskat.....Section Chief  
Nancy Carroll.....Hazardous Substances Scientist

TRC  
1590 Solano Way  
Concord, CA 94520  
(925) 688-1200

Jonathan Scheiner.....Project Manager  
W. David Augustine.....Technical Editor

## ***8.0 – List of Abbreviations & Acronyms***

DRAFT

**LIST OF  
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

AA	Administering Agency
AAQS	Ambient Air Quality Standards
AB	Assembly Bill
ADT	Average Daily Traffic
AFFF	Aqueous film forming foam
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
AST	Aboveground Storage Tank
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BCDC	Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Cal/EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal/OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
CalTrans	California Department of Transportation
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGS	California Geological Survey
CHSC	California Health and Safety Code
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	Carbon Monoxide
COCs	Chemicals of Concern
CPRC	California Public Resources Code
CRT	Cathode Ray Tube
CWA	Clean Water Act
dBA	Decibel, A weighted
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substance Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPAPD	East Palo Alto Police Department
EPASD	East Palo Alto Sanitary District
EPAWD	East Palo Alto Waterworks District
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act
ERA	Ecological Risk Assessment
ERPG	Emergency Response Planning Guidelines
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FCS	Federal Candidate Species
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
HAZWOPER	Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response
HHRA	Human Health Risk Assessment
HI	Hazard Index

**LIST OF  
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle
HWCL	Hazardous Waste Control Law (California)
IDLH	Immediately Dangerous to Life and Health
LEPC	Local Emergency Planning Committee Liability Act
LOS	Level of Service
LUP	Land Use Plan
MEI	Maximally Exposed Individual
MGD	Million Gallons per Day
MPFPD	Menlo Park Fire Protection Department
MSDS	Material safety data sheets
NIOSH	National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health
NOI	Notice of Intent
NO <sub>x</sub>	Nitrogen Oxides
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
PARWQCP	Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant
PCBs	Polychlorinated biphenyls
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
PM <sub>10</sub>	Particulate Matter, 10 microns
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
ppm	Parts per million
PSM	Process Safety Management
PVC	Polyvinyl Chloride
RBD	Ravenswood Business District
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RFI	Remediation Feasibility Investigation
ROG	Reactive Organic Gasses
SERC	State Emergency Response Committee
SFRWQCB	San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board
SFWD	San Francisco Water Department
SLC	Species of Local Concern
SPCC	Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures
SSC	Species of Special Concern
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TSD	Treatment Storage Disposal facility
UBC	Uniform Building Code
UFC	Uniform Fire Code
USC	United States Code
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
UST	Underground Storage Tank
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound