APPENDIX G HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SOLID WASTE, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Appendix</u> G

Appendix G-1 – Hazardous Materials Assessment Appendix G-2 – Figure F-1 San Fernando Valley Superfund Site THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX G-1 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ASSESSMENT THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Geotechnical Services

A Report Prepared for:

RS&H California, Inc. 5901 West Century Boulevard Suite 1030 Los Angeles, California 90045

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ASSESSMENT PROPOSED BURBANK AIRPORT REPLACEMENT TERMINAL CITY OF BURBANK, CALIFORNIA

Project No. 2018-011

by

itan

Chaitanya Kukutla Project Engineer

Clint Isaac Isa Civil Engineer 76470



Diaz•Yourman & Associates 1616 East 17th Street Santa Ana, CA 92705 (714) 245-2920

May 5, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	IN	TRODUCTION	1
	1.1	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
	1.2	PURPOSE AND NEED	6
	1.3	SCOPE	6
	1.4	RISK ANALYSIS	7
2	SI	TE SETTING	8
	2.1	RESOURCE STUDY AREA	8
	2.2	EXISTING LAND USE1	1
	2.3	HISTORICAL LAND USE1	1
3	AF	REA GEOLOGY AND HYDROGEOLOGY1	5
4	DC	DCUMENTS REVIEW1	7
	4.1	USER-PROVIDED DOCUMENTS1	7
	4.2	ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASE REVIEW	7
5	СС	ONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS4	3
6	LIN	MITATIONS4	6
7	BI	BLIOGRAPHY4	7

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - LIST OF PREVIOUS REPORTS REVIEWED	17
Table 2 - IMPACT SUMMARY, ESA REPORT (2018)	21
Table 3 - IMPACT SUMMARY, RS&H EIR (2016)	24
Table 4 - GEOLOGIC IMPACT SUMMARY, NIÑYO & MOORE (2016)	31
Table 5 - SUMMARY OF REVIEWED ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASES	
Table 6 - SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACT SITES TO THE PROJECT	44

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - VICINITY MAP	3
Figure 2 - PROPOSED ACTION (CONSTRUCTION)	4
Figure 3 - PROPOSED ACTION (DEMOLITION)	5
Figure 4 - SITE MAP	9
Figure 5 - QUADRANTS AT BOB HOPE AIRPORT	.10
Figure 6 - RUNWAYS AT BOB HOPE AIRPORT	.13
Figure 7 - FORMER LOCKHEED SITES	.14
Figure 8 - REGIONAL GEOLOGIC MAP	.16
•	

LIST OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT A - PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS

EXHIBIT B - EDR RADIUS REPORT

1 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of our Hazardous Materials Assessment (HMA) for the proposed 14-gate replacement passenger terminal building at Hollywood Burbank Airport (BUR) in the Cities of Burbank and Los Angeles, California (Project). Diaz•Yourman & Associates (DYA) was authorized by RS&H California, Inc. (RS&H) to perform this work with a contract effective on April 24, 2018.

The intent of DYA's HMA was to evaluate the presence and potential impact of existing hazardous materials at the site on Project construction and to evaluate the potential impact of hazardous materials generated during construction on areas adjacent to the Project site. We understand that the HMA will be used by the Project team to develop the hazardous materials section of the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) document being prepared for the Project.

In this effort, DYA reviewed existing environmental investigation reports provided by the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority (BGPAA), publicly available online records, and the environmental database search results generated by Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) for the Project area and adjoining properties.

1.1 **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Project site is located about 12 miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles, primarily in the City of Burbank and partially in the City of Los Angeles near the San Gabriel Mountains that form the eastern boundary of the San Fernando Valley. BUR is located northwest of the intersection of North Hollywood Way and Empire Avenue, approximately 0.7 miles west of Interstate (I-) 5. The objective of the Project is to replace the existing passenger terminal with a new, 14-gate passenger terminal that will meet current California seismic design standards and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airport modern design standards. The proposed construction will enhance the safety of passengers and routine airport operations. The primary components of the proposed Project are shown on Figure 2 and Figure 3 and are summarized as follows:

- Demolition of the existing passenger terminal building.
- Construction of a replacement passenger terminal building.
- Demolition of shuttle bus dispatch office and staging area.



- Demolition of airline cargo and GSE maintenance building and associated pavement.
- Removal of commercial aircraft parking apron and adjacent taxi lanes.
- Removal of existing parking booth to allow for vehicle storage and staging.
- Removal of existing employee surface parking in Parking Lot A and the employee parking lot in the southeast quadrant.
- Removal of existing Parking Lots A, B, and E.
- Removal of existing public parking structure adjacent to the existing passenger terminal.
- Removal of tenant lease area to allow for the development of the replacement passenger terminal building.
- Construction of a 45,900-square yard aircraft parking apron.
- Construction of a replacement employee automobile parking lot.
- Construction of a public automobile parking structure.
- Construction of a new passenger terminal access road.
- Realignment of Avenue A.
- Construction of replacement airline cargo building.
- Construction of replacement Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting (ARFF) station.
- Construction of a ground-service equipment (GSE) and passenger terminal maintenance building.
- Construction of a central utility plant.
- Construction of ground access vehicle storage and staging area.
- Extension of Taxiways A and C to the ends of Runway 15-33 and Runway 08-26, respectively, to provide full-length parallel taxiways.
- Realignment of the airport service road.
- Relocation of the Shuttle Buys Dispatch Office.



Figure 1 - VICINITY MAP

3



10:52am K:\PROJECTS\2018\2018-011\F 2021 <u></u>б May



Figure 2 - PROPOSED ACTION (CONSTRUCTION)









1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority (Authority or Airport Sponsor) owns and operates the Airport. The FAA and the Authority have discussed the need for a replacement passenger terminal building since January 1980 because its location does not comply with FAA Airport standards. The existing passenger terminal does not meet current FAA Airport Design Standards related to runway separation and object free areas. The purpose of the Project is to provide a passenger terminal that meets the standards identified in FAA (2014) Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A, Change 1, Airport Design, as well as the FAA's regulations on the safe, efficient use and would eliminate an obstruction pursuant to 14 CFR Part 77. The replacement terminal would be separated from the aircraft movement areas to maintain setback distances that satisfy the requirements of a runway object-free area, taxilane/taxiway object-free area, and building restriction lines.

1.3 SCOPE

The intent of this HMA was to evaluate, in general accordance with the standard practices described in ASTM International (ASTM) Practice E1527-13, recognized environmental conditions (RECs), which are defined by ASTM as "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substance or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of future release to the environment."

The purpose of a Phase I environmental site assessment, according to ASTM, is to identify RECs with regards to a commercial real estate transaction of a specific parcel of land. In contrast, the purpose of this HMA was limited to evaluating the presence of potential impacts from any existing hazardous materials at the site on Project construction and to evaluate the potential impact of hazardous materials generated during construction on areas adjacent to the Project site. ASTM E1527-13 was used as the basis for identifying RECs for this HMA; however, our study did not include performing site reconnaissance; reviewing historical aerial photographs, topographic maps, Sanborn maps, and city directories; performing on-site interviews or user questionnaires. This report summarizes the findings of DYA's review, which was solely based on the desk-review of documents (refer to Section 4) available at the time of this HMA.



The scope of services to perform this HMA generally consisted of the following:

- Reviewing available environmental studies provided by the BGPAA.
- Reviewing publicly available online documents on GeoTracker.
- Reviewing computer-generated environmental databases and regulatory agency information for the Project site and adjoining properties.
- Preparing this stand-alone HMA report.

1.4 **RISK ANALYSIS**

The purpose of this HMA was to identify the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products at or near the site that have the potential to impact the Project improvements. Such sites are considered RECs. RECs identified during this HMA were further evaluated and assigned a risk level of high, medium, or low based on the RECs' ability to impact the Project planning, design, and/or construction. The risk-level criteria summarized below were developed based on professional judgment and following general ASTM (ASTM, 2013) and Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual guidelines (Caltrans, 2018).

- High Property with known contamination that is likely to be encountered during Project construction activities.
- Moderate Property with potential or suspect contamination that might be encountered during Project construction activities.
- Low Property where soils and/or groundwater might be disturbed during Project construction that uses or stores hazardous materials but has no history of significant violations, known releases, or evidence of inadequate chemical handling practices. Contamination from low-risk sites is less likely to be encountered during construction activities.



2 SITE SETTING

2.1 RESOURCE STUDY AREA

The Project team developed two study areas identified as the Detailed Study Area and General Study Area, as illustrated on Figure 4 (for the purpose of DYA's HMA, the Detailed Study Area was considered the Resource Study Area [RSA]). The Detailed Study Area consists of the BUR property and the geographic area is generally bounded by Tujunga Avenue and Clybourne Avenue to the west, San Fernando Boulevard to the north, Empire Avenue to the south, and North Hollywood Way to the east. Evaluation of the Detailed Study Area is limited to environmental considerations that do not result in impacts that could affect areas outside the Project site.

The General Study Area consists of the Detailed Study Area and the regional roadway system (i.e., freeways, major arterials, secondary arterials, collectors, and local streets) located in the adjacent portions of the Cities of Burbank and Los Angeles. Evaluation of the General Study Area consisted of environmental considerations that could result in impacts to areas outside the proposed Project site, including impacts associated with noise, air, pollutant emissions, transportation, and traffic.

The existing BUR passenger terminal building, portions of which were constructed as early as the 1930s, is located in the southeast quadrant of the BUR property. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was previously prepared by RS&H (RS&H 2016a, b, c) in which the owner, BGPAA, requested that three alternatives be evaluated for the Project:

- The northeast quadrant (NEQ), full-size terminal option.
- The southwest quadrant (SWQ), full-size terminal option.
- The SWQ, same-size terminal option.

The approximate limits of NEQ and SWG are shown on Figure 5. Based on the findings of the EIR, we understand that the NEQ site was selected as the preferred alternative for the proposed improvements and was, therefore, the basis for DYA's HMA.



Source: Authority, 2016; RS&H, 2018





10



2.2 EXISTING LAND USE

The existing BUR property is divided by the intersecting runways into quadrants commonly referred to as the northeast, southeast, southwest, and northwest guadrants; see Figure 5. The approximately 232,000-square-foot existing 14-gate passenger terminal is located in the southeast guadrant of the airport. In addition to the existing passenger terminal, the approximately 78-acre southeast quadrant also encompasses the Regional Intermodal Transportation Center, structured parking, and surface parking. The northeast quadrant consists of an approximately 150-acre portion of the former Lockheed Martin Corporation (Lockheed) Plant B-6 site. The currently undeveloped property is used for airport passenger and employee automobile parking, movie equipment staging, and truck/recreational vehicle parking. The approximately 118-acre southwest quadrant is used for general aviation hangars and aircraft parking aprons, FAA maintenance and communication facilities, rental car storage, air freighter facilities (Federal Express and United Parcel Service), and an air cargo building for commercial air carriers. The northwest quadrant of the Airport is approximately 161 acres and primarily features the Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting Facility (ARFF), aircraft hangars, and fixed-base operators.

At the time of this HMA, BUR had two intersecting runways: Runway 08-26 and Runway 15-33 (see Figure 6). Runway 08-26 was 5,800-feet-long and 150-feet-wide and had a surface gradient descending to the east, with elevations ranging from approximately 697 feet to 727 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). Runway 15-33 was 6,886 feet long and 150 feet wide with surface elevations ranging from a minimum of 695 feet AMSL at the south end of the runway to a maximum of 778 feet AMSL at the north end of the runway. BUR has a parallel and connecting taxiway system that allows for aircraft movement from the two runways to the four quadrants of the BUR property.

2.3 HISTORICAL LAND USE

The existing passenger terminal building dates to the 1930s when the central portion of the passenger terminal was originally constructed. Construction continued through World War II into the early 1940s. The original structure burned in 1966 and was subsequently rebuilt by Lockheed in the same location.

The NEQ, which occupies a portion of the former Lockheed Plant B-6 site, was vacant or used for agricultural purposes prior to the late 1930s. From the early 1940s through the late 1980s,

Lockheed constructed approximately 65 buildings in the NEQ (including the site of the proposed replacement passenger terminal) for aircraft research, warehouse, maintenance, and office purposes in support of the United State Department of Defense. The facility was known as Plant B-6. Three additional Lockheed facilities (identified as Plant B-5, Plant A-1, and Plant C-1) were also located in the vicinity of present-day BUR, as shown on Figure 7. In later years, the name of the airport was changed to Bob Hope Airport, and the property was acquired from Lockheed by BGPAA in 1978. In 1997 and 1998, most of the Plant B-6, buildings, foundations, and pavement were demolished and removed from the site, with the remaining on-site buildings being demolished in 2001.



12







REVISION:

Canuan Mater 2 Tans 0 Canuan Mater 2 Tans 0 Canuan Mater 2 Tans 0 Canuan Salar	
Powerplant wr	
OCKHEED SI TES	PROJECT NUMBER: 2018-011 SCALE:
ort Replacement Terminal Burbank, CA	As Shown Figure number: 7

3 AREA GEOLOGY AND HYDROGEOLOGY

The RSA is located close to the San Gabriel Mountains which is easternmost portion of the San Fernando Valley and the Santa Monica Mountains to the south, as shown on the Regional Geologic Map, Figure 8 (Yerkes and Campbell, 2005; California Geological Survey [CGS], formerly California Division of Mines and Geology [CDMG], 1997, 1998). Geologic mapping of the area indicates that the RSA sits atop a large alluvial fan derived from the San Gabriel Mountains. This Quaternary alluvium consists of unconsolidated gravel, sand, and silt that was deposited during the Holocene and late Pleistocene Epochs (Yerkes and Campbell, 2005). The ground elevation at the RSA ranged from approximately 690 to 780 feet AMSL.

The RSA is located within the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin. Based on the recent subsurface investigations and GeoTracker Gama data at the RSA and adjacent sites, the groundwater in the Project vicinity varies from 180 to 240 feet below ground surface (bgs). Subsurface investigation data (Section 4.1.8) for the site adjoining the RSA indicated that groundwater was encountered at an average depth of 220 feet and is expected to be flowing southwesterly. Other investigation reports (prepared for the adjacent properties) reviewed also indicated that the groundwater flow direction is towards south-southeast (see Exhibit A). It should be noted that the groundwater level and flow direction might vary depending on the seasonal fluctuations, local dewatering operations, and amount of rainfall.

15





Figure 8 - REGIONAL GEOLOGIC MAP

4 DOCUMENTS REVIEW

4.1 USER-PROVIDED DOCUMENTS

DYA reviewed available environmental studies of the sites within the RSA to identify the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at the site that has potential to impact Project improvements and to evaluate the potential impact of hazardous materials generated during construction on areas adjacent to the Project site. The environmental studies provided by the BGPAA included assessment and cleanup action reports for various sites within and adjacent to the RSA. Table 1 presents a list of environmental studies reviewed by DYA (refer to Exhibit A for complete reports) and summarized in Sections 4.1.1 through 4.1.28. In addition to the studies listed in Table-1, DYA obtained and reviewed regulatory agency databases of hazardous materials sites and underground storage tank records as well as publicly available online records on GeoTracker; see Section 4.2.

	REPORT	DOCUMENT			
LOCATION	SECTION	DATE	DOCUMENT TITLE	SITE	AUTHOR
	Section 4.1.1	August 2018	Draft Environmental Impact Report	Avion Project	Environmental Science Associates
	Section 4.1.2	January 2018	Letter – Review of Draft and Final Human Health Risk Assessment	Hollywood Burbank Airport Replacement Passenger Terminal	RWQCB-LAR
	Section 4.1.3	May 2017	Technical Memorandum – Assessment of Subsurface Soil and Soil Vapor for Chemical Impacts	2801 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California	EFI Global
Former Plant B-6	Section 4.1.4	December 2017	Final Human Health Risk Assessment	NEQ site (Preferred Alternative)	Geosyntec Consultants
	Section 4.1.5	May 2017	Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment	Replacement Terminal – Northeast site	Niñyo & Moore
	Section 4.1.6	June 2016	Environmental Impact Report for a Replacement Airline Passenger Terminal at Burbank Bob Hope Airport Volumes - 1, 2, 3,	Burbank Bob Hope Airport	RS&H
	Section 4.1.7	February 2016	Subsurface Investigation and Human Health Risk Assessment	Portions of former Lockheed Plant B-6	Ardent

Table 1 - LIST OF PREVIOUS REPORTS REVIEWED

\\DYASERVER\data\datafls\PROJECTS\2018\2018-011\Report\2018-011 Report v3.docx

LOCATION	REPORT SECTION	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT TITLE	SITE	AUTHOR
	Section 4.1.8	December 2015	Phase I Environmental Assessment and Document Review	Portions of Former Lockheed Plant B-6	Ardent
	Section 4.1.9	Multiple, 1996	Letters (Multiple) – No Further Requirements	Parcels A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J, L of Lockheed Plant B-6 West	RWQCB-LAR
	Section 4.1.10	October 1996	Letters – No Further Requirements	Multiple sites at Plant B-6	RWQCB-LAR
	Section 4.1.11	September 1996	Letters – No Further Requirements	Parking Lot northeast of Building 82, Lockheed Plant B-6	RWQCB-LAR
	Section 4.1.12	April 1996	Letters – No Further Requirements/ Supplemental Soil Gas Investigation, Report	Lockheed Plant B-6	RWQCB-LAR
	Section 4.1.13	October 1995	Letters – No Further Requirements	7550 Wheatland Avenue, Sun Valley, California	RWQCB-LAR
	Section 4.1.14	July 1995	Letters – Request for Supplemental Subsurface Investigation	2736-2760 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California	RWQCB-LAR
	Section 4.1.15	March 2016	Soil Management Plan	Trust Property	Ardent
	Section 4.1.16	March 2016	Limited Soil Sampling	Trust Property	Ardent
Sites	Section 4.1.17	March 2016	Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation, Replacement Terminal Project	Replacement Terminal - Northeast and southwest sites	Niñyo & Moore
adjacent to former Plant B-6	Section 4.1.18	March 2016	Results of a Soil Gas Survey	Former Aviall Parking Lot Property, 3120 and 3130 Kenwood Street, Burbank, California	Ardent
	Section 4.1.19	February 2016	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment	Parking Lot, 3120 and 3130 Kenwood Street, Burbank, California	Ardent
	Section 4.1.20	July 1996	Letters – No Further Requirements	Former Aviall Services, Inc.	RWQCB-LAR
Former Plant	Section 4.1.21	June 2004	Letter – No Further Requirements (Soil Only)	Former Lockheed, Plant B-5	RWQCB-LAR
5	Section 4.1.22	April 1996	Phase I Environmental Assessment	Former Plant B-5	Tetra Tech

Table 1 - LIST OF PREVIOUS REPORTS REVIEWED (cont.)

LOCATION	REPORT SECTION	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT TITLE	SITE	AUTHOR
	Section 4.1.23	June 2018	Aircraft Underground Fueling System Description Draft	Hollywood Burbank Airport	Conway Consulting
	Section 4.1.24	May 2012	Limited Asbestos and Lead-Containing Paint Survey Report	Bob Hope Airport, 2627 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California	Geocon West, Inc.
Existing Airport	Section 4.1.25	February 2012	Initial Mold Survey	Burbank Airport Hangar 35, ARFF Office Buildings	Aurora
	Section 4.1.26	December 2011	Limited Asbestos, Lead-paint, and Universal Wastes Survey	Bob Hope Airport – Hangar 35,	Geocon West, Inc.
	Section 4.1.27	September 1995	Letters – Supplemental Subsurface Investigation Report	Media Aviation (Lease 4B, 4C and 4D), 3000 North Clybourn, Burbank, California	RWQCB-LAR
Plant A-1 North, Plant B-1, Plant B-6, Plant C-1	Section 4.1.28	December 2014	Additional Site Investigation Report	Former Lockheed Plants A-1 North, B- 1, B-6, and C-1	Tetra Tech
Note(s): Ardent = Ardent Environmental Group, Inc. RWQCB-LAR = Regional Water Quality Control Board - Los Angeles Region. 					

Table 1 - LIST OF PREVIOUS REPORTS REVIEWED (cont.)

• Aviall = Aviall Services, Inc.

The following sections summarize the contents of the reports identified in Table 1 and significant findings of our review which pertain to this HMA.

4.1.1 Environmental Science Associates, Draft Environmental Impact Report, Avion Project, August 2018

The Draft EIR (DEIR) was prepared by Environmental Science Associates to evaluate the potential environmental impacts related to the proposed construction and operation of the Avion Burbank mixed-use project. The proposed Avion mixed-use project site, located at 3001 North Hollywood Way, is an approximately 61-acre portion of the former Lockheed Plant B-6. The proposed Avion project will be located east of the proposed Bob Hope airport replacement passenger terminal alternative (NEQ) site, immediately west of North Hollywood Way, and south of San Fernando Boulevard. The mixed-use project includes multiple components consisting of



transit connectivity, parking, street improvements, industrial uses, offices, retail buildings, and a hotel. The DEIR indicated that the Avion project site and the adjacent NEQ site were used for the same type of industrial uses.

The DEIR document included significant findings obtained from review of previously conducted site-specific environmental assessment and remediation studies. The findings include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The site has been subject to several assessment and remediation actions since the early 1990s, and records indicate that most of the contamination has been remediated since.
- Based on the site assessments and remediation actions, the RWQCB issued a letter in 2003 indicating that no further requirements for soil investigations, especially for chromium, is required on the proposed Avion site.
- Beginning in the 2000s, groundwater samples from drinking water wells in San Fernando Groundwater Basin began detecting emergent chemicals including perchloroethylene (PCE), trichloroethylene (TCE), and hexavalent chromium.
- In 2013, RWQCB issued a letter to Lockheed requesting that soil sampling be performed in selected areas of the former Lockheed Plant B-6 site including proposed Avion site.
- Based on the results of the soil investigation performed, Tetra Tech concluded that the proposed Avion site is not a significant source of hexavalent chromium to groundwater (Tetra Tech, 2014). RWQCB concurred with the conclusions in a letter dated August 4, 2015. Because, other off-site areas of concern (AOC) that are part of Lockheed Plant B-6 site still needed evaluation at that time, the RWQCB did not issue case closure related to surrounding groundwater contamination for the Avion project site.
- There are approximately nine groundwater monitoring wells currently on the Avion Project site as part of the EPA's mandatory Well Investigation Program (WIP).
- The DEIR indicated that the Avion Project would not create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of materials if following the Best Management Practices indicated in the report.
- The DEIR included the associated mitigation measures that are to be followed during the construction and operation of the proposed project to minimize the potential hazardous impacts to the environment and construction workers. The hazards and hazardous

20



materials impacts evaluated, their impact potential, and mitigation measures are summarized in Table 2:

IMPACT	IMPACT POTENTIAL	MITIGATION MEASURE
Routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials	Less than Significant Mitigation	Any transite pipe containing asbestos, encountered during construction, should be removed in full compliance with SCAQMD and Cal-OSHA requirements to ensure proper handling, notification, and disposal by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor.
		During construction, the haul trucks and other equipment that come in contact with project waste are inspected and put through procedures to remove loose debris from tire wells and truck exterior.
Foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment	Less than Significant	Proper identification of truck haul routes for the potential transportation of contaminated soils from the project site and getting city approval for routes prior to beginning of construction.
Hazardous Materials complied to Government code section 65962.5	Less than Significant	None.
Project located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport	Less than Significant	None.
Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan	Less than Significant	None.

Table 2 - IMPACT SUMMARY, ESA REPORT (2018)

4.1.2 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, Letter – Review of Draft and Final Human Health Risk Assessment, Hollywood Burbank Airport Replacement Passenger Terminal, January 29, 2018

The letter indicates that RWQCB has reviewed documents related to the Draft HHRA dated July 17, 2017, and the Final HHRA dated December 21, 2017, both prepared by Geosyntec Consultants. The letter includes the following conclusions/recommendations:

 Based on the review of the results of the field investigation, Draft/Final HHRAs, and Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment memo, RWQCB considered the NEQ site suitable for the construction and operation of an airport replacement passenger terminal and associated facilities.



- Construction activities exceeding a depth of 25 feet bgs and construction of buildings in restricted portions (Area D-DU3 and F-DU1, as noted in the letter) may require additional assessments and risk analysis.
- An SMP should be prepared and submitted prior to the start of construction activities.

4.1.3 EFI Global (EFI), Technical Memorandum – Assessment of Subsurface Soil and Soil Vapor for Chemical Impacts, Burbank Airport Replacement Terminal, 2801 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California, May 15, 2017

This technical memorandum details drilling and sampling activities and procedures performed by EFI at the NEQ site to evaluate the potential presence of chemical constituents in soil and soil vapor. The investigation included soil and soil vapor sampling at 144 locations located across the site. PCE was detected in the range of 0.0281 µg/L to 2.48 µg/L; TCE was detected in the range of 0.0151 µg/L to 1.22 µg/L; 1,1-DCE had a maximum concentration of 0.0651 µg/L; carbon tetrachloride ranging from 0.0151 µg/L to 0.202 µg/L; methylene chloride in the range of 0.076 µg/L to 0.991 µg/L; 1,1,1-TCA had a maximum concentration of 0.0293 µg/L; trichlorofluoromethane was detected in the range of 0.0159 µg/L to 0.0657 µg/L; trichlorotrifluoroethane (Freon-113) had a maximum concentration of 0.479 µg/L; ethylbenzene and benzene was detected in 1 of 137 samples and had concentrations of 0.105 µg/L and 0.0591 µg/L respectively. The results of this Assessment served as the primary basis for performing a site-specific Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA). (Refer to Section 4.1.4).

4.1.4 Geosyntec Consultants, Final Human Health Risk Assessment, Hollywood Burbank Airport Replacement Passenger Terminal, 2801 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California, December 21, 2017

This report presents results of the Final HHRA prepared for the NEQ site (shown on Figure 5), which is a portion of the former Lockheed Plant B-6 site. The Adjacent Property, approximately 49 acres, is located about 1,000 feet northeast of the intersection of Runway 08-26 and Runway 15-33. The report included data from numerous and extensive environmental investigations, including soil remedial activities historically conducted within the Plant B-6 site. The data obtained was used to plan for and evaluate potential exposure to construction workers and users of the replacement terminal after Project development. The HHRA determined the following:



- For an airport worker, the calculated cancer risk and non-cancer hazard index (HI) are at or below the de minimis levels.
- For a construction worker, the calculated cancer risk is well below the acceptable target level equivalency of 1.0 used by the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal-EPA) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA).
- Based on the calculated HI and cancer risk to airport and construction workers being below target levels, the HI and cancer risk to an off-site worker and occasional visitor would also be below target levels.
- Investigation results indicated that the Adjacent Property is suitable for the construction and operation of a replacement passenger terminal and associated facilities. Geosyntec recommended that a Soil Management Plan (SMP) be prepared and followed to provide continued protection of human health and the environment during construction activities.

4.1.5 Niñyo & Moore, Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment, Replacement Passenger Terminal Project, Hollywood Burbank Airport, Burbank, California, May 4, 2017

The report presents the findings of a preliminary geotechnical evaluation of the NEQ site for the proposed replacement passenger terminal. The report provided geotechnical recommendations for the design and construction of the Project. The subsurface investigations included drilling soil borings to 100 feet bgs as well as collecting cone penetration test data up to 50 feet bgs. The report indicated that groundwater was not encountered to a depth of up to 100 feet bgs. The report indicated that the proposed terminal structure includes one basement level, which would not have a significant impact on deep groundwater levels during planned construction.

4.1.6 RS&H, Environmental Impact Report for a Replacement Airline Passenger Terminal at Burbank Bob Hope Airport, Volumes 1, 2, and 3, June 2016.

The EIR document presents the results of a study conducted to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed Project per National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements. The EIR document was prepared to enable the BGPAA to consider the environmental consequences of the proposed Project and to facilitate issuance of permits and approvals to responsible agencies. The EIR studied three possible alternatives in detail for the development of the proposed replacement terminal, the associated potential environmental effects, and feasible mitigation measures. The three proposed alternatives included the following:

23



- Adjacent Northeast Property Full-Size Terminal Option (also known as a portion of former Plant B-6 or NEQ site).
- Southwest Quadrant Full-Size Terminal Option.
- Southwest Quadrant Same-Size (as existing passenger terminal) Terminal Option.

The associated developments include construction of an aircraft ramp to accommodate 14 replacement parking positions, internal public access roadways, and curb-front areas; construction of public and employee parking structures, a replacement air cargo building, a ground service equipment maintenance building and an electric substation; realignment of the existing terminal loop road; improvements to taxiway and engineered material arresting system; relocation of airside service road, perimeter security fencing, air traffic control tower access road, and ARFF station; potential extension of the existing Tulare Avenue; and staging of ground access vehicles (such as taxis, shuttles, and ride-hailing vehicles). Demolition activities under this development option would include demolition of the existing terminal and parking structure.

The eight impacts analyzed in the hazards and hazardous materials section of the EIR are summarized in Table 3:

ir <u> </u>		
IMPACT	IMPACT POTENTIAL	MITIGATION MEASURE
Impacts related to hazardous emissions near a school	Less than significant with mitigation	All asbestos containing waste materials should be contained in leak tight containers, labeled appropriately, transported, and disposed of in accordance with applicable rules.
		Prior to demolition involving any areas of known to contain lead-based paint, the contractor should follow protocols for proper removal and disposal.
Impacts related to location on a site on the Cortese list	Less than significant	None.
Impacts related to safety hazard for people in airport vicinity	Less than significant	None.
Impacts related to safety hazard for people in airport vicinity	Less than significant	None.
Impacts related to emergency response of evacuation plans	Less than significant	None.
Impacts related to wildland fires	Less than significant	None.

Table 3 - IMPACT SUMMARY, RS&H EIR (2016)

\\DYASERVER\data\datafls\PROJECTS\2018\2018-011\Report\2018-011 Report v3.docx

Of eight impacts analyzed, all were considered less than significant, except for Impacts related to transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, which are considered less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. Based on the detailed study of the development options, potential impacts, and their associated mitigation measures outlined in Draft EIR/EIS, the BGPAA's preferred alternative for a 355,000-square-foot replacement passenger terminal is the adjacent NEQ site, which is a portion of the former Lockheed Plant B-6. (RS&H, 2016).

4.1.7 Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., Subsurface Investigation and Human Health Risk Assessment, Portions of Former Lockheed Plant B-6, Burbank, California, February 25, 2016

The report presents the results of a subsurface investigation completed at portions of the former Lockheed Plant B-6. The data collected from the soil gas survey was used to complete an HHRA to evaluate possible vapor intrusion. The following are the results of the report:

- The evaluation of the soil and soil gas conditions determined that no human health risk was present and the likelihood for potential human health risk to future occupants through vapor intrusion is low.
- The soil samples tested showed non-detect to low concentrations of petroleum hydrocarbons or VOCs.

4.1.8 Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Document Review, Portions of Former Lockheed Plant B-6, Burbank, California, December 22, 2015

The report presents the results of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and document review for portions of the former Lockheed property. The proposed Ardent project site consisted of approximately 60 acres of the former 130-acre Lockheed Plant B-6 site. The Lockheed site had various chemicals and materials used/stored on site in support of aerospace operations. Some of the materials included aircraft fuels, biocides, descalers, fuel oils, gasoline, paints, solvents, acids, caustics, plastic resins, and hardeners. The project site was located within the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin, a USEPA superfund site due to groundwater contamination associated with historical uses. As discussed in the report, numerous assessment and remediation actions have been conducted since the 1990s. The report indicated the following:



- Based on the results of numerous assessment and remediation actions, RWQCB issued No Further Action (NFA) letters for soil only.
- The residual contaminants would not pose a significant human health risk through dermal contact; however, vapor intrusion for future occupants may be present at the site.
- Asbestos-containing transite piping is reportedly located beneath the site; the extent of which is unknown.
- In 1991, McLaren Hart completed an environmental assessment of the Lockheed Plant B-6 site that presented a detailed study of the historical land use, operations, and AOCs. The investigations identified several AOCs including about 35 USTs, sumps, clarifiers, process lines, degreasers, floor drains and trenches, and chemical storage and handling areas. Most tanks were reportedly removed or abandoned in place during the mid-1980s through the early 1990s.
- From 1992 to 1996, Tetra Tech performed several soil assessments and remediations to address the issues identified by McLaren Hart. Based on the results of these cleanup actions, RWQCB issued NFA letters for areas of the 130-acre Lockheed site B-6.
- From 1996 to 1998, ENSR conducted independent assessments of the sites on behalf of the BGPAA. The results of these reports were outlined in a 2001 environmental summary report along with previous investigation results and the RWQCB NFA letters.
- In the 2000s, groundwater samples from drinking water wells in the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin detected emergent chemical contamination. Per RWQCB's request, Tetra Tech performed additional groundwater sampling at selected AOCs at Lockheed Plant B-6 site and determined that the AOCs tested were not a source of the contamination.
- In 2014, an evaluation of on-site and off-site sources of hexavalent chromium contamination in groundwater was conducted. Based on the laboratory results of soil sampling, RWQCB concluded that there was a low likelihood that the site contributed to the chromium contamination. However, the case is still open as the evaluation of other Lockheed properties is ongoing. The groundwater at the site was encountered at approximately 220 feet bgs and was generally flowing in a southeasterly direction.



The report recommended the following clean-up actions:

- A soil gas survey to be completed to assess current conditions at the site based on human health risk criteria.
- An SMP to be prepared and implemented during grading/development activities.
- Remove existing underground tank structure that was identified during the time of site reconnaissance.
- Properly abate any known or otherwise encountered transite piping during proposed construction.
- The EPA should be notified if any existing groundwater monitoring wells, which are part of the superfund program, will be disturbed by proposed construction activities.

4.1.9 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, Letters – No Further Requirements, Parcels A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J, L of Lockheed Plant B-6 West, 1996

The letters present the RWQCB review comments regarding the site closure requests for Parcels A through G, I, J, and L of Plant B-6. The letters include the following RWQCB significant comments:

- Based on the results of the investigation, no further requirements with respect to the WIP were required for the subject parcels.
- The detected soil contamination was not considered a threat to groundwater quality, and therefore no further assessment or remediation action appeared to be necessary.

4.1.10 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, Letters – No Further Requirements, Multiple Sites at Plant B-6, October 1996

The letters present the RWQCB review comments regarding the site closure requests for the following subject areas.

- Area #3 Subsurface Soil Investigation Building #353 Drywall and Reservoir Sump
- Area #7 Subsurface Soil Investigation Building #88 Former Fuel UST & UST F28
- Area #4 Subsurface Soil Investigation Building #353 Process Lines
- Area #11 Subsurface Soil Investigation Building #310 Former Closed In-place UST F15

- Area #10 Subsurface Soil Investigation Building #310 Former Closed In-place UST F20
- Area #13 Subsurface Soil Investigation Building #304 Former Closed In-place UST F25; Clarifiers B-6-F, B-6-K, B-6-Z
- Building #309 Former UST F14
- Area #5 Building #353 Former TCA Degreaser
- Area #6 Building #352 Former Sewage Sump

Based on the results of the investigation, RWQCB issued NFA letters with respect to the WIP for the subject sites. The detected soil contamination was not considered a threat to groundwater quality, and therefore no further assessment or remediation action was necessary.

4.1.11 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, Letters – No Further Requirements, Parking Lot Northeast of Building 82, Lockheed Plant B-6, September 1996

The letters present the RWQCB review comments regarding the geophysical survey conducted on the parking lot located northeast of Lockheed Building 82. The letters indicated no further investigation related to the subject area is required with respect to the WIP

4.1.12 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, Letters – No Further Requirements/Supplemental Soil Gas Investigation Report, April 1996

The letter documents the RWQCB review of the "Supplemental Soil Vapor Surveys, Six Sites, Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport, Burbank, California" report dated January 1996, prepared by Fugro West, Inc. The six areas include Old Trapper's property, former American Drug and Chemical plant/ facility, former paint storage area, former Bo Jamison Company wash rack, former Civil Air patrol fire pit, and former bunker simulated gasoline fire pit within the limits of the Burbank Airport. Based on the review of investigation results, RWQCB indicated no additional assessment or cleanup is necessary for the subject sites.

4.1.13 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, Letters – No Further Requirements, 7550 Wheatland Avenue, Sun Valley, California, October 1995

The letter documents the RWQCB review of Phase I and Phase II Environmental Assessment reports and the soil excavation report for the subject site, which is in the northwest quadrant



portion parallel to the existing north-south (08-26) runway. Based on the results of the investigations, RWQCB issued an NFA letter for the subject airport-owned parcel with respect to the WIP.

4.1.14 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, Letters – Request for Supplemental Subsurface Investigation, 2736-2760 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California, July 1995

Based on the review of previous soil investigation results, RWQCB requested that the BGPAA conduct a supplemental soil gas investigation to verify the existence of any potential sources of soil contamination. The investigation was conducted, and the results were reported to RWQCB. Based on the results, RWQCB issued an NFA letter dated September 18, 1995.

4.1.15 Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., Soil Management Plan, Trust Property, Burbank, California, March 3, 2016

The SMP presents the procedures and criteria to manage potential environmental issues that may be encountered during redevelopment activities at the Trust Property located in Burbank, California. The Trust Property collectively refers to three properties, which include an approximately 60-acre portion of former Lockheed Plant B-6, the former Aviall parking lot property, and the former Pacific Airmotive Corporation property. The site is located within the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin, which has been designated as a USEPA superfund site due to groundwater contamination associated with historical uses. Based on the historic contamination, an SMP has been prepared to characterize and properly manage excavated soils.

4.1.16 Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., Limited Soil Sampling, Trust Property, Burbank, California, March 4, 2016

The report presents the results of a limited soil-sampling activity completed at the Trust Property. Based on the results of the soil gas survey, the concentrations of VOCs were determined to be low and not to pose a threat to human health through vapor intrusion.



4.1.17 Niñyo & Moore, Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation, Replacement Terminal Project, Bob Hope Airport, Burbank, California, March 10, 2016

The report presents the findings and conclusions regarding the general geologic conditions and seismic hazards in the BUR area and their potential impacts on the replacement terminal project alternative sites in accordance with CEQA. The geotechnical evaluation was conducted at the proposed alternative (NEQ and SWQ) sites selected for development of the replacement terminal project (refer to discussion in Section 4.1.1). The report indicated that the topography at the BUR gently sloped from the northwest toward the southeast. The elevations at the NEQ site ranged from approximately 750 feet above MSL to 700 feet above MSL at the SWQ site. It was indicated that implementation of the proposed Project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on the geologic environment. However, development of the proposed Project may be subjected to potential impacts from geologic and seismic hazards. These hazards may be addressed by employing best engineering practices in the design and construction of the proposed Project elements. This practice includes the implementation of appropriate geotechnical recommendations prior to the design and construction of the facilities at the Project site. The report recommended that a detailed subsurface geotechnical evaluation be performed to address site-specific conditions at locations of the planned improvements and to provide recommendations for design and construction of the Project. The geologic impacts evaluated, their impact potential, and mitigation measures for the proposed project construction consisted of the items summarized in Table 4.

30



GEOLOGIC CONDITION	IMPACT POTENTIAL	MITIGATION MEASURE
Earthquake fault rupture	Less than Significant	None
Strong Seismic Ground Shaking	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Structural elements of planned improvements to be designed to resist or accommodate appropriate site-specific ground motions and to conform to the current seismic design standards.
Liquefaction and Seismically Induced Settlement	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Structural design and mitigation techniques such as in-situ ground modification or supporting foundations with piles at depths designed for seismically induced settlement.
Landslides	No Impact	None
Substantial Soil Erosion	Less than Significant	None
Subsidence	No Impact	None
Compressible/ Collapsible Soils	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Removal of compressible/collapsible soil layers and replacement with compacted fill; surcharging to induce settlement prior to construction of improvements; allowing for a settlement period after or during construction of new fills; dynamic compaction, compaction grouting, use of and specialized foundation design like deep foundations.
Expansive Soils	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Incorporation of techniques such as over excavation and replacement with non-expansive soil, soil treatment, moisture management, and/or specific structural design for expansive soil conditions developed during design phases.
Corrosive Soils	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Use of concrete resistance to sulfate exposure. Typical mitigation techniques include epoxy and metallic protective coatings, the use of corrosion resistant materials, and selection of the appropriate type of cement and water/cement ratio.
Groundwater and Excavations	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Subsurface exploration performed during the design phases to evaluate the presence of seepage and/or perched groundwater, and to evaluate the potential for stormwater infiltration at the site. Mitigation techniques such as casing, shoring, and/or construction dewatering would be developed to reduce the impacts related to groundwater to low levels.

Table 4 - GEOLOGIC IMPACT SUMMARY, NIÑYO & MOORE (2016)



4.1.18 Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., Results of a Soil Gas Survey, Former Aviall Parking Lot Property, 3120 and 3130 Kenwood Street, Burbank, California, March 3, 2016

The report presents the results of a soil gas survey conducted at the former Aviall parking lot property located at 3120 and 3130 Kenwood Street, Burbank, California. The soil gas survey was conducted to evaluate any elevated concentrations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in soil gas based on human health risk criteria. The report determined the following results:

- The detectable concentrations of PCE and toluene were well below regulatory screening levels.
- None of the tested locations were indicative of an on-site release. Therefore, the likelihood of elevated concentrations of VOCs present at the site is low.

4.1.19 Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Parking Lot, 3120 and 3130 Kenwood Street, Burbank, California, February 24, 2016

The report presents the results of the Phase I ESA for the parking lot property located at 3120 and 3130 Kenwood Street, Burbank, California. The following findings were identified:

- The parking lot property is located north of the former Lockheed Plant B-6 site. The historical site use from 1928 has been vacant, agricultural, residential, commercial, retail buildings, or parking lot. The site was acquired by a manufacturing business in 1976 and has been used as a parking lot since then.
- The site is located within the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin, which has been designated as a USEPA superfund site due to groundwater contamination associated with historical uses.
- No RECs were identified in, on, or at the subject property except for the regional groundwater issue.
- Groundwater wells are not located on site, and the site has not been investigated by regulatory agencies as a possible contributor to the groundwater issues.
- A soil gas survey is recommended to evaluate the human health risk criteria caused by off-site sources.



4.1.20 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, Letters – No Further Requirements, Former Aviall Services, Inc., July 1996

The letters present the RWQCB review comments regarding destruction of vadose zone wells at the former Aviall site. This site is located north of the former Lockheed Plant B-6, east of Kenwood Street. Based on the review of documents, RWQCB issued NFA letters on multiple occasions for the subject site with respect to the WIP.

4.1.21 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, Letter – No Further Requirements (Soil Only), Former Lockheed Martin Plant B-5, Burbank, California, June 29, 2004.

The letter describes the RWQCB decision regarding the review of the supplemental soil vapor, soil matrix, and groundwater investigation report for the former Lockheed Plant B-5 facility. This site assessment was performed in compliance with the cleanup and abatement order issued by RWQCB on December 17, 1987. The letter indicated the following items:

- Several multi-phase site assessments were conducted by Lockheed between 1998 and 2002 to evaluate whether the potential sources identified in Tetra Tech's, April 1996, Phase I ESA (summarized in Section 4.1.22) impacted the soil and posed a threat to groundwater quality.
- Based on the results of the multi-phase assessments, the depth to groundwater, and current land use, RWQCB issued a no further soil requirements letter with respect to the San Fernando Valley Cleanup Program. However, Lockheed must continue to monitor the groundwater in the vicinity of former Plant B-5 for heavy metals and VOCs.

4.1.22 Tetra Tech, Phase I Environmental Assessment, Former Plant B-5, Burbank, California, April 18, 1996

The Phase I Environmental Assessment report documented the site activities of former Lockheed Plant B-5 located at 4207 Empire Avenue, Burbank, California. Plant B-5 was approximately 60 acres, developed primarily between 1940 and 1956. The report documented the history of property use activities during the Lockheed ownership and use from 1936 to 1978. As indicated in the report, some of the on-site activities included industrial operations, chemical use, and hazardous materials storage/use. The site was occupied by multiple buildings that housed several aboveground tanks for chemical processing, fuel, solvents, chemical storage,



degreasers, a few transformers, underground storage tanks, spray booths, oil tanks, paint shops, inactive clarifiers, abandoned underground structures, and wash rack areas. In addition, the report documented the former locations of process lines, storage vessels, aboveground/underground storage tanks, and other features at the site from 1936 to 1978. Lockheed conducted multi-phase assessments to evaluate 35 potential source areas of liquid wastes identified to assess whether these potential sources impacted the soil and posed a threat to groundwater quality. The assessment results were summarized in the RWQCB letter dated June 29, 2014, and are discussed in Section 4.1.21.

4.1.23 Conway Consulting, Aircraft Underground Fueling System Description Draft, Hollywood Burbank Airport, Burbank, California, June 14, 2018

The document discussed the proposed construction of an underground aircraft fueling system to replace existing fuel transportation from the storage area to the aircraft with trucks. The proposed underground fueling system will include distribution lines to transport fuel from the existing fuel farm to the proposed replacement terminal. It was indicated that the main distribution line will branch off into lateral fuel lines to be able to supply fuel to multiple aircraft at different gates. The new fueling system will be comprised of filters, leak detection pumps, fuel pits, fuel carts, and emergency shut-off valves.

4.1.24 Geocon West, Inc., Limited Asbestos and Lead-Containing Paint Survey Report, Bob Hope Airport, 2627 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California, May 2012

The report presents the results of a limited asbestos and lead-containing paint survey conducted at the areas that may be impacted by the proposed telecommunications equipment installation. The report determined the following:

- Asbestos-containing materials were found in the areas surveyed.
- Lead-containing paint was found in the areas tested.
- Prior to renovation or demolition, the materials containing asbestos and/or lead-paint should be properly handled by a licensed contractor per the federal, state, and local regulations.



4.1.25 Aurora, Initial Mold Survey, Burbank Airport Hangar 35, ARFF Office Buildings, February 8, 2012

The report presents the results of the Initial Mold Survey, Burbank Airport Hangar 35, ARFF Office Buildings. The report determined the following:

- The ARFF office buildings located on the west side of Hangar 35 are three single-story, wood-framed buildings with concrete slabs, primarily with drywall walls/ceilings.
- Mold growth was observed on walls, ceilings, drywall roofs, and door frames.
- Surface sampling confirmed the presence of mold growth.
- Water damage was observed on exterior and interior walls.
- Elevated moisture readings were detected on some of the exterior walls tested.
- The report outlined general and site-specific recommendations to be followed.
- Prior to renovation/demolition activities in the mold affected area, it was recommended to abate mold from the affected areas. All work should be performed by licensed, trained, and experienced mold abatement contractors.

4.1.26 Geocon West, Inc., Limited Asbestos, Lead-paint and Universal Wastes Survey, Bob Hope Airport – Hangar 35, Burbank, California, December 2011

The report presents the results of the limited asbestos, lead-containing paint, and universal wastes survey conducted at Hangar 35 at Burbank Airport. The report determined the following:

- Asbestos was identified in approximately 128 square feet of blue vinyl floor tile located in the small office enclosure in the areas surveyed. Prior to renovation or demolition, the asbestos-containing materials should be properly handled by a licensed contractor per the federal, state, and local regulations.
- Lead-containing paint was identified on the hangar structural steel and rolling doors, the dark yellow diagonal parallelograms and circles on the concrete floor, and the metal tank. It was noted that no deteriorated paint was observed during the survey. Prior to any planned renovation/demolition activities, the lead-paint should be properly handled by the licensed contractors per the federal, state, and local regulations.
- Universal wastes and suspect hazardous materials (including polychlorinated biphenyls in some fluorescent light ballasts and chlorofluorocarbon refrigerant in air conditioning



units and refrigerated equipment) present in buildings and structures should be properly managed or handled prior to any planned renovation or demolition activities.

4.1.27 Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, Letters – Supplemental Subsurface Investigation Report, Media Aviation (Lease 4B, 4C and 4D), 3000 North Clybourn, Burbank, California, September 1995

The letter documented RWQCB comments on the review of Fugro West, Inc.'s supplemental soil matrix and soil gas investigation report. Based on the results of the investigations, RWQCB issued an NFA letter for the subject parcel with respect to the WIP.

4.1.28 Tetra Tech, Additional Site Investigation Report, Former Lockheed Martin Plants A-1 North, B-1, B-6, and C-1, Burbank, California, December 2014

The report presents the results of soil investigations conducted at 19 AOCs at former Lockheed Plants B-1, B-6, A-1, and C-1 within the Burbank Operable Unit (BOU) of the San Fernando Valley Superfund Area 1. The report includes the following key items:

- All 19 areas were investigated for hexavalent chromium, and 8 of them were investigated for VOCs to identify potential sources that could contribute to groundwater contamination of the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin.
- Test results indicated the presence of total chromium in all soil samples tested, and hexavalent chromium was only detected in about 30% of the samples.
- VOCs in soil vapor were not detected above the field screening criteria.
- The available hexavalent chromium attenuation capacity analyses revealed that site soils have the capacity to reduce hexavalent chromium to a much less toxic state, trivalent chromium, resulting in its natural attenuation in the vadose zone. Where reduction occurred, there is no evidence suggesting migration of trivalent chromium in soil.
- If any impacts to groundwater were to occur from these AOCs, immediately adjacent extraction wells would capture the hexavalent chromium before further migration could take place (containment is verified in the annual and semiannual groundwater monitoring reports for the BOU; Tetra Tech, 2014b).



4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASE REVIEW

DYA obtained and reviewed the database search report for the proposed Project to identify activities at the Project site or adjacent properties that could indicate potential significant impact to the proposed Project. The database information was obtained through EDR in August 2018 and is presented in Exhibit B. A general search radius following standard search distance for each environmental database specified by ASTM D1527-13 was used to generate sites registered under hazardous materials/wastes databases. The electronic search included numerous databases that are managed by federal, state, tribal, and local agencies. The search also included other ascertainable sources and EDR's exclusive record database. DYA reviewed EDR-generated sites that pertain to the objective of this HMA. A summary of environmental databases reviewed by DYA is presented in Table 5. Also provided in Table 5 are the number of sites identified in the EDR Radius Map (2018) within the ASTM search distance and the number of sites identified by DYA as potentially impacting the Project based on our review of the available records.

37

ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASE ¹	TOTAL NUMBER OF LISTINGS ²	NUMBER OF LISTINGS IDENTIFIED AS RECS			
Federally Managed Environmental Databases					
NPL	1	1			
SEMS	2	0			
SEMS-ARCHIVE	8	0			
CORRACTS	1	0			
RCRA-TSDF	1	0			
RCRA-LQG	19	0			
RCRA-SQG	78	0			
RCRA-CESSQG	4	0			
US ENG CONTROLS	1	0			
US INST CONTROLS	1	0			
ERNS	2	0			
State, Tribal, and Local Environmenta	l Databases				
ENVIROSTOR	28	0			
SWF/LF	3	0			
LUST	46	0			
CPS-SLIC	71	4			
UST	20	0			
AST	7	0			
VCP	1	0			
Additional Environmental Records					
SWRCY	5	0			
HIST-CAL SITES	1	0			
CDL	1	0			
SWEEPS UST	55	0			
HIST UST	53	0			
CA FID UST	53	0			
DEED	4	0			
CHMIRS	8	0			
Other Ascertainable Records					
RCRA-NonGen/NLR	12	0			
ROD	1	0			
PRP	1	0			
CONSENT	1	0			
FINDS	6	0			
ECHO	3	0			
CA BOND EXP. PLAN	1	0			

Table 5 - SUMMARY OF REVIEWED ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASES

\\DYASERVER\data\datafis\PROJECTS\2018\2018-011\Report\2018-011 Report v3.docx

TOTAL NUMBER OF LISTINGS ²	NUMBER OF LISTINGS IDENTIFIED AS RECS			
1	0			
2	0			
3	0			
1	0			
13	0			
32	0			
6	0			
3	0			
3	0			
1	0			
242	0			
8	0			
EDR High Risk Historical Records				
13	0			
827	5			
Note(s):				
	TOTAL NUMBER OF LISTINGS ² 1 2 3 1 13 32 6 3 1 13 32 6 3 1 242 8			

Table 2 - SUMMARY OF REVIEWED ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASES (cont.)

See acronym list in Exhibit B for database definitions. 1.

Based on a research distance of up to 1 mile as specified by DYA in accordance with the recommended 2. minimum research distance in Section 8.2.1 of ASTM E1527 (ASTM, 2013).

A total of 827 database listings at 619 sites were identified within a 1-mile radius of the selected Project footprint. Upon detailed review of environmental database records, DYA identified five database-listed sites that may be of a potential environmental concern to the Project and are discussed below. These sites are classified as high-, moderate-, or low-risk sites with regard to the potential impacts to the Project and are summarized in Table 6 in Section 5.

1. San Fernando Valley (Area 1), Map ID: 0, was listed as a National Priority List (NPL) site. The San Fernando Valley (Area 1) is an area with contaminated groundwater in the vicinity of the North Hollywood section of the City of Los Angeles (refer to overview map in EDR report [2018]). This area is part of the San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin, a natural underground reservoir that represents an important source of drinking water for at least 3 million people in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. The contaminated groundwater, which lies in an area of approximately 5,100 acres, contains TCE, PCE, and to a lesser extent carbon tetrachloride and chloroform, according to analyses conducted by the California Department of Health Services, as well as numerous local government agencies. The



federal, state, and local agencies have been conducting investigations and cleanup of contaminated groundwater since contamination in the 1980s. The responsible parties have been identified and notified to conduct cleanup actions. Several investigations have been performed, and the extent of contamination has reduced over the decades. Currently, the San Fernando Valley is being regularly monitored by the EPA mandatory WIP, and the site is under the Final NPL listing. Groundwater in the Project vicinity has been measured at a depth of approximately 220 feet bgs and flows in a southeasterly direction (Section 4.1.8). Any potential migration of contamination to the groundwater will be captured by the monitoring wells, and necessary remediation actions will be immediately implemented.

- 2. Former Lockheed Plant B-6, Hollywood Burbank Airport Replacement Terminal, Map ID: 94, located at 2801 North Hollywood Way, was listed as a Cleanup Program Sites-Spills, Leaks, Investigation, and Cleanup (CPS-SLIC) site. The review indicated that over 25 environmental investigations and assessments have been conducted at former Plant B-6 that identified various features of environmental concern. Based on the data gathered from the investigations and assessments, various remedial activities took place at former Plant B-6 prior to the BGPAA's acquisition of the property. These remedial activities included UST removals and closures and demolition and removal of other subsurface features of concern. From these remedial actions, RWQCB has issued over 10 "No Further Requirements" letters for former Plant B-6 (Sections 4.1.9 through 4.1.10). Based on the review of recent HHRA results (Section 4.1.2), RWQCB indicated that the site is suitable for the construction and operation of an airport replacement passenger terminal.
- 3. Former Lockheed Plant B-5, Map ID: 79, was listed in multiple databases including CPS-SLIC. The Lockheed Plant B-5 was one of the former Lockheed plants within the BOU of the San Fernando Valley Superfund Area 1. Several multi-phase site assessments and cleanup actions were conducted by Lockheed between 1998 and 2002 to remediate the impacted area. Based on the on-site cleanup actions and the existing conditions, RWQCB had issued a no further soil requirements letter with respect to the San Fernando Valley Cleanup Program (Section 4.1.21). However, groundwater monitoring must be continued in the vicinity of former Plant B-5 for heavy metals and VOCs as part of the EPA Superfund Program.
- 4. Former Lockheed Plant C-1, Map ID: 151, was listed in multiple databases including LUST and CPS-SLIC. The Lockheed plant C-1 was one of the former Lockheed plants within the



BOU of the San Fernando Valley Superfund Area 1. There have been extensive assessments and cleanup actions performed at all the AOCs identified on the former Lockheed sites. Approximately 110,000 tons of metal- and VOC-impacted soil were removed, and NFA for soils letters were issued in 1990 and 1994 (GeoTracker). The Additional Site Investigation report discussed in Section 4.1.28 was submitted to the RWQCB for review; at the time of this report, response from the RWQCB was still pending.

5. Physicians Clinical Laboratory, Map ID: 271, located at 3111 North Kenwood, was listed in multiple databases including CPS-SLIC. The site was formerly occupied by Aviall, which conducted metal finishing operations as a function of its aviation manufacturing processes. Site activities included repair, maintenance, inspection, testing, and overhauling of jet engines. Historically, this portion of the site was also used for agricultural purposes or vacant land in the late 1920s. From the 1930s to the 1950s, this portion of the site contained sparse residential development and a possible office. From at least 1954 to 1964, the southern portion of the Aviall site was used as a parking lot and the northern portion appeared to have consisted of residential development and possible commercial and/or retail buildings along Kenwood Street. By 1976, the property was acquired by Aviall and was redeveloped as a parking lot. No reported manufacturing operations have been conducted on the property.

As indicated on GeoTracker, the site was investigated for total petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs, and heavy metals. In May 1992, a WIP Phase II Report was submitted to RWQCB by SCS Engineers describing the results of a soil investigation conducted at the site. The Phase II Report confirmed a release of heavy metals at the location of the former plating shop, and limited soil excavation and removal was performed. Site assessments conducted in 2014 and 2015 reported detectable concentrations of hexavalent chromium in soils; groundwater samples analyzed reported non-detect for hexavalent chromium. A letter was sent to Aviall by RWQCB (December 2016) requesting sampling of groundwater from on-site groundwater monitoring wells as part of the USEPA-lead effort of acquiring basin-wide groundwater elevation and chemical concentration data on an annual basis.

The remaining database listings identified in the EDR report (2018) were considered not potential impacts to the Project based on one or more of the following considerations:

• The locations and depths where soil and/or groundwater will be disturbed during construction of the proposed Project.

- The horizontal distance from the environmental database listing site to the Project alignment.
- The relative distance to subject Project from listed environmental database sites.
- Whether the ground surface at the environmental database listing site was upgradient, downgradient, or cross gradient from the Project alignment.
- The historical and/or recent groundwater gradient direction at the environmental database listing site with respect to the Project alignment.
- The history of documented releases and/or environmental violations for an environmental database listing site.
- The quantity of hazardous materials released at the environmental database listing site and the affected media (e.g., soil, groundwater).
- The depth of the medium impacted by hazardous materials at the environmental database listing site.
- The degree to which previous releases at the environmental database listing site had been remediated, if at all.
- The fact that responsible parties have been identified in case of any past or future releases.
- The likelihood that hazardous materials released at the environmental database listing site would migrate to the areas of the Project where soil and/or groundwater will be disturbed during construction of the proposed improvements (Mace et al., 1997; Buonicore, 2011).
- The existing streets or structures in the vicinity of the property that would prevent surface runoff from entering the property.
- The lack of information on the agency databases about the site.
- Historic sites where the storage tanks were properly abandoned in place or removed and an NFA letter was issued by the regulatory agencies.
- In the event of a case-closure status issuance or an NFA letter having been issued by the corresponding agency.
- Based on the above facts, the 614 database sites were considered as "De Minimis Conditions" that would not likely impact the subject Project.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our review of the documents summarized in Sections 4.1.1 through 4.1.28 and the EDR report discussed in Section 4.2, DYA has classified the potential RECs as high-, moderate-, or low-risk sites with regard to the potential impacts to the proposed Project. Such sites, listed in Table 6, were evaluated based on the information obtained and the likelihood that the hazardous materials might impact soil and/or groundwater during construction.

43



Table 6 - SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACT SITES TO THE PROJECT

SITE NAME (Reference in this Report)	LOCATION	DISCUSSION	RISK LEVEL
San Fernando Valley (Area 1) (Section 4.2)	Throughout the Project site	A number of investigations have been completed over the years. Currently, there are groundwater monitoring wells located throughout the basin as part of an EPA groundwater monitoring program. Based on the historic contamination, cleanup actions, and ongoing assessments, it can be assumed that the contamination at the San Fernando Valley area may have been significantly decreased. However, due to the uncertainty regarding the extent of underground plume migration, DYA cannot draw conclusions as to whether the migration of contaminated groundwater is stabilized. Therefore, the San Fernando Valley area is considered a moderate risk to the Project activities.	Moderate
Former Lockheed Plant B-6 (Sections 4.1.1 through 4.1.14)	2960 Hollywood Way, Adjacent NEQ site	The former Lockheed Plant B-6 site is considered the preferred alternative for the construction of the proposed Burbank replacement terminal (Section 4.1.1). In addition, the RWQCB letter (Section 4.1.2) indicated that the site is suitable for the construction and operation of an airport replacement passenger terminal. The GeoTracker records indicate that the site is still open for assessment as of July 2016. This is because sites that are part of B-6 are still under evaluation. Upon review of the available information and ongoing assessment actions, the former Plant B-6 site is considered a low risk to the Project.	Low
Former Lockheed Plant B-5 (Sections 4.1.22 and 4.1.21)	Southwest quadrant property	The former Lockheed Plant B-5 site is one of the alternatives considered for the construction of the proposed Burbank replacement terminal (Section 4.1.1). Several multi-phase site assessments and cleanup actions have been conducted by Lockheed between 1998 and 2002. RWQCB had issued a no further soil requirements letter with respect to the San Fernando Valley Cleanup Program. However, the groundwater monitoring for heavy metals and VOCs is ongoing as part of the EPA Superfund Program. Upon review of the available information and ongoing assessment actions, the former Plant B-6 site is considered a low risk to the Project.	Low
Former Lockheed Plant C-1 (Section 4.1.28)	North of the existing east- west (15-33) runway	The Lockheed Plant C-1 was one of the former Lockheed plants within the BOU of the San Fernando Valley Superfund Area 1. There have been extensive assessments and cleanup actions performed at all the AOCs identified on the former Lockheed sites. The recent Additional Site Investigation report (Section 4.1.28) was submitted, and the response regarding the RWQCB review was not available on GeoTracker at the time of this assessment. Based on the available records, the former Plant C-1 was considered a moderate risk site to the Project.	Moderate



Table 6 - SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACT SITES TO THE PROJECT (cont.)

SITE NAME (Reference in this Report)	LOCATION	DISCUSSION	RISK LEVEL
Physicians Clinical Laboratory (Sections 4.1.20 and 4.2)	3111 North Kenwood, Former Aviall property	The property was historically used for aviation industry and reported for undocumented releases. GeoTracker records indicated that several environmental investigations have been conducted since the 1980s. A letter was sent to Aviall by RWQCB (December 2016) requesting sampling of groundwater from the on-site groundwater monitoring wells as part of the USEPA-lead effort of acquiring basin-wide groundwater elevation and chemical concentration data on an annual basis. Based on the available information, it can be assumed that the contamination at the site may have been significantly decreased. However, due to the uncertainty of the contamination migration and the hydrologically upgradient location, the 3111 North Kenwood site is considered a moderate risk if the Project.	Moderate



45

6 LIMITATIONS

This report is an instrument of service of DYA and includes review of limited documents provided by the client, reasonable ascertainable listings generated by EDR, and publicly available documents to identify RECs. DYA has relied on information provided by others and our review of regulatory databases and files. However, DYA does not warranty or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of the information provided or compiled by others. This report was solely based on the desk-review of limited documents and did not include site reconnaissance. This report was prepared in general compliance with the ASTM guidelines for evaluating environmental impacts due to hazardous materials during construction. The purpose of this assessment is limited to identification of the potential impacts of hazardous substances during construction of a replacement terminal.

RECs are defined under ASTM standards as: "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, groundwater or surface water of the property." These standards and this report do not address other environmental conditions such as geologic or geotechnical hazards. DYA's HMA was performed in accordance with generally accepted practices of the profession undertaken in similar studies at the same time and in the same geographical area; DYA observed a degree of care and skill generally exercised by those of the profession under similar circumstances and conditions. However, no HMA can eliminate uncertainty regarding the potential for hazardous materials conditions in connection with a property. The existence of residual contamination may be present within the Project site in quantities below those categorized as actionable by current regulations. DYA cannot be responsible if regulatory standards are changed in the future in a manner that renders the current proposed Project conditions actionable.

This study and report have been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of, RS&H and the Project owners solely for their use and reliance in the environmental assessment of this Project site. Accordingly, reliance on this report by any other party may involve assumptions whose extent and nature lead to a distorted meaning and impact of the findings and opinions related herein. DYA's findings and opinions related in this report may not be relied upon by any party except RS&H and the Project owners.

46



7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., 2015, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Document Review, Portions of Former Lockheed Plant B6, Burbank, California, Project No. 100715001, December 22, 2015.
- Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., 2016a, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Parking Lot, 3120 and 3130 Kenwood Street, Burbank, California, Project No. 100715003, February 24, 2016.
- Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., 2016b, Results of a Soil Gas Survey, Former Aviall Parking Lot Property, 3120 and 3130 Kenwood Street, Burbank, California, Project No. 100715004, March 3, 2016.
- Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., 2016c, Soil Management Plan, Trust Property, Burbank, California, Project No. 100715005, March 3, 2016.
- Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., 2016d, Limited Soil Sampling, SG-27, SG-32, and SG-35, Trust Property, Burbank, California, Project No. 100715004, March 4, 2016.
- Ardent Environmental Group, Inc., 2016e, Results of a Subsurface Investigation and Human Health Risk Assessment, Portions of Former Lockheed Plant B6, Burbank, California, Project No. 100715002, February 25, 2016.
- Aurora Industrial Hygiene, Inc., 2012, Initial Mold Survey Burbank Airport Hanger 35 ARFF Office Buildings, Bob Hope Airport, Burbank, California, February 8, 2012.
- ASTM International, Inc., 2013, Designation E1527-13 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, Annual Book of Standards, Volumes 11.05.
- Buonicore, Anthony J., 2011, Methodology for Identifying the Area of Concern Around a Property Potentially Impacted by Vapor Migration from Nearby Contaminated Sources, Paper 2011-A-301-AWMA, June 2011.
- California Department of Toxic Substance Control, 2017, EnviroStor website, http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/, Accessed: June 2017.
- California Department of Water Resources, Groundwater Level Data, CDWR website, http://www.water.ca.gov/waterdatalibrary, Accessed: June 2017.
- California Environmental Reporting System (CERS), 2018, Hollywood Burbank Airport Fire Dept. (CERSID: 10413829), Facility Information and Hazardous Materials Inventory, Accessed: August 7, 2018.
- California Geological Survey, 1969, Geologic Atlas of California, Los Angeles Sheet; scale 1:250,000, http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/GAM/losangeles/losangeles.html, Accessed: October 2, 2018.



- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, 1995a, Letter No Further Requirements, Review of Environmental Assessment Reports, Hensler Acquisition, 7550 Wheatland Avenue, Sun Valley, California, (File No. 104.1593), October 16, 1995.
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, 1995b, Letter -Supplemental Subsurface Investigation, 2736-2760 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California, (File No. 104.1685), July 12, 1995.
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, 1995c, Letter -Supplemental Subsurface Investigation Report, Media Aviation (Lease 4B, 4C and 4D), 3000 North Clybourn Avenue, Burbank, California, (File No. 104.1299), September 22, 1995.
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, 1996a, Letter No Further Requirements, Former Aviall Services, Inc., 3111 Kenwood St., Burbank, California, (File No. 104.0150), July 11, 1996.
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, 1996b, Multiple Letters -No Further Requirements, Lockheed Plant B-6, (File No. 104.0674) (Cleanup & Abatement Order No. 87-161), 1996.
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, 2004, Letter No Further Requirements (Soil Only), Former Lockheed Martin Plant B-5, Burbank, California, (File No. 104.5167) (Cleanup & Abatement Order No. 87-161), June 29, 2004.
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region, 2018, Letter Review of Draft and Final Human Health Risk Assessment, Hollywood Burbank Airport Replacement Terminal, 2801 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California, (SCP No. 104.0674A, Site ID No. 2040502), Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs): 2466-011-914, 2466-011-916, January 29, 2018.
- California Water Resources Control Board, GeoTracker website, http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/, Accessed: September 2018.
- Caltrans, 2018, Project Development Procedures Manual, March 1, 2018.
- Conway Consulting, 2018, Aircraft Underground Fueling System Description Draft, Hollywood Burbank Airport, June 14, 2018.
- EFI Global, 2017, Technical Memorandum Assessment of Subsurface Soil and Soil Vapor for Chemical Impacts, Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport, Replacement Terminal, 2801 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California, May 15, 2017.
- Environmental Database Resources, Inc., 2018, The EDR Radius Map[™] Report with GeoCheck®, BGPAA BUR Replacement Terminal, 2627 Hollywood Way, Burbank, CA 91505, Inquiry Number: 5393437.2s, August 15, 2018.
- Environmental Science Associates (ESA), 2018, Draft Environmental Impact Report, Avion Project, August 2018.
- Federal Aviation Administration, 2014, Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5300-13A, Change 1, Airport Design, February 26, 2014.



- Federal Aviation Administration, 2015, 1050.1F Desk Reference, Federal Aviation Administration Office of Environment and Energy, July 2015.
- Geocon West, Inc., 2011, Results of Limited Asbestos Containing Material Survey, Bob Hope Airport Hanger 35, Burbank, California, Project No. A8580-77-01A, December 29, 2011.
- Geocon West, Inc., 2012, Limited Asbestos and Lead-Containing Paint Survey Report, Bob Hope Airport, 2627 North Hollywood Way, Burbank, California, Geocon Project No. A8580-77-25, May 2012.
- Geosyntec Consultants, 2017, Final Human Health Risk Assessment, Hollywood Burbank Airport Replacement Passenger Terminal, Project Number WR2211, December 21, 2017.
- Google, 2018, Google Maps Aerial Imagery, Accessed: September 2018.
- Google Earth Pro Historical Aerial Imagery Accessed: September 2018.
- Mace, R. E., R. S. Fisher, D. M. Welch, S. P. Parra, 1997, Extent, Mass, and Duration of Hydrocarbon Plumes from Leaking Petroleum Storage Tank Sites in Texas, Geological Circular 97-1, Bureau of Economic Geology, University of Texas at Austin, 1997.
- Niñyo & Moore, 2016, Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation, Replacement Terminal Project, Bob Hope Airport, Burbank, California, Project No. 207789006, March 10, 2016.
- Niñyo & Moore, 2017, Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment, Replacement Passenger Terminal Project, Hollywood Burbank Airport, Burbank, California, Project No. 210048001, May 4, 2017.
- RS&H, 2018, Project Communication and previous environmental related documents provided.
- RS&H, 2016a, Environmental Impact Report for a Replacement Airline Passenger Terminal at Burbank Bob Hope Airport, Volume 1, State Clearinghouse No. 2015121095, June 2016.
- RS&H, 2016b, Environmental Impact Report for a Replacement Airline Passenger Terminal at Burbank Bob Hope Airport, Volume 2, State Clearinghouse No. 2015121095, June 2016.
- RS&H, 2016c, Environmental Impact Report for a Replacement Airline Passenger Terminal at Burbank Bob Hope Airport, Volume 3, State Clearinghouse No. 2015121095, June 2016.
- Tetra Tech, 1996, Final Phase I Environmental Assessment, Former Plant B-5, Burbank, California, April 18, 1996.
- Tetra Tech, 2014, Additional Site Investigation Report, Former Lockheed Martin Plants A-1 North, B-1, B-6, and C-1, Burbank, California, December 2014.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency, Enforcement and Compliance History Online, Accessed: September 2018.
- Yerkes, Robert F., and Russell H. Campbell, 2005, Preliminary Geologic Map of the Los Angeles 30' x 60' Quadrangle, Southern California, Version 1.0; United States Geologic Survey Open-File Report 05-1019, Scale 1:100,000.

Exhibit A - PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS



Exhibit B - EDR RADIUS REPORT



APPENDIX G-2 FIGURE G-1 SAN FERNANDO VALLEY SUPERFUND SITE THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



SOURCE: United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2018. Five -Year View Report for San Fernando Valley (Area 1) Superfund Site, North Hollywood and Burbank, Los Angeles County, California Burbank Bob Hope Airport

Figure G-1 San Fernando Valley Groundwater Basin (Area 1) Superfund Site

