

# Chapter 17: Hazardous Waste Sites

<b>17.1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>17-1</b>
<b>17.2</b>	<b>Regulatory Setting.....</b>	<b>17-2</b>
<b>17.3</b>	<b>Affected Environment.....</b>	<b>17-2</b>
	17.3.1 Resource Identification Methods.....	17-2
	17.3.2 Hazardous Sites in the Impact Analysis Area .....	17-4
<b>17.4</b>	<b>Environmental Consequences .....</b>	<b>17-4</b>
	17.4.1 Methodology .....	17-4
	17.4.2 No-Action Alternative.....	17-5
	17.4.3 Alternatives A1–A2 and B1–B2.....	17-5
	17.4.4 Wetland Avoidance Options .....	17-7
	17.4.5 Mitigation Measures.....	17-7
	17.4.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	17-8
	17.4.7 Summary of Impacts .....	17-8
<b>17.5</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>17-8</b>

## 17.1 Introduction

This chapter lists sites near the proposed West Davis Corridor (WDC) alternatives that could potentially contain hazardous waste. This chapter analyzes any effects of the proposed alternatives on these potentially hazardous sites. The chapter also analyzes the health and safety effects on construction workers or people who live near any hazardous waste sites affected by the proposed alternatives.

***Hazardous Waste Sites Impact Analysis Area.*** The hazardous waste sites impact analysis area is the WDC study area described in Section 1.2, Description of the Needs Assessment Study Area.

### What is the hazardous waste sites impact analysis area?

The hazardous waste sites impact analysis area is the WDC study area described in Section 1.2, Description of the Needs Assessment Study Area.

## 17.2 Regulatory Setting

Hazardous waste sites are regulated by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, and by Utah Administrative Code Title 19 (Environmental Quality Code).

The following concerns are raised when a transportation project could affect hazardous waste sites:

- The spread of existing soil or groundwater contamination through road-construction activities
- The potential for increased construction costs
- The potential for construction delays
- The health and safety of construction workers and people who live near the hazardous waste site
- The short-term and long-term liability associated with acquiring environmentally distressed properties

This chapter provides a preliminary identification of known parcels that contain hazardous waste sites. During the final design phase for the project and before any property is acquired, assessments would be conducted on sites of concern to determine the presence of contamination and establish the exact nature and limits of the chemical hazard. For more information, see Section 17.4.5, Mitigation Measures.

## 17.3 Affected Environment

### 17.3.1 Resource Identification Methods

To determine the presence of potential hazardous waste sites in the hazardous waste sites impact analysis area, the following pertinent private and public databases were reviewed: the Utah Division of Environmental Response and Remediation's (DERR) Interactive Map, DERR's leaking underground storage tanks (LUST) database, DERR's underground storage tanks (UST) database, the Utah Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste's active and closed landfills database, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) EnviroMapper database.

#### How were potential hazardous waste sites identified?

Hazardous waste sites were identified using various state and national databases.

The DERR Interactive Map and the EPA EnviroMapper database were used to query the following databases:

- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) database, which is a database of Superfund sites that includes the following layers:
  - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS), which is a list of all of Superfund sites
  - National Priorities List, which is a list of priority CERCLIS sites
- Assessment, Cleanup, and Redevelopment Exchange System, which is a database of EPA-designated Brownfield sites
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) database, which is a list of sites that are Large-Quantity Generators (LQG), Small-Quantity Generators (SQG), or Treatment, Storage, or Disposal Facilities for hazardous materials regulated by the RCRA
- Voluntary Cleanup Program, which is a database of Utah Brownfield sites that are being redeveloped outside of the federal Brownfield process
- Toxics Release Inventory, which is a database of sites that use, manufacture, treat, transport, or release toxic chemicals into the environment
- Tier 2 database, which is a database of sites that either store or release toxic materials specified by the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act
- Formerly Used Defense Sites, which is a database of former military sites that have been identified for environmental restoration by the U.S. Department of Defense
- Underground Storage Tanks (UST), which is a database of locations in Utah that have underground storage tanks
- Permitted Used Oil Facilities, which is a database of permitted sites in Utah that transport, transfer, burn, market, refine, or process used oil
- Solid Waste Landfills (SWLF), which is a database of active or closed landfill sites in Utah
- Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST), which is a database of sites in Utah with leaking underground storage tanks whose status is either open (under investigation) or closed (no additional remedial actions are required or ever took place)

#### What are Brownfield sites?

With certain legal exclusions and additions, the term *brownfield site* means real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which might be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant.

## 17.3.2 Hazardous Sites in the Impact Analysis Area

The potentially hazardous sites in the impact analysis area are listed by facility type in Table 17-1 and shown in Figure 17-1, Hazardous Waste Sites, in Volume IV. Some sites are listed in multiple databases.

In general, the hazardous waste sites are located in industrial areas of the impact analysis area. The Freeport Center area in Clearfield, the Ogden Commercial and Industrial Park in southwest Ogden, and areas adjacent to State Route 126 have the highest concentrations of potential hazardous waste sites in the impact analysis area.

**Table 17-1. Hazardous Waste Sites in the Impact Analysis Area**

Facility Type	Number of Sites
CERCLA sites	9
Targeted Brownfield sites	1
RCRA large-quantity generators	2
RCRA small-quantity generators	41
Voluntary Cleanup Program sites	2
Toxic Release Inventory sites	26
Tier 2 sites	35
Formerly used defense sites	2
Underground storage tanks	191
Permitted used-oil facilities	0
Solid-waste landfills	1
Leaking underground storage tanks	228

Sources: EPA 2017; DERR 2017a, 2017b; Utah Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste 2017

## 17.4 Environmental Consequences

### 17.4.1 Methodology

Hazardous waste–related sites and facilities were screened to identify those that have a higher probability of containing contaminated soil or groundwater and those that are located closer to the proposed alternatives. The sites that meet both of these criteria have the potential to affect or be affected by the proposed alternatives.

#### How were impacts to hazardous waste sites determined?

Impacts to hazardous waste sites were determined by analyzing the sites' locations relative to the proposed alternatives and the sites' probability of contamination.

*Sites of greatest concern* are sites with a high probability of contamination whose property boundaries are within the proposed right-of-way of the alternatives. The criterion for determining the sites of greatest concern involved analyzing each site's location relative to the proposed alternatives.

*Sites of secondary concern* are sites with a high to moderate probability of contamination that are outside but near (within 1,000 feet to 0.5 mile, depending on the site type) the right-of-way for the alternatives.

Sites with a property boundary that is within about 1,000 feet of the alternatives were examined in greater detail. The inferred direction of groundwater flow was also considered in the analysis.

## 17.4.2 No-Action Alternative

With the No-Action Alternative, the WDC would not be constructed, so no impacts to hazardous waste sites would occur as a result of the WDC. With the No-Action Alternative, growth in the WDC study area is expected to occur at a pace similar to that with the action alternatives. The current zoning allows residential, commercial, and industrial uses, which suggests that future development in the WDC study area will be diverse.

Hazardous waste sites are typically associated with industrial and commercial facilities. Therefore, future development in the WDC study area could create additional hazardous waste sites. However, the regulatory climate for hazardous material users and waste generators discourages them from allowing uncontrolled releases of hazardous waste.

Because the WDC study area has many developed areas and because of the current regulatory climate, it is expected that the rate of creation of new hazardous waste sites will be lower in the future than it has been in the past. In addition, existing hazardous waste sites will continue to be remediated. The net effect would be a long-term reduction in the number of hazardous waste sites in the WDC study area over the next 25 years. However, it is likely that the number would never reach zero.

## 17.4.3 Alternatives A1–A2 and B1–B2

As shown below in Table 17-2, there are 10 sites within 0.5 mile of the proposed alternatives. These sites consist of seven closed LUSTs (as determined by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality), one operational UST, one site that is a small-quantity generator of RCRA-regulated hazardous waste, and one Tier 2 site.

None of these sites would be directly or indirectly affected by any of the proposed alternatives, so there are no sites of greatest concern and no sites of secondary concern. Overall, no effects on hazardous waste sites are expected from any of the proposed alternatives; therefore, there would be no health impacts to construction workers or the public from hazardous waste sites.

### How would the proposed alternatives affect hazardous waste sites?

The proposed alternatives are not expected to affect any hazardous waste sites.

**Table 17-2. Hazardous Waste Sites within 0.5 Mile of the WDC Alternatives**

Site Type	Site Name	Address	Distance from WDC Alternatives	Identification (ID) Number(s)	Impacts	UST Status/ LUST Closed Date
UST	Central Davis Sewer District facility	2627 W. Shepard Lane, Kaysville	Within 1,000 feet of all alternatives	Facility ID: 2730 DERR ID: 3000301	None. All alternatives stay south and west of the Central Davis Sewer District facility.	1 closed UST. LUST closed 2/5/1992.
UST	Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints real estate: Farmington Crops Farm	1913 S. Sunset Drive, Kaysville	Within 0.5 mile of all alternatives	Facility ID: 2528 DERR ID: 3000064	None.	3 closed USTs. LUST closed 4/6/1995.
UST	Golden Spike Enterprises	5500 West 5500 South, Hooper	Within 1,000 feet of Alternative A2	Facility ID: 1367 DERR ID: 1200059	None. Site is about 300 feet from Alternative A2 but would not be affected by the alternative.	3 open, active USTs at Sinclair gas station. No LUST history.
RCRA SQG	Kendrick and Lowe Body and Paint	5500 West 5107 South, Hooper	Within 0.5 mile of Alternative A2	EPA ID: UTD980960009	None. Site would not be affected by any alternatives.	Not applicable.
Tier 2	Verizon Wireless	3523 West 700 South, Syracuse	Within 0.5 mile of Alternatives B1 and B2	DERR ID: 7189	None. Site would not be affected by any alternatives.	Not applicable.
UST	Rentmeister and Company	1950 West 2250 South, Syracuse	Within 0.5 mile of Alternatives B1 and B2	Facility ID: 2608 DERR ID: 3000164	None. Site would not be affected by any alternatives.	1 closed UST. LUST closed 12/1/2005.
UST	RC Willey Home Furnishings	1693 West 2700 South, Syracuse	Within 0.5 mile of Alternatives B1 and B2	Facility ID: 2596 DERR ID: 3000152	None. Site would not be affected by any alternatives.	1 closed UST. LUST closed 1/11/1996.
UST	Flint Plumbing and Heating Company	1930 West 2250 South, Syracuse	Within 0.5 mile of Alternatives B1 and B2	Facility ID: 2530 DERR ID: 3000066	None. Site would not be affected by any alternatives.	4 closed USTs. LUST closed 12/30/1996.
UST	North Davis Sewer District facility	4252 West 2200 South, Syracuse	Within 0.5 mile of Alternatives A1 and A2	Facility ID: 2763 DERR ID: 3000337	None. Site would not be affected by any alternatives.	1 closed UST. LUST closed 4/25/2000.
UST	Blanche Bingham	614 North 5000 West, West Point	Within 0.5 mile of Alternative A2	Facility ID: 2815 DERR ID: 3000392	None. Site would not be affected by any alternatives.	1 closed UST. No LUST history.

Sources: DERR 2017a, 2017b

## 17.4.4 Wetland Avoidance Options

Two wetland avoidance options are being evaluated in this Final EIS, as shown in Table 17-3. The purpose of these options is to avoid wetland impacts per guidance from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on wetland avoidance. Either wetland avoidance option could be implemented with any of the A or B Alternatives.

In this section, the impact information for the wetland avoidance options provides only the differences in impacts for the A and B Alternatives as a result of using the wetland avoidance options. The differences in impacts would apply to any of the A and B Alternatives if they were to use the wetland avoidance options.

**Table 17-3. Components of the Wetland Avoidance Options**

Option	Location	City	Description
Farmington	Prairie View Drive and West Ranches Road	Farmington	Shift the A and B Alternatives in Farmington about 150 feet east to the southwest side of the intersection of Prairie View Drive and West Ranches Road.
Layton	2200 West and 1000 South	Layton	Shift the A and B Alternatives in Layton about 500 feet east to the northeast side of the intersection of 2200 West and 1000 South.

There would be no changes to the effects on hazardous waste sites from the wetland avoidance options. Overall, no effects on hazardous waste sites are expected from any of the proposed alternatives with or without the wetland avoidance options; therefore, there would be no health impacts to construction workers or the public from hazardous waste sites.

## 17.4.5 Mitigation Measures

No hazardous waste sites are expected to be affected, so no mitigation measures are proposed. However, previously unidentified sites or contamination (such as buried drums, fuel USTs, or solvent USTs) could be encountered during construction. In such a case, all work will stop in the area of the contamination according to the Standard Specifications of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), and the contractor will consult with UDOT and DERR to determine the appropriate remedial measures. Hazardous wastes will be handled according to UDOT's Standard Specifications and the requirements and regulations of EPA and the Utah Department of Environmental Quality. Any remediation of a previously unidentified contaminated site would be considered a public health benefit.

## 17.4.6 Cumulative Impacts

There are no anticipated cumulative impacts to hazardous waste sites. Cumulative impacts were analyzed for local and regionally important issues (ecosystem resources, air quality, water quality, floodplains, farmland, economics, and community impacts). The list of resources analyzed for cumulative impacts was developed with input from resource agencies and the public during scoping. For a more detailed discussion of cumulative impacts, see Chapter 24, Cumulative Impacts.

### What are cumulative impacts?

Cumulative impacts are the resulting impacts from the proposed action combined with impacts from other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

## 17.4.7 Summary of Impacts

Overall, no effects on hazardous waste sites are expected from any of the proposed action alternatives.

## 17.5 References

[DERR] Utah Division of Environmental Response and Remediation

- 2017a Interactive Map viewer. [www.environmentalresponse.utah.gov](http://www.environmentalresponse.utah.gov). Accessed January 12, 2017.
- 2017b UST and LUST Lists. [www.undergroundtanks.utah.gov/ust\\_lists.htm](http://www.undergroundtanks.utah.gov/ust_lists.htm). Accessed January 12, 2017.

[EPA] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

- 2017 Envirofacts web page. [www.epa.gov/emefdata/em4ef.home](http://www.epa.gov/emefdata/em4ef.home). Accessed January 12, 2017.

Utah Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste

- 2017 Utah Solid Waste Facilities. [www.hazardouswaste.utah.gov/Solid\\_Waste\\_Section/SolidWasteSection.htm](http://www.hazardouswaste.utah.gov/Solid_Waste_Section/SolidWasteSection.htm). Accessed January 12, 2017.