

**Decommissioning and Remediation
Of the Chevron Carpinteria
Oil and Gas Processing Facility
Project #2128**

Initial Study

July 2022

Prepared by:

City of Carpinteria
5775 Carpinteria Ave.
Carpinteria, CA 93013

And

MRS Environmental
1306 Santa Barbara St
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	Project Overview.....	2
1.2	California Environmental Quality Act Compliance.....	2
1.3	Preparation and Processing of this Initial Study.....	3
1.4	Initial Study Checklist.....	3
1.5	Point of Contact	4
2.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	5
2.1	Project Location	5
2.2	Environmental Setting.....	8
2.3	Proposed Project.....	8
2.4	Construction Schedule.....	9
2.5	Project Approvals.....	10
3.0	INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST.....	13
	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	14
	Determination:	16
	Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:	17
3.1	Aesthetics.....	27
3.2	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	29
3.3	Air Quality	30
3.4	Biological Resources	31
3.5	Cultural Resources.....	34
3.6	Energy	39
3.7	Geology and Soils.....	39
3.8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	40
3.9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	42
3.10	Hydrology and Water Quality.....	45
3.11	Land Use and Planning.....	46
3.12	Mineral Resources	47
3.13	Noise	47
3.14	Population and Housing.....	49
3.15	Public Services	49
3.16	Recreation.....	49
3.17	Transportation	50
3.18	Tribal Cultural Resources.....	52
3.19	Utilities and Service Systems.....	52
3.20	Wildfire	53
3.21	Mandatory Findings of Significance	54

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Overview

The Project's purpose is to demolish and remove surface and subsurface facilities and subsequent remediation of impacted soils at the onshore Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility. Remediation is intended to achieve the most stringent clean up levels as determined by the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services Department (SBCEHS), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), while preserving existing site resources, including mature trees and bluffs, and while respecting site constraints including buffer zones adjacent to the railroad right-of-way. Tier 1 Environmental Screening Levels for residential uses (or equally protective contaminant-specific, agency-approved levels) provide the standard for on-site soil remediation, consistent with Chevron's clean up objectives. Although relevant agencies with jurisdiction will establish required clean up levels, by assuming the most stringent clean up level, soil excavation and truck trip estimates are higher. This assumption affects the reasonably foreseeable scope of environmental impacts because the most stringent clean up levels would require more intensive remediation activities (e.g., truck trips, site activities). The most stringent clean up levels would also result in greater flexibility for development on the site meeting the most rigorous standards (e.g., unrestricted land use). It should be noted that cleanup levels do not include removal of the existing legacy wells on the site, nor the potential contamination associated with those wells.

The Project is subject to analysis pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15367, the City of Carpinteria (City) is the lead agency with principal responsibility for considering the Project for approval (14 CCR 15000 et seq.).

1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

CEQA, a statewide environmental law contained in California Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 21000–21177, applies to most public agency decisions to carry out, authorize, or approve actions that have the potential to adversely affect the environment (PRC Section 21000 et seq.). The overarching goal of CEQA is to protect the physical environment. To achieve that goal, CEQA requires that public agencies identify the environmental consequences of their discretionary actions and consider alternatives and mitigation measures that could avoid or reduce significant adverse impacts when avoidance or reduction is feasible. It also gives other public agencies and the public an opportunity to comment on the project. If significant adverse impacts cannot be avoided, reduced, or mitigated to below a level of significance, the public agency is required to prepare an environmental impact report (EIR) and balance the project's environmental concerns with other goals and benefits in a statement of overriding considerations.

This initial study (IS) has been prepared by the City as the lead agency, in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, to evaluate potential environmental effects and to determine whether an environmental impact report (EIR), a negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration (MND) should be prepared for the proposed project.

1.3 Preparation and Processing of this Initial Study

The City's Community Development Department directed and supervised preparation of this Initial Study (IS). Although prepared with assistance from the consulting firm MRS Environmental, Inc., the content contained, and the conclusions drawn within this IS reflect the independent judgment of the City. The IS was prepared with the assistance of the following documentation submitted by the applicant as part of the Project application package:

- *Project Description, Padre and Associates Inc., October 2021;*
- *Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facilities – Volume III – Initial Study, Padre Associates Inc., October 2021;*
- *Summary of Remedial Action Plan, Padre Associates Inc.;*
- *Marine Biological Resources Study, Padre Associates Inc, June 2021;*
- *Essential Fish Habitat Assessment , Padre Associates Inc., October 2021;*
- *Carpinteria Harbor Seal Rookery Monitoring and Protection Plan, Padre Associates Inc., June 2021;*
- *Terrestrial Biological Resources Study , Padre Associates Inc., June 2021;*
- *Tree Report, Padre Associates Inc., Padre Associates Inc., June 2021;*
- *Bluff Retreat Evaluation Report, Padre Associates Inc., June 2021;*
- *Coastal Wetland Delineation Report, Padre Associates Inc., October 2021;*
- *Preliminary Restoration/ Vegetation Plan, Padre Associates Inc., June 2021;*
- *Carp O&G Plant Decommissioning Emissions Calcs June 2021, Padre Associates Inc., ;*
- *Policy Consistency Analysis, October 2021;*
- *Cultural Resources Assessment, Padre Associates Inc., October 2021;*
- *Noise Management Plan, Padre Associates Inc., June 2021;*
- *Traffic, Parking and VMT Analysis, Associated Transportation Engineers, June 2021; and,*
- *Description of Facilities not Included in Project Activities.*

1.4 Initial Study Checklist

MRS Environmental, Inc., under the City's guidance, prepared the project's Environmental Checklist (i.e., Initial Study) per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15063–15065. The CEQA Guidelines include a suggested checklist to indicate whether a project would have an adverse impact on the environment. The checklist is found in Section 3, Initial Study, of this document. Following the Environmental Checklist, Sections 3.1 through 3.21 include an explanation and discussion of each significance determination made in the checklist for the project.

For this Initial Study, one of the following four responses is possible for each environmental issue area:

1. Potentially Significant Impact
2. Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
3. Less-Than-Significant Impact
4. No Impact

The checklist and accompanying explanation of checklist responses provide the information and analysis necessary to assess relative environmental impacts of the project. In doing so, the City will determine the extent of additional environmental review for the project.

1.5 Point of Contact

The City of Carpinteria is the lead agency for this environmental document. Any questions about preparation of this IS, its assumptions, or its conclusions should be referred to the following:

Name: Steve Goggia
Community Development Director
City of Carpinteria
Community Development Department
5775 Carpinteria Avenue
Carpinteria, California 93013
Phone: (805) 755-4414

The point of contact for the applicant is as follows:

Becky Trujillo, CPL
Chevron Regulatory Affairs Manager
3916 State Street, Suite 200
Santa Barbara, California, 93105

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Project Location

Access to the Project site is from U.S. Highway 101 to Bailard Avenue and west onto Carpinteria Avenue to Dump Road. The site is bisected by Dump Road (a private, two-lane roadway) from west to east, and by the Union Pacific Railroad from north to south. The eastern portion of the Project site remains predominantly developed by oil and gas processing equipment, ancillary equipment, and other support facilities/buildings. A large above-ground tank (Tank 861) is the predominant feature onsite. The western portion of the site is primarily open space. The southern third of the site is open space along the bluffs, and two large parking areas utilized in support of the Casitas Pier operations.

The nearshore beach area along Tar Pits Park/Carpinteria State Beach provides public recreational access. A known harbor seal rookery is located approximately 70 feet to the east of Casitas Pier. The City of Carpinteria closes public access to the beach from December 1st to May 31st per ordinance 12.24.090 to avoid human interference with harbor seal pupping at the rookery. However, during the open season, the beach is accessible to the public at low tides from both the west and east. The pipelines and utilities that cross the beach in this area are in some cases above ground, on risers, or are seasonally exposed to view. Offshore water depths range up to 148 feet out to Federal waters.

2.2 Historical Site Use

Historical use at the Project site included both agricultural and oil and gas development. The Project Site is located within CA-SBA-6, a large prehistoric shell midden and lithic scatter that indicates seasonal prehistoric habitation. Archaeologist David Rogers initially recorded CA-SBA-6 in 1929 as three distinct loci. He described the site as a dense shell midden between the sea cliff and the railroad with a hunting camp and a cemetery (Rogers, 1929). Agricultural uses included dry farming, row crops, orchards and commercial flower production. Oil and gas processing began in 1959 as part of the offshore Summerland oil field with the installation of Platform Hazel. Oil was stored in Tank 861 and processed gas was sold to the Southern California Gas Company.

The Chevron facility consisted of offices, production pipelines from offshore platforms, separation, processing, and storage infrastructure. Historical processing levels reached up to 20,000 barrels of oil per day and 20 million standard cubic feet per day (MMSCF) of natural gas. The oil was shipped to Ventura via pipeline and the natural gas sold to Southern California Gas Company. Refined products were also transferred from the facility via marine tanker. From 1960 to 1989, the oil and gas plant received oil and gas from several other offshore platforms constructed in the Santa Barbara Channel, including Hilda, Hope, Hazel, and Heidi (Carpinteria Field), and Grace and Gail (Santa Clara Field and Sockeye Field). Abandonment of the wells and decommissioning/removal of offshore Platforms Hazel, Hilda, Hope, and Heidi (4H Platforms) from the Santa Barbara Channel were completed in 1996.

***Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study***

Chevron sold its Santa Barbara Channel assets to Venoco, Inc. in 1998. Platform Grace ceased operations in 1998 and Platform Gail in 2017.

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**



Source: Project Description October 2021.

Project Location

2.3 Environmental Setting

Existing Project Site

The Project site encompasses seven parcels (APN Nos. 001-170-003, 001-170-004, 001-170-014, 001-170-021, 001-170-022, and 001-170-023), that total approximately 64.28 acres. The Project site is located on a relatively flat coastal terrace, and slopes slightly downward to the south and west. Coastal bluffs of between 35 and 50 feet in height descend from the terrace to a narrow sand beach (Tar Pits Park at Carpinteria State Beach) and the Pacific Ocean.

Surrounding Land Uses

Surrounding land uses include the Carpinteria City Hall, Carpinteria Avenue, and U.S. Highway 101 to the north, the Pacific Ocean to the south, the Concha Loma single-family residential neighborhood to the west, and a public golf driving range, agriculture, and open space to the east.

2.4 Proposed Project

The Project's purpose is to demolish and remove surface and subsurface facilities and subsequent remediation of impacted soils at the onshore Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility. Remediation is intended to achieve the most stringent clean up levels as determined by the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services Department (SBCEHS), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), while preserving existing site resources, including mature trees and bluffs, and while respecting site constraints including buffer zones adjacent to the railroad right-of-way. Tier 1 Environmental Screening Levels for residential uses (or equally protective contaminant-specific, agency-approved levels) provide the standard for on-site soil remediation, consistent with Chevron's clean up objectives. Although relevant agencies with jurisdiction will establish required clean up levels, by assuming the most stringent clean up level, soil excavation and truck trip estimates are higher. This assumption affects the reasonably foreseeable scope of environmental impacts because the most stringent clean up levels would require more intensive remediation activities (e.g., truck trips, site activities). The most stringent clean up levels would also result in greater flexibility for development on the site meeting the most rigorous standards (e.g., unrestricted land use). Primary Project tasks are summarized in the list below:

Onshore

- Idling and removal of all existing surface and subsurface equipment, piping, and structures within the Oil and Gas Processing Plant;
- Removal of concrete foundations, asphalt, oil spray and road base;
- Excavation/remediation of any impacted soil;
- Recycling/disposal of all materials removed from the Project site(s); and,
- Site restoration.

Beach Crossing and Offshore Pipelines (State Waters)

- Pig and flush pipelines in preparation for removal;
- Removal of offshore Project pipeline segments out to 3-mile State waters limit;
- Potential nighttime activities in surf zone due to tidal restrictions;
- Removal of nearshore beach crossing pipeline segments;
- Recycling/disposal of all materials removed from the Project site(s); and,
- Site restoration.

Project Objectives

The Project's purpose is to demolish and remove surface and subsurface facilities and subsequent remediation of any impacted soils at the onshore Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility to accommodate the site's potential future redevelopment. Any residually impacted soils at the Project Site will be remediated to a unrestricted land use standard consistent with the approvals from the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services Department (SBCEHS), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to facilitate reuse of the property for land use acceptable under the City's current Draft General Plan/Local Coastal Plan Update (anticipated to be Planned Unit Development and Open Space/Recreation). Nearshore and offshore pipeline segments will be removed.

2.5 Construction Schedule

Based on the proposed Project application package, the Project is expected to require 670 days over a three year period. Daily schedule is estimated at Monday through Friday for eight to ten hours for onshore components and up to seven day a week and twelve hours per day for offshore components. The applicant has submitted the following schedule in the table below.

Project Activity Location	Approximate Date Range
Project Initiation	October 2022
Onshore	
Chevron Pipeline Area	October 2022 – December 2022
Former Marketing Terminal	April 2023 – August 2023
Shop and Maintenance Area	August 2023 – October 2023
Main Plant Area	May 2024 – March 2025
MSRC Lease Area	June 2024 – August 2024
Offshore	
Former Marketing Terminal/Marine Terminal Offloading Bundle	August 2024 – November 2024
Gail and Grace Pipeline Bundle	September 2024 – December 2024
Grading and Revegetation	
Pier Parking Lot Area	December 2024 – March 2025
Final Site Grading and Revegetation	March 2025 – May 2025
Project Completion	May 2025

Source: Chevron Project Description, October 2021 .

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

2.6 Project Approvals

The proposed Project would require review and or approval from local, state and federal public agencies. The table below submitted by the applicant provides a comprehensive list of the potential public agencies for the proposed Project. CalGEM has been added to the list for consultation and guidance on the legacy wells located on the Project site.

Agency	Regulated Activity	Project Components	Authority	Permit Approval
Local				
City of Carpinteria	Removal of project components located onshore and within City deeded tidelands (beach & offshore segments). Activities within designated coastal zone	Onshore operations and deeded tidelands	California Coastal Act and CSLC deeded tidelands, CEQA lead agency	Certification of CEQA Documentation Coastal Development Permit for onshore facilities removals and remediation Demolition and Grading Permit for onshore facilities removals and remediation Approval of Facility decommissioning plan within City Deeded Tidelands and Issuance of a Lease Quit Claim
Santa Barbara County Department of Planning and Building	Removal of project components located within County deeded tidelands. Activities within designated coastal zone	Deeded tidelands	California Coastal Act and CSLC deeded tidelands	Approval of Pipeline Right of Way Lease Agreement within County Deeded Tidelands
Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services Department	Establishment of remediation levels for any onshore impacted soil	Onshore Facilities	Onsite Hazardous Waste Treatment ("Tiered Permit")- Authority: HSC Chapter 6.5 & Title 22 CCR Division 4.5; California Accidental Release Prevention ("CalARP") - Authority: Chapter 6.95, Article 2 & Title 19 CCR Chapter 4.5	Approval of Remedial Action Plan
Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District	Air emissions	Marine and onshore operations	1990 Clean Air Act CEQA Review	CEQA Review Portable Engine Permits for onshore facilities
State				

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

Agency	Regulated Activity	Project Components	Authority	Permit Approval
California Coastal Commission	Any development within the coastal zone	Marine and onshore within coastal zone	California Coastal Act Coastal Zone Management Act	Federal Consistency Determination for all Federal approvals and permits. Coastal Development Permit for actions within State Waters Appeal jurisdiction of Coastal Development Permits issued for onshore activities with the Coastal Zone
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Activities affecting State Waters biological resources Onshore activities affecting onshore biological resources including streams and wetlands	Marine component and onshore facilities within Coastal Zone	State Endangered Species Act Section 1601	Consultation under State Endangered Species Act Section 1601 approval for work within designated waterways
Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)	Discharges that may affect surface and ground water quality in waters of the state Discharges associated with flushing pipes; runoff from facilities during storms Sanitary and domestic waters from the platforms or vessels Establishment of remediation targets of any impacted groundwater	Marine and onshore operations	Clean Water Act Porter-Cologne State Water Quality Act	Section 401 certification in association with 404 Permit Approvals Stormwater permits for all onshore excavations Approval of Remedial Action Plan
California State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and the State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO)	Impacts to historic and pre-historic resources	None identified to date	National Historic Preservation Act Protection of Historic Resources (36CGR800)	Consultation under Section 106
California State Fire Marshal, Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Division	Pipeline inspections and safety	Onshore and offshore pipelines	Federal 49 CFR Part 195 State CCR/Chapter 5.5 Sections 51010 through 51019	Consultation with CalGEM and California States Lands Commission (CSLC)
CalGEM	To be determined	Legacy wells	California Health and Safety Code Division 3 Oil and Gas Article 4.1 Abandoned Wells	To be determined

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

Agency	Regulated Activity	Project Components	Authority	Permit Approval
Federal				
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (U.S. ACOE)	Discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. during construction. Jurisdictional waters include territorial seas, tidelands, rivers, streams and wetlands Structures or work in or affecting navigable waters of the U.S. Review and issuance concurrent with Section 404	Marine components	Section 404 Clean Water Act (33 USC 1344) Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S.C. 403) (Section 4(f) of the OCS Act of 1953)	Issuance of a 404 Permit associated with excavation and related bottom disturbance Issuance of a Section 10 Permit associated with excavation and related bottom disturbance in navigable waters
United States Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Impacts to federally-listed endangered and threatened species and species proposed for listing	Both terrestrial & marine components	16 USCA 1513 50 CFR Section 17	Consultation under the Endangered Species Act (Section 7) and Issuance of Biological Opinion/Incidental Take Permit (if necessary)
National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Impacts to federally-listed and species proposed for listing. Protection of Marine Mammals Managed Marine Fish Resources	Marine components	16 USCA 1513 50 CFR Section 17	Consultation under the Federal Endangered Species Act, Section 7, Marine Mammal Protection Act, Essential Fish Habitat Assessment Issuance of Biological Opinion/Incidental Take Permit (if necessary)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Discharges that may affect surface and ground water quality Establish remediation levels for onshore PCB-impacted soil and groundwater	Both terrestrial & marine components	Clean Water Act 40 CFR 761.61(a) 40 CFR 761.61(c)	Issuance of NPDES permit (if necessary) for offshore discharges. Termination of existing NPDES Permits associated with facility operations Approval of remedial activities for PCBs
United States Coast Guard (USCG)	Activities that may affect navigable waters	Activities in navigable waters	33 CFR Part 62, 67 and 153 OPA 90	Notice to Mariners

Source: Chevron Project Description, October 2021 .

3.0 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title:

Decommissioning and Remediation Of the Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility

2. Lead agency name and address:

City of Carpinteria
Community Development Department
5775 Carpinteria Avenue
Carpinteria, California 93013

3. Contact person and phone number:

Name: Steve Goggia
Community Development Director
Phone: (805) 755-4414
Email: steveg@ci.carpinteria.ca.us

4. Project location:

5675 and 5663 Carpinteria Avenue, Carpinteria, CA

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Becky Trujillo, CPL
Chevron Regulatory Affairs Manager
3916 State Street, Suite 200
Santa Barbara, California, 93105

6. General plan designation: Coastal Dependent Industrial

7. Zoning: The Project site is Coastal Dependent Industry (CDI) and Recreation (Rec).

8. Description of project:

The Project's purpose is to demolish and remove surface and subsurface facilities and subsequent remediation of impacted soils at the onshore Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility. Remediation is intended to achieve the most stringent clean up levels as determined by the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services Department (SBCEHS), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), while preserving existing site resources, including mature trees and bluffs, and while respecting site constraints including buffer zones adjacent to the railroad right-of-way. Tier 1 Environmental Screening Levels for residential uses (or equally protective contaminant-specific, agency-approved levels) provide the standard for on-site soil remediation,

consistent with Chevron’s rigorous clean up objectives. Although relevant agencies with jurisdiction will establish required clean up levels, by assuming the most stringent clean up level, soil excavation and truck trip estimates are higher. This assumption affects the reasonably foreseeable scope of environmental impacts because the most stringent clean up levels would require more intensive remediation activities (e.g., truck trips, site activities). The most stringent clean up levels would also result in greater flexibility for development on the site meeting the most rigorous standards (e.g., unrestricted land use).

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

Surrounding land uses include the Carpinteria City Hall, Carpinteria Avenue, and U.S. Highway 101 to the north, the Pacific Ocean to the south, the Concha Loma single-family residential neighborhood to the west, and a public golf driving range, agriculture, and open space to the east.

9. Other public agencies whose approval is required: (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

See Section 2.5, Project Approvals, for details.

10. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

The City will contact the appropriate Native American tribe representative as part of the noticing of the proposed Project and preparation of the environmental document. The Project site does have an identified archaeological resource (cultural resource CA-SBA-06) and the Project will have mitigation measures including a Native American monitor to protect CA-SBA-06 and other potential cultural resources.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |

***Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study***

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Services Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

Determination:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature

July 29, 2022
Date

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors, as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VI. ENERGY. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would				
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-Than-Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3.1 Aesthetics

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

Less than Significant. The Carpinteria Bluffs and Carpinteria Avenue view sheds are considered important scenic vistas to the City. No new structures are part of the proposed Project, rather, existing structures (surface and subsurface infrastructure of the oil and gas facility) are proposed for removal.

The proposed Project includes limited tree removal, four percent or approximately 40 trees along the north-south orientated windrow along the eastern Project boundary. These trees are part of a parallel set of two rows of trees, therefore, removal of a small percentage of the trees would not significantly alter the visual effect of the tree windrow or degrade the view scape.

Temporary stockpiling of soils, parking and storage of construction equipment at the Project site would potentially be visible during the three year Project duration. These features would be partially screened by the windrow trees or other vegetation but may be potentially seen by the public from certain viewpoints. Given the fact that the primary view sheds in the Project area are the Carpinteria Bluffs, Tar Pits Park, and the ocean, temporary impacts to the overall area scenic vistas from the Project would be less than significant.

Offshore portions of the Project would include the use of large work vessels, barges, and other types of work boats. These vessels would be visible from the bluffs, beach and ocean users and would be an increase of existing vessel traffic. However, the potential impact to coastal views would be temporary and therefore the short term impact to the coastal scenic vista would be less than significant.

b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings in a state scenic highway?*

Less than Significant. Views from Highway 101 of the Project site are broken up by trees, therefore, views of the Project site from moving vehicles on Highway 101 would be less than significant. The proposed Project will require the removal 62 non-native trees for soil excavation and remediation. None of the trees are located in City designated Open Space or ESHA areas. The City considers the loss of ten percent of trees of biological value on a project site a potentially significant impact. The Tree Report for the proposed Project documented 1,500 total trees on the Project site, therefore, the loss of 62 trees equates to approximately four percent which is less than the ten percent of the City guideline and would not be expected to have a significant impact on a viewshed. The proposed Project involves removal of oil and gas processing equipment infrastructure, therefore, would not damage any scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings.

c) *Would the project, in nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

Less than Significant. The Project site is zoned as Coastal Industry District (M-CD), and Recreation (REC). The Project would remove the oil and gas processing equipment infrastructure and remediate the area to undeveloped conditions. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with zoning or City regulations or polices related to scenic quality. The construction activities associated with the Project would potentially cause short term impacts to public views of the scenic area, however, these impacts would be temporary and therefore less than significant.

d) *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Less Than Significant with Mitigation. The Project would involve the short term use of lighting during critical work activities. Existing site vegetation, including the trees located in the Buffer Zone, would

help minimize lighting disturbance to adjacent neighborhoods such as Concha Loma. Onshore Project lighting impacts to Carpinteria Avenue and Highway 101 would be minimized by existing fencing and vegetation.

Construction activities on the beach areas may include nighttime lighting to work with tidal and weather conditions. Lights from these activities would be visible from the Carpinteria Bluffs and adjacent neighborhoods but could be mitigated with standard light minimization techniques such as the use of low intensity lights and light shielding. With the use of these types of light minimization methods, the short term degradation of nighttime views would be less than significant with mitigation.

3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

- a) ***Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?***

No Impact. The Project site has been used for agriculture in the past, however, the site currently has no agricultural uses. The site has not been identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, the proposed Project would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use.

- b) ***Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?***

No Impact. The Project site is not currently zoned agricultural and is not located within or adjacent to parcels enrolled in Williamson Act contracts.

- c) ***Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?***

No Impact. The Project site is not currently zoned in support of forest lands or timberlands. The Project site is not located within or adjacent to forest land as defined in the PRC Sections noted above.

- d) ***Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

No Impact. The proposed Project does not involve forest land, therefore, would not impact or convert forest land to a non-forest use.

- e) ***Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

No Impact. The proposed Project may proceed future re-zoning to a residential or other use, however, the Project would not result in conversion of any farmland or forest land uses.

3.3 Air Quality

- a) ***Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

No Impact. The proposed Project does not involve any type of development; the Project would remove of oil and gas processing equipment infrastructure and remediate the area to natural, undeveloped conditions. Emissions associated with the Project involve construction equipment on a temporary basis, therefore, the Project would not conflict or impact the implementation of any air quality plan.

- b) ***Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?***

Less than Significant. The applicant submitted emissions calculations as part of the application package to the City (*Appendix E – Carp O&G Plant Decommissioning Emissions Calcs June 2021*). A summary of those emissions estimated for the construction equipment for the decommissioning activities along with applicable Santa Barbara APCD and County thresholds is listed in the table below.

Emissions Scenario	NO_x	ROC	PM₁₀
Peak 12 Month (tons/year)	8.35	0.72	0.37
Peak Day (pounds/day)	228.2	20.1	10.8
Peak Day Motor Vehicle Only (pounds/day)	13.6	0.2	0.2
SBCAPCD Rule 202 Construction Emissions (tons/year)	25	25	25
SBCAPCD Motor Vehicle Only (pounds/day)	25	25	---
SB County Motor Vehicle Only (pounds/day)	25	---	---

Source: Chevron Appendix E, – Carp O&G Plant Decommissioning Emissions Calcs June 2021 .

As listed in the table above, construction/decommissioning emissions associated with the Project are below the SBCAPCD and SB County thresholds for construction activities, therefore, the emissions of criteria pollutants from the Project would be less than significant.

- c) ***Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

Less than Significant. As noted above, the proposed Project emissions are estimated to be below both the SBAPCD and SB County thresholds for construction activity emissions. The closest residential community to the Project site, the Concha Loma neighborhood, is approximately 300 feet from the Former Marketing Terminal (FMT) section of the Project. Construction activities in the FMT area very

short term with an anticipated schedule of 90 days. Other Project work areas are at least 500 feet from the Concha Loma neighborhood. In addition, SBAPCD Rule 345, Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities, would apply to the Project and would minimize offsite particulate matter impacts. Therefore, the proposed Project pollutant concentrations to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

d) *Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The proposed Project has the potential for hydrocarbon related odors from the decommissioning and demolition of pipelines, tanks, contaminated soils, and other oil and gas processing infrastructure. Pipelines and tanks are proposed to be flushed to remove any residual hydrocarbons with the flush water to be disposed to permitted and approved disposal facilities. The Project does not propose to do any venting of storage tanks. As noted above, contaminated soil activities would be subject to dust control measure per SBCAPCD and the trucks transporting soils would be required to be covered. In addition, the nearest residential location is 300 feet from the Project site and other areas are at least 500 feet away. Therefore, the potential for offsite impacts of hydrocarbon from the Project would not be expected to impact a significant number of people. The added mitigation measures for dust control and odor controls should result in impacts that are less than significant with mitigation.

3.4 Biological Resources

The applicant included the following reports in support of analyzing the potential Project impacts to biological resources:

- *Essential Fish Habitat Assessment*, Padre Associates Inc., October 2021;
- *Terrestrial Biological Resources Study*, Padre Associates Inc., June 2021;
- *Tree Report*, Padre Associates Inc., June 2021;
- *Carpinteria Harbor Seal Rookery Monitoring and Protection Plan*, Padre Associates Inc., June 2021;
- *Coastal Wetland Delineation Report*, Padre Associates Inc., October 2021; and
- *Preliminary Restoration/Vegetation Plan*, Padre Associates Inc., June 2021.

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Potentially Significant. The analysis contained in the reports noted above determined potential impacts from the proposed Project to the following species:

- Monarch Butterfly;
- Southern California Legless Lizard;
- Western Snowy Plover;

- Cooper's Hawk;
- White-tailed Kite;
- Loggerhead Shrike;
- Sharp-shinned Hawk;
- Scripp's Murrelet;
- Ashy Storm Petrel;
- Black Storm Petrel;
- Marine Mammals; and,
- Carpinteria Harbor Seal Rookery.

It should be noted that Southern California Legless Lizard has a Low-Moderate potential to occur at the site since the potential scrub habitat is highly disturbed. The biological resource assessments and analysis further identified the following types of mitigation to reduce the potential impacts to the species noted above to less than significant:

- Twice monthly surveys for the Monarch butterfly along with avoidance measures if roosting Monarch butterflies are found;
- A nesting bird survey and buffer zones if nesting birds are observed;
- A Marine Wildlife Contingency and Training Plan; and,
- Harbor Seal Rookery Monitoring and Protection Plan.

With the implementation of the mitigation measures noted above, and other mitigation measures that may be needed for other species, impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be reduced, however, any impacts to these biological resources from the overall decommissioning and the release of hydrocarbons would be considered potentially significant.

b) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Potentially Significant. The biological resource assessments and analysis for the proposed Project identified the Environmental Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) as the following:

- A small patch of willows occurs in the Drainage No. 4 area identified as potential riparian habitat;
- Potential Monarch butterfly roost areas;
- Harbor seal rookery;
- Essential fish habitat areas;
- Rocky intertidal and nearshore areas; and,
- Carpinteria Bluffs.

No Project activities are proposed for the Drainage No. 4 area. The potential for impacts to the Monarch butterfly roost areas would be addressed by the twice monthly survey and avoidance measures noted above. Potential impacts to the Harbor Seal Rookery would be mitigated by a Harbor Seal Rookery Monitoring and Protection Plan, however, a release of hydrocarbons from pipeline construction activities would be potentially significant.

The Essential Fish Habitat Assessment identified potential impacts to rocky intertidal/nearshore areas and fish habitat from boat anchors, pipeline removal equipment, underwater cutting and associated sedimentation of the water column. These potential impacts could be mitigated with a Essential Fish Habitat Avoidance Plan. The plan would include a pre-project biological survey and mapped anchoring locations to avoid hard bottom locations. Impacts to the water column from sedimentation would be temporary and short term. However, even with the implementation of as Essential Fish Habitat Avoidance Plan, impacts to rocky intertidal, nearshore areas and fish habitat from a hydrocarbon release could be potentially significant.

Potential impacts to the Carpinteria Bluffs could result from the pipeline removal from the bluff face and the potential for increase in run-off and bluff erosion from soil removal. The proposed Project stormwater management plan, habitat restoration plan, and bluff stabilization methods such as compaction, revegetation, or other measures identified by a geotechnical engineer would minimize the potential for accelerated bluff retreat to less than significant. A release of hydrocarbons to the ESHA area of the Carpinteria Bluffs from the removal of pipelines in the sensitive has the potential to be significant impact.

- c) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Coastal Wetland Delineation Report for the proposed Project identified two wetland areas:

- Area around Tank 861 and associated pipelines identified as Wetland W-1; and,
- Area around the bluff face identified as Wetland W-5.

The wetland associated with Tank 861 is due to the secondary containment berm for the tank itself, therefore, removal of the tank and associated infrastructure would permanently remove the wetland. Mitigation for this impact is identified in the Coastal Wetland Delineation Report in the form of a coastal wetland replacement by enhancement of the wetland area at Drainage No. 4 area. With this or similar mitigation the loss of the man-made wetland associated with the secondary containment of Tank 861 would be reduced to less than significant.

The potential impact to the hydrophytic vegetation at the bluff face, known as Wetland W-5, would be temporary with the vegetation expected to grow back at the bluff face.

- d) *Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

Less than Significant. The proposed Project site onshore does not connect to two habitat areas and is primarily developed. As noted above, the vegetation at the bluff face disturbed by pipeline removal

activities is expected to grow back. Pipeline removal offshore would be limited to the pipeline right of way and adjacent areas and would not prevent fish or marine mammals from moving about in the Santa Barbara Channel. Noise from underwater construction and demolition activities has the potential to impact whales and other marine mammals, however, a marine mammal watch and avoidance program or other similar mitigation program would minimize potential marine mammal impacts to less than significant. Noise also has the potential to impact the harbor seal rookery but noise mitigation measures can reduce the noise impact to less than significant. Therefore, the potential impact to the movement of fish or wildlife species and migratory wildlife corridors would be less than significant.

- e) ***Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

Less than Significant. The proposed Project will require the removal 62 non-native trees for soil excavation and remediation. None of the trees are located in City designated Open Space or ESHA areas. The City considers the loss of ten percent of trees of biological value on a project site a potentially significant impact. The Tree Report for the proposed Project documented 1,500 total trees on the Project site, therefore, the loss of 62 trees equates to approximately four percent which is less than the ten percent of the City guideline. In addition, the Project site is primarily developed and would be remediated , therefore, the Project would not conflict with any ordinances protecting biological resources or tree protection.

- f) ***Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?***

No Impact. The Project site is not subject to a habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other habitat conservation plan.

3.5 Cultural Resources

- a) ***Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?***

Potentially significant. The applicant submitted a Cultural Resources Assessment for the proposed Project. In 1980, CA-SBA-6 was evaluated and determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); thus, CA-SBA-6 qualifies as a historical resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Previous cultural resource studies and testing have identified intact deposits related to CA-SBA-6 within the Former Marketing Terminal Area, the Chevron Pipeline Area, the Pier Parking Lot Area, the Railroad Ditch Area, and the Former Nursery Area; however, no Project impacts are proposed for the Railroad Ditch Area or the Former Nursery Area.. Mitigation measures for historical resources, also applicable to cultural resources impacts and are included below and are expected to be able to mitigate the impact to less than significant:

MM CUL-1: Cultural Resources Management Plan (CRMP). The applicant shall retain an archaeologist that meets the minimum professional qualifications standards set forth by the U.S. Secretary of the Interior to prepare a comprehensive Project CRMP. The purpose of the CRMP is to document the actions and procedures to be followed to ensure avoidance or minimization of impacts to cultural resources consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b). The CRMP shall include at a minimum and shall implement the performance standards in MM CUL-3 through 8:

- A description of the roles and responsibilities of cultural resources personnel (including Native American representatives), and the reporting relationships with Project construction management, including lines of communication and notification procedures.
- Description of how the monitoring shall occur.
- Description of frequency of monitoring (e.g., full-time, part time, spot checking).
- High-resolution maps for use by cultural resource monitors to identify locations of intact cultural deposits.
- Description of what resources are expected to be encountered.
- Description of circumstances that would result in the halting of work.
- Description of procedures for halting work on the site and notification procedures.
- Procedures for the appropriate treatment of human remains.
- Description of artifact collection, retention/disposal, and curation policies, including a statement that all cultural materials retained will be curated in accordance with the requirements of an identified, qualified curatorial facility, and that the applicant shall be responsible for all expenses associated with the curation of the materials at the qualified curatorial facility; and
- A description of monitoring reporting procedures including the requirement that reports resulting from the Project be filed with the Central Coast Information Center within one year of Project completion.

Plan Requirements/Timing: The CRMP shall be submitted to the City and approved prior to the initiation of any ground disturbance.

Monitoring: Implementation of this measure shall be initiated by the applicant project manager and monitored by the designated cultural resources monitor.

MM CUL-2: Worker Cultural Resources Awareness Program. The applicant shall develop and implement a worker cultural resources awareness program for all applicant staff, consultants, contractors, subcontractors, and other workers, with subsequent training sessions to accommodate new personnel becoming involved in the Project. The program may be conducted together with other environmental or safety awareness and education programs for the Project, provided that the program elements pertaining to cultural resources are provided by a qualified archaeologist. The awareness program shall address:

- The cultural sensitivity of the Project site and how to identify these types of resources.
- Specific procedures to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery.
- Safety procedures when working with monitors; and,
- Consequences in the event of noncompliance.

Plan Requirements/Timing: The worker cultural resources awareness program shall be submitted to the City and approved prior to the initiation of any ground disturbance.

Monitoring: Implementation of this measure shall be initiated by the applicant project manager and monitored by the designated cultural resources monitor.

MM CUL-3: Cultural Resources Monitoring and Avoidance. Cultural resources monitoring shall be conducted during Project-related ground-disturbing activities for the purpose of identifying and avoiding impacts to cultural resources, consistent with the CRMP. The monitoring shall be conducted under the supervision of a City-approved archaeologist and a Native American representative. In the event of any inadvertent discovery of prehistoric or historic period archaeological resources during construction, all work within 50 feet of the discovery shall immediately cease (or greater or lesser distance as needed to protect the discovery and determined in the field by the Project archaeologist). The applicant shall immediately notify the City of Carpinteria. The Project archaeologist shall evaluate the significance of the discovery prior to resuming any activities that could impact the site/discovery. If the Project archaeologist determines that the find may qualify for listing in the CRHR, the site shall be avoided or shall be subject to a mitigation program, such as data recovery excavations, and funded by the applicant. Work shall not resume until authorization is received from the City.

Plan Requirements/Timing: Cultural resources monitoring requirements shall be documented in the approved CRMP.

Monitoring: Implementation of this measure shall be initiated by the applicant project manager and monitored by the designated cultural resources monitor.

MM CUL-4: Avoidance of Inadvertent Impacts to Cultural Resources. The applicant shall ensure that Project-related activities are limited to permitted areas to avoid inadvertent impacts to Site CA-SBA-6. An exclusion zone shall be designated around each intact portion of CA-SBA-6 within the Project site. An exclusion zone is a fenced area where construction equipment and personnel are not permitted. The exclusion zone fencing shall be installed (and later removed) under the direction of a City-approved archaeologist and a Native American representative and shall be placed one meter beyond the boundary of the defined area to avoid inadvertent damage to cultural resources during installation.

Plan Requirements/Timing: Exclusion zones shall be documented in the approved CRMP and fenced prior to ground disturbance.

Monitoring: Implementation of this measure shall be initiated by the applicant project manager and monitored by the designated cultural resources monitor.

MM CUL-5: Identification of Discovered Human Remains. Human remains and burials have been encountered during previous cultural resources studies within the Project site. The applicant shall retain

a forensic anthropologist (or functional equivalent) to examine and identify bone fragments as human or not human. The forensic anthropologist may be available on an on call basis and not need to be present during all ground disturbance. Additionally, if numerous bone fragments are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, arrangements shall be made for the forensic anthropologist to make regularly scheduled (i.e., weekly, monthly) visits.

Plan Requirements/Timing: A forensic anthropologist (or functional equivalent) shall be under contract prior to any ground disturbance.

Monitoring: Implementation of this measure shall be initiated by the applicant project manager and monitored by the designated cultural resources monitor.

MM CUL-6: Avoidance of Human Remains. If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The City shall be immediately notified of any human remains found. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission.

Plan Requirements/Timing: Notification requirements and contacts shall be documented in the approved CRMP.

Monitoring: Implementation of this measure shall be initiated by the applicant project manager and monitored by the designated cultural resources monitor.

MM CUL-7: Curation of Cultural Materials. Prior to any ground disturbance, the applicant shall identify a single accredited repository at which to curate all archaeological materials recovered from the Project Site. The repository shall be located in southern California so that the materials are available locally to Tribal members and researchers and shall meet the standards provided in the California State Historical Resources Commission's Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collections. The applicant shall work with the identified local curatorial facility to transfer curation of materials currently in their possession or currently housed at a nonlocal facility, to the agreed-upon accredited local repository such that the materials can be accessioned as a unified collection. Subsequently, materials transferred from a non-local facility may require evaluation using current analytic methods to re-analyze artifacts and faunal remains that were recovered from CA-SBA-6 during previous excavations. If it is determined that there is no southern California curation facility that can accommodate the entire CA-SBA-6 collection, other accredited facilities in the State of California may be considered.

Plan Requirements/Timing: Curation requirements and contacts shall be documented in the approved CRMP.

Monitoring: Implementation of this measure shall be initiated by the applicant project manager and monitored by the designated cultural resources monitor.

MM CUL-8: Phase III Data Recovery. Any potentially intact portions of CA-SBA-6 that may be impacted by the Project shall first be mitigated with Phase III data recovery excavations prior to ground disturbance. The Phase III data recovery excavations shall be conducted under the direction of a research design and testing plan and may consist of a combination of Data Recovery Excavation Units and Shovel Test Probes.

Plan Requirements/Timing: The approved CRMP shall identify conditions when a Phase III data recovery program is required and methods for implementation.

Monitoring: Implementation of this measure shall be initiated by the applicant project manager and monitored by the designated cultural resources monitor.

b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Cultural Resources Assessment identified archaeological resources at the Project site (cultural resource CA-SBA-06). CA-SBA-6, is a large prehistoric shell midden and lithic scatter that indicates seasonal prehistoric habitation. Archaeologist David Rogers initially recorded CA-SBA-6 in 1929 as three distinct loci. He described the site as a dense shell midden between the sea cliff and the railroad with a hunting camp and a cemetery (Rogers, 1929). The report details the resource as disturbed to heavily disturbed dependent on the location within the Project site. Given the presence of a cultural resource and the ground disturbing activities of the proposed Project, potential for impacts to previously undisturbed resources is possible without mitigation. Mitigation Measures CUL-1 to CUL-8 detailed above would reduce the potential for impacts to archaeological resources to less than significant.

c) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?*

Potentially Significant. Due to the potential to disturb known human remains from the ground disturbing activities of the proposed Project, mitigation measures such as a Cultural Resources Management Plan and worker training for cultural resource awareness would be required to reduce potential impacts (see MM CUL-1 to CUL-8 above). However, because the majority of the Project Site is a burial site and known cemetery with a substantial number of human remains, excavation impacts are considered to be significant.

3.6 Energy

- a) *Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project will use energy for the construction equipment, vehicles and marine vessels to remove and transport the oil and gas processing infrastructure and potential contaminated soils. However, this short term energy use would not be considered to be wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary. The Project proposes to remediate the area to natural, undeveloped conditions so there would be no energy use associated with operations.

- b) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

No Impact. The proposed Project does not involve any energy use outside of the short term construction activities and thus would not obstruct with any state or local renewable energy plan impact energy efficiency.

3.7 Geology and Soils

- a) *Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

- i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*
- ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*
- iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*
- iv) *Landslides?*

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located on an area designated as a known earthquake fault on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning map. The proposed Project would not cause adverse effects or exposure to ground shaking, liquification or landslides because it does not involve the development of any structures or facilities at the Project site.

- b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would include the removal of contaminated soils and replacement of those soils with clean imported fill material. The remediated areas would be graded

to pre-project natural topography and treated with soil binders and or seed mix to prevent erosion. The site is not zoned for agriculture and so there would be no significant impact to topsoil.

- c) ***Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?***

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The proposed Project involves the removal of pipeline sections from the Carpinteria Bluffs. Based on a report (*Bluff Retreat Evaluation Report Padre Associates Inc. June 2021*) submitted by the applicant, the bluff retreat rate is estimated at 14 centimeters per year. Pipeline removal activities in the bluff area could accelerate the bluff retreat rate without mitigation measures. Bluff stabilization methods such as compaction, revegetation, or other measures identified by a geotechnical engineer would minimize the potential for accelerated bluff retreat to less than significant.

- d) ***Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?***

No Impact. Based on regional soil mapping, the Project site does not support expansive soils. The proposed Project does not involve the development of any structures or facilities at the Project site and therefore would not create an increase of risk to life or property.

- e) ***Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?***

No Impact. The Project does not involve any development that would generate municipal wastewater or require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

- f) ***Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?***

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The proposed Project would not involve excavation with the Monterey Formation or tar seeps, however, as noted above the site does have the potential to disturb cultural resources including cultural resource CA-SBA-06. The implementation of mitigation measures such as a Cultural Resources Management Plan and worker training for cultural resource awareness would be reduce the potential impact to less than significant.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- a) ***Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?***

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The applicant submitted emissions calculations as part of the application package to the City (*Appendix E – Carp O&G Plant Decommissioning Emissions Calcs June 2021*). GHG emissions were estimated for each major Project phase to identify the peak 12-month period. Maximum annual emissions were associated with the option to dispose of offshore pipe at Port Hueneme instead of the Port of Long Beach estimated at 1,749 metric tons per year CO₂ equivalent. Thus, worst case annual average GHG emissions for the project are less than 20% of the SBCAPCD threshold of 10,000 metric tons per year CO₂ equivalent for a stationary source. However, the Santa Barbara County threshold for GHG emissions is 1,000 metric tons per year and the Project would exceed this threshold (the City would need to determine if it wants to adopt this threshold). Consistent with other projects, coordination with the City, the SBCAPCD, and the applicant could identify applicable mitigation measures such as a GHG mitigation plan or offsets to mitigate this impact. The GHG emissions for the Project would be short term temporary construction emissions and although the worst case annual emissions exceed the Santa Barbara County stationary source threshold, mitigation measures are available to mitigate GHG emissions, therefore, Project GHG emissions would be less than significant with mitigation.

b) *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

Less than Significant with mitigation. As noted above, the proposed Project GHG emissions are short term construction emissions and worst case annual emissions are less than the SBCAPCD threshold for stationary sources. However, the projected GHG emissions would exceed Santa Barbara County thresholds. Although the City does not have its own thresholds, the City chooses to use the more stringent GHG threshold established by the County. Therefore, the proposed Project would conflict with the County's GHG regulations aimed at reducing GHG gases.

The Santa Barbara County Energy and Climate Action Plan (ECAP) identifies GHG Reduction Measures with goals to reduce GHG measures to various target percentages by year. Measure BE 10 is applicable to the proposed Project because it applies to the operation of the heavy construction equipment that would be used for decommissioning and remediation activities:

Construction Equipment Operations (BE 10) Measure: Implement best management practices (BMPs) for construction equipment operation; examples of BMPs include reduced equipment idling, use of alternative fuels or electrification of equipment, and proper maintenance and labeling of equipment.

The Project Description does not propose the use of electrically powered heavy construction equipment or alternative fuels as the use of such equipment is not widely available at this time. However, the proposed Project would include reduced equipment idling and properly maintained equipment and therefore would be consistent with the County ECAP. All fuels purchased as part of the Project would be covered by the Cap-and-Trade program and would therefore be covered by and comply with an applicable GHG policy.

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation. The proposed Project does not involve any development that would create the routine transport, use or disposal of any hazardous materials. The proposed Project would involve the excavation and transportation of contaminated soils. These soils would be handled and transported as described in the Project Description and Interim Remedial Action Plan to minimize public exposure, including dust suppression, sweeping of roadways to limit off-site migration of dust, soil sampling during excavation, segregation and stockpiling of soils considered hazardous, transportation in covered bins or truck beds, and disposal at an appropriate facility, based on contamination levels and constituents. Onshore facilities have been inventoried and sampled for the presence of asbestos and lead-based paint. Subsurface pipelines (contents and any coating materials) would be assessed for the presence of contaminated materials for waste characterization and removal planning purposes. Removal would be accomplished utilizing an excavator and/or hydro-excavation methods to safely excavate buried pipelines in consideration of other potential adjacent uses or lines, and the pipelines would be removed and cut into sections appropriate for hauling. If contaminated materials (i.e., asbestos) are present, the pipelines would be managed accordingly as directed by a certified hazardous materials oversight specialist.

The Project use of the heavy haul trucks on the City's roads, particularly Carpinteria Avenue and Dump Road, has the potential for impacts to the road surface which could cause future safety impacts for other road users. Potential impacts to the road surface can be mitigated with pre and post Project surveys of the road surface and applicant sponsored road repair if road damage is identified.

- b) ***Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?***

Potentially Significant Impact.

The proposed Project process of the removal of all existing surface and subsurface equipment, piping, and structures within the Oil and Gas Processing Plant has the potential to release hydrocarbons to the environment. The potential for such a release can be mitigated with the implementation of an oil spill contingency plan, however, a release of hydrocarbons to the ESHA area of the Carpinteria Bluffs from the removal of pipelines in sensitive resources has the potential to be a significant impact.

The pigging, flushing, and removal of the nearshore beach crossing and offshore areas out to the three mile State waters limit pipeline segments also have the potential to release hydrocarbons to the

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

environment. Any release of hydrocarbons to these ESHA or marine areas would be a significant impact. The use of an anchoring plan can reduce the potential for impacts to the pipeline segments during offshore construction activities. An anchoring plan to avoid potential work boat anchor impacts to Project pipelines along with an oil spill contingency plan that could include response vessels located in the immediate area, would reduce the potential for a release of hydrocarbons to the ocean environment; however, any release would be considered significant, therefore, the potential release of hazardous materials to the environment would be a potentially significant impact.

The proposed Project site also contains oil and gas wells from previous operations as summarized in the table below that are not slated for plugging and abandonment or remediation as part of this Project.

Well Name	API	Status	Year Drilled
P.C. Higgins No. 1	0408304644	Idle with metal well vault cover.	1913
Carpinteria Community Well No. 1	0408304313	Idle with concrete, wood, and plastic tarp cover.	1924
Caitlin Fletcher No. 1	0408304297	Plugged dry hole.	1951
Thornbury-Community Well Number: 1	0428304313	Plugged dry hole.	Unknown
Thornbury-Community Well Number: 3	0408304315	Plugged dry hole.	1949
Nugent No. 1	0408304327	Plugged dry hole.	1925
Nugent No. 2	0408304328	Plugged dry hole.	1925

Source: Chevron Appendix I, Description of Facilities Not Include in Project Activities.

As noted in the table, the age of these wells indicate that it is likely that the plugging and abandonment of the wells was not performed to current CalGEM requirements. In addition, details and documentation on the plugging and abandonment of several of these wells is not available or unknown. Therefore, there is a potential of a release of hydrocarbons from one of these wells in the future and any release of hydrocarbons from one of these wells could be a significant impact to any future use or development at the Project location. Release of gas from these wells could cause public health impacts and would be a significant impact.

The applicant noted in the application submittal package that the wells are not part of the Project and are the responsibility of CalGEM. In addition, the agencies listed as required for review or permitting of the proposed Project contained in the application package does not include CalGEM. In order for the City to determine the Project site as suitable for a future land use, the potential impact to public health and safety related to the potential for leakage of gas or other hazardous substances to the surface from the wells must be assessed. Therefore, the City will seek correspondence and coordination with CalGEM to review the current status of the legacy wells on the Project site and develop a path forward for a final disposition of the wells that meets the needs of the City and protects the health and safety of the public.

Construction activities could encounter asbestos during the excavation and removal of pipelines. However, the use of an asbestos minimization plan and a certified hazardous materials oversight specialist would minimize the potential for a release of asbestos to the environment to less than significant.

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

No Impact. The proposed Project area and transportation route for the removal of project infrastructure and contaminated soils are not within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

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

No Impact. The proposed Project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (DTSC, 2021).

- e) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?***

No Impact. The proposed Project is not located with an airport land use plan nor within two miles of a public or public use airport.

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

Less than Significant. Ingress and egress to the proposed Project site is via Dump Road, which is also the access route to MSRC, the Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility, City of Carpinteria Tar Pits Park and open space areas, and the Casitas Pier employee parking lot. The additional traffic from the project will not significantly impact Dump Road's ability to function as an egress route for these land uses during an emergency. The Project will not interfere with any adopted evacuation or emergency response plan.

- g) ***Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?***

No Impact. The Project site is not located within or near a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone as designed by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. In addition, the Project site is located within a low fire hazard area as defined within the City General Plan.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

- a) ***Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?***

Less than Significant. The proposed Project would include Remedial Action Plan and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The controls and mitigation measures in these documents would minimize the potential for releases of diesel fuel, gasoline, coolant, hydraulic oil, and lubricants associated with the use of heavy construction equipment. Water associated with flushing or cleaning of facility infrastructure and any water encountered during excavation activities would be tested and disposed of in one of three ways:

- Discharged to surface waters under Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCAQB) Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges with Low Threat to Surface Waters where the effluent limitations are met;
- Discharged to the Carpinteria Sanitary District municipal wastewater collection system to be treated and discharged to the Pacific Ocean (via the existing outfall pipeline) under an existing NPDES permit; or,
- Trucked off-site to Buttonwillow (Clean Harbors) or Fontana (World Oil) as hazardous liquid waste (oily water).

The proposed Project would not be expected to impact waters of the Carpinteria Groundwater Basin aquifer because those aquifers are located too deep to be affected by Project excavations. Therefore, the proposed Project would not significantly impact water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

- b) ***Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?***

Less than Significant. The proposed Project water use would be limited to potable water used for dust control, soil compaction and site restoration. This water use is temporary and short term, the applicant has estimated this water use to a few thousand gallons per day. This short term and temporary water use would not be a significant impact to groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

- c) ***Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:***

- i) ***result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

- ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?*
- iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*
- iv) impede or redirect flood flows?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Project proposed to remediate impacted areas and grade the site to pre-project natural topography. The Project does not involve the installation of any impervious surfaces and would involve the removal of concrete and other impervious surfaces. An updated Project SWPPP would minimize erosion or siltation associated with storm water run-off. Excavated areas would be backfilled with clean soil and compacted to minimize potential future erosion. Therefore, the Project would not alter the existing drainage pattern, increase erosion, or stormwater runoff patterns.

- d) Would the project, in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*

No Impact. The proposed Project locations on the bluffs and landward are not located in a tsunami inundation hazard zone. The Project locations seaward of the bluffs are unlikely to be impacted by tsunami or floods, however, the proposed Project is to remove contaminated materials from the site, therefore, the potential for release of pollutants is not likely. In addition, the Project is short term and it is unlikely that a tsunami would occur during that time and impact the project site. If a tsunami were to impact the Project site after the Project has been completed, impacts would have been avoided since the contaminants would have been removed.

- e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

Less than Significant. As discussed above, Project-related storm water, pipeline flush water or other waters would be discharged under RWQCB or NPDES permitted methods with applicable waste discharge requirements. . The proposed Project does not involve any long term use of water; therefore, the Project would not conflict with a Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin.

3.11 Land Use and Planning

- a) Would the project physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The proposed Project includes demolition of oil and gas processing equipment and other structures onsite as well as remediation of contaminated soils. No structures are proposed, and the Project would not have the potential to divide an established community.

- b) ***Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?***

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The proposed Project involves the demolition of oil and gas processing equipment and other structures onsite, the remediation of contaminated soils, and grading to return the Project area to pre-development natural topography. With the mitigation measures identified for cultural resources, hazards, and noise the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on any land use plan, policy or regulation.

The applicant submitted a policy consistency summary analysis (Policy Consistency Analysis, October 2021) as part of the proposed Project application package. The analysis confirms consistency with California Coastal Commissions and City of Carpinteria land use documents.

3.12 Mineral Resources

- a) ***Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?***

No Impact. The proposed Project does not involve the use of mineral resources or have the potential to impact the availability of any mineral resources.

- b) ***Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?***

No Impact. The proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

3.13 Noise

- a) ***Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The applicant included a noise assessment (*Padre Associates Carpinteria Noise Management Plan, Behrens and Associates, Inc., June 7, 2021*) as part of the application package submittal. Ambient noise levels were measured at three different locations at the north, west and south property boundaries of the proposed Project site. Results of the ambient monitoring was also used to assign ambient noise levels for at seven different receptor locations. Noise modeling was then completed to estimate the peak day construction noise for maximum noise generating equipment at the Former Marketing Terminal Area, the nearest proposed work area to residential areas. The noise modeling also included the noise from heavy-duty trucks using Dump Road to export contaminated soil and import

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

clean fill. Results of the noise modeling was used to calculate the existing ambient noise levels plus proposed worst case Project construction noise levels for the seven offsite receptors. Results are shown in the table below.

Receptor Number	Location	Noise Levels dBA CNEL		
		Project Construction Impact	Ambient + Project	Increase over Ambient
R1	Holiday Inn	53.2	68.6	0.1
R2	5615 Carpinteria Multi Family Residential	52.6	68.6	0.1
R3	5585 Carpinteria Multi Family Residential	51.2	60.9	0.5
R4	Residence Arbol Verde Drive	52.7	61.1	0.7
R5	Residence Arbol Verde Drive	57.2	62.1	1.7
R6	Residence at Eastern Terminus of Calle Pacific	56.9	62.0	1.6
R7	Carpinteria Bluffs Trail	52.1	67.8	0.1

Source: Padre Associates Carpinteria Noise Management Plan, Behrens and Associates, Inc., June 7, 2021.

The table indicates the City’s 75 dBA CNEL construction noise standard would not be exceeded. Further, construction Project-related noise increases would be less than 2 dBA over existing levels and would not exceed City thresholds for temporary construction noise. Nighttime construction activities may be necessary in the surf zone due to tidal access issues, however, these activities would be temporary and short term. The proposed Project does not involve a permanent noise source, therefore, generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project would be less than significant with the addition of mitigation measures to reduce noise.

b) *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

Less than Significant Impact. The applicant estimated vibration levels from a worst case construction/demolition activity of the operation of a large dozer at the MSRC Lease Area and the closest potential structure receptor, City Hall located approximately 95 feet to the south. The construction/demolition related vibration was estimated using methodology provided by the California Department of Transportation (2013), which indicates vibration (based on use of a large dozer) would generate a PPV of 0.016 inches/second, which would be barely perceptible to humans and would not cause any damage to structures. Therefore, vibration impacts would be less than significant.

c) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. The Project site is not located within two miles of an airport and is not subject to an airport land use plan. No increase in aviation-related noise would occur.

3.14 Population and Housing

- a) *Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

No Impact. The proposed Project does not involve any development of new homes, businesses, roads or other infrastructure. The Project would not induce any population growth.

- b) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. The proposed Project would not displace people or housing.

3.15 Public Services

- a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services, including: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?*

No Impact. The proposed Project involves removal of petroleum processing, storage and transportation facilities and related flammable materials, such that fire protection requirements would decrease at the site. New or altered fire protection facilities, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities are not included in the Project and would not be required to serve the site.

3.16 Recreation

- a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

Less than Significant. The proposed Project would not increase the use of any neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities. The Project would not change any access or use of Tar Pits Park of the Carpinteria Bluffs Trail. During offshore work activities the Project has the potential to impact recreational boating activities for several months due to the increase in work boat and barge use to remove the offshore pipeline sections. This use would be short term, temporary and limited to the immediate area near the pipeline routes, therefore, would not be a significant impact to offshore recreational boating activities.

- b) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

Less than Significant. The proposed Project does not involve the development or expansion of recreational facilities or generate the need for additional recreational facilities. As noted above, the Project would not change any access or use of Tar Pits Park of the Carpinteria Bluffs Trail, however, Project activities have the potential for a short term interruption in trail use. However, the interruption in trail use would be short term and temporary and therefore less than significant.

3.17 Transportation

Senate Bill 743 (2013) required the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop alternative methods of measuring transportation impacts under CEQA. At a minimum, the new methods must apply within areas that are served by transit. Once the new transportation guidelines are adopted, automobile delay (often referred to as Level of Service or LOS analysis) generally would no longer be considered to be an environmental impact under CEQA. The OPR added CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 which provided that, in most cases, vehicle miles travelled is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts.

- a) *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities*

Less than Significant: The proposed Project does not involve any permanent change or increase in traffic or change to any circulation system or transit, roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian facility. The applicant included a traffic analysis for the proposed Project as part of the application submittal package (*Traffic, Parking and VMT Analysis, Associated Transportation Engineers, June 2021*). The traffic analysis estimated peak hour traffic increases at local intersections as provided in table below.

Intersection	Peak Hour LOS	Project Added Trips	Consistent Yes/No
A.M. Peak Hour			
U.S Highway 101 NB/Bailard Ave.	LOS C	6	Yes
U.S Highway 101 SB/Bailard Ave.	LOS B	6	Yes
Carpinteria Ave./Bailard Ave.	LOS B	6	Yes
Carpinteria Ave./Casitas Pass Rd.	LOS C	7	Yes
P.M. Peak Hour			
U.S Highway 101 NB/Bailard Ave.	LOS B	6	Yes
U.S Highway 101 SB/Bailard Ave.	LOS C	6	Yes
Carpinteria Ave./Bailard Ave.	LOS B	6	Yes
Carpinteria Ave./Casitas Pass Rd.	LOS C	7	Yes

Source: Traffic, Parking and VMT Analysis for the Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facilities – City of Carpinteria, Associated Transportation Engineers, June 2021.

**Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study**

The traffic analysis also estimated the ADT, Average Daily Traffic, for the proposed Project trip generation as summarized in the table below.

Project Component	Number per Day	Shift Schedule	Trip Generation		
			ADT	AM Peak	PM Peak
Employees	15	7:00 am to 5:00 pm	26	13	13
Haul Trucks	16	9:00 am to 4:00 pm	32	0	0
Deliveries	2	9:00 am to 4:00 pm	4	0	0
Totals			62	13	13

Source: Traffic, Parking and VMT Analysis for the Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facilities – City of Carpinteria, Associated Transportation Engineers, June 2021.

The addition of six to seven additional trips to intersections operating at Level B or C would not cause a change to the level of service at the intersections noted above and therefore would be consistent with the City’s thresholds regarding LOS.

The proposed Project daily one-way trip total of 62 is also below the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory for the evaluation of transportation impacts 110 one-way trips per day threshold. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with any transportation plan, policy or ordinance.

b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

Less than Significant.

CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3(b) generally requires that a project’s transportation impacts be evaluated for CEQA purposes using vehicle miles traveled, however, as noted above projects that generate less than 110 on-way trips and is a construction, not an operational, project and therefore are not expected to cause as significant impact pursuant to CEQA guidelines.

c) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The traffic analysis prepared for the proposed Project analyzed intersection design, intersection operations, and intersection site distance. Although the traffic study did not identify any potential conflicts with haul truck use, any increase in traffic at the Carpinteria Avenue/Dump Road intersection could be significant and may require temporary traffic controls such as flaggers. The Project does not involve any incompatible uses such as farm equipment.

d) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

No Impact: The proposed Project would not alter any existing emergency access road, Carpinteria Avenue would remain open during all Project activities.

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*

i) *Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?*

Less than Significant with Mitigation. The Cultural Resources Assessment identified archaeological resources at the Project site (cultural resource CA-SBA-06). The report details the resource as disturbed to heavily disturbed dependent on the location within the Project site. Given the presence of a cultural resource and the ground disturbing activities of the proposed Project, potential for impacts to previously undisturbed resources is possible without mitigation. Standard mitigation techniques for cultural resources such as a Cultural Resources Management Plan and worker training for cultural resource awareness would reduce the potential for impacts to archaeological resources to less than significant.

ii) *A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?*

No Impact. The City has not identified any tribal cultural resources beyond that identified by other agencies.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

The State CEQA Guidelines and Checklist have been amended for Utilities and Service Systems. The previous question a) was removed and questions b), c), h), and i) were consolidated. Question d) and f) were reworded. The modifications to the checklist resulted in fewer questions. Previous environmental review has been consolidated accordingly.

a) *Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

No Impact. The proposed Project does not involve the construction of any infrastructure.

- b) ***Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?***

Less than Significant. The proposed Project water use would be limited to potable water used for dust control, soil compaction and site restoration. This water use is temporary and short term, the applicant has estimated this water use to a few thousand gallons per day. This short term and temporary water use would not be a significant impact to groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

- c) ***Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?***

No Impact. Workers employed at the Project site would use portable restrooms which would be emptied and transported to an appropriate sanitary district disposal facility by a commercial third party vendor.

- d) ***Would the project generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?***

Less than Significant. The proposed Project would generate solid waste in the form of equipment and piping, concrete, asphalt, gravel and contaminated soil. Equipment, piping and related metal materials would be recycled at an appropriate facility. Concrete, asphalt and gravel would be recycled at State Ready Mix. Non-hazardous contaminated soils would be transported to the Simi Valley Landfill. Hazardous contaminated soils would be transported to the Kettleman or McKittrick disposal sites. These facilities have adequate capacity to receive Project-related solid waste and recycle these wastes to the extent feasible. Therefore, the proposed Project would not impact the attainment of any State-mandated solid waste reduction goals by the City or Santa Barbara County.

- e) ***Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

No Impact. The proposed Project would dispose of recovered materials at solid waste disposal facilities approved and permitted by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery.

3.20 Wildfire

The State CEQA Guidelines were amended in July 2015 and the CEQA Checklist has been amended since the December 2013 Final MND was prepared to specifically include a separate section on wildfire impacts. Nonetheless, the potential for wildfires were addressed in the December 2013 Final MND under Hazards.

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

- a) *Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

No Impact. The proposed Project would not involve the closure of either public or private roadways, therefore, would not impact ingress or egress for emergency access and thus not impact an emergency response or evacuation plan.

- b) *Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*

- c) *Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

- d) *Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?*

No Impact. The proposed Project site is not located within a designated High Fire Hazard Severity Zone as designed by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. The City General Plan Seismic and Safety Element identifies the Project site as within a low fire hazard area. The beach and offshore Project site are not subject to wildfires. The Project does not involve any development of infrastructure that could increase the spread of a wildfire. The Project site does not include any steep slopes or major drainages that may cause downstream flooding, landslides, excessive run-off or post-fire slope instability in the event the Project site was affected by wildfire.

3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

- a) *Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

As addressed throughout this Initial Study, the proposed Project would have no impact, a less-than-significant impact, a less-than-significant impact with mitigation incorporated, or a potentially significant impact as indicated for each issue area. Impact areas Agriculture/Forestry, Minerals, Public Services and Wildfire were found to have no potential impact. Potential impacts to Air Quality, Energy, Noise, Recreation, Transportation/Circulation, Utilities were found to be less than significant. Cultural Resources, Geology, Greenhouse Gases, Hydrology, Land Use and Tribal Resources were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

Due to the potential for an oil spill or release of hydrocarbons from infrastructure demolition, flushing and pigging of pipelines, removal of pipelines or a release from one of the legacy onsite oil wells impacts to Biological Resources and Hazardous Materials was determined to be potentially significant. Mitigation

measures would reduce the potential for such an impact; however, the potential could still remain and the impact to the environment could be significant.

- b) ***Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)***

The proposed Project is short term with temporary demolition and construction type activities over a project schedule of approximately three years. No other large construction projects are currently scheduled in the immediate Project area nor are any oil and gas remediation projects. Upon conclusion of the proposed Project the Project site would be remediated and graded back to a natural state with no development, a net benefit for the environment and community. Therefore, the proposed Project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact.

- c) ***Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

Less than Significant. While the potential impact to the environment from a release of hydrocarbons could have significant impacts, these potential impacts would not have a direct or indirect substantial adverse effect on human beings.

References

- Associated Transportation Engineers, 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility – Traffic, Parking and VMT Analysis. June 2021.
- City of Carpinteria, 2021. Project Application for the Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility. October 2021.
- City of Carpinteria, 1994. Environmental Review Guidelines. January 1994.
- City of Carpinteria, 2003. General Plan/Local Coastal Land Use Plan & Environmental Impact Report. April 2003.
- Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix B Summary of Remedial Action Plan. October 2021.
- Padre Associates Inc., 20231. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix C1 Part 1 Marine Biological Resources Study, June 2021.
- Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix C1 Part 2 Terrestrial Biological Resources Study. June 2021.
- Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix C2 Tree Report. June 2021.
- Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix C3 Preliminary Restoration/Vegetation Plan. June 2021.
- Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix C4 Essential Fish Habitat Assessment. October 2021.
- Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix C5 Carpinteria Harbor Seal Rookery Monitoring and Protection Plan. June 2021.
- Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix C6 Coastal Wetland Delineation Report. October 2021.
- Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix E Carp O&G Plant Decommissioning Emissions Calcs. June 2021.
- Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix F Cultural Resources Assessment. October 2021.
- Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix G Bluff Retreat Evaluation Report. June 2021.

***Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning
Initial Study***

Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix H Noise Management Report. June 2021.

Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix I Description of Facilities not Included in Project Activities. October 2021.

Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Appendix J Policy Consistency Analysis. October 2021.

Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility Project Description. October 2021.

Padre Associates Inc., 2021. Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Gas and Oil Processing Facility - Volume III Initial Study. October 2021.