

---

## **Appendix D**

### Notice of Preparation and Initial Study Supporting Information

---

**Appendix D – Notice of Preparation and Initial Study Supporting Information**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page #</u></b>
Notice of Preparation.....	D-1
Initial Study .....	D-3
California Coastal Commission Comment Letter .....	D-61
California Department of Fish and Wildlife Comment Letter .....	D-62
Chevron Comment Letter .....	D-75
Julie Tumamait Stenslie Comment Letter .....	D-79
Native American Heritage Commission Comment Letter.....	D-80
Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District Comment Letter .....	D-85
The Sportfishing Conservancy Comment Letter .....	D-93
Susan Allen Comment Letter .....	D-95
Susan Mailheau Comment Letter .....	D-97
Location of Comment Discussion in Draft EIR Table.....	D-100

## NOTICE OF PREPARATION

TO: State Clearinghouse  
Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
1400 Tenth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95812

FROM: Steve Goggia  
City of Carpinteria  
5775 Carpinteria Ave.  
Carpinteria, CA 93013

**SUBJECT:** Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report

**PROJECT NAME:** Decommissioning and Remediation of the Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** 5675 and 5663 Carpinteria Avenue, Carpinteria, CA

**PROJECT CASE #:** 2128

**PROJECT APPLICANT:** Chevron

The City of Carpinteria will be the Lead Agency and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Project identified above and all interested agencies, organizations and individuals are invited by the City to comment on the scope and content of the EIR. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the 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.

The Project description, location and the potential environmental effects are contained in the attached Initial Study.

For the convenience of property owners and residents in the Project area, comments can be provided via email as detailed below. The Scoping comments should be limited to understanding the proposed Project and associated environmental concerns, including potential mitigation measures and possible alternatives to the Project. The attached Initial Study will be used as a starting point for discussion within the Draft EIR, but other environmental concerns may be raised by the public.

For current Project information, the following page has been established on the City's website:  
<https://carpinteriaca.gov/city-hall/community-development/oil-gas-information/oil-processing-facility-decommissioning/>

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be received at the earliest possible date, but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to Steve Goggia, Community Development Director, at the address shown above or email to the email address below.



Date: August 1, 2022

Planner: Steve Goggia, [steveg@carpinteriaca.gov](mailto:steveg@carpinteriaca.gov)

Department: Community Development

Telephone: (805) 755-4414

cc: Clerk of the Board (please post for 30 days)

Encl: Initial Study

**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.

<b>Project Activity Location</b>	<b>Approximate Date Range</b>
Project Initiation	October 2022
<b>Onshore</b>	
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
<b>Offshore</b>	
Former Marketing Terminal/Marine Terminal Offloading Bundle	August 2024 – November 2024
Gail and Grace Pipeline Bundle	September 2024 – December 2024
<b>Grading and Revegetation</b>	
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
<b>Local</b>				
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
<b>State</b>				

D-13

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

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Regulated Activity</b>	<b>Project Components</b>	<b>Authority</b>	<b>Permit Approval</b>
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

D-14



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

Agency	Regulated Activity	Project Components	Authority	Permit Approval
<b>Federal</b>				
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
<b>I. AESTHETICS.</b> 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"/>
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</b> 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"/>
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> 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"/>
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> 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"/>
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b> 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"/>
<b>VI. ENERGY.</b> 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"/>
<b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> 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"/>
<b>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:</b>				
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
<b>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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"/>
<b>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b> 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"/>
<b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</b>				
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"/>
<b>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>				
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
<b>XIII. NOISE.</b> 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"/>
<b>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b> 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"/>
<b>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b> 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
<b>XVI. RECREATION.</b>				
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"/>
<b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:</b>				
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"/>
<b>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b>				
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"/>
<b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</b>				

**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"/>
<b>XX. WILDFIRE.</b> 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"/>
<b>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
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.

<b>Emissions Scenario</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>ROC</b>	<b>PM<sub>10</sub></b>
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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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., 2023. 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.

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

455 MARKET STREET, SUITE 300  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
FAX (415) 904-5400  
TDD (415) 597-5885



August 15, 2022

Steve Goggia  
Director  
Community Development  
City of Carpinteria  
5775 Carpinteria Avenue  
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Re: Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning Initial Study (IS)

Dear Mr. Goggia:

Commission staff appreciates the opportunity to review and provide comment on the draft IS for the Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility decommissioning, posted on August 1 and available for comment through September 1. The proposed project would include demolition and removal of surface and subsurface facilities and subsequent remediation of impacted soils, occupying 64.28 acres of land. A coastal development permit (CDP) would be required from the City of Carpinteria (City) for those portions of the project located onshore and within the City's local coastal program jurisdiction while a separate CDP would be required from the California Coastal Commission (Commission) for project components located offshore below the Mean High Tide Line (MHTL). Because a portion of the project is within the Commission's retained jurisdiction the project could also be processed as a consolidated CDP should the applicant, the City and the Commission all consent to consolidation.

As stated in Section 3.0 of the draft IS the determination is that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, and an environmental impact report (EIR) is required. Commission staff support the City's determination that an EIR is required and we look forward to coordinating with the City on the development of the EIR and the CDP process.

Please contact Wesley Horn at [Wesley.Horn@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:Wesley.Horn@coastal.ca.gov) if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. Horn'.

Wesley Horn  
Environmental Scientist



State of California – Natural Resources Agency  
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE  
South Coast Region  
3883 Ruffin Road  
San Diego, CA 92123  
(858) 467-4201  
[www.wildlife.ca.gov](http://www.wildlife.ca.gov)

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor  
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



August 30, 2022

Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
5775 Carpinteria Avenue  
Carpinteria, CA 93013  
[SteveG@carpinteriaca.gov](mailto:SteveG@carpinteriaca.gov)

**Subject: Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Decommissioning and Remediation of the Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility Project #2128, SCH #2022080026, Santa Barbara County**

Dear Steve Goggia:

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Decommissioning and Remediation of the Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility Project #2128 (Project). The City of Carpinteria (City) is the lead agency preparing a DEIR pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Pub. Resources Code, § 15082 et. seq.) with the purpose of informing decision-makers and the public regarding potential environmental effects related to the Project.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and recommendations regarding those activities involved in the Project that may affect California fish and wildlife. Likewise, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding those aspects of the Project that CDFW, by law, may be required to carry out or approve through the exercise of its own regulatory authority under the Fish and Game Code.

### **CDFW's Role**

CDFW is California's Trustee Agency for fish and wildlife resources and holds those resources in trust by statute for all the people of the State [Fish & Game Code, §§ 711.7, subdivision (a) & 1802; Public Resources Code, § 21070; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, § 15386, subdivision (a)]. CDFW, in its trustee capacity, has jurisdiction over the conservation, protection, and management of fish, wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary for biologically sustainable populations of those species (Id., § 1802). Similarly, for purposes of CEQA, CDFW is charged by law to provide, as available, biological expertise during public agency environmental review efforts, focusing specifically on projects and related activities that have the potential to adversely affect state fish and wildlife resources.

CDFW is also submitting comments as a Responsible Agency under CEQA (Public Resources Code, § 21069; CEQA Guidelines, § 15381). CDFW expects that it may need to exercise regulatory authority as provided by the Fish and Game Code, including lake and streambed alteration regulatory authority (Fish & Game Code, § 1600 et seq.). Likewise, to the extent



Steve Goggia  
 Community Development Director  
 City of Carpinteria  
 August 30, 2022  
 Page 2 of 13

implementation of the Project as proposed may result in “take” (see Fish & Game Code, § 2050) of any species protected under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA; Fish & Game Code, § 2050 *et seq.*) or the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA; Fish & Game Code, § 1900 *et seq.*), CDFW recommends the Project proponent obtain appropriate authorization under the Fish and Game Code.

**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 from west to east, and by the Union Pacific Railroad from north to south. The eastern portion of the Project site remains mainly developed by oil and gas processing equipment. The western portion of the site is primarily open space. The southern third of the site is open space along the bluffs with two large parking areas available for the Casitas Pier operations.

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.

**Project Description/Objectives:** 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 to accommodate the site's potential future redevelopment. Remediation is targeted to the most stringent clean up levels as determined by the Santa Barbara County Public Health Department, Environmental Health Services Department, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, while preserving existing site resources, including mature trees and bluffs, and buffer zones adjacent to the railroad right-of-way. Tier 1 Environmental Screening Levels for residential uses are being used as the standard for on-site soil remediation, consistent with Chevron's clean up objectives. Project objectives include:

#### **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.

Based on the proposed Project application package, the Project is expected to require 670 days over a three-year period.

Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
August 30, 2022  
Page 3 of 13

## COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CDFW offers the following comments and recommendations to assist the City in adequately identifying and/or mitigating the Project's significant, or potentially significant, direct and indirect impacts on fish and wildlife (biological) resources.

### Marine Comments

#### Sensitive Marine Habitats

According to the Project's Marine Biological Resources Report (Report), the following sensitive marine habitats occur or may occur in the Project area: rocky reefs, kelp forest, eelgrass (*Zostera* spp.) beds, and surf grass (*Phyllospadix* spp.) beds. These habitats have been designated as habitat areas of particular concern (HAPC) within the Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery Management Plan under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. HAPC, a subset of Essential Fish Habitat, are habitats of special importance to fish populations due to their rarity, vulnerability to development and anthropogenic degradation, and/or ability to provide key ecological functions. Eelgrass is further protected under state and federal "no-net-loss" policies for wetland habitats. Additionally, the importance of eelgrass protection and restoration as well as the ecological benefits of eelgrass are identified in the California Public Resources Code, section 35630.

In-water Project activities may impact sensitive marine habitats. Kelp or surf grass attached to the pipelines would be directly affected by pipeline removal. Similarly, in sections where the pipelines are buried, eelgrass growing in those sediments would likely be uprooted as the pipelines are excavated. The resuspension and distribution of sediments by underwater excavation methods such as jetting may also impact sensitive marine habitats via direct burial/smothering, increased turbidity, and/or decreased light availability.

CDFW agrees with the Report that further study is needed to determine whether eelgrass is present near the Project area. CDFW recommends conducting eelgrass surveys in accordance with the California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy (NMFS 2014) and in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service. Further study is also needed to determine if kelp, eelgrass, or surf grass are growing on or above the pipelines. The DEIR should document these findings as well as all sensitive marine habitats within the Project area. Project activities should avoid sensitive marine habitats to the greatest extent possible. If these habitats cannot be avoided, the DEIR should include appropriate mitigation measures.

#### Sensitive Marine Species Surveys and Monitoring

CDFW agrees with the Report that California grunion (*Leuresthes tenuis*) may occur seasonally within the Project area. California grunion are endemic to California and Baja California and support a culturally important recreational fishery. Grunion are known to regularly spawn on several nearby beaches during the spawning season (March–August). Project activities occurring below the highest tide line (e.g., sand moving, use of heavy equipment) during this timeframe may disturb or bury incubating grunion eggs and larvae. In-water activities in the surf zone/nearshore that generate high underwater sound levels or turbidity may also deter grunion from spawning.

Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
August 30, 2022  
Page 4 of 13

Project activities on the beach (below the highest tide line) and in the surf zone during March–August should be avoided to the greatest extent feasible. If work during this time cannot be avoided, the DEIR should provide measures to mitigate for the Project’s potential impacts on California grunion. CDFW recommends that a qualified biological observer monitor the work site prior to the start of activities in the intertidal zone during the previous forecast grunion run period (3–4 nights in a row). If grunion is observed at the work site, the Project should suspend activities below the highest tide line for at least two weeks to allow grunion eggs to incubate and hatch out. The expected run schedule and further information about grunion can be found on CDFW’s website: <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Fishing/Ocean/Grunion>.

The Report also identifies black abalone (*Haliotis cracherodii*) and white abalone (*Haliotis sorenseni*) as special-status species that may occur in the Project area. There is some probability that abalone could be found on the pipelines themselves in unburied sections. For this reason, CDFW recommends conducting abalone surveys on the unburied sections of pipeline prior to removal under consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service. The DEIR should consider the potential impacts to abalone that may be found on the pipelines and include appropriate mitigation measures.

### **Underwater Noise**

Some Project activities, such as jack hammering and cutting of the pipelines, may generate underwater noise (e.g., high underwater sound levels) that is harmful to marine mammals and/or fish. For assessing impacts of underwater noise on fish, CDFW relies on guidance from the Fisheries Hydroacoustic Working Group to set safe sound pressure level (SPL) criteria (FHWG 2008). The criteria include a peak SPL of 206 decibels and a cumulative sound exposure (SEL) level of 187 decibels for fish two grams and heavier or a cumulative SEL of 183 decibels for fish lighter than two grams. While these criteria were developed for pile driving, they are applicable to any noise-producing underwater activity.

The DEIR should discuss potential impacts to marine mammals and fish from underwater noise-producing activities and include an analysis of anticipated underwater sound levels for these activities. If activities will generate high underwater sound levels, CDFW recommends using a “soft-start” technique for these activities so that any marine mammals or fish present may vacate the area before injury occurs. CDFW appreciates AMM 3 (Marine Wildlife Contingency Plan Implementation), which includes the presence of a Marine Wildlife Monitor during Project activities offshore and on the beach and looks forward to reviewing this document once it is available. CDFW recommends that the Marine Wildlife Contingency Plan include exclusion zones for marine mammals, which should be developed in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service and CDFW.

### **Oil Spill Response**

CDFW appreciates the inclusion of AMM 6 (Oil Spill Response and Contingency Plan Implementation) and recommends coordinating closely with CDFW’s Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) while developing this plan.

Steve Goggia  
 Community Development Director  
 City of Carpinteria  
 August 30, 2022  
 Page 5 of 13

## Marine Life on Pipelines

CDFW expects that a variety of marine life is currently growing on or attached to the pipelines proposed for removal. These organisms may include, but are not limited to, mussels, barnacles, hydroids, surf grass, kelp, and other marine algae. The DEIR should explain in detail what the Project plans to do with the marine life attached to the pipelines; for instance, if organisms will be removed, how and where they will be removed, etc. Special consideration should be given to special-status species, such as black abalone, and what mitigation measures may be required. CDFW recommends that the Project proponent consult with CDFW on what authorizations may be required for the removal of species attached to the pipelines.

## Terrestrial Comments

CDFW uses natural communities, as found in the online version of the Manual of California Vegetation (2022), to track vegetation communities of California as well as their rarity. Many of the alliances listed in the NOP were not able to be verified in either the current Manual of California Vegetation 2022 (online version) or the CDFW list of natural community alliances and associations list (links provided below). CDFW is unable to verify the rarity ranking or determine if these natural communities (alliances/association) are Sensitive Natural Communities without the proper nomenclature. Alliances and associations are continuously updated; as such, the book version published in 2009 should no longer be solely relied on as accurate.

Section 3.4 (b) of the NOP lists several alliances without any ranking, and some alliances whose names CDFW could not verify as currently existing alliances/associations. Of the alliances listed in the NOP, CDFW has designated the following Manual of California Vegetation (2022 version; MCV) alliances and associations as Sensitive Natural Communities.

Alliance Listed in NOP	Ranking	Issue
Platanus racemosa – Quercus agrifolia Alliance	S3	This alliance is considered rare by CDFW. The NOP should include this ranking information.
Artemisia californica shrubland alliance/California sagebrush scrub	Not a recognized alliance	This appears to be an older alliance name that is no longer used. The NOP should use current nomenclature for natural communities to allow CDFW to assess the rarity ranking of the habitat.
Atriplex lentiformis alliance	S4 - CEQA locally rare	CDFW considers this alliance locally rare in Carpinteria and coastal Santa Barbara County due to high levels of loss.
Baccharis pilularis alliance	S5 - CEQA locally rare	CDFW considers this alliance locally rare in Carpinteria and coastal Santa Barbara County due to high levels of loss.
Isocoma menziesii alliance	S3	This alliance is considered rare by CDFW. The NOP should include this ranking information.

Steve Goggia  
 Community Development Director  
 City of Carpinteria  
 August 30, 2022  
 Page 6 of 13

"Heteromeles arbutifolia shrubland alliance" and "toyon chaparral"	Not a recognized alliance	The NOP should update to currently recognized nomenclature. The Heteromeles arbutifolia (Provisional Association 37.912.01) might be a good fit, and this alliance has been given a rare rank and should be considered a sensitive natural community. CDFW is not clear if this was the association found onsite as the naming is unclear.
Rhus integrifolia Shrubland Alliance	S3	This alliance is considered rare by CDFW. The NOP should include this ranking information.
"Sambucus nigra alliance"	Not a recognized alliance	The NOP should update to currently recognized nomenclature. The Sambucus nigra association (63.410.01) might be a good fit, and this alliance is listed as rare. CDFW is not clear if this was the association found onsite as the naming is unclear.

CDFW recommends re-assessing the natural communities on-site using current MCV online (2022) nomenclature. CDFW recommends avoiding all sensitive natural communities. The complete list of alliances/associations can be found here

<https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/VegCAMP/Natural-Communities#sensitive%20natural%20communities> or here: <https://vegetation.cnps.org/search?>

### General Comments

- 1) California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Project-related activities may adversely impact potential habitat for this species. CDFW considers adverse impacts to a species protected by CESA to be significant without mitigation under CEQA. As to CESA, take of any endangered, threatened, candidate species, or State-listed rare plant species that results from the Project is prohibited, except as authorized by State law (Fish and Game Code, §§ 2080, 2085; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §786.9). Consequently, if the Project, Project construction, or any Project-related activity during the life of the Project will result in take of a species designated as endangered or threatened, or a candidate for listing under CESA, CDFW recommends that the Project proponent seek appropriate take authorization under CESA prior to implementing the Project. Appropriate authorization from CDFW may include an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) or a consistency determination in certain circumstances, among other options [Fish & Game Code, §§ 2080.1, 2081, subds. (b) and (c)]. Early consultation is encouraged, as significant modification to a Project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain a CESA Permit. Revisions to the Fish and Game Code, effective January 1998, may require that CDFW issue a separate CEQA document for the issuance of an ITP unless the Project CEQA document addresses all Project impacts to CESA-listed species and specifies a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that will meet the requirements of an ITP. For these reasons, biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposals should be of sufficient detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA ITP.

Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
August 30, 2022  
Page 7 of 13

- 2) Fully Protected Species. CDFW cannot authorize the take of any fully protected species as defined by State law. State fully protected species may not be taken or possessed at any time and no licenses or permits may be issued for its take except for collecting those species for necessary scientific research and relocation of the bird species for protection of livestock (Fish & G. Code, §§ 3511, 4700, 5050, 5515). Take of any species designated as fully protected under the Fish and Game Code is prohibited.
  
- 3) Project Description and Alternatives. To enable CDFW to adequately review and comment on the proposed Project from the standpoint of the protection of plants, fish, and wildlife, we recommend the following information be included in the DEIR:
  - a) A complete discussion of the purpose and need for, and description of, the proposed Project, including all staging areas and access routes to the construction and staging areas; and,
  
  - b) A range of feasible alternatives to Project component location and design features to ensure that alternatives to the proposed Project are fully considered and evaluated. The alternatives should avoid or otherwise minimize direct and indirect impacts to sensitive biological resources and wildlife movement areas.
  
- 4) Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreements. As a Responsible Agency under CEQA, CDFW has authority over activities in streams and/or lakes that will divert or obstruct the natural flow; or change the bed, channel, or bank (including vegetation associated with the stream or lake) of a river or stream; or use material from a streambed. For any such activities, the project applicant (or "entity") must provide written notification to CDFW pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* of the Fish and Game Code. Based on this notification and other information, CDFW determines whether a LSA Agreement with the applicant is required prior to conducting the proposed activities. CDFW's issuance of an LSA Agreement for a project that is subject to CEQA will require related environmental compliance actions by CDFW as a Responsible Agency. As a Responsible Agency, CDFW may consider the CEQA document prepared by the local jurisdiction (Lead Agency) for the Project. To minimize additional requirements by CDFW pursuant to section 1600 *et seq.* and/or under CEQA, the DEIR should fully identify the potential impacts to the stream or riparian resources and provide adequate avoidance, mitigation, monitoring and reporting commitments for issuance of the LSA Agreement<sup>1</sup>.
  - a) The Project area supports aquatic, riparian, and wetland habitats; therefore, a preliminary jurisdictional delineation of the streams and their associated riparian habitats should be included in the DEIR. The delineation should be conducted pursuant to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) wetland definition adopted by the CDFW (Cowardian, 1970). Some wetland and riparian habitats subject to CDFW's authority may extend beyond the jurisdictional limits of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' section 404 permit and Regional Water Quality Control Board section 401 Certification.
  
  - b) In areas of the Project site which may support ephemeral streams, herbaceous vegetation, woody vegetation, and woodlands also serve to protect the integrity of

---

<sup>1</sup> A notification package for a LSA may be obtained by accessing the CDFW's web site at [www.wildlife.ca.gov/habcon/1600](http://www.wildlife.ca.gov/habcon/1600).

Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
August 30, 2022  
Page 8 of 13

ephemeral channels and help maintain natural sedimentation processes; therefore, CDFW recommends effective setbacks be established to maintain appropriately-sized vegetated buffer areas adjoining ephemeral drainages.

- c) Project-related changes in drainage patterns, runoff, and sedimentation should be included and evaluated in the DEIR.
- 5) Wetlands Resources. CDFW, as described in Fish and Game Code section 703(a), is guided by the Fish and Game Commission's policies. The Wetlands Resources policy (<http://www.fgc.ca.gov/policy/>) of the Fish and Game Commission "...seek[s] to provide for the protection, preservation, restoration, enhancement and expansion of wetland habitat in California. Further, it is the policy of the Fish and Game Commission to strongly discourage development in or conversion of wetlands. It opposes, consistent with its legal authority, any development or conversion that would result in a reduction of wetland acreage or wetland habitat values. To that end, the Commission opposes wetland development proposals unless, at a minimum, project mitigation assures there will be 'no net loss' of either wetland habitat values or acreage. The Commission strongly prefers mitigation which would achieve expansion of wetland acreage and enhancement of wetland habitat values."
- a) The Wetlands Resources policy provides a framework for maintaining wetland resources and establishes mitigation guidance. CDFW encourages avoidance of wetland resources as a primary mitigation measure and discourages the development or type conversion of wetlands to uplands. CDFW encourages activities that would avoid the reduction of wetland acreage, function, or habitat values. Once avoidance and minimization measures have been exhausted, the Project must include mitigation measures to assure a "no net loss" of either wetland habitat values, or acreage, for unavoidable impacts to wetland resources. Conversions include, but are not limited to, conversion to subsurface drains, placement of fill or building of structures within the wetland, and channelization or removal of materials from the streambed. All wetlands and watercourses, whether ephemeral, intermittent, or perennial, should be retained and provided with substantial setbacks, which preserve the riparian and aquatic values and functions for the benefit to on-site and off-site wildlife populations. CDFW recommends mitigation measures to compensate for unavoidable impacts be included in the DEIR and these measures should compensate for the loss of function and value.
- b) The Fish and Game Commission's Water policy guides CDFW on the quantity and quality of the waters of this state that should be apportioned and maintained respectively so as to produce and sustain maximum numbers of fish and wildlife; to provide maximum protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife and their habitat; encourage and support programs to maintain or restore a high quality of the waters of this state; prevent the degradation thereof caused by pollution and contamination; and, endeavor to keep as much water as possible open and accessible to the public for the use and enjoyment of fish and wildlife. CDFW recommends avoidance of water practices and structures that use excessive amounts of water, and minimization of impacts that negatively affect water quality, to the extent feasible (Fish & Game Code, § 5650).
- 6) Biological Baseline Assessment. To provide a complete assessment of the flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with particular emphasis upon identifying

Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
August 30, 2022  
Page 9 of 13

endangered, threatened, sensitive, regionally and locally unique species, and sensitive habitats, the DEIR should include the following information:

- a) Information on the regional setting that is critical to an assessment of environmental impacts, with special emphasis on resources that are rare or unique to the region [CEQA Guidelines, § 15125(c)];
- b) A thorough, recent, floristic-based assessment of special status plants and natural communities, following CDFW's *Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Natural Communities* (see <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=18959&inline>). Anyone who collects scientific plant specimens of state-listed species, or who may encounter a state-listed species that needs to be identified during field surveys should have a plant voucher collection permit (see <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=44384&inline>);
- c) Floristic, alliance- and/or association-based mapping and vegetation impact assessments conducted at the Project site and within the neighboring vicinity. *The Manual of California Vegetation* online edition should also be used to inform this mapping and assessment (<https://vegetation.cnps.org/search?>). Adjoining habitat areas should be included in this assessment where site activities could lead to direct or indirect impacts offsite. Habitat mapping at the alliance level will help establish baseline vegetation conditions;
- d) A complete, recent, assessment of the biological resources associated with each habitat type on site and within adjacent areas that could also be affected by the project. CDFW's California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB) in Sacramento should be contacted to obtain current information on any previously reported sensitive species and habitat. CDFW recommends that CNDDDB Field Survey Forms be completed and submitted to CNDDDB to document survey results. Online forms can be obtained and submitted at [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/submitting\\_data\\_to\\_cnddb.asp](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/submitting_data_to_cnddb.asp);
- e) A complete, recent, assessment of rare, threatened, and endangered, and other sensitive species on site and within the area of potential effect, including California SSC and California Fully Protected Species (Fish & Game Code, §§ 3511, 4700, 5050 and 5515). Species to be addressed should include all those which meet the CEQA definition of endangered, rare or threatened species (CEQA Guidelines, § 15380). Seasonal variations in use of the project area should also be addressed. Focused species-specific surveys, conducted at the appropriate time of year and time of day when the sensitive species are active or otherwise identifiable, are required. Acceptable species-specific survey procedures should be developed in consultation with CDFW and the USFWS; and,
- f) A recent, wildlife and rare plant survey. CDFW generally considers biological field assessments for wildlife to be valid for a one-year period, and assessments for rare plants may be considered valid for a period of two years, in non-drought conditions. Some aspects of the proposed project may warrant periodic updated surveys for certain sensitive taxa, particularly if build out could occur over a protracted time frame, or in phases.



Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
August 30, 2022  
Page 10 of 13

- 7) Biological Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts. To provide a thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific measures to offset such impacts, the following should be addressed in the DEIR:
- a) A discussion of potential adverse impacts from lighting, noise, human activity, exotic species, and drainage. The latter subject should address Project-related changes on drainage patterns and downstream of the project site; the volume, velocity, and frequency of existing and post-Project surface flows; polluted runoff; soil erosion and/or sedimentation in streams and water bodies; and, post-Project fate of runoff from the project site. The discussion should also address the proximity of the extraction activities to the water table, whether dewatering would be necessary and the potential resulting impacts on the habitat (if any) supported by the groundwater. Mitigation measures proposed to alleviate such Project impacts should be included;
  - b) A discussion regarding indirect Project impacts on biological resources, including resources in nearby public lands, open space, adjacent natural habitats, riparian ecosystems, and any designated and/or proposed or existing reserve lands (e.g., preserve lands associated with a Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP, Fish & Game Code, § 2800 et. seq.). Impacts on, and maintenance of, wildlife corridor/movement areas, including access to undisturbed habitats in adjacent areas, should be fully evaluated in the DEIR;
  - c) An analysis of impacts from land use designations and zoning located nearby or adjacent to natural areas that may inadvertently contribute to wildlife-human interactions. A discussion of possible conflicts and mitigation measures to reduce these conflicts should be included in the DEIR; and,
  - d) A cumulative effects analysis, as described under CEQA Guidelines section 15130. General and specific plans, as well as past, present, and anticipated future projects, should be analyzed relative to their impacts on similar plant communities and wildlife habitats.
- 8) Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation for Sensitive Plants. The DEIR should include measures to fully avoid and otherwise protect sensitive plant communities from Project-related direct and indirect impacts. CDFW considers these communities to be imperiled habitats having both local and regional significance. Plant communities, alliances, and associations with a statewide ranking of S-1, S-2, S-3 and S-4 should be considered sensitive and declining at the local and regional level. These ranks can be obtained by querying the CNDDDB and are included in MCV.
- 9) Compensatory Mitigation. The DEIR should include mitigation measures for adverse Project-related impacts to sensitive plants, animals, and habitats. Mitigation measures should emphasize avoidance and reduction of Project impacts. For unavoidable impacts, on-site habitat restoration or enhancement should be discussed in detail. If on-site mitigation is not feasible or would not be biologically viable and therefore not adequately mitigate the loss of biological functions and values, off-site mitigation through habitat creation and/or acquisition and preservation in perpetuity should be addressed. Areas proposed as mitigation lands should be protected in perpetuity with a conservation easement, financial assurance and

Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
August 30, 2022  
Page 11 of 13

dedicated to a qualified entity for long-term management and monitoring. Under Government Code section 65967, the lead agency must exercise due diligence in reviewing the qualifications of a governmental entity, special district, or nonprofit organization to effectively manage and steward land, water, or natural resources on mitigation lands it approves.

- 10) Long-Term Management of Mitigation Lands. For proposed preservation and/or restoration, the DEIR should include measures to protect the targeted habitat values from direct and indirect negative impacts in perpetuity. The objective should be to offset the Project-induced qualitative and quantitative losses of wildlife habitat values. Issues that should be addressed include (but are not limited to) restrictions on access, proposed land dedications, monitoring and management programs, control of illegal dumping, water pollution, and increased human intrusion. An appropriate non-wasting endowment should be set aside to provide for long-term management of mitigation lands.
- 11) Nesting Birds. CDFW recommends that measures be taken to avoid Project impacts to nesting birds. Migratory nongame native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (Title 50, § 10.13, Code of Federal Regulations). Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests including raptors and other migratory nongame birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA). Proposed Project activities including (but not limited to) staging and disturbances to native and nonnative vegetation, structures, and substrates should occur outside of the avian breeding season which generally runs from February 1 through September 1 (as early as January 1 for some raptors) to avoid take of birds or their eggs. If avoidance of the avian breeding season is not feasible, CDFW recommends surveys by a qualified biologist with experience in conducting breeding bird surveys to detect protected native birds occurring in suitable nesting habitat that is to be disturbed and (as access to adjacent areas allows) any other such habitat within 300-feet of the disturbance area (within 500-feet for raptors). Project personnel, including all contractors working on site, should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. Reductions in the nest buffer distance may be appropriate depending on the avian species involved, ambient levels of human activity, screening vegetation, or possibly other factors.
- 12) Translocation/Salvage of Plants and Animal Species. Translocation and transplantation is the process of moving an individual from the Project site and permanently moving it to a new location. CDFW generally does not support the use of translocation or transplantation as the primary mitigation strategy for unavoidable impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species. Studies have shown that these efforts are experimental and the outcome unreliable. CDFW has found that permanent preservation and management of habitat capable of supporting these species is often a more effective long-term strategy for conserving sensitive plants and animals and their habitats.
- 13) Moving out of Harm's Way. The proposed Project is anticipated to result in clearing of natural habitats that support many species of indigenous wildlife. To avoid direct mortality, we recommend that a qualified biological monitor approved by CDFW be on-site prior to and during ground and habitat disturbing activities to move out of harm's way special status species or other wildlife of low mobility that would be injured or killed by grubbing or Project-related construction activities. It should be noted that the temporary relocation of on-site wildlife does not constitute effective mitigation for the purposes of offsetting project impacts

Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
August 30, 2022  
Page 12 of 13

associated with habitat loss. If the project requires species to be removed, disturbed, or otherwise handled, we recommend that the DEIR clearly identify that the designated entity shall obtain all appropriate state and federal permits.

14) Revegetation/Restoration Plan. Plans for restoration and re-vegetation should be prepared by persons with expertise in southern California ecosystems and native plant restoration techniques. Plans should identify the assumptions used to develop the proposed restoration strategy. Each plan should include, at a minimum: (a) the location of restoration sites and assessment of appropriate reference sites; (b) the plant species to be used, sources of local propagules, container sizes, and seeding rates; (c) a schematic depicting the mitigation area; (d) a local seed and cuttings and planting schedule; (e) a description of the irrigation methodology; (f) measures to control non-native vegetation on site; (g) specific, measurable success criteria; (h) a detailed qualitative monitoring program; (i) contingency measures should the success criteria not be met; and (j) identification of the party responsible for meeting the success criteria and providing for conservation of the mitigation site in perpetuity. Monitoring of restoration areas should extend across a sufficient time frame to ensure that the new habitat is established, self-sustaining, and capable of surviving drought. Monitoring should demonstrate a positive trend for native species cover, diversity, and abundance, and a negative trend for non-native species cover with no further manipulation of the site occurring during this period. If manipulation of the site is still occurring (replacing dead plants, irrigation, weeding) then this is still considered the installation period and should not be used as monitoring data to determine success. The monitoring period should start after the installation period has been completed and the site is not being actively manipulated, as manipulation of the site skews any data collection toward prematurely meeting success criteria that might not have been met had the site been left alone.


- a) CDFW recommends that local on-site propagules from the Project area and nearby vicinity be collected and used for restoration purposes. On-site seed collection should be initiated in the near future to accumulate sufficient propagule material for subsequent use in future years. On-site vegetation mapping at the alliance and/or association level should be used to develop appropriate restoration goals and local plant palettes. Reference areas should be identified to help guide restoration efforts. Specific restoration plans should be developed for various Project components as appropriate.
- b) Restoration objectives should include providing special habitat elements where feasible to benefit key wildlife species. These physical and biological features can include (for example) retention of woody material, logs, snags, rocks and brush piles (see Mayer and Laudenslayer, 1988).

## CONCLUSION

CDFW appreciates the opportunity to comment on the NOP to assist the City in identifying and mitigating Project impacts on biological resources. If you have any questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Kelly Schmoker, Senior Environmental Scientist, at (626) 848-8382 or by email at [Kelly.Schmoker@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:Kelly.Schmoker@wildlife.ca.gov).

Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
August 30, 2022  
Page 13 of 13

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:  
  
B6E58CFE24724F5...

Erinn Wilson-Olgin  
Environmental Program Manager I  
South Coast Region

cc: CDFW

Steve Gibson, Los Alamitos – [Steve.Gibson@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:Steve.Gibson@wildlife.ca.gov)  
Sarah Rains, Los Alamitos – [Sarah.Rains@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:Sarah.Rains@wildlife.ca.gov)  
Amanda Canepa, Marine Region – [Amanda.Canepa@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:Amanda.Canepa@wildlife.ca.gov)  
Eric Wilkins, Marine Region – [Eric.Wilkins@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:Eric.Wilkins@wildlife.ca.gov)  
Cindy Hailey, San Diego – [Cindy.Hailey@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:Cindy.Hailey@wildlife.ca.gov)  
CEQA Program Coordinator, Sacramento – [CEQACommentLetters@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:CEQACommentLetters@wildlife.ca.gov)  
Office of Planning and Research  
State Clearinghouse, Sacramento – [State.Clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov](mailto:State.Clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov)

## References

[FHWG] Fisheries Hydroacoustic Working Group. 2008. Interim Criteria for Injury of Fish Exposed to Pile Driving Operations: Memorandum. Washington: Federal Highway Administration. Available from: <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/ser/bio-fhwg-criteria-agree-a11y.pdf>.

[NMFS] National Marine Fisheries Service. 2014. California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy and Implementing Guidelines. NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region (October 2014). Available from: [https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/cemp\\_oct\\_2014\\_final.pdf](https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/cemp_oct_2014_final.pdf)

[NMFS] National Marine Fisheries Service. 2014. California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy and Implementing Guidelines. NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region (October 2014). Available from: [https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/cemp\\_oct\\_2014\\_final.pdf](https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/cemp_oct_2014_final.pdf).

Sawyer, J. O., Keeler-Wolf, T., and Evens J.M. 2022. A manual of California Vegetation online version, accessed at <https://vegetation.cnps.org/>



**Rebecca Trujillo**  
Regulatory Affairs Manager  
West Coast Decommissioning Program

September 27, 2022

Mr. Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
5775 Carpinteria Ave  
Carpinteria, CA 93013

**RE: Chevron U.S.A. Inc. Comment to Notice of Preparation for the Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facilities  
Project No. 21-2128-DP/CDP  
5675 and 5663 Carpinteria Avenue (APNs 101-170-003, -004, -014, -021, -022, and -023)**

Dear Mr. Goggia:

Thank you again for your consideration of our application. Chevron appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the City's Initial Study and Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report sent to the State Clearinghouse in the Governor's Office of Planning and Research posted on August 1, 2022.

Chevron has reviewed the City's Initial Study prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and supports the City's recommendation to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to support further CEQA review. Chevron requests that the City consider the following points and clarifications regarding the scope and content of the EIR for the Decommissioning and Remediation of the Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facilities, Project No. 21-2128-DP/CDP (Project):

• **Project Acreage**

- The Chevron property encompasses the APNs referenced above, including APNs 101-170-003, -004, -014, -021, -022, and -023. The Operational Project Areas within the site, however, are limited to the ~55 acres within APNs 101-170-004, -014, -021, -022, and -023.
- The City's Initial Study identifies APN 101-170-003 as part of the Project Site, increasing the Project Site to ~64.28 acres.<sup>1</sup> To be clear, APN 101-170-003 is not part of the Project Site and will not be affected by Project activities.
- Chevron requests that the EIR clarify that the Project Site, in which Project activities will take place, consists only of the Operational Project Areas within Chevron's property (~55 acres within APNs 101-170-004, -014, -021, -022, and -023).

• **Referenced Soil Remediation Targets**

- As specified in Chevron's October 2021 project application, the goal is to remediate the Project Site to an unrestricted, residential level that would allow for a broad range of future reuse opportunities. The specific remediation targets necessary to allow for future redevelopment on the Project Site will be established via consultation with the appropriate regulatory agencies.
  - Chevron's project application explains that: "The unrestricted land use cleanup goals (Soil Cleanup Goals) are conservative and used to develop an anticipated upper threshold for Project specific characteristics of expected soil volume and ancillary factors for traffic/truck

---

<sup>1</sup> 2.3 Environmental Setting, p. 8<sup>2</sup> Project Description, p. 6-6

trips and potential air emission impacts. Actual cleanup levels will be developed in consultation with the appropriate regulatory agency and will/may/could differ from those presented here.”<sup>2</sup>

- The City’s Initial Study categorizes Chevron’s objective as achieving Tier 1 Environmental Screening Levels to meet the “most stringent” clean up objectives.<sup>3</sup> The phrase “most stringent” is undefined.
- Chevron requests that the EIR clarify that Chevron’s actual intended objective is to achieve an unrestricted, residential target. The project application states that the Tier 1 ESLs used to analyze project impacts are based on residential use and that other levels used in the analysis were also based on future residential use. To be clear, the EIR should state that the analysis of the reasonably foreseeable scope of environmental impacts is based on remediation activity assumptions (e.g., truck trips, soil excavation and other site activities) that are specifically necessary to achieve an unrestricted, residential target.<sup>4</sup>

- **Referenced Project Execution Schedule**

- The schedule included with our application in October 2021 reflected an execution schedule we believed to be achievable in 2022.<sup>5</sup> Given that we are approaching one year since the submission of our application and we are supportive of the City’s recommendation to prepare and EIR for our Project, the execution schedule will need to be amended. Once the City establishes its updated CEQA schedule, Chevron will incorporate that information into its current schedule and deliver an updated proposed execution schedule to the City. To the extent the City’s schedule is further revised, Chevron anticipates additional revisions to its proposed execution schedule.

- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

- The Initial Study states that “worst case annual average GHG emissions for the Project are less than 20% of the SBCAPCD threshold of 10,000 metric tons per year CO<sub>2</sub> 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).”<sup>6</sup>
- As the relevant air quality agency in the project area, the SBCAPCD threshold is more applicable to the Project. In addition, the Santa Barbara County threshold is designed to address industrial stationary sources, specifically oil and gas production and surface mining projects, and not short-term remediation or decommissioning activities such as those contemplated by the Project.
- Chevron requests that the City adopt the SBCAPD threshold.

- **Significant Impact decisions for Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

- While Chevron supports the enhanced level of environmental review via the EIR, Chevron has concerns about the rationale used to characterize some impacts as potentially significant.
  - Under Biological Resources (3.4), the City’s Initial Study describes the potential release of hydrocarbons during the decommissioning activities as potentially significant<sup>7</sup>.
    - As described in Chevron’s project application, the liquids pipelines are currently out of service and were previously pigged and flushed of hydrocarbons. The gas pipeline is currently flowing refined natural dry gas from shore to the offshore platform, and also

---

<sup>2</sup> Project Description, p. 6-6

<sup>3</sup> 2.4 Proposed Project, p. 8

<sup>4</sup> 2.4 Proposed Project, p. 8

<sup>5</sup> 2.5 Construction Schedule, p. 9

<sup>6</sup> 3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions, p. 41.

<sup>7</sup> 3.4 Biological Resources, p. 31-34

contains no liquid hydrocarbons. There is no risk of a significant release of hydrocarbons from the pipeline activities.

- Chevron requests that the EIR analysis of potential releases from pipeline decommissioning re-evaluate the negligible risk of actual/probable impact.
- Under Cultural Resources (3.5)<sup>8</sup>, Chevron requests the following modifications to the City's proposed mitigations:
  - MM CUL-4 describes exclusion zones which must be documented and fenced prior to ground disturbance. However:
    - Intact subterranean cultural resources may be located in areas where no ground disturbance is planned but where staging of people, or equipment may occur on the surface, potentially making fencing infeasible.
    - Since submitting its October 2021 application, Chevron has learned that soil impacts and facilities that must be addressed may be within areas of identified subterranean cultural resources.
    - Chevron requests that the City, in consultation with Tribal members, work with Chevron to identify the appropriate scope and boundaries of Cultural Resources mitigation to achieve the Project's decommissioning and remediation objectives.
  - MM CUL-6 describes the requirements under California Public Resources Code §5097.98 that must be met if Chevron encounters Human Remains while executing their Proposed Project Activities.
    - Chevron requests that, in addition to the time period (24 hours) that the coroner has to notify the Native American Heritage Commission, MM CUL-4 should also reflect the 48-hour turnaround the descendants must be given to complete their investigation and make their recommendation in accordance with California Public Resources Code §5097.98.
- Under Hazards and Hazardous Materials (3.9), the City's Initial Study describes potential release of hazardous materials during pipeline construction activities as well as relating to the Legacy Wells.<sup>9</sup>
  - As previously described, the risk of a release of hydrocarbons during the pipeline construction (removal) activities is extraordinarily low. Chevron will have pigged and flushed all pipelines prior to the execution of the Proposed Project Activities.
  - The presence of Legacy Wells on the Project site is an existing baseline condition for purposes of CEQA analysis. Chevron has not included any activity as part of the Project that will disturb the Legacy Wells; the environmental risk of the Legacy Wells is no greater during Chevron's Proposed Project Activities than exists today.
  - Chevron requests that the EIR analysis of potential releases from pipeline decommissioning re-evaluate the negligible risk of actual/probable impact. Chevron further requests that the EIR scope specifically exclude any existing risks concerning the Legacy Wells as a baseline condition under CEQA and acknowledge that there is no greater environmental risk from Legacy Wells as a result of Chevron's Proposed Project Activities.
- **Legacy Wells**
  - In Chevron's Project application, Chevron included the Historic Onsite Idle Wells (Legacy Wells) in the Facilities Not Included in Proposed Project Activities.

---

<sup>8</sup> 3.5 Cultural Resources, p. 36-37

<sup>9</sup> 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, p. 42-43

- Chevron bears no obligation or responsibility for the abandonment of the Legacy Wells (Cal. Pub. Rec. Code § 3237), and has no intention of disturbing these Wells as part of the Decommissioning and Remediation of the Project Site.
- The City's Initial Study stated that "In order for the City to determine the Project site as suitable for 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."
  - Under Project Approvals, the City has added CalGEM to the list for consultation and guidance on the Legacy Wells for which Chevron bears no responsibility.<sup>10</sup>
  - Under Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the City has further identified the Legacy Wells as a hazard that could involve "...the release of hazardous materials into the environment."<sup>11</sup>
    - The City further adds, "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."
- It is Chevron's intention only "... 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<sup>12</sup>."
  - Chevron has not made any future sale, development, or use decisions for the Project site, and only desires to achieve a remediation standard that allows the site to be used for a variety of potential future uses.
    - Chevron has not requested Project approval for future use, nor would that be appropriate at this time when such use is unknown. For these reasons, the action subject to this CEQA EIR review is limited to approval of permits related to decommissioning and remediation only.
    - The Proposed Project does not include or require determination of the Project Site as suitable for any future land use or assessment of any potential impact or potential leakage from Legacy Wells that may affect a future land use.
    - Chevron has elected to remediate the property to achieve an unrestricted, residential target, which will help facilitate future land uses that may be advanced at a later date in another project, potentially by another project proponent. However, any future land use that may be proposed in a later, separate project is presently unknown and speculative, not part of this Proposed Project being undertaken by Chevron.
- Chevron requests that the City's EIR reflect the appropriate scope of decommissioning and remediation, and exclude speculative future land uses and the Legacy Wells for which Chevron bears no responsibility from the EIR scope.

Chevron appreciates your attention to our comments. Please reach out to me directly if you would like to discuss any questions or concerns further. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Rebecca Trujillo  
Regulatory Affairs Manager

---

<sup>10</sup> 2.6 Project Approvals, p. 10-11

<sup>11</sup> 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, p. 43

<sup>12</sup> Project Description, 1.5 Purpose and Objectives, p. 1-2



**From:** Julie Tumamait-Stenslie <[jtumamait@hotmail.com](mailto:jtumamait@hotmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 03, 2022 8:41 PM  
**To:** Steve Goggia <[steveg@carpinteriaca.gov](mailto:steveg@carpinteriaca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas

Greetings Steve,  
I hope this finds you well.  
This has been awhile in the making.  
There has been changes in the Tribal organization  
I am no longer Chair.  
But I can still consult under section 106 as interested party.  
If you went through the NAHC you would see the chairs contact info.  
I would like to see a map.  
Also recommend that there be a Phase 1 done for the project.  
Ultimately I would recommend monitoring by a qualified Archaeologist and a qualified Native Chumash monitor.  
Any ground disturbance including demolition.  
In AB- 52, the chair of a Band can consult, the others on the NAHC are people who may have information on cultural resources Absence or Presence. This list is not a monitoring list. The BVBMI does not employ monitors.  
We are all Independent contractors.  
Hope this helps.  
Julie Tumamait Stenslie  
805 701 6152.



## NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

August 4, 2022

Steve Goggia, Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
5775 Carpinteria Ave.  
Carpinteria, CA 93013

**Re: 2022080026, Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Facility Decommissioning Project, Santa Barbara County**

Dear Mr. Goggia:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP), Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) or Early Consultation for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code §21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code §21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5 (b)). If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code §21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 5064 subd.(a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064 (a)(1)). In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources within the area of potential effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, "tribal cultural resources" (Pub. Resources Code §21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.2). Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21084.3 (a)). **AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation, a notice of negative declaration, or a mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015.** If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). **Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements.** If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. §800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC's recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments.

**Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.**

CHAIRPERSON  
**Laura Miranda**  
Luiseño

VICE CHAIRPERSON  
**Reginald Pagaling**  
Chumash

PARLIAMENTARIAN  
**Russell Attebery**  
Karuk

SECRETARY  
**Sara Dutschke**  
Miwok

COMMISSIONER  
**William Mungary**  
Paiute/White Mountain  
Apache

COMMISSIONER  
**Isaac Bojorquez**  
Ohlone-Costanoan

COMMISSIONER  
**Buffy McQuillen**  
Yokayo Pomo, Yuki,  
Nomlaki

COMMISSIONER  
**Wayne Nelson**  
Luiseño

COMMISSIONER  
**Stanley Rodriguez**  
Kumeyaay

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
**Raymond C.  
Hitchcock**  
Miwok/Nisenan

**NAHC HEADQUARTERS**  
1550 Harbor Boulevard  
Suite 100  
West Sacramento,  
California 95691  
(916) 373-3710  
[nahc@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:nahc@nahc.ca.gov)  
[NAHC.ca.gov](http://NAHC.ca.gov)

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

- 1. Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project:** Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:

  - a. A brief description of the project.
  - b. The lead agency contact information.
  - c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d)).
  - d. A "California Native American tribe" is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21073).
- 2. Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe's Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report:** A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or Environmental Impact Report. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1(b)).

  - a. For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code §65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (b)).
- 3. Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe:** The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:

  - a. Alternatives to the project.
  - b. Recommended mitigation measures.
  - c. Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).
- 4. Discretionary Topics of Consultation:** The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:

  - a. Type of environmental review necessary.
  - b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
  - c. Significance of the project's impacts on tribal cultural resources.
  - d. If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).
- 5. Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process:** With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code §6254 (r) and §6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (c)(1)).
- 6. Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document:** If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency's environmental document shall discuss both of the following:

  - a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
  - b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (b)).

- 7. Conclusion of Consultation:** Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
- a.** The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
  - b.** A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (b)).
- 8. Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document:** Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (a)).
- 9. Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation:** If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (e)).
- 10. Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:**
- a.** Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
    - i.** Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
    - ii.** Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
  - b.** Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
    - i.** Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
    - ii.** Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
    - iii.** Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
  - c.** Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
  - d.** Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code §21084.3 (b)).
  - e.** Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a non-federally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code §815.3 (c)).
  - f.** Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code §5097.991).
- 11. Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource:** An Environmental Impact Report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
- a.** The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 and §21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2.
  - b.** The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
  - c.** The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (d)).

The NAHC's PowerPoint presentation titled, "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices" may be found online at: [http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation\\_CalEPAPDF.pdf](http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf)

## SB 18

SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code §65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: [https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09\\_14\\_05\\_Updated\\_Guidelines\\_922.pdf](https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf).

Some of SB 18's provisions include:

1. **Tribal Consultation:** If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. **A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe.** (Gov. Code §65352.3 (a)(2)).
2. **No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation.** There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.
3. **Confidentiality:** Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code §65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code §5097.9 and §5097.993 that are within the city's or county's jurisdiction. (Gov. Code §65352.3 (b)).
4. **Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation:** Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
  - a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
  - b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and "Sacred Lands File" searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: <http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/>.

### NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center ([https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=30331](https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=30331)) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
  - a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
  - b. If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
  - c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
  - d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
  - a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
  - b. The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.



3. Contact the NAHC for:
  - a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project's APE.
  - b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.
  
4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.
  - a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
  - b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
  - c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code § 7050.5, Public Resources Code § 5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email address:  
[Cody.Campagne@nahc.ca.gov](mailto:Cody.Campagne@nahc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

*Cody Campagne*

Cody Campagne  
Cultural Resources Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse

August 26, 2022

Steve Goggia  
City of Carpinteria  
Community Development Department  
5775 Carpinteria Avenue  
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Sent via Email: [Steveg@carpinteriaca.gov](mailto:Steveg@carpinteriaca.gov)

**Re: Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Decommissioning and Remediation of the Chevron Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility, Project Case #2128**

Dear Steve Goggia:

The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (District) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the referenced project. The project proposal is for removal of surface and subsurface facilities and subsequent remediation of impacted soils at the onshore Carpinteria Oil and Gas Processing Facility. Project activities at the onshore location include: 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; and site restoration. The project also proposes an offshore pipeline component in state waters which includes: pigging and flushing pipelines in preparation for removal; removal of offshore project pipeline segments out to the 3-mile state water limit; potential nighttime activities in the surf zone; removal of nearshore beach crossing pipeline segments; recycling/disposal of all materials removed from the project site; and site restoration. Project activities are expected to occur for 670 days over a three-year period between October 2022 and May 2025. The project site encompasses several parcels (APNs 001-070-003, -004, -014, -021, -022, and -023) over an approximately 64.28-acre site located at 5675 and 5663 Carpinteria Avenue in the City of Carpinteria.

District staff reviewed the NOP and concur that air quality and climate change impacts may be potentially significant. The proposed project includes equipment and/or operations that may be subject to District permit requirements and prohibitory rules. Therefore, the **District may be a responsible agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and will rely on the EIR when evaluating any District permits for proposed equipment.** To avoid additional CEQA documentation related to District permit issuance, the EIR should include the air pollutant emissions for all proposed operations and equipment in the project's air quality and GHG analysis and include mitigation as appropriate to reduce the impacts. The District's guidance document, entitled *Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents*, is available online at [www.ourair.org/land-use/](http://www.ourair.org/land-use/). This document should be referenced for general guidance in assessing air quality and climate change impacts in the EIR. The District should be contacted directly for specific guidance as needed.

**The EIR should evaluate the following potential impacts related to the project:**

1. Increase in Criteria Pollutant and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Decommissioning activities may involve air quality and climate change impacts associated with the following potential activities:

- Construction activities,
- Support/utility boat main propulsion and auxiliary engines,
- Operation of oil storage tanks/vessels,
- Operation of support/utility boat main work engines (water blasters, welding, jet pumps, rotoscrows, compressors, pumps, winches, cranes),
- Operation of derrick barge/heavy lift vessel work engines (main power, winches, hoists, cranes, compressors, welding, backup power),
- Operation of other portable and stationary engines and equipment,
- Transportation of materials and equipment by on-road trucks,
- Worker commute trips from light duty trucks and passenger vehicles,
- Indirect emissions from electricity use, water use, and waste disposal.

Air pollutant emissions from all proposed operations and equipment require quantification and disclosure in the EIR. Please ensure that the analysis is based on the most up-to-date project description and activity data. Air pollutants that may be examined include criteria pollutants, greenhouse gases and toxic air contaminants (such as diesel particulate matter, hydrogen sulfide, and other toxic or hazardous air pollutants). Any associated combustion exhaust, fugitive hydrocarbons, and/or fugitive dust generation from these activities should also be included in the analysis. Air quality impacts are based on project-specific information and supported by technical studies whenever possible.

The EIR should present significance thresholds for ozone precursor emissions (reactive organic compounds [ROC], and oxides of nitrogen [NO<sub>x</sub>]), particulate matter, and carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) and determine whether the proposed project will produce emissions in excess of the thresholds. The District's *Environmental Review Guidelines for the Santa Barbara County APCD* (available at [www.ourair.org/landuse/](http://www.ourair.org/landuse/)) contains the District Board-adopted criteria for evaluating the significance of air quality and greenhouse gas impacts for District projects. In the absence of locally-adopted thresholds, the District recommends that these thresholds be used to determine significance of air quality impacts.

The emissions scenario for a peak year/day should include all project activities that could reasonably occur in a given year/day. The EIR should ensure that project tasks that could occur concurrently are included in the peak year/day compared to CEQA thresholds. To the extent possible, the District recommends that the methodology used to estimate stationary-source emissions be consistent with calculations that will need to be performed to fulfill requirements of the permitting process. Emissions from mobile, area, and stationary sources should be summed before comparing to a threshold of significance.

2. Attainment Status and Consistency with the District's Ozone Plan. Attainment status for the County is posted on the District website at [www.ourair.org/air-quality-standards](http://www.ourair.org/air-quality-standards). The most recent Ozone Plan (previously known as the Clean Air Plan) was adopted in December 2019 and is available at



[www.ourair.org/clean-air-plans](http://www.ourair.org/clean-air-plans). The District website should be consulted for the most up-to-date air quality information prior to the release of the public Draft EIR.

Consistency with local and regional plans, including the District's 2019 Ozone Plan, is required under CEQA for all projects. Consistency with the Ozone Plan should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, and the EIR should include an assessment of whether the proposed project will be consistent with the Ozone Plan. The Ozone Plan relies primarily on land use, population, and on-road emissions projections provided by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) as a basis for vehicle emission forecasting. All development projects should be evaluated to determine whether direct and indirect emissions associated with the project are accounted for in the Ozone Plan's emissions growth assumptions, and whether the project is consistent with policies adopted in the Ozone Plan.

Commercial or industrial stationary source projects will generally be considered consistent with the Ozone Plan if they are consistent with District rules and regulations. Large industrial stationary sources may be found inconsistent if their emissions are not considered in the Plan's stationary source emission inventory.

3. Impacts to Air Quality Standard Attainment. If the project has the potential to cause or contribute to a violation of an air quality standard, an Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA) should be performed to determine whether project emissions will violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The AQIA should be performed pursuant to District Rule 805 and the District's *Modeling Guidelines for Air Quality Impact Assessments*, available at [www.ourair.org/wp-content/uploads/aqia.pdf](http://www.ourair.org/wp-content/uploads/aqia.pdf). For the purposes of CEQA analysis the modeling should include stationary, mobile, and fugitive dust emission sources. For more information on AQIAs, please refer to the District's webpage [www.ourair.org/air-quality-impact-assessment](http://www.ourair.org/air-quality-impact-assessment).

4. Impacts to Sensitive Receptors and Potential for Nuisance Issues. The EIR should examine whether any of the operations associated with the proposed project will result in air quality impacts by exposing sensitive receptors (e.g. residential, childcare facilities, schools, or senior living communities) to substantial pollutant concentrations. Examples of this type of impact include odors, dust, or toxic or hazardous air pollutants. Specifically, pipeline flushing operations could generate unpleasant odors. Please see the "Pipeline Purging" section on page 5 for measures to reduce the potential of odor impacts from this activity. Any measures implemented to control odors should be included in the project description, as a mitigation measure, or by some other enforceable mechanism.

If the project has the potential to emit toxic or hazardous air pollutants, or is located in close proximity to sensitive receptors, the EIR should determine the potential level of risk associated with their operations by conducting an HRA in accordance with the District's *Modeling Guidelines for Health Risk Assessments*, Form-15i, available at [www.ourair.org/wp-content/uploads/apcd-15i.pdf](http://www.ourair.org/wp-content/uploads/apcd-15i.pdf). More information on HRAs can be found at [www.ourair.org/air-toxics-for-business](http://www.ourair.org/air-toxics-for-business).

5. Mitigation. If impacts are found to be significant, mitigation should be applied to reduce those emissions as appropriate under CEQA. Mitigation measures should be made enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments. The EIR should include a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan that explicitly states the required mitigations and establishes a mechanism for enforcement. Section 6 of the District's Scope and Content document offers ideas for air quality mitigation. In addition, CAPCOA has published the *Handbook for Analyzing Greenhouse Gas*

*Emission Reductions, Assessing Climate Vulnerabilities, and Advancing Health and Equity*, an extensive sector-by-sector compendium of project-specific mitigation measures, including quantification methods to calculate GHG reductions. The Handbook is available at [www.caleemod.com/handbook/index.html](http://www.caleemod.com/handbook/index.html). Additionally, the District has identified some potential strategies for local GHG mitigation that could be implemented in Santa Barbara County. These strategies are summarized and posted on the District's website at [www.ourair.org/ghgmitigation-sbc](http://www.ourair.org/ghgmitigation-sbc). Project-specific measures may be developed that are pertinent to the specific project and are enforceable by the District.

6. **Asbestos Reporting Requirements.** Since the project will involve demolition and renovation of existing structures, the EIR should include a discussion of how materials will be removed in compliance with District Rule 1001 – *National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) – Asbestos*. Advance notification to the District is required before asbestos is disturbed and/or removed. For additional information regarding asbestos notification requirements, please visit our website at [www.ourair.org/asbestos](http://www.ourair.org/asbestos).

**District staff has the following regulatory advisories:**

1. **New Source Review:** The District will evaluate the emissions from the project to determine which New Source Review (NSR) requirements will apply as part of the District ATC application review. NSR requirements may include Best Available Control Technology (BACT), Air Quality Impact Analysis (AQIA), Health Risk Assessment (HRA), and/or Emission Reduction Credits (ERCs). The District permit process can take several months. To avoid delay, the applicant is encouraged to submit their Authority to Construct permit application to the District as soon as possible, see [www.ourair.org/permit-applications/](http://www.ourair.org/permit-applications/) to download the necessary permit application(s).
2. **Contaminated Soils.** District Authority to Construct and/or Permit to Operate permits will be required for the proposed contaminated soil remediation activities. See [www.ourair.org/csc-projects](http://www.ourair.org/csc-projects) for more information on contaminated soil clean-up.
3. **Diesel Engines.** All portable diesel-fired construction engines rated at 50 brake horsepower or greater must have either statewide Portable Equipment Registration Program (PERP) certificates or District permits prior to grading/building permit issuance. Construction engines with PERP certificates are exempt from the District permit, provided they will be on-site for less than 12 months.
4. **Marine Engines.** Per District Rule 202.F.8., marine vessel engines may be subject to NSR requirements if activities exceed 12 consecutive months or the potential to emit of such engines exceeds 10 tons per stationary source of NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, ROCs, or particulate matter.
5. **Asbestos.** The applicant is required to complete and submit an Asbestos Demolition/Renovation Notification or an EXEMPTION from Notification for Renovation and Demolition (District Form ENF-28 or District Form ENF-28e), which can be downloaded at [www.ourair.org/compliance-forms](http://www.ourair.org/compliance-forms) for each regulated structure to be demolished or renovated. Demolition notifications are required regardless of whether asbestos is present or not. The completed exemption or notification should be presented, mailed, or emailed to the District with a minimum of 10 working days advance notice prior to disturbing asbestos in a renovation or starting work on a demolition. The applicant should visit [www.ourair.org/asbestos](http://www.ourair.org/asbestos) to determine whether the project triggers asbestos notification requirements or whether the project qualifies for an exemption.

6. Onsite Storage. If there is any planned or potential storage of ROC-containing liquids or solids (e.g. ROC-impacted soils), the applicant must obtain a District permit or written exemption for permit.

7. Pipeline Purging. Pipeline purging operations have the potential for odor generation. In order to prevent odors from causing a violation of District Rule 303, *Nuisance*, the District recommends that carbon canisters or a thermal oxidizer be employed to control vapors released during pipeline decommissioning activities. Some companies already have permits with the District for thermal oxidizer units. The applicant should consider using an already permitted unit through a company, or could contact the District to obtain a permit or written permit exemption.

8. Fugitive Dust. Construction/demolition activities are subject to District Rule 345, *Control of Fugitive Dust from Construction and Demolition Activities*. This rule establishes limits on the generation of visible fugitive dust emissions at demolition and construction sites, includes measures for minimizing fugitive dust from on-site activities, and from trucks moving on- and off-site. Please see [www.ourair.org/wp-content/uploads/rule345.pdf](http://www.ourair.org/wp-content/uploads/rule345.pdf). Activities subject to Rule 345 are also subject to Rule 302 (*Visible Emissions*) and Rule 303 (*Nuisance*). To reduce the potential for violations of these District Rules, standard dust mitigations (**Attachment A**) are recommended for all construction and/or grading activities. The name and telephone number of an on-site contact person must be provided to the District prior to grading/building permit issuance.

9. Equipment Exhaust. The State of California considers particulate matter emitted by diesel engines carcinogenic. Therefore, during project grading, construction, and hauling, construction contracts must specify that contractors shall adhere to the requirements listed in **Attachment B** to reduce emissions of particulate matter (as well as of ozone precursors) from diesel equipment. Recommended measures should be implemented to the maximum extent feasible.

10. Idling. At all times, idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks should be minimized; auxiliary power units should be used whenever possible. State law requires that:

- Drivers of diesel-fueled commercial vehicles shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than 5 minutes at any location.
- Drivers of diesel-fueled commercial vehicles shall not idle a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system (APS) for more than 5 minutes to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on the vehicle. Trucks with 2007 or newer model year engines must meet additional requirements (verified clean APS label required).
- See [www.arb.ca.gov/noidle](http://www.arb.ca.gov/noidle) for more information.

We hope you find our comments useful. We would appreciate the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the air quality and GHG analyses and an internal draft of the Draft EIR before it is released for public review. If you have any questions or wish to discuss these comments, please contact me at (805) 979-8334 or by e-mail at [WaddingtonE@sbcapcd.org](mailto:WaddingtonE@sbcapcd.org).

Sincerely,



Emily Waddington  
Air Quality Specialist  
Planning Division

Attachments: Fugitive Dust Control Measures  
Diesel Particulate and NO<sub>x</sub> Emission Measures

cc: Becky Trujillo, Chevron Regulatory Affairs Manager [email only]  
David Harris, Manager, District Engineering Division [email only]  
William Sarraf, Supervisor, District Engineering Division [email only]  
Planning Chron File



**ATTACHMENT A**  
**FUGITIVE DUST CONTROL MEASURES**

These measures should be required for all projects involving earthmoving activities regardless of the project size or duration. Projects are expected to manage fugitive dust emissions such that emissions do not exceed APCD's visible emissions limit (APCD Rule 302), create a public nuisance (APCD Rule 303), and are in compliance with the APCD's requirements and standards for visible dust (APCD Rule 345).

- During construction, use water trucks, sprinkler systems, or dust suppressants in all areas of vehicle movement to prevent dust from leaving the site and from exceeding the APCD's limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60 minute period. When using water, this includes wetting down areas as needed but at least once in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency should be required when sustained wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible. However, reclaimed water should not be used in or around crops for human consumption.
- Onsite vehicle speeds shall be no greater than 15 miles per hour when traveling on unpaved surfaces.
- Install and operate a track-out prevention device where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can include any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out of dirt such as gravel pads, pipe-grid track-out control devices, rumble strips, or wheel-washing systems.
- If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than one day shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the site shall be tarped from the point of origin.
- Minimize the amount of disturbed area. After clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, treat the disturbed area by watering, OR using roll-compaction, OR revegetating, OR by spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible.
- Schedule clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation activities during periods of low wind speed to the extent feasible. During periods of high winds (>25 mph) clearing, grading, earthmoving, and excavation operations shall be minimized to prevent fugitive dust created by onsite operations from becoming a nuisance or hazard.
- The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor and document the dust control program requirements to ensure any fugitive dust emissions do not result in a nuisance and to enhance the implementation of the mitigation measures as necessary to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air Pollution Control District prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or map clearance.

**PLAN REQUIREMENTS:** All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans and/or as a separate information sheet listing the conditions of approval to be recorded with the map. **Timing:** Requirements shall be shown on plans prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or recorded with the map during map recordation. Conditions shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

**MONITORING:** The Lead Agency shall ensure measures are on project plans and/or recorded with maps. The Lead Agency staff shall ensure compliance onsite. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.



**ATTACHMENT B**  
**DIESEL PARTICULATE AND NO<sub>x</sub> EMISSION REDUCTION MEASURES**

Particulate emissions from diesel exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the state of California. The following is a list of regulatory requirements and control strategies that should be implemented to the maximum extent feasible.

The following measures are required by state law:

- All portable diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 brake horsepower (bhp) shall be registered with the state's portable equipment registration program OR shall obtain an APCD permit.
- Fleet owners of diesel-powered mobile construction equipment greater than 25 hp are subject to the California Air Resource Board (CARB) In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation (Title 13, California Code of Regulations (CCR), §2449), the purpose of which is to reduce oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), diesel particulate matter (DPM), and other criteria pollutant emissions from in-use off-road diesel-fueled vehicles. Off-road heavy-duty trucks shall comply with the State Off-Road Regulation. For more information, see [www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/ordiesel.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/ordiesel/ordiesel.htm).
- Fleet owners of diesel-fueled heavy-duty trucks and buses are subject to CARB's On-Road Heavy-Duty Diesel Vehicles (In-Use) Regulation (Title 13, CCR, §2025), the purpose of which is to reduce DPM, NO<sub>x</sub> and other criteria pollutants from in-use (on-road) diesel-fueled vehicles. For more information, see [www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/onrdiesel.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/onrdiesel/onrdiesel.htm).
- All commercial off-road and on-road diesel vehicles are subject, respectively, to Title 13, CCR, §2449(d)(3) and §2485, limiting engine idling time. Off-road vehicles subject to the State Off-Road Regulation are limited to idling no more than five minutes. Idling of heavy-duty diesel trucks during loading and unloading shall be limited to five minutes, unless the truck engine meets the optional low-NO<sub>x</sub> idling emission standard, the truck is labeled with a clean-idle sticker, and it is not operating within 100 feet of a restricted area.

The following measures are recommended:

- Diesel equipment meeting the CARB Tier 3 or higher emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- On-road heavy-duty equipment with model year 2010 engines or newer should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible. Electric auxiliary power units should be used to the maximum extent feasible.
- Equipment/vehicles using alternative fuels, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or biodiesel, should be used on-site where feasible.
- Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible.
- All construction equipment shall be maintained in tune per the manufacturer's specifications.
- The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.
- The number of construction equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized through efficient management practices to ensure that the smallest practical number is operating at any one time.
- Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.
- Construction truck trips should be scheduled during non-peak hours to reduce peak hour emissions whenever feasible.
- Proposed truck routes should minimize to the extent feasible impacts to residential communities and sensitive receptors.
- Construction staging areas should be located away from sensitive receptors such that exhaust and other construction emissions do not enter the fresh air intakes to buildings, air conditioners, and windows.

**PLAN REQUIREMENTS AND TIMING:** Prior to grading/building permit issuance and/or map recordation, all requirements shall be shown as conditions of approval on grading/building plans, and/or on a separate sheet to be recorded with the map. Conditions shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods. The contractor shall retain the Certificate of Compliance for CARB's In-Use Regulation for Off-Road Diesel Vehicles onsite and have it available for inspection.

**MONITORING:** The Lead Agency shall ensure measures are on project plans and/or recorded with maps. The Lead Agency staff shall ensure compliance onsite. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.



100 N. Hope Ave. Suite 3-B  
Santa Barbara, CA. 93110  
(805) 895-3000

Steve Goggia  
Community Development Director  
City of Carpinteria  
5775 Carpinteria Avenue  
Carpinteria, CA. 93013

Dear Steve:

The Sportfishing Conservancy has a proud history of coastal and marine conservation, habitat enhancement and restoration efforts. Our efforts within the fishing community have consistently focused on employing “best practices” in the pursuit of their sport. Understanding the value of marine habitat, we have dedicated our efforts in support of other local organizations that specialize in marine habitat enhancement and restoration. For more than a decade we have supported local Santa Barbara county non-profit organizations including the Land Trust for Santa Barbara County (with their Carpinteria Salt Marsh restoration and enhancement efforts), South Coast Habitat Restoration (with their steelhead habitat enhancement efforts) and the Gaviota Coast Conservancy (with their coastal recreation/preservation efforts). We raise funds and contribute these directly to these organizations for their ongoing efforts. With this as background, we are happy to see the Chevron decommissioning efforts underway. Done well, these efforts can provide an environmental benefit to both our coastal landscape and marine seascape. The biggest threat to these benefits is prolonged legal wrangling. History shows that work that should take 36 months to complete quite literally drags on for years or decades, benefitting no one beyond the attorneys. Going through your analysis, it is clear that the proposed actions have little, if any negative environmental impact and yet potentially large benefits with the project moving forward as described. As noted, the only significant impact was a possible accidental release of potential hydrocarbons during the removal process. This work will be done by a skilled workforce and in full public view. And should an accidental release happen, it clearly could be immediately stopped and mitigated if necessary.

Therefore, we suggest it is time to “fish or cut bait,” and mercifully forego the legal wrangling’s that do more damage than good. It is time to move forward with a mitigated negative declaration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tom Raftican". The signature is written in a cursive style with a prominent "T" and "R".

Tom Raftican  
President, The Sportfishing Conservancy



-----Original Message-----

From: Susan Allen <[dlssallen@aol.com](mailto:dlssallen@aol.com)>

Sent: Sunday, September 25, 2022 10:49 PM

To: Steve Goggia <[steveg@ci.carpinteria.ca.us](mailto:steveg@ci.carpinteria.ca.us)>

Subject: Comments on the NOP decommissioning the Chevron plant

Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Susan Allen Comments on the NOP

In light of the odor nuisance violation issued in September 2022 and previous other odor violations the public should have notice if and when an odor incident occurs through the city newsletter, social media and news releases.

Temporary signage along Dump Road and the hiking /biking trail should give current updates of the nature of the work and who to contact for any questions or concerns.

Where are the historic and current cathodic wells located and how will they be monitored and abandoned?

What if any recent testing has occurred in the Sandblast area (east of the ocean sideparking area?) When that area was cleaned years ago it was reported that a foot of soil was removed but in my observations only a few inches were removed.

A large tower type piece of equipment was removed a number of years ago at the east side of the operations area and to my knowledge without permit. Can that piece of equipment and its usage be identified and has adequate soil testing been done in that area?

Have drainage issues been addressed? Often there is water in the cement drainage ditch west of Dump Rd but no water is visible on the east side. Pipes gathering drainage from the bluffs 1 area are thought to cross the Chevron property.

Parking for employees working on decommissioning the plant area should occur north of the RR tracks to avoid possible increased disturbance of the harbor seals. This would also apply to all equipment or supply storage. As a safety measure it will also cut down on traffic crossing RR tracks and interface with folks using the hiking/biking trail.

During non drought years the retention basin around tank 861 has had substantial water collection. Why has it not been included in the wetlands analysis? It once held wetlands species.

How will historic pedestrian and bike traffic be handled on Dump Rd during decommissioning?

Will the native plants covering the metal topped vault located on the bluffs edge west of the pier be replaced?

How will the pipelines left in place be abandoned? Filled with concrete? If left in place and not filled will pipes eventually corrode and create sinkholes? I believe this has happened in an area in Tarpits Park.

## SEALS

Suggest that western most pipes be removed first. This will give workers and MM observers an opportunity to assess how best such work can quickly proceed to avoid unnecessary seal disturbance. Note that the offshore rocks are also a seal haulout site. (One of the three Carpinteria haulout locations.)

Exactly what pipes are in the cement bundle....isn't there a water outfall pipe in that location? Where is the electrical line for Gail and Grace located?

No work should occur during city beach closure. In recent years Sealwatch has noted a decline in the population and to date have not been able to discern a cause. All work must be done outside the beach closure window.

A minimum of two well qualified MM observers must be required and video cameras installed so that interested members of the public can be assured that the seals are being fully protected. Members of Sealwatch have witnessed too many occasions when the seals have not been fully protected.

Placing a screen on the beach will need more research and monitoring. Has this been done with harbor seals in other areas and has it been effective?

Data collection should be made public on a daily basis.

How long will concrete removal on the beach take and will the crane be moved closer to shore for this operation? Will the crane be moved away when not in use— what effect may a new large structure near the haulout have on the seals even when not in motion?

Has the drainage pipe and concrete at the west corner of the Seal Sanctuary overlook been included in any study?

Pupping has been as early as January and as late as May with surviving pups.

## Comment on the Carpinteria CEQA Initial Study of Chevron's Decommissioning

The **CEQA Initial Study** concerns me in that the decommissioning will place an unacceptable burden on our environment. I am commenting from two standpoints:

1. As a Veterinarian who works closely with Seal Watch and CIMWI (Channel Islands Marine and Wildlife Institute) I would like to fortify and add to Padre and Associates Inc. conclusions regarding the Harbor Seal Rookery; and
2. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change determined we are in a CLIMATE CODE RED ALERT. If we do not greatly curb Greenhouse Gas Emissions ASAP, we will not be able to avoid the rise of temperature which will carry catastrophic results.

### Item 1 Harbor Seals

- The numbers in the Carpinteria Harbor Seal rookery are in decline;
- This is one of only two remaining rookeries on Southern California coast where harbor seals can be viewed by the public;
- Harbor seals have a low reproductive rate. During the projects anticipated course, jeopardizing the three years during which maturing seals could have given birth, were it not for being underweight and diminishing healthy pups will adversely affect the colony;
- Their habitat will become uninhabitable with sediment, pollution, noise and ongoing disturbance pollution.

The Carpinteria Harbor Seal Rookery Monitoring and Protection Plan by Padre Associates Inc. of June 2021 identified that activities to be undertaken would require applying for a take. In other words, loss of seals was anticipated.

That alone indicates that this plan is not acceptable for the seals who have already adapted their physiology and behavior to tolerate Chevron's pier activities. Wild animals gauge potential threat by a Predatory Imminence Continuum under which their stress levels are tolerable. Changing the timing, noise levels, light levels, and predictability will quite possibly push this stressed colony to engage in energetically expensive, aversive behaviors (i.e. increase vigilance, decreased foraging, etc.).

In February of 2019, PACOPS was performing emergency repair in the seal rookery, at a time that seals were giving birth. There were people assigned to monitor seal reactions. I monitored independently. To those without in-depth knowledge of seal physiology and behavior, stress and reactions were repeatedly underscored.

### Item 2 Climate Crisis

Climate action must take precedence for governments, agencies, and individuals over all other activities, including Chevron's obligation to decommission its oil and gas processing plant. Carpinteria and the surrounding highway expansion have instead greatly **added to GHG Emissions**, and in order to decommission to Tier 1, the trucking, concrete demolition, soil excavation, grade and fill activities and deforestation will further set us back. But there are laws such as the California Marine Resources Legacy Act can assist in removing much of the additional harm by converting platforms to reefs; and the newly signed Climate Resiliency Districts could and should be used to the fullest possible extent to avoid further destruction.

### Our Obligation as a City and as Citizens

I URGE YOU TO PROTECT OUR SEALS, OUR LAND AND OCEAN BY ABANDONING THE FACILITY FOR OPEN SPACE INSTEAD OF DECOMMISSIONING TO TIER 1

## HOW THE DECOMMISSIONING CEQA INITIAL STUDY RELATES TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Climate change is hurtling forward when it is our responsibility - all of us- to do what we can to mollify its effects. Carpinteria has made no visible climate abatement efforts. To its credit, Carpinteria has determined that an EIR is called for with Chevron's CEQA Initial Study. Therefore, Chevron - a representative of the industry which set climate change on a fast course - and is responsible for remediation of the oil and gas processing plant - can be tasked with a major role in climate change mitigation. The mechanism I propose is explained at the close of my comments through the use of a new California Law providing Climate Resiliency Districts.

Soon after the determination was made that climate change is rapidly proceeding, a multitude of environmental organizations put into play a list of potential mitigations. This statement, taken from one of the many organizations (Sea Doc Society), sums up the obligation of Chevron to take responsibility for their industry's role in the destruction of our planet:

**WHEREAS**, such necessary measures to restore a safe climate include:

- a. A rapid, just, managed phase-out of fossil fuels;
- b. Ending greenhouse gas emissions as quickly as possible to establish a zero-emissions economy;
- c. A rapid transition to a 100% renewable energy system across all economic sectors;
- d. A widespread effort to safely drawdown excess carbon from the atmosphere;
- e. A full transition to a regenerative agriculture system; and
- f. An end to the Sixth Mass Extinction through widespread conservation and restoration of ecosystems;

They go on to state:

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, the [CITY/COUNTY] Council directs all departments, proprietaries, and commissions to identify and prioritize climate adaptation and mitigation strategies that are people-centered, including but not limited to:

**1. Clean and renewable energy**, which involves deploying and efficiently using clean, renewable and locally sourced electricity generated on site or transmitted through the power grid; including upgrading public and private facilities to 100% renewable energy such as solar and battery storage.

**2. Community-wide electrification and fossil fuel phase out**, which involves upgrading and replacing carbon-intensive, fossil fuel-based infrastructure, including buildings, heating sources, appliances, and combustion power with efficient, energy-saving infrastructure powered by clean, renewably-generated electric power.

**3. Carbon sequestration**, which involves drawing down carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases from the atmosphere through ecological and/or technological methods and capturing and safely storing them in plants, soils, water systems, and other solid forms;

**4. Transportation, mobility, and connectivity**, which involves developing and enhancing land use patterns that foster safe, multimodal, accessible, equitable, intelligent, and clean motorized and non- motorized travel options, infrastructure, and community connectivity; including updating zoning codes to allow compatible residential infill and neighborhood-oriented commercial uses so that services like bakeries, grocery stores, and coffee shops are accessible to residents by foot or bike;

**5. Resource conservation and the elimination of waste**, which involves conserving natural and manufactured resources by means of responsible production, consumption, reuse, and recycling; including developing a community-wide Zero Waste Plan; adopting the "food recovery hierarchy" citywide through educational programs and policies to first promote the reduction of surplus food, and then ensure excess food is use to feed the hungry, animals, or composted before it ends in the landfill; expanding [CITY/COUNTY'S] conservation programs to further reduce water and resource use;

**6. Green infrastructure and restorative ecology**, which involves incorporating green infrastructure (trees, capture and use of stormwater runoff) into community design, and restoring, rehabilitating, and restoring/repurposing damaged ecosystems through active intervention to maximize biodiversity and the drawdown and sequestration of carbon dioxide;

**7. Climate adaptation and resilience**, which involves preparing for, learning from, and adapting to the effects of climate change through proactive and holistic planning and response at the infrastructural, cultural, and institutional levels, including limiting/restricting development in areas that are vulnerable to flooding, landslides, and wildfires, increasing the number of community cooling centers for vulnerable populations during extreme heat, incorporating changing climatic conditions and climate hazards into emergency response and recovery programs and ensuring affordable housing units are available for vulnerable communities.

Carpinteria's CEQA Initial Study documents a number a ways that this decommissioning will not only fail to mitigate climate change, but will in fact worsen it significantly.

Chevron's operations over the 62+ acres of Carpinteria and the surrounding ocean ecosystems have wreaked destruction that may never be truly be remediated.

The Decommissioning that Chevron proposes **should not be allowed to further worsen our crisis**. The Initial Study reveals many plans which will do just that:

Item d. above calls for the drawdown of excess atmospheric carbon. The buffer zone on Bluffs 0 has been fallow, and effectively rewilding. Trees and vegetation, many of which are native, are currently sequestering carbon. The soil has a high content of organic matter. With a 2% organic matter, 42 tons per acre of atmospheric carbon is sequestered - trapped in aggregates with water-holding capacity, providing shade, cooling, and diminishing evaporation and acting as a buffer when a fire breaks out. The Bluffs 0 has been estimated to have 3% or 4% organic matter. If released you lose that soil health.

To propose converting this property to Tier 1 would incur trucking, grade and fill activities that cannot possibly remediate when it is in fact contributing still more Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Chevron should be encouraged to do the following to fulfill their obligations instead of attempting to return the land to original state at the environmental cost that would incur.

1. We should evaluate and preserve the existing tree inventory and develop a planting program to renew and extend a native tree canopy, restoring habitat for bees, bats, and birds;

SUSAN MAILHEAU, DVM

9/28/22

## Location of Comment Discussion in Draft EIR

Commenting Agency	Comment	Location of Comment Discussion in Draft EIR
California Coastal Commission	Commission staff support the City's determination that an EIR is required and we look forward to coordinating with the City on the development of the EIR and the CDP process.	Section 1.0
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	CDFW agrees with the Report that further study is needed to determine whether eelgrass is present near the Project area. CDFW recommends conducting eelgrass surveys in accordance with the California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy (NMFS 2014) and in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service. Further study is also needed to determine if kelp, eelgrass, or surf grass are growing on or above the pipelines. The DEIR should document these findings as well as all sensitive marine habitats within the Project area. Project activities should avoid sensitive marine habitats to the greatest extent possible. If these habitats cannot be avoided, the DEIR should include appropriate mitigation measures.	Section 4.3
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	Project activities on the beach (below the highest tide line) and in the surf zone during March–August should be avoided to the greatest extent feasible. If work during this time cannot be avoided, the DEIR should provide measures to mitigate for the Project's potential impacts on California grunion. CDFW recommends that a qualified biological observer monitor the work site prior to the start of activities in the intertidal zone during the previous forecast grunion run period (3–4 nights in a row). If grunion is observed at the work site, the Project should suspend activities below the highest tide line for at least two weeks to allow grunion eggs to incubate and hatch out. The Report also identifies black abalone ( <i>Haliotis cracherodii</i> ) and white abalone ( <i>Haliotis sorenseni</i> ) as special-status species that may occur in the Project area. There is some probability that abalone could be found on the pipelines themselves in unburied sections. For this reason, CDFW recommends conducting abalone surveys on the unburied sections of pipeline prior to removal under consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service. The DEIR should consider the potential impacts	Section 4.3
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	The DEIR should discuss potential impacts to marine mammals and fish from underwater noise-producing activities and include an analysis of anticipated underwater sound levels for these activities. If activities will generate high underwater sound levels, CDFW recommends using a "soft-start" technique for these activities so that any marine mammals or fish present may vacate the area before injury occurs. CDFW appreciates AMM 3 (Marine Wildlife Contingency Plan Implementation), which includes the presence of a Marine Wildlife Monitor during Project activities offshore and on the beach and looks forward to reviewing this document once it is available. CDFW recommends that the Marine Wildlife Contingency Plan include exclusion zones for marine mammals, which should be developed in consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service and CDFW.	Section 4.3
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	CDFW appreciates the inclusion of AMM 6 (Oil Spill Response and Contingency Plan Implementation) and recommends coordinating closely with CDFW's Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) while developing this plan.	Section 4.3

**Location of Comment Discussion in Draft EIR**

Commenting Agency	Comment	Location of Comment Discussion in Draft EIR
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	CDFW expects that a variety of marine life is currently growing on or attached to the pipelines proposed for removal. These organisms may include, but are not limited to, mussels, barnacles, hydroids, surf grass, kelp, and other marine algae. The DEIR should explain in detail what the Project plans to do with the marine life attached to the pipelines; for instance, if organisms will be removed, how and where they will be removed, etc. Special consideration should be given to special-status species, such as black abalone, and what mitigation measures may be required. CDFW recommends that the Project proponent consult with CDFW on what authorizations may be required for the removal of species attached to the pipelines.	Section 4.3
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	CDFW recommends re-assessing the natural communities on-site using current MCV online (2022) nomenclature. CDFW recommends avoiding all sensitive natural communities.	Section 4.3
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	General Comments on 1) California Endangered Species Act (CESA); 2) Fully Protected Species; 3) Project Description and Alternatives; 4) Lake and Streambed Alteration (LSA) Agreements; 5) Wetlands Resources; 6) Biological Baseline Assessment; 7) Biological Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Impacts 8) Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation for Sensitive Plants; 9) Compensatory Mitigation; 10) Long-Term Management of Mitigation Lands; 11) Nesting Birds; 12) Translocation/Salvage of Plants and Animal Species; 13) Moving out of Harm's Way; 14) Revegetation/Restoration Plan	Section 4.3
Chevron	Chevron requests that the City consider the following points and clarifications regarding the scope and content of the EIR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Acreage</li> </ul>	Section 2.0
Chevron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referenced Project Execution Schedule</li> </ul>	Section 2.0
Chevron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Referenced Soil Remediation Targets</li> </ul>	Section 2.0
Chevron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenhouse Gas Emissions</li> </ul>	Section 4.6
Chevron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant Impact decisions for Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, and Hazards and Hazardous Materials</li> </ul>	Sections 4.3, 4.4, and 4.7
Chevron	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legacy Wells</li> </ul>	Section 4.7
Julie Tumamait Stenslie	I would like to see a map. Also recommend that there be a Phase 1 done for the project. Ultimately I would recommend monitoring by a qualified Archaeologist and a qualified Native Chumash monitor. Any ground disturbance including demolition. In AB- 52, the chair of a Band can consult, the others on the NAHC are people who may have information on cultural resources Absence or Presence. This list is not a monitoring list. The BVBMI does not employ monitors. We are all independent contractors.	Section 4.12
Native American Heritage Commission	The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources.	Section 4.12

## Location of Comment Discussion in Draft EIR

Commenting Agency	Comment	Location of Comment Discussion in Draft EIR
Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District	The EIR should evaluate the following potential impacts related to the project: 1. Increase in Criteria Pollutant and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. 2. Attainment Status and Consistency with the District's Ozone Plan. 3. Impacts to Air Quality Standard Attainment. 4. Impacts to Sensitive Receptors and Potential for Nuisance Issues. 5. Mitigation. 6. Asbestos Reporting Requirements.	Sections 4.2 and 4.6
The Sportfishing Conservancy	We suggest it is time to "fish or cut bait," and mercifully forego the legal wrangling's that do more damage than good. It is time to move forward with a mitigated negative declaration.	Section 1.0
Susan Allen	In light of the odor nuisance violation issued in September 2022 and previous other odor violations the public should have notice if and when an odor incident occurs through the city newsletter, social media and news releases.	Section 4.2
Susan Allen	Temporary signage along Dump Road and the hiking/biking trail should give current updates of the nature of the work and who to contact for any questions or concerns.	
Susan Allen	Where are the historic and current cathodic wells located and how will they be monitored and abandoned?	Section 4.7
Susan Allen	What if any recent testing has occurred in the Sandblast area (east of the oceanside parking area?) When that area was cleaned years ago it was reported that a foot of soil was removed but in my observations only a few inches were removed.	Section 4.7
Susan Allen	A large tower type piece of equipment was removed a number of years ago at the east side of the operations area and to my knowledge without permit. Can that piece of equipment and its usage be identified and has adequate soil testing been done in that area?	Section 4.7
Susan Allen	Have drainage issues been addressed? Often there is water in the cement drainage ditch west of Dump Rd but no water is visible on the east side. Pipes gathering drainage from the bluffs 1 area are thought to cross the Chevron property.	Section 4.8
Susan Allen	Parking for employees working on decommissioning the plant area should occur north of the RR tracks to avoid possible increased disturbance of the harbor seals. This would also apply to all equipment or supply storage. As a safety measure it will also cut down on traffic crossing RR tracks and interface with folks using the hiking/biking trail.	Section 4.3, Section 4.11
Susan Allen	During non drought years the retention basin around tank 861 has had substantial water collection. Why has it not been included in the wetlands analysis? It once held wetlands species.	Section 4.3
Susan Allen	How will historic pedestrian and bike traffic be handled on Dump Rd during decommissioning?	Section 4.11
Susan Allen	Will the native plants covering the metal topped vault located on the bluffs edge west of the pier be replaced?	Section 4.3



---

**Location of Comment Discussion in Draft EIR**

Commenting Agency	Comment	Location of Comment Discussion in Draft EIR
Susan Allen	How will the pipelines left in place be abandoned? Filled with concrete? If left in place and not filled will pipes eventually corrode and create sinkholes? I believe this has happened in an area in Tarpits Park.	Section 2.0, Section 4.7
Susan Allen	Suggest that western most pipes be removed first. This will give workers and MM observers an opportunity to assess how best such work can quickly proceed to avoid unnecessary seal disturbance. Note that the offshore rocks are also a seal haulout site. (One of the three Carpinteria haulout locations.)	Section 2.0
Susan Allen	Exactly what pipes are in the cement bundle....isn't there a water outfall pipe in that location? Where is the electrical line for Gail and Grace located?	Section 2.0
Susan Allen	No work should occur during city beach closure. In recent years Sealwatch has noted a decline in the population and to date have not been able to discern a cause. All work must be done outside the beach closure window.	Section 2.0
Susan Allen	A minimum of two well qualified MM observers must be required and video cameras installed so that interested members of the public can be assured that the seals are being fully protected. Members of Sealwatch have witnessed too many occasions when the seals have not been fully protected.	Section 4.3
Susan Allen	Placing a screen on the beach will need more research and monitoring. Has this been done with harbor seals in other areas and has it been effective?	Section 4.3
Susan Allen	Data collection should be made public on a daily basis.	Section 2.0
Susan Allen	How long will concrete removal on the beach take and will the crane be moved closer to shore for this operation? Will the crane be moved away when not in use— what effect may a new large structure near the haulout have on the seals even when not in motion?	Section 2.0, Section 4.3
Susan Allen	Has the drainage pipe and concrete at the west corner of the Seal Sanctuary overlook been included in any study?	Section 4.3
Susan Allen	Pupping has been as early as January and as late as May with surviving pups.	Section 4.3
Susan Mailheu	I urge you to protect our seals, our land and ocean by abandoning the facility for open space instead of decommissioning to Tier 1. Chevron should be encouraged to do the following to fulfill their obligations instead of attempting to return the land to original state at the environmental cost that would incur. 1. We should evaluate and preserve the existing tree inventory and develop a planting program to renew and extend a native tree canopy, restoring habitat for bees, bats, and birds	Section 2.0, Section 4.3