

## 3.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section presents:

- changes to hazards and hazardous materials existing conditions and applicable regulations since adoption of the GP/CLUP and certification of the Final EIR in 2006; and
- an analysis of the potential hazards and hazardous materials effects of proposed amendments to the existing GP/CLUP.

### 3.7.1 Existing Conditions

Existing hazards or potential hazards within the City of Goleta are described in the 2006 Final EIR and include:

- urban and wildland fire hazards;
- oil and gas production, processing, and transport hazards (including hazards associated with the Venoco Ellwood Onshore Oil and Gas Processing Facility);
- hazardous materials and wastes (including household hazardous wastes, materials used by commercial and industrial land uses, and accidental releases along transportation corridors);
- businesses that handle more than a specified amount of hazardous materials and must submit a Hazardous Materials Disclosure Program;
- releases of hazardous materials that may occur during a natural disaster such as an earthquake, overturning or breakage of improperly stored containers of hazardous substances, pipeline rupture, and storage tank failure;
- contaminant releases from active remediation sites, closed sites, and properties that can be considered a higher risk for contamination based on historic or current land uses (examples include Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act sites, underground storage tanks, and the County landfill);
- airport-related hazards; and
- electromagnetic fields.

### 3.7.2 Changes in Regulatory Framework

#### 3.7.2.1 Federal and State

Since adoption of the GP/CLUP in 2006, there have been no changes to the following regulations that are relevant to the proposed amendments categorized as Track 3 revisions to the GP/CLUP:

- Clean Water Act Section 402 (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program),
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] Section 6901-6987),
- Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act (EPCRA) (42 U.S.C. 11001 et seq.),

- FAR Part 77, Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, (14 C.F.R. §§77.1, et seq.),
- Proposition 65, the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986,
- Asbestos Emissions from Demolition/Renovation Activities,
- State Air Resources Board Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Emissions of Asbestos from Construction, Grading, Quarry, and Surface Mining Operations,
- Hazardous Material Release Response Plans and Inventory Law (California Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.95),
- Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.5), and
- Aboveground Storage of Petroleum (California Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.67 and Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, Part 112).

### **3.7.2.2 Local**

Since adoption of the GP/CLUP in 2006, there have been no changes to the following regulations that are relevant to the proposed amendments categorized as Track 3 revisions to the GP/CLUP:

- Santa Barbara County Fire Prevention Division, Leaking Underground Fuel Tank program

#### ***City of Goleta GP/CLUP***

Since adoption of the GP/CLUP and certification of the Final EIR, the City adopted three General Plan amendments. First, the City adopted an amendment to Subpolicy CE 10.3 as part of the approval of the Village at Los Carneros. The amendment changed prohibitions against post-development stormwater discharge rates and was adopted on February 19, 2008. Second, the City adopted various clarifying amendments as part of the City-sponsored Track 2 amendments. The Track 2 amendments were adopted and the related CEQA Addendum was certified by the City Council on June 17, 2008. Third, the City adopted a land use designation re-classification (General Industrial to General Commercial) as part of the approval of the Harwin Family Trust project. All amendments are reflected in the text of the GP/CLUP cited in the Supplemental EIR.

The City has also established a new ordinance to the municipal code, Chapter 25b, titled "Change of Owner, Operator, or Guarantor for Certain Oil and Gas Facilities." No other changes to the GP/CLUP and no new ordinances relative to land use designations and densities have been enacted by the City since October 2006. There have been modifications to enabling ordinances and resolutions related to the Design Review Board's review of projects and process. Moreover, in fall 2008, the City modified the Goleta Growth Management Ordinance to exempt from its consideration the Goleta Valley Cottage Hospital Replacement Projects, along with associated medical office space and parking.

#### ***Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District***

The SBCAPCD revised its Clean Air Plan (CAP) in 2007. The 2007 CAP is discussed in Section 3.3.2.2 of this Supplemental EIR.

### 3.7.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

As in the 2006 Final EIR, the evaluation in this Supplemental EIR concerns the potential effects on hazards and hazardous materials that would result from implementation of the GP/CLUP policies and, in this case, from alternate versions of those policies in the form of GP/CLUP amendments.

#### 3.7.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

##### ***City of Goleta Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual***

The City's adopted Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual (Thresholds Manual) (City of Goleta 2003) provides specific thresholds for conducting CEQA analysis. Section 14, "Public Safety Thresholds," and Section 9, "Electromagnetic Fields Thresholds," provides guidance for assessing the significance of hazards impacts associated with a proposed project.

The City's adopted thresholds address public safety impacts resulting from involuntary exposure to hazardous materials. These thresholds focus on the activities that include the installation or modification to facilities that handle hazardous materials, transportation of hazardous materials, or nonhazardous land uses in proximity to hazardous facilities. A significant impact with regard to hazards and hazardous materials would be expected to occur if the proposed project (i.e., the GP/CLUP) resulted in an increase of public safety risks that exceed risk-based thresholds contained in the City's Thresholds Manual. For the purposes of this analysis, an impact would be considered significant if it results in an unsafe exposure of people to a variety of hazards or hazardous materials as listed in Section 3.7.1 above. For hazardous materials releases, determination of whether unsafe exposure levels exist is dependent upon the following: type of hazardous material released, media to which the hazardous material was released (e.g., to air, soil, or water), concentration to which such hazardous material exists in air, soil, or water, duration of the release, and persistence of the hazardous material in the environment. Permissible exposure levels if such releases occur are estimated in the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Handbook (NIOSH 2005).

According to the Thresholds Manual, there is potential of significant impact to public safety from a project if the following conditions within the proposed development exist:

- oil wells and gas wells and associated production;
- gas and hazardous liquid pipelines; or
- oil and/or gas processing and storage facilities.

Hazards and hazardous materials releases associated with these types of facilities, which may result in significant impacts are discussed in Section 3.7.1.2.

The Threshold Manual also includes a threshold for EMF exposure—in particular, radio frequency radiation (RFR). No specific threshold has been adopted in the City of Goleta for extremely low frequency (ELF); instead, ELF exposure should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis using the most current scientific data. For RFR, standards have been established for effects resulting from thermal heating of body tissue. The most widely used conservative standards are the IEEE-ANSI C95.1-1992, which are based on power densities (see Figures 2 and 3 of Section 9, City of Goleta 2003). A significant impact to humans would occur if:

- humans are exposed to RFR in excess of the IEEE-ANSI C95.1-1992 standard, through the siting of new projects next to RFR sources or through the siting of new RFR sources adjacent to sensitive receptors (If the FCC rulemaking committee adopts a revised standard, said standard shall apply).

### **CEQA Thresholds**

The following thresholds of significance are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For the purposes of this document, implementation of the GP/CLUP may have a significant adverse impact related to hazards and hazardous materials if it would result in any of the following:

- create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- 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;
- emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;
- include a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, creates a significant hazard to the public or the environment;
- create a safety hazard for people residing or working in an area within two miles of a public or public use airport;
- impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or
- expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

#### **3.7.3.2 Discussion of Relevant GP/CLUP Policies**

The action under consideration by the City is to amend the existing GP/CLUP to approve the changes in Alternatives 2a, 2b, or 3; combine or eliminate changes proposed in Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3; or choose not to change the GP/CLUP at this time (Alternative 1).

The Safety and Land Use Elements of the City's GP/CLUP contain policies that minimize the risk to humans and structures from hazards associated with production, use, and transport of hazardous materials, natural hazards, and hazards related to other City operations. The following GP/CLUP policies are relevant to hazards and hazardous materials.

#### **Safety Element**

Policies in the Safety Element focus on protecting humans and structures from potential hazards. The policies aim to avoid siting of development or land use activities in hazardous areas, and where this is infeasible, require appropriate mitigation to lessen (minimize) exposure to hazards. Policies addressing these hazards are listed below:

- Policy SE 1: Safety in General
- Policy SE 7: Urban and Wildland Fire Hazards

- Policy SE 8: Oil and Gas Industry Hazards
- Policy SE 9: Airport-Related Hazards
- Policy SE 10: Hazardous Materials and Facilities

### ***Land Use Element***

Land use plans are the major means to control development within the City. Hazards are not uniformly distributed within the City. Therefore, land use decisions have a direct effect on public safety. Restrictions concerning types of industry, location of permissible industrial activity, where residential areas can be developed, and the density of those developments are controlled by the GP/CLUP policies under the Land Use Element. Policies addressing these hazards are listed below:

- Policy LU 1: Land Use Plan Map and General Policies
- Policy LU 10: Energy-Related On- and Off-Shore Uses

### **3.7.3.3 Project Impacts**

In this Supplemental EIR, the evaluation of the potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts of proposed amendments considers the potential effects of individual changes on hazards and hazardous materials in the City and on the mitigation provided by the Conservation Element, Safety Element, and Land Use Element policies for the impacts of GP/CLUP implementation.

For purposes of the analysis, the source of direct and indirect impacts remains as identified in the 2006 Final EIR. Identified impacts were evaluated in terms of their potential significance based on the thresholds indicated in Subsection 3.7.3.1 and the classes of impacts (I through IV) used by the City for CEQA analyses. Cumulative impacts were examined in terms of the combined effects of the impacts associated with GP/CLUP implementation and foreseeable projects in areas adjacent to the City. Residual impacts were examined in terms of the potential for significant effects to occur after mitigation of any Class I, Class II, or significant cumulative impacts.

### ***Methodology***

The analysis in this Supplemental EIR is intended to determine how impacts of GP/CLUP implementation and the mitigating effect of the policies in the GP/CLUP would change if some or all of the proposed amendments were adopted. To determine this, each policy change proposed in Alternatives 2a, 2b, and 3 was evaluated in terms of three questions:

1. Is the change to a policy cited as mitigation for a Class II impact of the existing GP/CLUP?
2. If the change were accepted, would implementation of the amended GP/CLUP result in greater or different impacts than those analyzed in the 2006 Final EIR?
3. Does the change have the potential to result in potentially significant impacts? If yes, is there feasible mitigation to reduce the effects?

In response to Question 1, Table 3.7-1 provides a tabular summary of those policies cited as mitigation for a Class II hazards and hazardous materials impacts identified in the existing GP/CLUP. Responses to Questions 2 and 3 are addressed in the analyses for each impact, as

follows. A tabular summary of this analysis is presented in the alternative screening tables in Appendix B.

**TABLE 3.7-1  
POLICIES PROPOSED FOR AMENDMENT THAT ARE  
CITED AS MITIGATION FOR CLASS II HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS  
IMPACTS IN 2006 FINAL EIR**

Proposed Policy Change (ID #)	Potential Impact Identified with One or More Action Alternative
CE 1.1	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 1.2	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 1.3	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 1.5	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 1.6	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 1.9	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 2.2	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 2.3	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 2.5	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 3.1	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 3.4	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 3.5	Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water
CE 10.3	Impact 3.7-7 Surface Water

The following hazards and hazardous materials impact analysis considers issues related to proposed amendments to the City of Goleta GP/CLUP. Those issues include hazards and hazardous materials impacts resulting from changes in the locations of large regional development, revisions to growth management directives, access to open space, protection of biological resources, and traffic mitigation options. The analysis also includes review of cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with development within, and adjacent to, the City of Goleta.

### ***Class I Impacts***

#### Short-Term Impacts—None

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there are no short-term significant and unavoidable impacts involving the creation of a public safety hazard, exposure of people to hazardous materials, or conflicts with any emergency response or evacuation plan associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Long-Term**Impact 3.7-1. Risk of Upset at Venoco Facilities****Impact 3.7-2. Transport**

None of the policies included in the 2006 Final EIR as measures to reduce the significance of the above-listed impacts are proposed for amendment. Accordingly, the proposed GP/CLUP amendments would not affect the analysis presented in Section 3.7.3.3 of the 2006 Final EIR for these impacts, and no further discussion need be presented in this Supplemental EIR.

**Class II Impacts**Short-Term

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there are no short-term potentially significant but mitigable impacts involving the creation of a public safety hazard, exposure of people to hazardous materials, or conflicts with any emergency response or evacuation plan associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Long-Term**Impact 3.7-3. Risk of Upset at S.L. 421 Wells****Impact 3.7-4. Risk of Upset at Ellwood Marine Terminal****Impact 3.7-5. Airport****Impact 3.7-6. Wildland Fires**

None of the policies included in the 2006 Final EIR as measures to reduce the significance of the above-listed impacts are proposed for amendment. Accordingly, the proposed GP/CLUP amendments would not affect the analysis presented in Section 3.7.3.3 of the 2006 Final EIR for these impacts, and no further discussion need be presented in this Supplemental EIR.

**Impact 3.7-7. Surface Water**

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, surface water quality could be adversely affected by ordinary use or spills of hazardous materials used during site grading and construction activities. Fuels, solvents, paint, and other similar substances used during grading and construction could adversely impact local surface water quality if they were spilled directly into the runoff drainage system. Impacts to water quality associated with spills of such materials would be considered potentially significant.

Policies That Would Reduce Impact 3.7-7. Implementation of SWPPPs and Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plans as discussed in the GP/CLUP would greatly reduce the impact to the environment of any spills. These plans would help minimize the potential for spills of hazardous materials in drainages and creeks. In addition, implementation of the following policies identified in the Conservation Element of the GP/CLUP would ensure that construction impacts on surface water quality resulting from Plan implementation would be less than significant. Policies proposed for amendment are indicated in bold type.

- Policy CE 1: Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations and Policy
  - **CE 1.1: Definition of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas**

- **CE 1.2:**           **Designation of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas**
- **CE 1.3:**           **Site-Specific Studies and Unmapped ESHAs**
- CE 1.4:           Illegal Destruction of ESHAs
- **CE 1.5:**           **Corrections to Map of ESHAs**
- **CE 1.6:**           **Protection of ESHAs**
- CE 1.7:           Mitigation of Impacts to ESHAs
- CE 1.8:           ESHA Buffers
- **CE 1.9:**           **Standards Applicable to Development Projects**
- CE 1.10:           Management of ESHAs
- Policy CE 2:       Protection of Creeks and Riparian Areas
  - CE 2.1:           Designation of Protected Creeks
  - **CE 2.2:**           **Streamside Protection Areas**
  - **CE 2.3:**           **Allowable Uses and Activities in Streamside Protection Areas**
  - CE 2.4:           Dedication of Easements or Other Property Interests
  - **CE 2.5:**           **Maintenance of Creeks as Natural Drainage Systems**
  - CE 2.6:           Restoration of Degraded Creeks
- Policy CE 3:       Protection of Wetlands
  - **CE 3.1:**           **Definition of Wetlands**
  - CE 3.2:           Designation of Wetland ESHAs
  - CE 3.3:           Site-Specific Wetland Delineations
  - **CE 3.4:**           **Protection of Wetlands**
  - **CE 3.5:**           **Wetland Buffer Areas**
  - CE 3.6:           Mitigation of Wetland Fill
  - CE 3.7:           Lagoon Protection
  - CE 3.8:           Vernal Pool Protection
- Policy CE 10:      Watershed Management and Water Quality
  - CE 10.1:          New Development and Water Quality
  - CE 10.2:          Siting and Design of New Development
  - **CE 10.3:**          **Incorporation of Best Management Practices for Stormwater Management**
  - CE 10.4:          New Facilities
  - CE 10.5:          Beachfront and Blufftop Development
  - CE 10.6:          Stormwater Management Requirements
  - CE 10.7:          Drainage and Stormwater Management Plans
  - CE 10.8:          Maintenance of Stormwater Management Facilities

- o CE 10.9: Landscaping to Control Erosion

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2a has the same potential for long-term significant adverse impacts to hazards and hazardous materials as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. As can be seen from the list above, all of the policy amendments applicable to this impact are related to the Conservation Element. Because Alternative 2a includes policy changes that would reduce the minimum width of certain buffers and provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for temporary short-term impacts than Alternative 1, especially in terms of temporary habitat disturbance or degradation from adjacent activities. Further, because Alternative 2a changes how ESHAs are formally designated within the City, it is possible that the number of acres and types of ESHA protected from temporary impacts would be fewer than under Alternative 1 and consequently more acres and types would be subject to short-term impacts. Alternative 2a also clarifies how Best Management Practices (BMPs) for stormwater management are implemented. The proposed policy change under CE 10.3 would ensure that the revised policy language is consistent with the City's adopted Stormwater Management Program. However, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2a would amend the GP/CLUP in ways that eliminate or substantially change the requirements to avoid, minimize, and mitigate long-term potentially significant impacts to special-status biological resources as stated in other City policies. In addition, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2a alter the resource protection and impact mitigation requirements that apply to special-status habitats and species under Federal and State regulations, including CEQA. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element policies under Alternative 2a would have no new or modified impacts to hazards and hazardous materials.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Alternative 2b has substantially the same potential for long-term Class II impacts as Alternative 2a. Alternative 2b differs from Alternative 1 and 2a in that it calls for the City to replace the measures included in ESHA-related policies in the existing GP/CLUP with a comprehensive habitat management plan and comprehensive guidelines for biological assessments and ESHA determinations within the City. Because Alternative 2b defers to a plan and guidelines not yet developed, it creates an interim scenario in which special-status habitat and species are potentially more at risk from short-term impacts than would occur under Alternative 1 or 2a. However, as with Alternative 2a, none of the policy changes under Alternative 2b would eliminate or substantially change the City policies or applicable Federal and State regulations that apply to the protection of special-status habitats and species. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element policies under Alternative 2b would have no new or modified impacts to hazards and hazardous materials.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Alternative 3 has the same potential for short-term significant adverse impacts to special-status habitats and species as the existing GP/CLUP (Alternative 1) and would reduce those impacts through policies that are substantially the same as those in the existing GP/CLUP. Because Alternative 3 includes policy changes that provide a more detailed list of allowed activities in and near ESHAs, remove the specific noise limit, and reduce the minimum width of buffer areas, it can be viewed as having a greater potential for temporary short-term impacts than Alternative 1, especially in terms of temporary habitat disturbance or degradation from adjacent activities. However, as with Alternative 2a, the policy changes under Alternative 3 would not eliminate or change requirements under other City policies and under Federal and State regulations regarding mitigation for significant impacts to special-status biological resources. Accordingly, revisions to the Conservation Element policies

under Alternative 3 would have no new or modified impacts to hazards and hazardous materials.

**Impact 3.7-8. Exposure of Population to Listed/Contaminated Sites**

**Impact 3.7-9. Contaminated Soil**

None of the policies included in the Final EIR as measures to reduce the significance of the above-listed impacts are proposed for amendment. Accordingly, the proposed GP/CLUP amendments would not affect the analysis presented in Section 3.7.3.3 of the Final EIR for these impacts, and no further discussion need be presented in this Supplemental EIR.

**Class III Impacts**

Short-Term

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there are no short-term less-than-significant impacts to hazardous and hazardous materials associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Long-Term

**Impact 3.7-10. Exposure of Populated Areas to Oil and Gas Pipelines**

**Impact 3.7-11. Ellwood Facility**

**Impact 3.7-12. EMFs**

**Impact 3.7-13. Upset and Accident Conditions**

**Impact 3.7-14. Contaminated Groundwater**

None of the policies included in the Final EIR as measures to further reduce and maintain the above-listed impacts at less-than-significant levels are proposed for amendment. Accordingly, the proposed GP/CLUP amendments would not affect the analysis presented in Section 3.7.3.3 of the 2006 Final EIR for these impacts, and no further discussion need be presented in this Supplemental EIR.

**Class IV Impacts**

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, there are no short- or long-term beneficial (Class IV) impacts to hazards and hazardous materials associated with implementation of the City's adopted GP/CLUP.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

**3.7.3.4 Cumulative Impacts**

Alternative 1: No Changes (No Project). As indicated in the 2006 Final EIR, implementation of the GP/CLUP, as well as other development outside the City, would increase the number of

persons that could be potentially exposed to hazards and hazardous materials. Development of Emergency Preparedness Programs, as well as implementation of the GP/CLUP policies noted above, would provide adequate safety protection for the public and the environment resulting from exposure to hazards and hazardous materials.

Furthermore, as with geologic impacts, risks resulting from exposure of people and the environment to hazards and hazardous materials are usually site-specific and generally do not combine with similar effects that could occur with other projects throughout the cumulative study area. Laws and regulations that apply to hazards and hazardous materials are extensive and quite stringent, which generally serves to mitigate any potential project-specific and/or cumulative impacts that could result.

Alternative 2a: City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2b: Options Associated with City-Initiated Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 3: SEIR Recommended Revisions. Same as Alternative 1.

In sum, the proposed amendments evaluated in this Supplemental EIR would not affect the level of significance of cumulative impacts determined for the 2006 Final EIR.

### **3.7.3.5 Mitigation**

#### ***Modifications to GP/CLUP Policies***

Proposed modifications to selected GP/CLUP policies are presented in Chapter 2.0 as amendments to the GP/CLUP. No further modifications are proposed for consideration beyond those identified as alternatives in this Supplemental EIR.

#### ***Other Mitigation***

No additional mitigation is identified.

### **3.7.3.6 Residual Impacts**

Significant residual impacts exist associated with accidental releases of hazardous materials during operation of Venoco EOF facility and supporting oil transportation facilities (e.g., pier well and pipelines) and routine transport of hazardous materials and wastes. These hazards are significant and can be reduced through implementation of Safety Element and Land Use Element policies, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the GP/CLUP land use policies, as amended, would not affect this determination.

*This page intentionally left blank*