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CITY OF GOLETA
FINAL INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. PROJECT TITLE:
   Line 96 Decommissioning Project; Case No. 12-045-DP-CUP (Previous Case Numbers: 09-088-DP, 09-088-CUP, and CDP E-11-003)

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS:
   City of Goleta, 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B, Goleta, CA 93117

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:
   Jasch Janowicz, Contract Planner, (805) 961-7546

4. APPLICANT:
   Ellwood Pipeline, Inc. (Venoco, Inc.)
   Venoco, Inc.
   Mr. Bruce Carter
   6267 Carpinteria Ave., Suite 100
   Carpinteria, CA 93013

5. PROJECT LOCATION:
   The project involves the decommissioning of Line 96, which begins at the Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) located at 7979 Hollister Avenue in the City of Goleta, and extends approximately 2.0 miles east beneath Hollister Avenue to Pacific Oaks Road. The pipeline then extends south beneath Pacific Oaks Road for approximately 0.3 miles, west beneath Phelps Road for approximately 0.5 miles, and then south beneath the City-owned Ellwood Mesa Open Space property for approximately 0.5 miles. The line ultimately terminates at the Ellwood Marine Terminal (EMT).

   The regional location of the project, as well as the specific location of the project in the City of Goleta, is shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2.
Regional Location

Figure 1
Figure 2. Site Location
6. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

6.1 Project Background

The original Line 96 pipeline carried oil production fluids between Venoco’s EOF and the EMT. The pipeline is currently out of service as a result of the recently completed Line 96 Modification Project (11-116-LUP, 09-088-DP, 09-088-CUP, and CDP E-11-003). The modified Line 96 transports oil from the EOF to a connection point on the Plains All American Pipeline (PAAP) near Las Flores Canyon. Pursuant to Condition No. 15 of Permit No. 09-088-DP/CUP (Appendix A) and Condition 9b of the City of Goleta Franchise Agreement (on file at the City of Goleta Planning Department), Venoco is required to decommission in place and/or remove the original portions of Line 96.

6.2 Request

Venoco Inc. (“Venoco”) requests approval of a Development Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and a Coastal Development Permit to allow the decommissioning of Line 96. The original project description submitted by Venoco proposed to decommission the subsurface pipeline in place. However, two potentially affected private landowners located along Phelps Road (University of California Santa Barbara and the Goleta Union School District) formally requested removal of portions of the pipeline that traverse their private properties. Therefore, this Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration considers the overall project to include a total of seven (7) pipeline segments are proposed for decommissioning in place or with removal of pipeline segments 3 and 5. A description of each pipeline segment is provided below. Figure 3 shows the location of each pipeline segment and proposed work area.

- **Pipeline Segments 1 and 2.** These segments traverse beneath the parking lot portion of the EOF facility, Hollister Avenue, Pacific Oaks Road, and approximately 880 feet of Phelps Road (west of the Phelps Road/Pacific Oaks Road intersection). These segments would be decommissioned in place.

- **Pipeline Segment 3.** This segment traverses beneath a vacant parcel owned by the Goleta Union School District and would be removed as requested by the Goleta Union School District.

- **Pipeline Segment 4.** This segment traverses the western portion of UCSB’s North Campus housing project and would be decommissioned in place to minimize impacts to ongoing construction, impacts to wetlands, and the recently constructed entrance improvements of the North Campus housing project.

- **Pipeline Segment 5.** This segment traverses beneath a future phase of UCSB’s North Campus housing project and would be removed as requested by UCSB.

- **Pipeline Segment 6.** This segment traverses beneath the city-owned Ellwood Mesa Open space parcels and would be decommissioned in place.

- **Pipeline Segment 7.** This segment traverses beneath the city-owned Ellwood Mesa Open Space parcel and beneath the southwestern portion of UCSB’s North Campus parcel, where it ultimately terminates beneath the existing EMT facility. This pipeline segment would be decommissioned in place.
Proposed Work Areas and Pipeline Segments

Figure 3

- **Work Area 1**: EOF Valve Box 1293
- **Work Area 2**: Rectifier Station N. of Hollister Ave.
- **Work Area 3**: Pipeline Removal
- **Work Area 4**: Pipeline Removal
- **Work Area 5**: Valve Box 1291, Ellwood Mesa
- **Work Area 6**: Grout Pumping Location

Segments:
- Segment 1
- Segment 2
- Segment 3
- Segment 4
- Segment 5
- Segment 6
- Segment 7
Although the majority of the pipeline segments would be decommissioned in place, construction activity would occur within selected pipeline segments. The activities and the degree of physical disturbance proposed within each pipeline segment have been identified as “Work Areas.” The construction activities proposed within each Work Area are described below. Photographs of each proposed work area are included in Figure 4.

- **Work Area No. 1.** The area includes Vault Box 1293, which is located near the existing entrance to the EOF. Pipeline grouting would be initiated from this location. The paved parking lot/entrance driveway area would be used for equipment staging during the grouting procedure. Pipeline grouting equipment would be staged in the paved area between the EOF fence line and Hollister Avenue. The equipment staging would not likely obstruct bicycle or pedestrian access or existing natural vegetation. Venoco is prepared to provide appropriate traffic controls (i.e., flaggers, detour signs, orange safety cones, etc.), if necessary. No physical disturbance to the ground surface would occur. Detours would last as long as necessary to complete grouting in one or two working days.

- **Work Area No. 2.** This area is located along Pipeline Segment 1 near the intersection of Hollister Avenue and Lowell Way and near the existing commercial property located at 7272 Hollister Avenue (survey location 97 + 47.00). The proposed construction activities involve the removal of the existing cathodic protection rectifier located on the north side of Hollister Avenue. Construction activities would include disconnecting the cathodic protection rectifier from power and physically removing the structure to a minimum depth of 24” below grade. The associated deep bed anode well would be abandoned in place in accordance with standards set by the California Department of Water Resources (CWDR). The physical disturbance to the ground surface would include asphalt and pavement demolition, removal and replacement in accordance with City standards. Limited amounts of existing streetscape landscaping may also be removed, but would be replanted after completion of construction activities in accordance with the City’s landscaping requirements. Detours would last as long as necessary to complete grouting in one or two working days.

- **Work Area No. 3.** This area includes Pipeline Segment 3, which parallels the Phelps Road right-of-way and traverses beneath the northern portions of the 9.28-acre parcel owned by Goleta Union School District. The existing pipeline would be grouted in place and then removed. The construction activities would include pipeline excavation, pipeline removal/demolition, off-site disposal of pipeline material, and site restoration. Construction activities would only occur within the northern portions of this property, which are currently undeveloped. Access to this work area would be provided by the existing paved portions of Phelps Road.

- **Work Area No. 4.** This area includes Pipeline Segment 5, which parallels the Phelps Road right-of-way and traverses beneath the northern portions of the 157.32 67.65-acre property owned by UCSB. Segment 5 is located approximately 30 feet west of the constructed wetlands and is immediately south of the existing pedestrian trail connecting to the Ellwood Mesa open space. The proposed construction activities include pipeline excavation, pipeline
removal/demolition, off-site disposal of pipeline material, and site restoration. Pipeline removal would only occur within the northern and western portions of this property, which have been rough graded to prepare for future development. Access to this work area would be provided by unpaved access roads that extend west from the intersection of Phelps Road and Cannon Green Drive.

- **Work Area 5.** This area is located at the terminus of Pipeline Segment 6, surrounding existing Vault Box 1291. This vault box is located in the southeast corner of the city-owned Ellwood Mesa Open Space property (approximately 770 feet west of the EMT). Construction activities would only occur within the immediate vicinity of the vault box, which consists of a metal lid and sub-surface concrete box walls. The entire lid and roof structure would be demolished and removed. The vault’s sub-surface concrete block walls would be demolished to a minimum depth of 18” below grade. Holes will be knocked through the bottom of the vault to permit drainage of any impounded moisture. Finally, the work area would be filled with an approved sand/soil mixture, compacted, and restored pursuant to City of Goleta requirements.

- **Work Area No. 6.** This area is located at the terminus of Pipeline Segment 7, directly adjacent to the western boundary of the EMT. The fenced area inside the EMT which is currently used for driving and/or parking paved areas surrounding the pipeline termination point would be used as a staging area for grouting equipment. The grouting of Line 96 would be initiated from this location. The equipment staging would not obstruct bicycle or pedestrian access or existing natural vegetation. No physical disturbance to the ground surface would occur.

The proposed grouting activities would involve pumping a fluid-like, workable mixture of bentonite, cement, and water from the beginning of Pipeline Segment 1 (located at the Ellwood Onshore Facility) and/or the end of Pipeline Segment 7 (located at the Ellwood Marine Terminal). The grout would be pumped through the entire length of the line without risk of over pressurization. Grout pumping would occur during one or two 12-14 hour work days. Grout would be introduced at the EMT and would be pumped west until it emerges out of the western end of Segment 1 at Vault Box 1293. As part of grouting and pipeline removal operations, the applicant’s contractor would also remove above-ground pipeline valves, above-ground concrete vault/valve boxes, and pipeline markers.

The physical removal of Pipeline Segments 3, and 5 would occur after completion of the grouting operation. The pipeline removal activities are anticipated to occur over 10 working days, in addition to the work days required to complete grout pumping.

### 6.3 Temporary Roadway and Trail Closures

Temporary roadway and trail closures within the work areas identified below would be required to complete the proposed grouting and pipeline removal activities.

- **Work Area No. 1.** Valve 1293, located at the EOF, would be accessed during the grouting procedure. Grouting equipment would be staged in this area and would not require temporary lane closure of Hollister Avenue, or obstruct bicycle or pedestrian access. Venoco would provide appropriate traffic controls (e.g. flaggers, detour signs, orange safety cones, etc.) in this area to the extent needed to avoid conflicts with EOF operations. Traffic controls along Hollister Avenue would occur during normal business hours and would only be required
for as long as necessary within one or for a maximum of 2 work days during grouting activities.

- **Work Area No. 2.** Valve Vault 1292 may be used during pipeline grouting. During grouting, the northernmost westbound lane of Hollister Avenue may be closed approximately 100 feet west of Vault 1292. Venoco would provide appropriate traffic controls (e.g. flaggers, detour signs, orange safety cones, etc.) and detours and/or alternative routes for local traffic and emergency vehicles. If the sidewalk is obstructed, an alternative pedestrian route would be provided through the adjacent property’s parking area. Venoco would work with the adjacent property owner to ensure the safe use of any pedestrian detour. Traffic controls and/or the establishment of a pedestrian detour would occur during normal business hours and would only be required for as long as necessary within one or a maximum of two work days during grouting.

Removal of the cathodic rectifier may require use of the existing driveway serving the commercial property located at 7272 Hollister Ave. Temporary vehicle travel lane closures are not anticipated, but this private driveway may be used for equipment staging during removal activities. If this driveway is used, safe vehicle passage would be maintained. If the sidewalk is obstructed, Venoco would work with the property owner to establish a safe pedestrian detour through the commercial property. During grouting, equipment staging, and pipeline removal activities, access to private and publically owned properties would be maintained. In the unlikely event that private property access is obstructed along Hollister Avenue, Venoco would provide access to the affected properties to the extent practical. If access to any commercial properties is obstructed during normal business hours, Venoco would provide lost-sales compensation to the property owner(s). Driveway traffic controls and/or the establishment of a pedestrian detour would occur during normal business hours and would only be required for as long as necessary within one or a maximum of two work days during grouting.

**Works Areas 3 and 4.** Equipment staging would occur on private property and therefore would not obstruct traffic flow. However, the existing unpaved trail extending west from the end of Phelps Road could possibly be temporarily obstructed during construction. Venoco would establish pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian detour(s) during normal business hours. These detours would be required for a maximum of 10 working days.

**Work Area 5.** Vault Box 1291 would be accessed via the EMT access road, via Storke Road. Demolition equipment would access the area from an existing unpaved trail that begins near the EMT and crosses into the Ellwood Mesa Open Space property. Vehicles would use this existing trail located approximately 50-100 feet south of the vault box, where there is sufficient space to allow equipment passage without impacting trees or vegetation. As a result, this east-west trail may be partially obstructed in order to avoid impacts to existing native vegetation. As a result of construction equipment staging, the existing north-south trail on the City’s Ellwood Mesa Open Space property adjacent to the vault box may also be temporarily obstructed. If any trails are obstructed, Venoco would provide appropriate pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian traffic controls (warning signs, trail detour signs, orange safety cones, etc.). Traffic controls and/or the establishment of pedestrian/bicycle/equestrian detour(s) would occur during normal business hours and would only be required for a maximum of two working days.
Proposed Work Areas

Figure 4a
Work Area 3 – Goleta Union School District Property

Work Area 4 – UCSB Property Along Phelps Road Along

Proposed Work Areas
Work Area 5 – Vault Box 1291 to Be Demolished in Ellwood Mesa Open Space

Work Area 6 – Grout Pumping Location at EMT
6.4 Properties Affected by Line 96 alignment

The majority of the proposed pipeline decommissioning project would be completed within existing paved public roadways. However, Pipeline Segments 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 traverse three privately owned parcels. Table 1 below provides information related to these parcels.

Table 1. Summary of Parcels Affected by the Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>073-090-026</td>
<td>Goleta Union School District</td>
<td>9.28 Acres</td>
<td>Pipeline Segment 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073-090-068074</td>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>167.65157.32 Acres</td>
<td>Pipeline Segments 4, 5, and 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079-210-024</td>
<td>City of Goleta</td>
<td>105.86 Acres</td>
<td>Pipeline Segment 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcel No. 073-090-026 is owned by the Goleta Union School District. The property is currently undeveloped, but it is zoned Planned Residential Development (PRD) up to 6 units per acre. Line 96 runs across the parcel’s northern boundary, adjacent to the Phelps Road right-of-way. The line also crosses beneath the channelized portions of Devereux Creek, south of Phelps Road, as it flows south to Devereux Slough.

Parcel No. 073-090-068-074 is owned by UCSB. This parcel is currently being developed as the North Campus university housing project. Line 96 traverses beneath the northern portion of this parcel and the southern portion of the parcel as it extends east from Vault Box 1291 to the grout pumping location near the EMT. The property is currently in the residential construction stage.

Parcel No. 079-210-024 is owned by the City of Goleta and is referred to as the Ellwood Mesa Open Space property. The property is utilized as a nature preserve and recreation area. Eucalyptus windrows are the dominant form of vegetation adjacent to the existing pipeline alignment. In addition, several types of riparian and wetland habitats are known to occur within the parcel, along with Coastal sage scrub and grassland habitats. Several areas of the parcel have been formally designated as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) by the City of Goleta.

7. APPROVAL REQUIRED BY OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES:
California Coastal Commission – Coastal Development Permit
8. PROJECT AREA INFORMATION:

Table 2. Summary of Pertinent Project Area Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing General Plan Land Use Designation</th>
<th>City of Goleta General Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venoco EOF parcel: Open Space - Passive Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goleta School District Parcel: Planned Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCSB: N/A (County of Santa Barbara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Goleta Ellwood Mesa: Open Space – Active Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning Ordinance, Zone District</th>
<th>City of Goleta Coastal Zoning Ordinance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venoco/City of Goleta Parcels: Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goleta School District: Planned Residential Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCSB: N/A (County of Santa Barbara)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Use and Development</th>
<th>Venoco’s EOF Parcel – Oil production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Roads - Hollister Avenue, Pacific Oaks Road, and Phelps Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goleta Union School District Property - Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCSB Parcel – North Campus housing project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goleta Ellwood Mesa Parcel – Open Space and Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding Uses/Zoning</th>
<th>North: US 101, Commercial and Residential Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East: Sandpiper Golf Course (SPGC), UCSB Housing, EMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South: Commercial and Residential Uses, Ellwood Beach/Mesa, Pacific Ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West: Bell Creek, Bacara Resort, Haskell’s Beach, Ellwood Mesa Open Space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Access                                    | Valve Box 1291 can be accessed from Storke Road and the existing access road providing access to the EMT. Valve Box 1292 can be accessed directly from Hollister Avenue. Vault Box 1293 would be accessed from the EOF’s paved access road connecting to Hollister Avenue. The areas proposed for pipeline removal can be accessed from Phelps Road. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities and Public Services</th>
<th>Utilities: Various Wet/Dry Utilities are located beneath Hollister Avenue, Pacific Oaks Road, Phelps Road, Goleta School District Parcel, UCSB north campus parcel, and city-owned Ellwood Mesa parcel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire: County of Santa Barbara Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police: City of Goleta Police Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Topography and Soils

The topography along the majority of the existing pipeline alignment is relatively flat, as it is located beneath the Hollister Avenue, Pacific Oaks Road, and Phelps Road roadways. The UCSB property is also relatively flat and the site is currently being developed as the North Campus housing project. The undeveloped northwestern portions of the UCSB property rise gently to a small knoll that has been developed as a multi-family housing project. Further south and west within the City’s Ellwood Mesa Open Space property, the topography undulates and then rises gently to marine terrace landforms at the coastline. Overall, Line 96 follows the existing topography described above at approximately 6 feet below existing grade.

The majority of the soils within the project area are disturbed, as they are located beneath or adjacent to public streets. Disturbed soils are also present above the portions of pipeline proposed for removal within the Goleta Union School District Parcel and the UCSB parcel. The soils present on the City’s Ellwood Mesa Open Space parcel are primarily undisturbed.
Fauna, Flora and Surface Water Bodies

No native fauna, flora, or surface water bodies are located within Pipeline Segments 1 and 2, as they are beneath existing roadways. Areas of sensitive native habitats are present on the Goleta Union School District and UCSB properties near Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5. However, these existing sensitive native habitats are located outside of the portions of Line 96 proposed for removal. Eucalyptus windrows are the dominant vegetation community surrounding Pipeline Segment 6 and 7 and Vault Box 1291 within the Ellwood Mesa Open Space property. Several types of riparian and wetland habitat are known to occur on Ellwood Mesa, including willow riparian, seasonal wetlands, and semi-perennial wetlands. Upland flora is comprised of coastal sage scrub and native grasslands. Furthermore, portions of the above-described habitats within the Ellwood Mesa Open Space property have been mapped as Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) by the City of Goleta. These wetlands, shrublands, and woodland areas provide suitable nesting and roosting habitat for a variety of migratory bird species, the monarch butterfly, and the western snowy plover.

Surrounding Land Uses

Sandpiper Golf Course is located directly east and south of the western terminus of Line 96. The Bacara Resort is located approximately 0.35 miles west of the EOF. The portions of the pipeline that run beneath the City streets are surrounded by existing commercial, residential, industrial and recreational land uses. The portions of the pipeline beneath the Ellwood Mesa Open Space property are surrounded by preserved open space and passive recreational uses. UCSB’s North Campus housing project and Ocean Meadows Golf Club are located further to the east.

10. 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 and analysis on the following pages.

- [ ] Aesthetics
- [x] Biological Resources
- [ ] Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- [ ] Land Use/Planning
- [ ] Population/Housing
- [ ] Transportation/Traffic
- [ ] Agriculture and Forest Resources
- [ ] Cultural Resources
- [ ] Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- [ ] Mineral Resources
- [ ] Public Services
- [ ] Utilities/Service Systems
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Geology/Soils
- [ ] Hydrology/Water Quality
- [x] Noise
- [ ] Recreation
- [ ] Mandatory Findings of Significance
11. 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 potential significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Anne Wells, Manager, Advance Planning Division  for    July 18, 2014  Date
12. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

(a) 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 will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

(b) All answers must take into account 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.

(c) 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.

(d) “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 (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (e) below, may be cross-referenced).

(e) 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:

1. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
2. 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.
3. 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.

(f) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). References to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

(g) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
(h) Lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected. The explanation of each issue should identify:

1. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

2. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

13. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST:

I. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>·</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

Beginning at Vault Box 1293 at the EOF, Line 96 travels north beneath the EOF access road, east beneath Hollister Avenue, south beneath Pacific Oaks Road and west beneath Phelps Road. Along this route, the pipeline is not visible as it is located beneath City streets. Low profile valve equipment and pipeline marker signs are visible. West of the Pacific Oaks Road/Phelps Road intersection, the line travels beneath a property owned by Goleta Union School District and beneath portions of the UCSB property currently being developed with multi-family residential dwellings.

Pipeline Segments 1 through 5 are surrounded by residential, commercial, industrial, and recreational uses. Pipeline Segment 6 travels south beneath the City’s Ellwood Mesa Open Space parcel, where it terminates at Vault Box 1291. Pipeline Segment 7 extends east from Vault Box 1291 where it terminates at the EMT.

The visual character of the environment surrounding Pipeline Segments 1-5 is primarily urban, with retail and residential uses present along Hollister Avenue and Pacific Oaks Road and single and multi-family residential uses present along Phelps Road. The visual character of the environment surrounding Pipeline Segments 6-7 is more natural, as it contains undeveloped and undulating hills, bluffs and beaches, a golf course, and riparian areas. A variety of
vegetative cover is present in this area, including large groves of trees, shrubs, dune habitats, disturbed grasslands, and frequently disturbed recreational trails.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant aesthetic impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual instructs the project evaluator to assess visual/aesthetic impacts through a two-step process. First, the visual resources of the project site must be evaluated, including the physical attributes of the site, its visual uniqueness, and its relative visibility from public viewing areas. Of particular concern are visibility from coastal and mountain areas, as well as its visibility from the urban fringe and travel corridors. Secondly, the potential impact of the project on visual resources located onsite and on views in the project area which may be partially or wholly obstructed must be determined. This step also includes an evaluation of the project’s consistency with City and State policies on the protection of visual resources.

Project Specific Impacts

a) Line 96 is located approximately six feet below the ground surface and the majority of the pipeline is proposed to be abandoned in place. Physical construction would involve the removal of the cathodic rectifier near Valve Box 1292, the demolition of Vault Box 1291 within the Ellwood Mesa Open Space, and the removal of the pipeline segments that traverse the northern portions of the UCSB property and the Goleta Union School District property.

Grout pumping equipment staging would occur at the end of Pipeline Segment 1. The staging would occur at Valve 1293 of the EOF and thus no disturbance to the natural environment would occur. The equipment staging would occur over a maximum of 2 working days, and therefore no impacts on scenic vistas would occur.

The decommissioning in place of Pipeline Segments 1 and 2 would only involve equipment staging within or adjacent to City Streets during normal business hours for a period of up to 2 working days. No impact to scenic vistas would occur as a result temporary construction staging activities within or adjacent to public roads.

The removal of Pipeline Segments 3, 4 and 5 and decommissioning in place of Pipeline Segment 4 would require short-term construction and equipment staging for up to 10 working days. Construction would occur near Phelps Road and adjacent to the Ellwood Mesa open space property during removal of the pipeline segments that traverse the Goleta Union School District and the UCSB properties. These activities would require the staging of construction debris and soil stockpile areas at varying heights for a period of up to 10 working days, which could temporarily alter views into or out of the open space areas located along the northern and eastern portions of the UCSB property and the City’s Ellwood Mesa Open Space property. However, the construction debris would be temporarily located along the relatively flat and low-lying portions (20-30 feet above sea level) of the UCSB and Goleta Union School District properties and thus foreground views into and out of the properties from the surrounding open space areas would not be significantly impacted. Similarly, the more significant background views of the City’s Ellwood Mesa Open Space area from the residential areas to the north would remain unaffected by the temporary construction activities, as the piles of construction debris would not substantially impair the line of sight south towards the Ellwood Mesa Open
Space areas. Temporary construction impacts on scenic vistas would be less than significant.

The proposed project would also remove all of the existing above ground petroleum infrastructure and signage. This is considered a beneficial impact on scenic vistas.

The project would involve the demolition of Vault Box 1291 at the end of Pipeline Segment 6. This structure is a low-lying feature which occupies an area no more than 100 square feet. Demolition would occur over a maximum of 2 working days and the construction area would be restored to its original natural condition. Thus, temporary construction impacts on scenic vistas would be less than significant. The removal of this existing infrastructure from the Ellwood Mesa Open Space would have a beneficial impact on scenic vistas.

Grout pumping equipment staging would occur at the end of Pipeline Segment 7. The staging would occur on the existing paved areas surrounding the EMT and thus no disturbance to the natural environment would occur. The equipment staging would occur over a maximum of 2 working days, and therefore no impacts on scenic vistas would occur.

b) US Highway 101 is “eligible for a scenic highway designation” along its entire length within Santa Barbara County; however, it has not been formally designated as a state scenic highway (Goleta General Plan EIR, 2006). The proposed project would not be visible from US Highway 101. Pipeline Segments 1 through 5 do not contain trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. Pipeline Segments 6 and 7 are surrounded by existing trees and other environmentally sensitive resources. However, the project would not require tree removal or native vegetation removal. Therefore, no impacts to a State scenic highway or other scenic resources would occur.

c) The decommissioning of Pipeline Segments 1 and 2 would occur within and/or adjacent to city streets and would only require temporary equipment staging to enable the grouting of Line 96, the removal of the cathodic rectifier, and the removal of ancillary above-ground infrastructure (pipeline markers and valves). Therefore, no impacts on the visual character would occur within these areas.

The removal of Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 would involve physical ground disturbance within the property owned by the Goleta Union School District and the eastern segments of the UCSB parcel. Although both parcels are currently undeveloped, the visual character is generally urban, and the pipeline removal activities would occur adjacent to Phelps Road, which is surrounded by existing single-family and multi-family development. Pipeline removal would require excavation, pipeline removal, demolition and off-site disposal of the pipeline, equipment staging, and site restoration to existing grades. The pipeline removal construction activities would occur over a maximum of 10 working days and the affected environment would be restored to pre-project conditions. Due to the temporary duration of the construction activity and the on-site restoration back to existing grades, impacts to visual character would be less than significant.

The demolition of Vault Box 1291 at the end of Pipeline Segment 6 would involve the disturbance of a small area within the City’s Ellwood Mesa Open Space parcel. It is estimated that approximately 100 square feet of soil and vegetation would be temporarily disturbed during the vault box demolition. However, the disturbance would be temporary
(approximately 1 or 2 working days) and Venoco would be required to restore the disturbance area to pre-project conditions (See Mitigation Measure BIO-2). The net result would be the removal of a visually incompatible structure and thus the long-term impacts to the visual character of the area would be beneficial.

Grout pumping equipment staging would occur at the end of Pipeline Segments 1 and 7. The staging would occur on the existing paved areas surrounding the EOF and EMT and thus no impacts to visual character would occur.

d) Night lighting would not be used during pipeline grouting or pipeline removal activities, as construction would occur only during normal business hours. All existing visual pipeline infrastructure (such as valves, pipeline markers, etc.) within the project area would be removed. No impacts from night lighting would occur. The removal of the existing pipeline markers would eliminate a source of glare within the project area. Impacts are therefore considered beneficial.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

Short-term construction impacts would be less than significant. Long-term impacts would be beneficial.

Residual Impacts

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

The project’s cumulative contribution to citywide aesthetics and visual resources would be beneficial, as it would remove petroleum infrastructure (e.g. vault boxes, valves, and above ground pipeline markers) from Hollister Avenue, Pacific Oaks Drive, Phelps Road, the Goleta Union School District property, the UCSB property, and the city-owned Ellwood Mesa Open Space property.
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 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))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

None of the work areas have been identified as agricultural land containing prime agricultural soils in the City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (GP/CLUP FEIR). The California Department of Conservation has identified the project area as “Urban and Built-Up Land” (http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html).
Thresholds of Significance

Significant impacts on Agriculture and Forest Resources would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, a project may pose a significant environmental effect on agricultural resources if it conflicts with adopted environmental plans and goals of the City, converts prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use, or impairs the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land.

Project Specific Impacts

a-c) The project would not convert any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as mapped by the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use. The proposed project would not impair agricultural productivity, or conflict with agricultural preserve programs. Finally, the project would not impact any unique or other farmland of State or Local Importance, as neither the project area, nor the land immediately surrounding the project site are zoned for current or future agricultural use. Moreover, none of the potentially affected properties are in agricultural use today and no properties within the project area are subject to a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

d-e) There are no parcels within the City that are identified as forest lands or timberlands. Therefore, the proposed project would not involve the conversion of forest lands to non-forest uses. No impact would occur.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for impacts to agricultural or forest resources.

Residual Impact

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

The project would not contribute to any cumulative impact on agriculture or forest resources on the project site, in the surrounding area, or within the City of Goleta.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

Line 96 is located within the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB), which is located in the southern portion of Santa Barbara County. The climate in and around the City of Goleta, as well as most of Southern California, is controlled largely by the strength and position of the subtropical high-pressure cell over the Pacific Ocean. This high-pressure cell typically produces a Mediterranean climate with warm summers, mild winters, and moderate rainfall. This pattern is periodically interrupted by periods of extremely hot weather brought in by Santa Ana winds. Almost all precipitation occurs between November and April, although during these months, the weather is sunny or partly sunny a majority of the time. Cyclic land and sea breezes are the primary factors affecting the region’s mild climate. The daytime winds are normally sea breezes, predominantly from the west, that flow at relatively low velocities. Additionally, cool, humid, marine air causes frequent fog and low clouds along the coast, generally during the night and morning hours in the late spring and early summer.

Surface temperature inversions (0 to 500 feet) are most frequent during the winter, and subsidence inversions (1,000 to 2,000 feet) are most frequent during the summer. Inversions are an increase in temperature with height and directly relate to the stability of the atmosphere. Inversions act as a cap to the pollutants that are emitted below or within them. The subsidence inversion is very common during the summer along the California coast, and is one of the principal causes of air stagnation. Poor air quality is usually associated with air stagnation (high stability/restricted air movement).

During the months of May to October, it is common for an inversion layer to form within the City and surrounding areas. Year round, light onshore winds hamper the dispersion of primary pollutants and the orientation of the inland mountain ranges interrupt air circulation patterns. Pollutants become trapped, creating ideal conditions for the production of secondary pollutants.

The Federal Government and the State of California have established air quality standards and emergency episode criteria for various pollutants. Generally, State regulations are more stringent than those at the Federal level. Air quality standards are set at concentrations that provide a sufficient margin of safety to protect public health and welfare. Air quality at a given location can be described by the concentration of various pollutants in the atmosphere. The
significance of a pollutant concentration is determined by comparing the concentration to an appropriate Federal and/or State ambient air quality standard.

Federal standards are established by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and are termed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The State standards are established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and are called the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). The region generally has good air quality, as it attains or is considered in maintenance status for most ambient air quality standards. The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is required to monitor air pollutant levels to assure that Federal and State air quality standards are being met.

A summary of the current NAAQS and CAAQS and the attainment status for Santa Barbara County is provided in Table 3. Currently, Santa Barbara County is classified as being in non-attainment of the state eight-hour ozone standard and the state PM$_{10}$ standard, though it is considered in attainment of the state one-hour ozone standard.

Table 3
Santa Barbara County Attainment/Nonattainment Classification Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>California Standards Concentration</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
<th>National Standards Concentration</th>
<th>Attainment Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O$_3$)</td>
<td>8 hour</td>
<td>0.070 ppm</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.075 ppm</td>
<td>U/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.09 ppm (180 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>revoked</td>
<td>revoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>8 hour</td>
<td>9.0 ppm (10 mg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.0 ppm (10 mg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>20.0 ppm (23 mg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>35.0 ppm (40 mg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO$_2$)</td>
<td>Annual average</td>
<td>0.030 ppm (56 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>53 ppb</td>
<td>U/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.18 ppm (336 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>100 ppb</td>
<td>U/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide (SO$_2$)</td>
<td>Annual average</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>revoked</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hour</td>
<td>0.04 ppm (105 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>revoked</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>0.25 ppm (655 µg/m$^3$)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>75 ppb</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM$_{10}$)</td>
<td>Annual arithmetic mean</td>
<td>20 µg/m$^3$</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Revoked</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hour</td>
<td>50 µg/m$^3$</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>150 µg/m$^3$</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter - Fine (PM$_{2.5}$)</td>
<td>Annual arithmetic mean</td>
<td>12 µg/m$^3$</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>15 µg/m$^3$</td>
<td>U/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 hour</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35 µg/m$^3$</td>
<td>U/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates (SO$_4$)</td>
<td>24 hour</td>
<td>25 µg/m$^3$</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (Pb)</td>
<td>Calendar quarter</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.5 µg/m$^3$</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thresholds of Significance

A significant air quality impact could occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist (a-e). In addition, per the City’s Thresholds Manual, a significant air quality impact could occur, if the project would:

f. Interfere with progress toward the attainment of the ozone standard by releasing emissions which equal or exceed the established long-term quantitative thresholds for NOx (nitrogen oxides) and ROC (reactive organic compounds; same as reactive organic gases [ROG]). Thresholds are 25 lbs/day of either NOx or ROC;

g. Equal or exceed the State or Federal ambient air quality standards for any criteria pollutant (as determined by modeling);

h. Result in toxic or hazardous air pollutants in amounts which may increase cancer risks for the affected population.

APCD Thresholds

The following significance thresholds have been established by the Santa Barbara County APCD (Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents, SBCAPCD, 2010). While the City of Goleta has not yet adopted any new threshold criteria, these APCD thresholds are considered appropriate for use as a guideline for the impact analysis.

The project would result in a significant impact, either individually or cumulatively, if it would:

1. Emit 240 pounds/day or more of ROG and NOx from all sources;
2. Emit 25 lbstons/year/day or more of unmitigated ROG from any motor vehicles trips only;
3. Emit 25 lbstons/year/day or more of unmitigated NOx form any motor vehicle trips only;
4. Emit 80 lb/day or more of PM10.
5. Cause or contribute to a violation of any California or Ambient Air Quality standard (except ozone);
6. Exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board (10 excess cancer cases in a million for cancer risk and a Hazard Index of more than 1.0 for non-cancer risk); or
7. Be inconsistent with Federal or State air quality plans for Santa Barbara County.

The cumulative contribution of project emissions to regional levels should be compared with existing programs and plans, including the most recent Clean Air Plan (CAP; 2010). Due to the County’s non-attainment status for ozone and the regional nature of ozone as a pollutant, if a project’s emissions from traffic sources of either of the ozone precursors (NOX or ROG), exceed the operational thresholds, the project’s cumulative impacts would be considered significant. For projects that do not have significant ozone precursor emissions or localized pollutant impacts, if emissions have been taken into account in the 2010 CAP growth projections, regional cumulative impacts may be considered to be less than significant.

Project Specific Impacts

a-d) The proposed project would only result in short-term construction emissions during pipeline grouting and removal activities. Although the City, County and APCD have not established thresholds for short-term construction emissions, the APCD uses 25 tons lbs per day year for NOX and ROG (both of which are precursors to the formation of ozone) as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts. To determine the project’s air emissions and potential impact on air quality, the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod, version 2011.1.1) was used to estimate project related construction emissions. Table 4 provides the estimated project emissions during construction based upon Venoco’s proposed list of construction equipment and their estimated construction timeframe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type</th>
<th>NOX</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Road Equipment Operation (including on-road</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concrete pumping trucks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Off-Site Transport of Material</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Emissions (lbs/day)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: All calculations were made using the CalEEMod computer model. See Appendix B for calculations.

Construction related ROG and NOX emissions are estimated at 2.00 and 13.2 lbs. per day over the course of the construction, respectively. The proposed project would be completed in 10 working days thus emitting a total of 0.01 and 0.07 tons of ROG and NOX, respectively. These emissions do not exceed 25 lbs tons per day year guideline for determining the significance of construction-related air quality impacts. Furthermore, the emissions shown in Table 4 do not exceed any of the SBCAPCD emissions thresholds discussed above. Therefore, project emissions would not contribute substantially toward an exceedance of standards, and have been adequately incorporated into the 2010 CAP in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
The County of Santa Barbara is currently in attainment for CO, therefore there are no adopted thresholds of significance for temporary CO emissions. CO hotspots are mainly a concern at major intersections. The project’s construction equipment would pass through major intersections; however, the amount of project related construction traffic would be insignificant and would adhere to a traffic management plan. Thus, impacts to air quality from CO emissions would be less than significant.

APCD Rule 345 regulates generation of visible fugitive dust emissions at demolition and construction sites. These measures are required for all projects involving earth moving activities regardless of the project size or duration. Proper implementation of these measures would fully mitigate any potential fugitive dust emissions. Thus, the requirements of APCD Rule 345 have been included in the project’s conditions of approval. Impacts would be less than significant.

Sensitive receptors, such as schools, hospital, residential units, etc., are located within a quarter mile of the project area. However, the project does not involve the construction of any new permanent structures or uses, and would not result in long-term pollutant emissions. Therefore, no impact would occur.

e) Odors could be generated during the proposed project from the operation of diesel engines, which are regulated by the SBCAPCD. The project applicant and its contractors would be required to comply with these regulations. The pipeline itself has been pigged, dewatered, and set an inert atmosphere of nitrogen and thus it is not anticipated to generate odors during grouting. The grouting mixture is not anticipated to generate odors as part of the repair project, as it would be composed of a non-hazardous cement mixture consisting generally of bentonite, cement, and water. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

h) Fine particulate emissions from diesel equipment exhaust are classified as carcinogenic by the State of California. PM$_{10}$ exhaust emissions for heavy equipment involved in project construction are estimated at 1.10 lbs/day. These emissions do not exceed the 80 lbs/day guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts. Impacts associated with temporary project generated particulate emissions would be less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures would be required to reduce impacts to air quality.

Residual Impact

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts (c, f, g)

Per the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, a project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts is considered significant if the project’s total emissions of either NO$_X$ or ROG exceed the long term threshold of 25 lbs/day. The project’s construction-related contributions to cumulative NO$_X$ and ROG emissions were below this threshold; therefore the project’s contribution to cumulative air quality impacts were less than significant, as these
emissions have been incorporated into the 2010 Clean Air Plan in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

The majority of Line 96 is buried approximately six feet below existing public roadways (Hollister Avenue, Pacific Oaks Road, and Phelps Road). These portions of the pipeline alignment are primarily surrounded by roadway asphalt and ornamental landscaping. Line 96 also travels beneath the channelized portions of Devereux Creek, near the northern limit of the property owned by the Goleta Union School District. The creek continues south through the UCSB housing project and the Ocean Meadows Golf Club, where it retains a relatively natural configuration throughout the existing golf course. Stream flows appear to be primarily provided by year round by residential and golf course irrigation.

The portions of the pipeline that extend beneath the western portion of the UCSB parcel and the City’s Ellwood Mesa Open Space property are surrounded by natural habitat, consisting
primarily of eucalyptus windrows, coyote brush, grasslands, seasonal wetlands, riparian areas,
and semi-perennial wetlands. Portions of these habitats have been designated as
Environmentally Sensitive Habitats Areas (ESHA) by the City of Goleta. Several types of
riparian and wetland habitat are also known to occur on the City's Ellwood Mesa Open Space
property. These include willow riparian, seasonal wetlands, and semi-perennial wetlands. Willow
riparian communities are dominated by a closed canopy of arroyo willow with variable
understory. Semi-perennial wetlands are dominated by various annual and perennial wetland
species including alkali heath, pickleweed, and curly dock.

Coastal sage scrub and grassland habitats are also common and typically include coyote brush
scrub dominated by coyote brush with occasional elderberry. The grasslands are generally
dominated by non-native grasses and forbs such as various species of Italian rye grass,
bromes, plantain, and wild oat. Native species such as beardless wild rye and purple
needlegrass are also present. All grassland and shrublands within the City’s Ellwood Mesa
Open Space property are considered sensitive biological habitats.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant impact on Biological Resources would be expected to occur if the project resulted
in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additionally, per the City’s Environmental
Thresholds and Guidelines Manual, a project would pose a significant environmental impact(s)
on biological resources if any of the following would result from project implementation:

a. A conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is
located;
b. Substantial effect on a rare or endangered plant or animal species;
c. Substantial interference with the movement of any migratory or resident fish or wildlife
species;
d. Substantial diminishment of habitat for fish, wildlife, or plants.

**Project Specific Impacts**

The City of Goleta’s General Plan Conservation Element includes policies that protect and
preserve biological resources within the City by designating specific resources and areas as
protected, including Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA), restricting activities and
uses in protected areas, providing for the management of the resources on City lands,
specifying impact avoidance and mitigation requirements for types of activities and by type of
biological resource, and providing guidance for development and conservation decisions over
the long-term. The majority of the project’s construction activities would take place within or
adjacent to the public right-of-way or within areas previously disturbed by construction activities.
Furthermore, Pipeline Segments 6 and 7 would be abandoned in place for the primary purpose
of avoiding impacts to the sensitive habitats located within the City’s Ellwood Mesa Open Space
area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with environmental preservation goals established
by the City of Goleta.

Construction activities within Pipeline Segments 1, 2 and 7 would have no impacts on biological
resources, as the construction activities would occur within existing City Streets or other paved
areas. The following discussion of potential impacts to biological resources is therefore limited
to the construction activities required for the removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 beneath the
properties owned by the Goleta Union School District and UCSB and the demolition of Vault
Box 1291 at the end of Pipeline Segment 6.
a) The proposed project would not decrease in the numbers of, restrict the range of, or otherwise significantly impact any unique, rare, or threatened plant community. A pre-project site survey, photo-documentation, and assessment of the project and staging areas was completed by Cardno Entrix (March 14, 2012) and Rincon Consultants, Inc. (May 9, 2013) to determine if impacts would occur.

The removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and -5 would involve the excavation, removal and disposal of pipeline segments located beneath the northern portions of the properties owned by the Goleta Union School District and UCSB. Removal activities would also occur adjacent to Pipeline Segment 4, which contains wetlands constructed as part of UCSB’s North Campus Faculty Housing Project. The pipeline removal activities would include construction equipment staging for up to 10 working days during normal business hours. In addition, pipeline removal would require trenching, soil/concrete stockpile, concrete demolition, and concrete disposal activities. These activities would create piles of construction debris and soil stockpile areas at varying heights during the construction period. The construction areas and stockpile areas for Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 would be located in areas inhabited by disturbed soils and non-native grasses. Therefore, impacts on candidate, sensitive, or special status species would be less than significant.

The proposed removal of Vault Box 1291 at the end of Pipeline Segment 6 would disturb an area totaling approximately 100 square feet. This vault box is located within the confines of an ESHA because it is within the drip line of the north-south oriented eucalyptus windrow. This eucalyptus windrow has been designated as a Monarch Butterfly Habitat Area and/or Raptor Roosting Habitat per Figure 4-1 in the City’s General Plan Conservation Element. The abandonment of this vault box would include the removal of the lid and roof structure, followed by demolition of the box walls to a minimum depth of 18” below existing grade. Holes would be knocked through the vault to permit drainage of any impounded moisture. Finally, the entire box would be filled with an approved sand/soil mixture and compacted per the City of Goleta Building and Safety requirements. Although demolition activities are not anticipated to result in tree removal or excavation outside of the 100 square foot construction footprint, significant impacts to candidate, sensitive or special status species, including the eucalyptus windrows, their associated understory, monarch butterflies, and nesting birds could occur if these activities are not appropriately confined and/or monitored. In addition, the sand/soil mixture proposed to fill the abandoned vault box could contribute to the proliferation of non-native plant species within this sensitive ecological area if non-invasive species are included within the mixture. With the implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3, impacts would be less than significant.

b,c) The removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 beneath the northern portions of the Goleta Union School District and UCSB properties would not impact existing riparian habitat. Pipeline removal activities would occur approximately 50 feet away from the existing channelized portions of Devereux Creek and over 180 approximately 30 feet west away from of the constructed wetland areas proposed as part of UCSB’s North Campus housing project. Nevertheless, the soil and/or construction debris stockpile areas have the potential to cause indirect adverse water quality impacts on these biological resources as a result of sedimentation or inadvertent debris deposits. The project would be required to comply with all local and state mandated stormwater best management practices which would ensure impacts to riparian habitats would be less
than significant. For further discussion of this issue, please refer to Section IX(a), Hydrology and Water Quality.

d) The removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 would occur directly adjacent to the Phelps Road right-of-way, south of the existing pavement. The construction activities would only occur in an area that has already been developed with residential uses and thus the area has not been designated as a wildlife movement corridor (City of Goleta General Plan Conservation Element, 2006). Furthermore, construction would occur only during daylight hours and would be limited to a relatively short construction timeline (10 working days). Therefore, the removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 would have a less than significant impact on wildlife movement.

The area surrounding Pipeline Segments 6 and 7 is identified by The City of Goleta General Plan as an ESHA. Therefore, this area is considered a wildlife movement corridor. The proposed demolition of Vault Box 1291 at the end of Pipeline Segment 6 would not physically obstruct wildlife movement, as it is located at ground level. Additionally, construction staging activities proposed at the end of Segment 7 would occur on paved areas within the EMT. Construction activity would temporarily increase noise during the 2 day construction period. However, construction noise would be limited to daylight hours when the open space area is already utilized for recreation. Therefore, short-term impacts on wildlife movement would be less than significant and long term impacts would be beneficial.

e,f) The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, as it involves the removal of petroleum transport infrastructure, which is consistent with City’s General Plan. The eucalyptus trees and other sensitive biological habitats would be avoided during construction by using existing dirt roads and/or trails for construction staging and access to Vault Box 1291. The area previously occupied by Vault Box 1291 would be backfilled with a soil/sand/native hydroseed mixture, which will promote revegetation of the disturbed areas. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Required Mitigation Measures

**BIO-1 Protection of Sensitive Species.** The project engineer shall submit a demolition plan for Vault Box 1291, Pipeline Segment 3, and Pipeline Segment 5 subject to review and approval by the City’s Building Official, and the City’s Planning Director, and representatives of the Goleta Union School District and UCSB. The plan shall clearly designate “SENSITIVE RESOURCE ZONE(S)” on the demolition plan in the vicinity of Vault Box 1291, Pipeline Segment 3, Pipeline Segment 4, and Pipeline Segment 5. The SENSITIVE RESOURCE ZONE(S) shall be clearly established in the field and shall be clearly marked with flagging and stakes, or construction fencing. No construction or demolition activity or equipment staging shall occur within these designated sensitive resource zones.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** This condition must be printed on project plans submitted for Coastal Development Permit, Land Use Permit, and Building Permit/Demolition Permit approval. Fencing must be graphically depicted on all project plans submitted for approval of any Land Use Permit and/or Building Permit/Demolition Permit Approval.
**Monitoring:** City Planning and Environmental Review staff, Goleta Union School District representatives, and UCSB representatives must review plans and confirm fence installation before Building Permit/Demolition Permit issuance. City Planning and Environmental Review staff must conduct site inspections to ensure compliance during all construction activities.

**BIO-2 Habitat Restoration.** The sand/soil mixture proposed to fill the abandoned vault box shall include a hydroseed mix consisting only of native seed obtained from the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space native plant stockplants known to thrive in the region. The mixture shall prevent the invasion and/or spread of undesired plant species and shall result in the restoration of native wildlife habitat and a plant palette consisting of entirely native species.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** The hydroseed mix specification sheet shall be prepared by a biologist specializing in native plant restoration. This plan shall be submitted prior to the issuance of Building/Demolition Permits.

**Monitoring:** The hydroseed specification sheet shall be reviewed and approved by City Planning and Environmental Review staff and/or the City’s biologist prior to issuance of Building/Demolition Permits.

**BIO-3 Nesting Birds.** If no vegetation or tree removal would occur during the avian nesting period/breeding season (typically February through August), but variable based on seasonal climatic conditions, no surveys are required. If vegetation clearing and/or tree removal would occur during the bird avian breeding season (February 1 through August 31), pre-construction surveys shall be conducted no more than three days prior to the initiation of vegetation clearance activities. If any active non-raptor nests are found, all project work shall be constructed at a suitable buffer distance (buffer area), determined by the City-approved biologist to ensure active nests are not disturbed and that any young have fledged and become independent of the adults. Project activities may encroach into the buffer only after receiving approval from the City-approved biologist, (varying from 250-300 feet), depending on the particular species found, shall be established from the nest, and that area shall be avoided until the nest becomes inactive (vacated). If any active raptor bird nests are found, a suitable buffer area of typically 250-500 feet from the nest shall be established and that area shall be avoided until the nest becomes inactive (vacated). The limits of construction to avoid nests shall be established in the field with flagging and stakes or construction fencing.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee must submit the name and qualifications of the project biologist that will conduct such survey work to the City for staff review and approval. The results of the survey must be submitted to the City for staff review and approval before the issuance of any grading or building permits for the project.

**Monitoring:** City Planning and Environmental Review staff must verify compliance before the issuance of any Building/Demolition Permits for the project as well as conduct periodic site inspections to verify compliance with any restrictions on construction activity posted by either this mitigation measure and/or the biological survey prepared before commencement of project construction.
Residual Impact

With the implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development in the western and central Hollister area of Goleta consists of infill of remaining undeveloped parcels within an urbanized area. Previous development in this area has permanently eliminated extensive tracks of native plant communities, some of them now classified as rare or threatened. The required mitigation measures would protect existing biological resources within the project area, such as nesting birds, eucalyptus trees, and other sensitive biological habitats. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative biological impacts would be less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

A summary of the prehistory and history of the general project area, excerpted from the Goleta General Plan FEIR (2006), is hereby incorporated by reference.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on cultural resources would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds are contained in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. The City’s adopted thresholds indicate that a project would result in a significant impact on a cultural resource if it would physically demolish, destroy, relocate, or alter the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of such a resource would be materially impaired.

Project Specific Impacts

a-d) Rincon Consultants, Inc. conducted a cultural resources background study for the project area (March 2013), which identified 40 previous studies and 17 recorded resources within 0.25 miles of the project site. A single cultural resource (P-42-001750-H) is recorded adjacent to and possibly within the project alignment, but this resource
was impacted by the construction of this or an adjacent oil pipeline and the abandonment in place of the pipeline in the vicinity of this site would not constitute an impact. No cultural resources are recorded along the portions of the pipeline located parallel to Phelps Road. The primary area of known cultural resources in the west end of the pipeline would not be affected as the pipeline would be abandoned in place with no additional disturbance of the ground surface. Although the likelihood of encountering isolated archaeological resources is very low, mitigation measure CR-1 is required in the unlikely event the proposed construction activities encounter remains.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

**CR-1 Human Remains.** Before initiating construction, excavation, or vegetation removal, the permittee and construction crew must meet on-site with a City-approved archeologist and appropriate local Native American representative(s) and present the procedures to be followed in the unlikely event human remains are uncovered. These procedures must include those identified in California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In addition, a satisfactory deposition of the remains must be agreed upon by the City-approved archaeologist and appropriate local Native American representatives so as to limit future disturbance. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the County Coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) of the deceased Native American, who will then help determine what course of action should be taken with the remains.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** Before the City issues Building/Demolition Permits, the permittee must provide the City Planning and Environmental Review staff the contact information of the Native American representative and the agreed upon procedures to be followed. In the event that remains are found and if the remains are found to be of Native American origin, the County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission and the Commission will name the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD, consulting archaeologist, permittee, and City Planning and Environmental Review Staff will consult as to the disposition of the remains. If the remains are identified as non-Native American, the County Coroner will take possession of the remains and comply with all state and local requirements.

**Monitoring:** The Planning and Environmental Review Director, or designee, must confirm that the County Coroner is notified in the event human remains are found, and that the Native American Heritage Commission is contacted if the remains are of Native American origin.

**Residual Impact**

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, potential impacts to known and as-yet undetected archaeological resources would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative development in the Goleta Valley will continue to disturb areas that may potentially contain cultural resources, including archaeological resources. City policies require protection of
cultural resources through, among other techniques, appropriate site design, monitoring of grading activities in archaeologically sensitive areas, avoidance and/or capping of identified resources, and coordination with Native American representatives. The proposed project’s contribution to cumulative impacts on cultural resources can be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the above-described mitigation measures.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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? | | | | | □
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | | | | □
| 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? | | | | | □
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | | | | | □
| 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? | | | | | □

Existing Setting

Line 96 travels predominantly along flat terrain associated with Hollister Avenue, Pacific Oaks Road, and Phelps Road, at elevations ranging from 30 feet to 60 feet above sea level. The pipeline then traverses an area of gently sloping terrain on the Ellwood Mesa and terminates at the EMT, which is situated on a coastal marine terrace at an elevation of approximately 60 feet. Line 96 is underlain by artificial fill, surficial soils, Holocene alluvium, Pleistocene older alluvium, and Miocene shale deposits. Because the pipeline predominantly traverses the City beneath City streets, artificial fill surrounds much of the alignment where grading has been completed for road construction. The remainder of the pipeline route between Phelps Road and the EMT is underlain by disturbed soils associated with roadway construction and the Milpitas-Positas-
Concepcion soils association, which consists of moderately well-drained, fin sandy loams on generally level terraces (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Services, 1981). Underlying these surficial soil deposits is Pleistocene older alluvium, consisting primarily of relatively unconsolidated silt, sand, and gravel. These alluvial deposits overlie the Miocene Sisquoc Formation, which is exposed in the coastal bluff northwest of the project area and consists of silty diatomaceous, clay shale.

Similar to much of California, the project site is located within a seismically active region. The Transverse Ranges are characterized by east-west trending structural features in contrast to the dominant northwest-southeast structural trend of California. The nearest confirmed, seismically active fault to the project site is the North Channel Slope Fault located four miles offshore. The closest Alquist-Priolo mapped earthquake fault is over 20 miles to the southeast (Pitas Point/Red Mountain Faults).

Thresholds of Significance

A significant geology/soils related impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual assumes that a project would result in a potentially significant impact on geological processes if the project, and/or implementation of required mitigation measures, could result in increased erosion, landslides, soil creep, mudslides, and/or unstable slopes. In addition, impacts would be considered significant if the project would expose people and/or structures to major geological hazards such as earthquakes, seismic related ground failure, or expansive soils capable of creating a significant risk to life and property.

Project Specific Impacts

a.i-iv. The proposed project would not locate people or structures within an area known to have the potential for fault rupture. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Liquefaction is the sudden loss of soil shear strength due to rapid increases in pore water pressures caused by seismic shaking. For liquefaction to occur, underlying soils should be granular and of low density located below the groundwater level. The proposed project involves the removal or decommissioning in place of an existing oil pipeline that traverses the City of Goleta and would not locate any people or structures in an area with seismic hazards. The potential impacts associated with liquefaction (such as seismically induced settlement and pipe breakage) would be less than significant.

The topography of the existing pipeline route is relatively flat with gentle rolling slopes within the Ellwood Mesa Open Space area. The areas proposed for pipeline removal are relatively flat and thus their removal would not increase the chance of slope failure. Where the terrain steepens, the pipeline is proposed for decommissioning in place. The geologic maps published for the area do not identify landslide hazards (Ellwood Pipeline Company Line 96 Modification Project Final Environmental Impact Report, 2011). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b) The removal of pipeline and other appurtenant structures would result in temporary vegetation removal and excavation, which may cause an increased potential for short-term erosion or the loss of topsoil. Impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels during all phases of construction through compliance with the Construction General Permit (the details of this permit are described in Section IX, of this Initial
To comply with this permit, the permittee would be required to prepare and implement a stormwater management plan, which must include erosion and sediment control best management practices (BMPs) that would meet or exceed measures required by the Construction General Permit, as well as BMPs that control other potential construction-related pollutants. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) No specific geologic hazards have been identified within project vicinity, as the existing pipeline traverses older alluvium and alluvium that comprise the coastal marine terraces and artificial fill associated with roadway construction. The removal of pipeline and appurtenant structures would require shallow trenching and other construction activities; however, these activities would not impact an unstable geologic unit as they would occur on areas that are essentially flat. Therefore, the activities would not contribute to a known landslide becoming unstable, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. No impacts would occur.

d) Surficial soils surrounding the majority of the existing pipeline primarily consist of artificial fill and roadway base. These areas would not be disturbed, as the pipeline would be abandoned in place. The pipeline segments proposed for removal would extend west from the intersection of Phelps Road and Canon Drive. These segments would be overlain by disturbed road base and native soils consisting primarily of older alluvium. These older alluvium deposits could contain expansive soils. However, upon removal of the pipeline segments, the trench would be backfilled with native soil. The use of native soil as a trench backfill would not be impacted by expansive soils. No impact would occur.

e) There were no septic systems associated with this project. Therefore, no potential geological hazards posed by the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems would be created. No impact would occur.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures would be required to reduce impacts to geology and soils.

**Residual Impact**

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impact would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The proposed project would not expose additional people and property to seismic and geologic hazards that are present in the region. The proposed pipeline removal activities would occur within soils previously disturbed and therefore the potential for encountering geologic hazards within the excavation zone (limited to approximately 6 feet below the ground surface) is low. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

Greenhouse gases (GHGs) are emitted by both natural processes and human activities. Of these gases, carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄) are emitted in the greatest quantities from human activities. Emissions of CO₂ are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion, whereas CH₄ results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Scientific modeling predicts that continued GHG emissions at or above current rates would induce more extreme climate changes during the 21st century than were observed during the 20th century.

According to the Air Resources Board (ARB), some of the potential impacts in California of global warming may include loss of snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more large forest fires, and more drought years (ARB, October 2007). While these potential impacts identify the possible effects of climate change at a global and potentially statewide level, in general, scientific modeling tools are currently unable to precisely predict what impacts occurred locally.

In response to an increase in man-made GHG concentrations over the past 150 years, California has implemented AB 32, the “California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.” AB 32 requires achievement by 2020 of a statewide GHG emissions limit equivalent to 1990 emissions (essentially a 25% reduction below 2005 emission levels) and the adoption of rules and regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emissions reductions.

GHG emissions contributing to climate change have only recently been addressed in CEQA documents. Senate Bill (SB) 97, signed in August 2007, acknowledges that global climate change is an environmental issue that requires analysis under CEQA. In December 2009, the California Resources Agency adopted amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines for the feasible mitigation of GHG emissions or the effects of GHG emissions. The adopted guidelines give lead agencies the discretion to set quantitative or qualitative thresholds for the assessment and mitigation of GHG impacts.

Thresholds of Significance

Neither the SBCAPCD nor the City of Goleta has adopted a quantitative significance threshold for GHG emissions or a specific methodology for analyzing air quality impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. To date, only the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the San Joaquin Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD), and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOCAPCD) have adopted quantitative significance...
thresholds for GHGs. Additionally, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has established interim thresholds.

BAAQMD GHG thresholds are summarized in Table 5. It is important to note that no thresholds of significance for construction emissions have been developed by the BAAQMD.

### Table 5
**BAAQMD/Santa Barbara County Interim Thresholds of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHG Emission Source Category</th>
<th>Operational Emissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Residential (land use projects)</td>
<td>1,100 MT of CO(_2)e/yr or 4.6 MT CO(_2)e/SP/yr(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Sources(^b)</td>
<td>10,000 MT of CO(_2)e/yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^a\) SP = Service Population (residents + employees).

\(^b\) Stationary Sources include stationary combustion sources (industrial-type uses) regulated by the APCD.

**Project Specific Impacts**

Greenhouse gases and climate change are inherently cumulative impacts. As such, the determination of whether a project’s GHG emissions impacts are significant depends on whether emissions would be a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact. This is assessed below.

**Cumulative Impacts**

a) The proposed project does not include any new land uses, buildings, or activity areas. As a result, the project would not generate any new or additional vehicle trips or energy usage that could contribute to operational greenhouse gas emissions. The temporary energy required for project implementation would be provided by gasoline and diesel fueled engines. The timeframe proposed for the pipeline decommissioning would take place over 2 working days and the pipeline removal would take up to 10 working days. As shown in Table 4 above, the project’s construction related emissions would not exceed any of the SBCAPCD’s construction emissions thresholds. Therefore, project emissions would not contribute substantially toward an exceedance of standards, and have been adequately incorporated into the Santa Barbara County 2010 Clean Air Plan in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative greenhouse gas impacts would be less than significant.

b) No local plans to reduce GHG emissions are currently in place. Regionally, SBCAG has adopted the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan – Sustainable Communities Strategy (2040 RTP-SCS) which addresses GHG emissions from passenger vehicles in Santa Barbara County. There are no active statewide, local, or regional plans, including AB 32 or the 2040 RTP-SCS, applicable to temporary construction projects. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency.
adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. No impacts would occur.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures would be required for impacts related to GHG emissions.

**Residual Impact**

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

### VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be located on a site which 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Setting

The Central Coast area has a number of oil and gas fields located both onshore and offshore. The California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) indicates that there are 61 active fields in the districts encompassing Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara counties. Although oil and gas pipelines and processing facilities in the region are engineered to the safety standards current at the time of construction, and undergo safety studies and environmental review prior to project approval and oversight, the nature of materials handled by these pipelines and facilities still poses risks to people and the environment in the vicinity. Risks include exposing the population to accidental spills of materials, which can subsequently lead to biological or hydrological damage, exposure to toxic chemicals, fires, and explosions.

An upset condition that results in the subsequent release of hazardous materials at the EOF, the portions of Line 96 proposed for removal or decommissioning in place, and the EMT could have an adverse impact on public health and/or environmental resources in the study area. Populations in the area include people visiting, living and working near the EOF and EMT, commercial business and residential dwellings along Hollister Avenue, UCSB West Campus Housing, and multi-family residential areas located south and north of Phelps Road.

The original Line 96 was installed by Mobil Pacific Pipeline Company around 1982. In 2001, ExxonMobil installed a leak detection system on Line 96. With the exception of a “pin-hole” leak discovered in vault box 1293 at the EOF facility in 2009, the service history of Line 96 has been leak free. Venoco immediately took action to contain this small leak and consequently the leak was contained within the vault box. Final repairs to Line 96 were approved by the Office of the State Fire Marshall. In addition to the leak detection system, Line 96 has been hydrotested per Department of Transportation requirements at regular intervals. Records from the hydrotests indicate Line 96 to be leak free and suitable for continued service. Hydrotest records are available for review at the City of Goleta. The line has been pigged and flushed with water in preparation of decommissioning. The line is currently out of service and is set in an inert atmosphere of nitrogen.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact with regard to hazards and hazardous materials would occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual addresses 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 non-hazardous land uses in proximity to hazardous facilities. Since the proposed project would not be a generator of hazardous materials, the City’s risk based thresholds are not applicable. However, for the purposes of this analysis, the project would be considered to pose a significant impact if it results in the exposure of people to a variety of hazards or hazardous materials as listed above.

Project Specific Impacts

a-c) The proposed project would remove infrastructure that has historically been used to transport oil through the City of Goleta. No transport of hazardous materials would occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, no impact would occur.
Given the pipeline’s history of use for oil transport, there is some risk of a minor oil release during pipeline and vault box removal or during grout pumping activities. There is also a low probability of a minor hazardous materials release during the operation and/or staging of the heavy equipment during pipeline removal activities. The risks associated with the release of hazardous materials during the physical removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 or during grout pumping activities are minimal, as the pipeline has been thoroughly cleaned and is no longer in service. Furthermore, prior to the physical removal of any surface or sub-surface segments of Line 96, the City of Goleta would first require a "Dig-Alert" notification to confirm that no disturbance to existing utility pipelines would occur.

The proposed project would utilize heavy equipment during construction, including 1 light duty crane, 1 backhoe, 1 vacuum truck, 1 mid pump and mixing truck, 1 gang truck, and 1 pick-up truck. This equipment is required to undergo routine maintenance to reduce the risks of fluid leaks during operation. Furthermore, this equipment would only be operated over a 1 or 2 day period during grout pumping and up to 10 working days during pipeline removal. The risk of a hazardous materials release would be minimal during this relatively short operational timeframe. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

Ellwood Elementary School is located adjacent to Hollister Avenue, parallel to the sub-surface alignment of Line 96. The pipeline would be decommissioned in place within ¼ mile of this school and no construction or pipe removal activity would occur in the vicinity of the school. No impacts would occur.

d) According to the State of California Geotracker website (http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov) there are no active hazardous materials sites within the project area. Remediation activities have been completed for the Chevron Gas Station located at 7952 Hollister Avenue and the Arco Rio Grande Gas Station located at 7801 Hollister Avenue. Both of these sites required soil remediation due to a leaking underground storage tank. The Chevron case was closed on 9/22/1997 and the Arco case was closed on 4/25/1997. No other hazardous materials sites are located within the project area. No impact would occur.

e-f) There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the project site. The project area is located outside of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport approach zone as defined by the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan and the project would not involve the construction of any above-ground structures that could potentially impact airport operations. No impact would occur.

gh) The project would not result in the construction of any new facilities or establishment of new uses that could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is located outside of the City’s Wildland Fire Hazard Area and construction activities would only occur over 10 working days. The staging of construction equipment within Hollister Avenue would be completed in accordance with the Traffic Management Plan and would include the appropriate traffic controls and detours to ensure sufficient emergency access to all adjacent land uses. No impact would occur.
Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures would be required for impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Residual Impact

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development within the City of Goleta is estimated to add an additional 2,922 residential units and more than 1.5 million square feet of commercial and industrial space (Cortona Apartments DEIR, 2013). Compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, including remedial action on contaminated sites, would address cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. The proposed project would decommission pipeline segments 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 in place and remove pipeline segments 3, 4, and 5, which would remove a possible source of sub-surface hydrocarbon contamination. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

The existing Line 96 pipeline route proposed for decommissioning begins at the western edge of the EOF where surrounding land uses include Sandpiper Golf Course, beach recreation, the Bacara Resort and Spa, the Southern Pacific Railroad, and Highway 101. The pipeline traverses east across the City of Goleta beneath the Hollister Avenue right-of-way to Pacific Oaks Road. The land uses along this segment include Sandpiper Golf Course, the Southern Pacific Railroad, vacant lots, an energy facility, commercial uses, and residential uses. The route then turns south along Pacific Oaks Road to Phelps Road, where it turns west towards Canon Green Drive and then south to the EMT. The pipeline crosses the channelized portions of Devereux Creek approximately 1,075 feet west of the Phelps Road/Pacific Oaks Drive intersection. Devereux Creek is mapped as a blue line creek and it is designated as an ESHA by the City of Goleta.

Approximately 60% of the Devereux Creek watershed is developed. Impacts to wetlands continue from historical filling, hydrologic modification including flood control and water supply projects, pollution from point and non-point sources, and introduction of native species. Water quality testing, which was included as part of the Santa Barbara County Water Agency’s Project Clean Water, indicates that Devereux Slough is polluted by runoff containing bacteria and nutrients that exceed acceptable levels, and are capable of accelerating aquatic plant growth and algae growth. In addition, the streams entering Devereux Slough carry a high sediment load and some are listed as impaired for metals, pathogens, priority organics, and sedimentation/siltation (City of Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Final Supplemental EIR, 2009).

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant impact on hydrology and water quality would occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, the City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual* assumes that a significant impact on hydrology and water resources would occur if a project would substantially alter existing drainage patterns, alter the course of a stream or river, increase the rate of surface runoff to the extent that flooding, including increased erosion or sedimentation, occurs, create or contribute to runoff volumes exceed existing or planned stormwater runoff facilities, or substantially degrade water quality.
Planning, implementation, and enforcement related to stormwater management during construction and post-construction activities are governed by the City of Goleta Storm Water Guidance Document (March 2013). The purpose of the Guidance Document is to implement and enforce a program designed to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the “maximum extent practicable” (MEP) to protect water quality within the City.

Project Specific Impacts

a) Pipeline Segments 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 are proposed to be decommissioned in place. Therefore, no impacts would occur. Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 are proposed for removal and Vault Box 1291 is proposed for demolition and restoration. The removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 would require excavation and would require the temporary staging of construction debris and/or excavated soils within areas near Devereux Creek and the newly constructed wetlands located on the UCSB parcel. If these disturbed areas are not managed properly during rain events, they could result in an incremental impairment of surface water quality in this drainage and the nearby Pacific Ocean. Impacts would be minimized during all phases of construction through compliance with the Construction General Permit and compliance with the City’s grading regulations. Moreover, the permittee would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the pipeline removal activities, which must include erosion and sediment control BMPs, as well as BMPs that control other potential construction-related emissions. Examples of BMPs that may be implemented during pipeline removal activities include, but are not limited to, temporary drains and swales, silt fences, sediment traps, removal of sediment from construction vehicles, and the restriction of cement wash out areas. These BMPs would limit not only sediment discharge, but also pollutants associated with sediments, including, but not limited to nutrients, heavy metals, and certain pesticides and herbicides. The development and implementation of a SWPPP is a standard requirement that would apply to the proposed project. Therefore, water quality impacts would be less than significant.

b-d) The proposed projects does not involve the construction of a new land use that would require water service. Therefore, no impact on groundwater supplies would occur.

The removal of Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 would involve trenching, soil excavation, and debris staging near Devereux Creek and the newly established wetland areas constructed as part of the UCSB North Campus project. Although the pipeline removal areas would ultimately be restored to their original grade upon disposal of the excavated pipeline segments, project construction and staging could temporarily alter runoff rates, percolation rates, or drainage patterns in the vicinity of Devereux Creek, Devereux Slough, and the UCSB constructed wetlands. As described above, preparation of a SWPPP must include erosion and sediment control BMPs, as well as BMPs that control other potential construction-related stormwater discharges. Furthermore, the temporary construction areas would be restored to their pre-project conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

f) The proposed project would include the pumping of a cement mixture, primarily composed of Bentonite, into the Line 96 pipeline, where it would cure in place below the ground surface. The bentonite cement mixture would be a non-toxic slurry, with a pH of approximately 7.0 (neutral). Over time, the buried pipeline segments would degrade and would become part of the surrounding soil matrix. Bentonite is a naturally occurring mineral and thus its decomposition would not form any hazardous materials or
compounds that could otherwise impact water quality. In addition, use of the bentonite cement mixture would immediately “seal” the existing Line 96 pipeline, thereby eliminating a potential pathway for the migration of contaminants into the soils and possibly into the groundwater basin. Line 96 has also been cleaned of any hydrocarbon residues and therefore any uncontained releases of the bentonite cement mixture would not contain significant quantities of oil or other chemicals which could impact water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

\[
g-j) \hspace{1cm} \text{All pipeline segments would be decommissioned in place below the ground surface or removed entirely. Thus, the project would not place any structures within an area mapped as a 100-year flood hazard area as denoted on FEMA FIRM maps. No impact would occur.}
\]

There are no levees or dams in the vicinity of the project site or within the Devereux Creek watershed. Because the project site is along the coast, the project site lies within the City’s Potential Tsunami Run-Up Area as mapped by the City’s General Plan. However, the project would not place new development within the Tsunami Run-Up Area. Therefore, no impacts to people and property associated with a tsunami or the failure of an upstream levee and/or dam would occur.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures would be required for impacts related to hydrology and water quality.

Residual Impact

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development within the City of Goleta is estimated to add an additional 2,922 residential units and more than 1.5 million square feet of commercial and industrial space (Cortona Apartments DEIR, 2013). These projects would add new sources of water pollution and would increase the amount of impervious surface in the Goleta area, contributing to existing impairments of waterways within the City. The proposed project could contribute incrementally to the sedimentation and siltation of surface water bodies during the brief period of construction. However, the proposed project would be required to meet the applicable stormwater control and water quality standards. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration

**Ellwood Pipeline Inc., Line 96 Decommissioning Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

The project area contains multiple General Plan land use designations. At the EOF, the land overlaying Line 96 is designated Open Space – Active Recreation. The purpose of this designation is encourage active recreational activities such as playgrounds, picnic areas, tennis courts, ballparks, and sports fields. It is also intended for significant private outdoor recreational facilities, such as golf courses and privately owned parks. The EOF and the associated pipeline connections (including Line 96) are existing non-conforming uses.

From the EOF, Line 96 travels east beneath existing roadways until it reaches the western portions of Phelps Road. Along Phelps Road, the pipeline traverses the property owned by the Goleta Union School District (APN 073-090-026) which has a land use designation of Planned Residential. The pipeline then travels further west, where it crosses a property owned by UCSB, which is located in the unincorporated portions of Santa Barbara County. This parcel has a land use designation of Planned Development and is currently being developed with multi-family housing.

The pipeline then turns south and travels beneath the city-owned Ellwood Mesa Open Space property (APN 079-210-024). This property has a land use designation of Open Space – Passive Recreation. The intent of the Open Space – Passive Recreation land use designation is to reserve areas with significant environmental values or resources, wildlife habitats, significant views, or other open space values.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant land use and planning impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

**Project Specific Impacts**

a. The project would not result in any new development and therefore it would not physically divide any established community or neighborhood. No impact would occur.

b. The following plans and policies apply to the project:

- City of Goleta General Plan
- City of Goleta Coastal and Inland Zoning Ordinance
The projects consistency with each of the above-referenced documents was analyzed in Section 4.7 of the Line 96 Modification Project Final EIR (July, 2011) prepared by the County of Santa Barbara and available on their website. Therefore, all applicable discussion is hereby incorporated by reference into this Initial Study-Mitigated Negative Declaration. In summary, the decommissioning of Pipeline Segments 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 and the removal of Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 would be consistent with the City’s General Plan policies, which call for the abandonment of unused oil and gas pipelines and infrastructure as well as the protection of sensitive environmental resources, such as ESHAs. As described above in Section IV, Biological Resources, the potential impacts to ESHAs would be reduce to a less than significant level after implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-3. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable to the pipeline segments proposed for removal. However, the demolition of Vault Box 1291 would occur in an area designated as ESHA by the City of Goleta General Plan. The implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-3 would reduce those impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans that either affect the project site or would conflict with the proposed project. Impacts would be less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for impacts related to land use.

Residual Impact

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would not conflict with the City’s General Plan goals and policies, the coastal and inland zoning ordinance, or any other applicable documents. The potential environmental impacts would be limited to areas where pipeline and vault removal activities would take place and mitigation measures have been developed to reduce impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, and noise. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

The project site is located beneath existing roadways and on marine terrace areas above the shoreline of the Santa Barbara Channel. No known mineral resources are identified within the project area nor would the project result in the loss of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on mineral resources would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the checklist above.

Project Specific Impacts

a, b) The project involves temporary construction activity to decommission and remove portions of Line 96. The proposed construction would occur at or near the existing ground surface and thus would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource or identified resource recovery site. No impacts would occur.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for impacts related to mineral resources.

Residual Impact

No mitigation measures are required thus no residual impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

Planned, pending and recently approved development in and around Goleta consists of 2,922 residential units and more than 1.5 million square feet of non-residential development. Some of these projects may potentially impact mineral resources. As discussed above, the temporary disturbance of surface soils as a result of pipeline removal activities would not impact mineral resources. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.
XII. NOISE

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound pressure levels to be consistent with that of human hearing response, which is most sensitive to frequencies around 4,000 Hertz (about the highest note on a piano) and less sensitive to low frequencies (below 100 Hertz). In addition to the instantaneous measurement of sound levels, the duration of sound is important since sounds that occur over a long period of time are more likely to be an annoyance or cause direct physical damage or environmental stress. One of the most frequently used noise metrics that considers both duration and sound pressure level is the equivalent noise level (Leq). The Leq is defined as the single steady A-weighted level that is equivalent to the same amount of energy as that contained in the actual fluctuating levels over a period of time. Typically, Leq is summed over a one-hour period.

The sound pressure level is measured on a logarithmic scale with the 0 dB level based on the lowest detectable sound pressure level that people can perceive (an audible sound that is not zero sound pressure level). Decibels cannot be added arithmetically, but rather are added on a logarithmic basis. Based on the logarithmic scale, a doubling of sound energy is equivalent to an increase of 3 dB and a sound that is 10 dB less than the ambient sound level would result in a negligible increase (less than 0.5 dB) in total ambient sound levels. Because of the nature of the human ear, a sound must be about 10 dB greater than the reference sound to be judged as twice as loud. In general, a 3 dB change in community noise levels is noticeable, while 1-2 dB
changes generally are not perceived. Quiet suburban areas typically have noise levels in the range of 40 to 50 dBA, while those along arterial streets are in the 50 to 60+ dBA range. Normal conversational levels are in the 60-65 dBA range and ambient noise levels greater than that can interrupt conversations.

Noise levels typically attenuate at a rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance from point sources such as industrial machinery. Noise from lightly traveled roads typically attenuates at a rate of about 4.5 dB per doubling of distance. Noise from heavily traveled roads typically attenuates at about 3 dB per doubling of distance.

The project area is located south of U.S. 101 and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks and east of Winchester Road. More specifically, Pipeline Segments 1 through 5 are located in an urban and sub-urban environment characterized primarily by business park, commercial, and residential land uses. Pipeline segments 6 and 7 and located within the City’s Ellwood Mesa open space area. Typical noise sources in the vicinity of Pipeline Segments 1-5 are traffic noise, railroad noise, and noise associated with office, commercial, and residential land uses. The City of Goleta General Plan has identified the area along Hollister Avenue within the 70 dBA CNEL noise contour. Noise sources in the vicinity of Pipeline Segments 6 and 7 are from recreational activities, ocean surf, and marine engines. Noise levels in this area range between 49.6 dBA Leq. and 56.3 dBA Leq. (Line 96 Modification Project FEIR, Table 4.10-1, 2011).

Vibration is sound radiated through the ground. The rumbling sound caused by the vibration of room surfaces is called groundborne noise. The ground motion caused by vibration is measured as particle velocity in inches per second and, in the U.S., is referenced as vibration decibels (VdB).

The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is usually around 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB. A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. Most perceptible indoor vibration is caused by sources within buildings, such as operation of mechanical equipment, movement of people, or the slamming of doors. Typical outdoor sources of perceptible groundborne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the groundborne vibration from traffic is rarely perceptible. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration velocity level, to 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant noise impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. The Noise Element of the Goleta General Plan establishes noise standards for various land use categories based on the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Guidelines and standards from the California Office of Noise Control. Table 6 shows the noise and land use compatibility criteria in the City’s Noise Element.
## Table 6
Goleta Noise and Land Use Compatibility Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Community Noise Exposure (Ldn or CNEL, dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normally Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - low density</td>
<td>50-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential – multiple family</td>
<td>50-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Lodging – motels and hotels</td>
<td>50-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, and nursing homes</td>
<td>50-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditoriums, concert halls, and amphitheaters</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports arenas and outdoor spectator sports</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds and neighborhood parks</td>
<td>50-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses, riding stables, water recreation, and cemeteries</td>
<td>50-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office buildings, business commercial, and professional</td>
<td>50-67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, manufacturing, utilities, and agriculture</td>
<td>50-75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 9-2, Noise Element, Goleta General Plan (September 2006)

**Normally Acceptable:** Specified land use is satisfactory, based upon the assumption that any buildings involved are of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.

**Conditionally Acceptable:** New construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design. Conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning, will normally suffice.

**NORMALLY UNACCEPTABLE:** New construction or development should be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements shall be made and needed noise insulation features shall be included in the design.

**Clearly Unacceptable:** New construction or development should generally not be undertaken.

**NA:** Not applicable.

The Noise Element also restricts construction activities near or adjacent to residential buildings and other sensitive receptors to the hours of 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Monday through Friday and 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM Monday through Friday for construction in nonresidential areas (Policy NE 6.4). Noise Element Policy NE 6.5 requires noise mitigation for construction equipment.
The Goleta Municipal Code ("GMC") Chapter 9.09 regulates noise in the City. The purpose of the Chapter is to preserve public peace and comfort of citizens of Goleta from unwarranted noise and disturbances. The GMC prohibits loud and unreasonable noise between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM Sunday through Thursday and between 12:00 midnight and 7:00 AM Friday and Saturday. Loud and unreasonable noise is defined as sound which is clearly discernible at a distance of 100 feet from the property line of the property upon which it is broadcast or sounds which is above 60 dBA at the edge of the property line upon which the sounds is broadcast. The City does not have any code requirements related to noise from construction activities other than the GMC noise regulations described above.

Project Specific Impacts

a,c,d) The proposed construction activity would occur over a period of up to 10 working days. Table 7 shows typical noise levels associated with the operation of various types of construction equipment at distances of 50, 100, 200, 400, and 500 feet from the noise source. Typical construction noise levels at 50 feet from the source range from about 76 to 89 dBA. The excavation phase of project construction tends to create the highest construction noise levels because of the operation of heavy equipment, although only a limited amount of equipment can operate near a given location at a particular time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Onsite</th>
<th>Typical Level (dBA) 50 Feet from the Source</th>
<th>Typical Level (dBA) 100 Feet from the Source</th>
<th>Typical Level (dBA) 200 Feet from the Source</th>
<th>Typical Level (dBA) 400 Feet from the Source</th>
<th>Typical Level (dBA) 500 Feet from the Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Compressor</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane, mobile</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hammer</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper Laying</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noise levels assume a noise attenuation rate of 6dBA per doubling of distance.
Source: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), May 2006.

As shown in Table 7, excavation, concrete mixing activities, paving, and pipeline removal activities would generate noise levels ranging from 80-88 dBA at 50 feet from the noise source. The most affected adjacent uses would be the residential uses located along Phelps Road, which are approximately 100 feet north of Pipeline Segments 3–4 and 5. At 100 feet from the project site, construction-related noise levels could reach up to 82 dBA. Although these noise impacts would only occur periodically during the
construction period, impacts would be potentially significant unless mitigation measures N-1, N-2, N-3 below are incorporated.

b) Vibration refers to groundborne noise and perceptible motion. Groundborne vibration is almost exclusively a concern inside buildings and is rarely perceived as a problem outdoors, where the motion may be discernible, but without the effects associated with the shaking of a building, there is less adverse reaction. The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is usually around 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB (Federal Transit Administration, 2006). A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. The range of interest is from approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration velocity level, to 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings (FTA, 2006).

The general human response to different levels of groundborne vibration velocity levels is described in Table 8.

### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vibration Velocity Level</th>
<th>Human Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 VdB</td>
<td>Approximate threshold of perception for many people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 VdB</td>
<td>Approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible. Many people find that transportation-related vibration at this level is unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 VdB</td>
<td>Vibration acceptable only if there are an infrequent number of events per day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Federal Transit Administration, 2006.*

Construction activities associated with the removal of Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 would occur along Phelps Road. These construction activities have the potential to generate relatively low levels of groundborne vibration. Table 8 identifies various vibration velocity levels for the types of construction equipment that would operate at the project site during construction activities.

The area of the project is surrounded by residential uses to the north, south, and east, and open space to the west. The closest buildings are multi-family dwellings approximately 100 feet north of Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5. Based on the information presented in Table 9, vibration levels could reach approximately 69 VdB at the nearest residences located approximately 100 feet north of the pipeline alignment. The likely source of the vibration would be construction vehicles fully loaded with pipeline debris and/or the use of a backhoe/jackhammer to break up the existing pipeline. Although the anticipated vibration level could be perceived by the nearest residential units, the vibration would be intermittent, below the 75 VdB level considered unacceptable, and would only occur during the 10-day pipeline removal timeframe and during 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Monday through Friday. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
Table 9
Typical Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Approximate VdB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoe Ram</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caisson Drilling</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Trucks</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


e, f) The project site is outside of the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport Area of Influence and the Airport Approach Zone, as defined by the Santa Barbara County Airport Land Use Plan. There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the impact of exposure to aviation-related noise sources would be less than significant.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

N-1 Construction Timing. Noise generating construction activity and equipment maintenance must be limited to the hours between 8 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday. No construction can occur on State holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day). Non-low noise generating construction activities such as pipeline grouting or similar activities which are located away from sensitive receptors, such as interior painting, are not subject to these restrictions and can occur within 12-14 hour workdays.

Plan Requirements and Timing: At least one sign near the project site entrance on Phelps Road stating these restrictions must be posted on the site. Signs must be a minimum size of 24” x 48.” Signs must be in place before the beginning of and throughout grading and construction activities. Violations may result in suspension of permits.

Monitoring: City Planning and Environmental Review staff must monitor compliance with restrictions on construction hours and must promptly investigate and respond to all complaints.

N-2 Construction Vehicle Travel Route. Construction vehicles and haul trucks must utilize roadways which avoid residential neighborhoods and sensitive receptors where possible.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The permittee must submit a proposed construction vehicle and hauling route. This information must be reviewed.
and approved by City staff before any LUP approval for the project. The approved route must be used for the duration of construction.

**Monitoring:** City Planning and Environmental Review staff must periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance.

**N-3 Electrical Power.** Electrical power must be used to run air compressors and similar power tools. If a diesel generator is used to provide electrical power for air compressors and similar power tools, the appropriate level of acoustical shielding shall be utilized.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** The equipment area with appropriate acoustic shielding must be designated on all building and grading and/or demolition plans. Equipment and any required acoustical shielding must remain in the designated location throughout construction activities.

**Monitoring:** City Planning and Environmental Review staff must periodically inspect the site to ensure compliance with all noise attenuation requirements.

### Residual Impact

With the above mitigation measures, construction-related noise would be reduced to a less than significant level.

### Cumulative Impacts

Construction and operation of other projects in the vicinity of the project site would likely generate noise that temporarily exceeds existing noise levels and perceptible vibration. However, the project’s temporary noise and vibration levels would be similar in intensity when compared to UCSB’s North Campus housing project, which is currently under construction approximately 50 feet south of the project area. The project’s contribution to existing noise and vibration levels would be temporary (up to 2 work days for grouting and 10 work days for pipeline removal activities) and would be limited to normal business hours. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

### XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Prior Document
Existing Setting

The pipeline alignment is currently located beneath Hollister Avenue, Pacific Oaks Drive, and Phelps Road. In addition, the pipeline is buried beneath undeveloped property (Goleta Union School District and the Ellwood Mesa Open Space property) and developed properties (the UCSB North Campus housing project site).

Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact on population and housing would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist.

Project Specific Impacts

a-c) The proposed project involves temporary pipeline decommissioning and pipeline removal activities. No new homes or business are proposed and no displacement of housing or people would occur. Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly impact population growth or housing supply within the City of Goleta. No impact would occur.

Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for impacts related to population and housing.

Residual Impact

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

The project would not contribute to cumulative population growth, as the project would only include temporary construction activities.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 these public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police protection?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parks?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

**Fire Protection**

The City of Goleta receives fire protection and related services from the Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD). Services are provided through six fire stations in the Goleta Valley area, including three stations (stations 11, 12, and 14) located within City boundaries. Fire station no. 11 located at 6901 Frey Way would be the stations closest to the project area. Fire Station 11 houses six on-duty firefighters per shift serving an estimated population of 21,594 people for a firefighter to population ratio of 1:3,599.

The SBCFD has implemented a dynamic deployment system for its fire engines, in addition to the traditional static deployment system from fire stations when the station’s engine is in-house. Dynamic deployment allows for the dispatching of engines already on the road to emergency calls rather than dispatching by a station’s “first in area,” as has been the previous practice. Basically, dynamic deployment uses a Global Positioning System (GPS) to monitor the exact location of each engine in real time. Previously, when an engine was out on routine (nonemergency) activities, such as inspections or training, the engine company was considered in-service and its exact location at any given moment in time was not known to County Dispatch. However, with dynamic deployment using the County’s GPS, County dispatch has real-time information on the exact location of each engine at all times and can dispatch the closest, un-engaged engine to an emergency incident, regardless of which fire station’s service area the call originates from (Ron Pepin, Captain, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District, personal communications, May 16, 2013). This precludes the need for an in-service engine to have extended run times when another fire engine would be closer. The SBCFD has also added a battalion chief as the fourth firefighter on scene, in order to meet the two-in-two-out rule.

The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and the SBCFD identify the following three guidelines regarding the provision of fire protection services:

1. A fire fighter-to-population ratio of one firefighter on duty 24 hours a day for every 2,000 persons is the ideal goal. However, one firefighter for every 4,000 persons is the absolute maximum population that can be adequately served.
2. A ratio of one engine company per 12,000 persons, assuming three firefighters per station (or 16,000 persons assuming four firefighters per station), represents the maximum population that the SBCFD determined can be adequately served by a three-person crew.
3. A five-minute response time in urban areas.

**Police Protection**

Police services are provided to the City of Goleta through a contract with the Santa Barbara County Sheriff’s Department. Sheriff Deputies enforce the statutes of the State of California and City municipal ordinances. Assigned officers are considered City police and use vehicles identified by the City of Goleta logo. A lieutenant is appointed as police chief, and he attends
weekly staff meetings and submits monthly and annual reports to the City Council. Law enforcement services include 24-hour police patrol for traffic enforcement, accident investigation, vehicle abatement, and parking control, as well as detective services for special investigations. Specialized functions through the Santa Barbara County Sheriff’s Department are provided as needed.

**Schools**

Public education services are provided within Goleta and the remainder of the Goleta Valley by the Goleta Union School District and the Santa Barbara High School District (SBHSD). GUSD owns and operates five schools (Brandon, El Rancho, Ellwood, Kellogg, and La Patera) located within the City and five other schools (El Camino, Foothill, Hollister, Isla Vista, and Mountain View) located within unincorporated areas of Santa Barbara County.

SBHSD oversees the secondary schools of Dos Pueblos High School and the Goleta Valley Junior High School, situated within Goleta’s boundaries, and San Marcos High School, located in the eastern Goleta Valley.

**Parks**

Park facilities in proximity to the project site include the Santa Barbara Shores regional open space, the Ellwood Mesa Open Space, Girsh Community Park, and University Village Neighborhood Park.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant impact on public services would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. While the NFPA and SBCFD criteria shown above are not adopted thresholds of significance, they provide a guideline for determining significance.

**Project Specific Impacts**

a) The proposed project may require temporary supervision and/or inspection by the fire department during construction. The Santa Barbara County Fire Inspector would review the project’s proposed construction staging plans to ensure sufficient emergency vehicle access would be maintained throughout construction. Furthermore, no significant ignition sources would be allowed near fire hazard areas. Therefore, the overall risk of fire during project construction is minimal and impacts would be less than significant.

The temporary nature of the activities would not increase the City’s population and thus no new fire station facilities or fire department staff would be needed as a result of the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

b-e) The proposed project would not increase the City’s population nor would the project introduce new land uses that could impact police, educational, health care services, or parks. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required for impacts related to public services.
Residual Impact

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development in and around the City of Goleta, including the proposed project, would add 2,922 residential units and more than 1.5 million square feet of commercial and retail space (Cortona Apartments EIR, 2013). The cumulative development could therefore impact police and fire protection, schools, and parks. However, the proposed project includes temporary construction activities only. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative population growth would be less than significant.

**XV. RECREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existing Setting

The City’s 10 public parks, 4 private parks, and 20 public open space areas comprise a total of 523 acres, which equate to approximately 18 acres per thousand residents. The three larger City-owned regional open space preserves, Ellwood Mesa Open space, Santa Barbara Shores Park, and Lake Los Carneros Natural and Historical Preserve collectively account for 363 acres of that total. Approximately 40 percent of the City’s two miles of Pacific shoreline is held in City ownership. Together with the neighborhood open space areas, these preserves provide many opportunities for passive recreation activities and enjoyment of natural areas. Areas specifically developed for active recreational uses are less abundant with about three acres of land per thousand residents. The City’s single recreation center, the Goleta Valley Community Center, is insufficient to fulfill all the needs of community groups and residents. Although privately owned and managed, Girsh Community Park provides much-needed facilities for active recreation, but there remains a shortage of public facilities for active recreation such as sports fields, tennis courts, swimming pools, and dedicated trails.

Pipeline Segments 3-7 traverse the western portions of Phelps Road and the eastern portions of the City’s Ellwood Mesa open space area, which are used by walkers, joggers, nature lovers, and occasionally by equestrian riders.

Thresholds of Significance

The City does not have specific thresholds regarding impacts involving recreational facilities, but strives to maintain a ratio of 4.7 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Therefore, impacts may
be significant if a project causes the City to contain less than 4.7 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, such that new facilities would need to be developed. Furthermore, in accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, impacts would be significant if the proposed project would 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.

**Project Specific Impacts**

a) The removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and -5, as well as removal of Vault Box 1291, has the potential to obstruct existing trails located within the Ellwood Mesa Open Space area. However, the applicant has proposed a traffic management plan, which would limit the obstruction of vehicle and pedestrian traffic within and adjacent to the public right-of-way and would also limit disturbances/obstructions within the Ellwood open space preserve area. Furthermore, the applicant is required to locate construction equipment outside of any sensitive habitat areas and public trail alignments. Therefore, no impacts to parks and open space would occur. No permanent land uses are proposed and thus no increases in park usage would occur.

b) No recreational facilities are proposed as part of the project. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required for impacts related to recreational uses.

**Residual Impact**

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative development in and around the City of Goleta, including the proposed project, would add 2,922 residential units and more than 1.5 million square feet of commercial and retail space (Cortona Apartments EIR, 2013). The proposed project would only involve temporary construction activities and thus would not generate any additional demand on existing recreational facilities. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative park impacts would be less than significant.
### XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Conflict with and applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety or such facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Setting**

The project area is located within or adjacent to Hollister Avenue, Pacific Oaks Road, and Phelps Road. It is anticipated that the completion of temporary construction activities would require the use of the following roads:

- Highway 101;
- Winchester Canyon on/off-ramps;
• Hollister Canyon on/off-ramps;
• Portions of Hollister Ave, from the Winchester Canyon off/on-ramps to Pacific Oaks Road;
• Pacific Oaks Road to Phelps Road; and
• Western portions of Phelps Road.

Thresholds of Significance

A significant project-generated traffic impact would be expected to occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. Additional thresholds of significance are set forth in the City’s Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual and include the following:

1) The addition of project traffic to an intersection increases the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio by the value provided below or sends at least 5, 10, or 15 trips to intersections operating at LOS F, E or D, respectively.

2) Project access to a major road or arterial road would require a driveway that would create an unsafe situation or a new traffic signal or major revisions to an existing traffic signal.

3) Project adds traffic to a roadway that has design features (e.g. narrow width, road side ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure) or receives use which would be incompatible with a substantial increase in traffic (e.g. rural roads with use by farm equipment, livestock, horseback riding, or residential roads with heavy pedestrian or recreational use, etc.) that will become potential safety problems with the addition of project or cumulative traffic.

4) Project traffic would utilize a substantial portion of an intersection(s) capacity where the intersection is currently operating at acceptable levels of service (A-C) but with cumulative traffic would degrade to or approach LOS D (V/C 0.81) or lower. Substantial is defined as a minimum change of 0.03 for intersections which would operate from 0.80 to 0.85 and a change of 0.02 for intersections which would operate from 0.86 to 0.90, and 0.01 for intersections operating at anything lower.

In addition to the CEQA impact thresholds, the City of Goleta has developed the administrative policy of defining a significant roadway impact if a project would increase traffic volumes by more than 1.0% (either project-specific or project contribution to cumulative impacts) on roadways that currently exceed the Acceptable Capacity or are forecast to exceed the Acceptable Capacity under cumulative conditions.

Project Specific Impacts

a,b) The project would involve a short-term increase in vehicular traffic on area roads during construction as a result of material and equipment deliveries. Project traffic would require the delivery of heavy-duty vehicles (concrete, backhoe, etc.), and the daily use of pick-up trucks, and related vehicles. A total of 13 construction team members would be assigned to the proposed project along with 6 pieces of portable construction equipment. Therefore, it was conservatively estimated that the proposed project could generate up to 20 trips per day along City streets during construction. This estimated trip volume would not constitute a substantial increase in vehicular movement compared to existing street and freeway traffic load and capacity.
Roadway construction is planned within the Hollister Avenue right-of-way, which would require temporary lane closures during normal business hours for up to 2 working days. However, the project would be required to prepare detailed construction staging plans that provide traffic controls and detours and/or alternative routes for local traffic and emergency vehicles to ensure intersection level of service and vehicle access impacts would be less than significant. The staging plans would include traffic controls (e.g., flaggers, detour signs, orange safety cones, etc.) and detours and/or alternative routes for local traffic and emergency vehicles. If the sidewalk or trails are obstructed, then an alternative pedestrian route will be provided. Moreover, the applicant will be required to obtain an encroachment permit from the City for all work proposed in the public right-of-way. The encroachment permit includes a number of conditions that must be complied with during construction, including permitted work hours on major roadways, traffic control requirements, trenching details, trench plating, resurfacing, and concrete work. Compliance with these standards will reduce traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

c-h) The proposed project would not establish any permanent uses and thus it would not result in any changes to transit systems, rail or air traffic, traffic hazards, ingress and egress, or emergency access. No impacts would occur.

**Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required for impacts related to traffic and circulation.

**Residual Impact**

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts**

The project would not result in permanent modifications to any roadway segment or intersection and would not establish permanent land uses with the potential to generate new vehicle trips. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative traffic impacts would be less than significant.

**XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>■</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact | See Prior Document |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | | ■ |
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded entitlements needed? | | | | | ■ |
e. 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? | | | | | ■ |
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? | | | | | ■ |
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | | | ■ |

Existing Setting

Wastewater Treatment

The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) provides sewer service in the project area. Sewage travels along gravity-fed collection lines to a main trunk line. The trunk line terminates at the GWSD pump house located on the UCSB campus Lot 32, at which point the waste is transferred via a pressurized line running parallel to the Santa Barbara Airport, to the Goleta Sanitary District’s (GSD) treatment plant located on William Moffett Place next to the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport. Treatment of wastewater collected by GWSD is provided through a contract with the GSD.

Water Supply

The Goleta Water District (GWD) is the water purveyor within the City of Goleta. The GWD relies on four sources of water to meet its existing and future demands: (1) surface water via the Cachuma Project, (2) surface water from the State Water Project (SWP), (3) groundwater from the Goleta Groundwater Basin, and (4) recycled water.

Landfill Capacity and Solid Waste

The Santa Barbara County Public Works Department owns and operates the Tajiguas Landfill as well as the South Coast Recycling and Transfer Station. The management of solid waste by the Department includes collection, recycling, disposal, and mitigation for illegal dumping. Within the City, collection services are provided by Marborg Industries and BFI Waste Systems. Waste generated in the City is handled at the South Coast Recycling and Transfer Station where
recyclable and organic materials are sorted out. The remaining solid waste is disposed of at the Tajiguas Landfill.

The 80-acre Tajiguas Landfill, located 26 miles west of Santa Barbara, has a permitted capacity of 23.3 million cubic yards and is permitted to operate through 2020. The South Coast Recycling and Transfer Station processes 550 tons of waste per day (City of Goleta GP/CLUP Final Environmental Impact Report, 2006).

**Drainage Facilities**

The majority of the project area is located within or adjacent to existing paved roadways. Drainage from the roadways is collected in a series of storm drains. Surface drainage within the southeastern portion of the site flows into Devereux Creek, which ultimately flows into the Pacific Ocean via Devereux Slough.

**Thresholds of Significance**

A significant impact on utilities and service systems would occur if the project resulted in any of the impacts noted in the above checklist. In addition, under the City’s *Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual*, a project that would generate 196 tons of solid waste/year, after receiving a 50% credit for source reduction, recycling, and composting, would result in a project specific, significant impact on the City’s solid waste stream. Any project generating 40 tons/year, after receiving a 50% credit for source reduction, recycling, and composting would be considered to make an adverse contribution to cumulative impacts to the City’s solid waste stream.

**Project Specific Impacts**

a,b,e) The proposed project would not establish permanent land uses that would require waste water service. The proposed pipeline removal activities would also avoid the City’s existing wastewater collection and treatment infrastructure. Therefore, no impacts to wastewater treatment requirements would occur.

c) The proposed project would not require any new permanent storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Furthermore, no additional impervious surfaces would be created as part of the project and thus no increases in runoff volumes would occur. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) The proposed project would not result in an increase in long-term water use in the area. Water required for project construction could be provided by existing water service infrastructure and thus no new or expanded water entitlements would be needed. Therefore, no impact would occur.

f,g) The proposed project would involve the removal of asphalt, concrete, rebar, native and engineered soils, and other construction debris, which would be disposed of offsite at the appropriate waste disposal and recycling center. The project description includes a provision to recycle construction waste to the maximum extent feasible. Furthermore, all project-related waste generation would be short-term in nature. With the commitment to recycle construction waste to the maximum extent feasible, the project’s specific impact on solid waste disposal capacity at the Tajiguas Landfill would be less than significant.
Required/Recommended Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required for impacts related to utilities and service systems.

Residual Impact

No mitigation measures would be required and thus no residual impacts would occur.

Cumulative Impacts

The project would not contribute to cumulative population growth. Therefore, the project’s contribution to cumulative utility and service system impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>See Prior Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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 endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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.)

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

a) Construction activities would occur within vacant parcels, which include biological resources. Therefore, mitigation measures have been identified (Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3) to reduce potential impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level. Although the project area is not anticipated to contain any known paleontological or archaeological resources, it may contain previously undetected subsurface archaeological resources. Mitigation measures have been identified (Mitigation Measures CR-1, CR-2) to mitigate any impacts associated with the discovery of previously undetected subsurface cultural resources during excavation activities. Adherence to this measure would reduce cultural impacts to a less than significant level. After mitigation, potential impacts of the project on these resources would be less than significant.
b) As presented in the discussion of environmental checklist Sections I through XVII, the project would have no impact, a less than significant impact, or a less than significant impact after mitigation with respect to all environmental issues. Due to the limited scope of direct physical impacts to the environment associated with the proposed project, the impacts are project-specific in nature. Consequently, the project along with other cumulative projects would result in a less than significant cumulative impact with respect to all environmental issues.

c) In general, impacts to human beings are associated with air quality and noise impacts. The removal of the proposed pipeline segments would contribute to air pollutant emissions on a short-term basis. As a result, the project would be required to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. The purpose of these rules is to reduce the amount of particulate matter in the atmosphere resulting from man-made fugitive dust sources. Adherence to these measures would reduce short-term construction air quality impacts to a less than significant level. Construction related noise levels were found to exceed applicable thresholds. Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-3 are required to reduce temporary noise impacts to less than significant levels. With implementation of these measures, potential impacts on human beings would be less than significant.
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15. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

This section includes comments received during the circulation of the Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS-MND) prepared for the Ellwood Pipeline Inc., Line 96 Decommissioning project.

The Draft IS-MND was circulated for a 30-day public review period that began on June 2, 2014 and concluded on July 1, 2014. The City received six (6) comment letters on the Draft IS-MND. The commenter and the page number on which each commenter’s letter appears are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter No. and Commenter</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Joe Petrini, Emission Inventory/Planning Specialist III,</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dana Trout</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dana Trout</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shari Hammond, Principal Planner, University of California</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bruce Carter, Venoco Inc</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Scott Morgan, Director, Office of Planning and Research</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comment letters and responses follow. Each comment letter has been numbered sequentially and each separate issue raised by the commenter, if more than one, has been assigned a number. The responses to each comment identify first the number of the comment letter, and then the number assigned to each issue (Response 1.1, for example, indicates that the response is for the first issue raised in comment Letter 1).
Letter 1

COMMENTER: Joe Petrini, Emission Inventory/Planning Specialist III, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District

DATE: June 5, 2014

Response 1.1

The commenter clarifies that the Air Pollution Control District’s guidance for determining construction impacts is 25 tons per year for both ROC and NOx and not 25 pounds per day as stated on page 26 of the IS-MND. The IS-MND has been amended as follows:

The proposed project would only result in short-term construction emissions during pipeline grouting and removal activities. Although the City, County and APCD have not established thresholds for short-term construction emissions, the APCD uses 25 tons lbs per day year for NOX and ROG (both of which are precursors to the formation of ozone) as a guideline for determining the significance of construction impacts. To determine the project’s air emissions and potential impact on air quality, the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod, version 2011.1.1) was used to estimate project related construction emissions. Table 4 provides the estimated project emissions during construction based upon Venoco’s proposed list of construction equipment and their estimated construction timeframe.

Construction related ROG and NOx emissions are estimated at 2.00 and 13.2 lbs. per day over the course of the construction, respectively. The proposed project would be completed in 10 working days thus emitting a total of 0.01 and 0.07 tons of ROG and NOx, respectively. These emissions do not exceed 25 lbs tons per day year guideline for determining the significance of construction-related air quality impacts. Furthermore, the emissions shown in Table 4 do not exceed any of the SBCAPCD emissions thresholds discussed above. Therefore, project emissions would not contribute substantially toward an exceedance of standards, and have been adequately incorporated into the 2010 CAP in terms of the overall emissions inventory for construction activities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
Can you be the keeper of the public comment? This is the first one... I usually save them as .pdf files when they come in as emails. You will need to update the City’s electronic folder when you come to City Hall each time.

Hi Anne,

As just discussed, in Section III of the Line 96 Decommissioning Project Draft Initial Study – Mitigated Negative Declaration (May 2014), it is stated that although short-term construction emission thresholds have not been established, the APCD uses 25 pounds per day for both NOx and ROC (page 26). Please be advised that the APCD’s guidance for determining construction impacts is **25 tons per year** for both ROC and NOx, not 25 pounds per day.

Thanks,

Joe

Joe Petrini
Emission Inventory/Planning Specialist III
260 North San Antonio Road, Suite A
Santa Barbara, CA 93110
Phone: (805) 961-8894
Fax: (805) 961 -8801
jep@sbcapcd.org
www.sbcapcd.org
Letter 2

COMMENTER: Dana Trout

DATE: June 13, 2014

Response 2.1

The commenter states that they are in support of the proposed project. This comment is noted.
Jasch, Here is an email for Final MND Public Comment. I’m assuming that you are the keeper of Line 96 public comment.

Anne

Hi Anne,

I finally went through the whole Draft MND for Line 96 decommissioning -- the newly-posted version which is searchable was a great help!

I have only one comment: I am in favor of the demolition and appreciate the hard work done by everyone, including Venoco, to do it in a timely and responsible manner.

Thank you for your help,

Dana Trout

On Wed, Jun 4, 2014 at 2:14 PM, Anne Wells <awells@cityofgoleta.org> wrote:
Dana, I’m working on this request now.

Thanks for the feedback, Anne

Hi Anne,

I started looking at the Draft MND for Line 96 decommissioning and found that while the first 75 pages is searchable text, everything after that, which includes all of Exhibit 2 Conditions of Approval, is saved as images of the text and is not searchable at all.

It would be really helpful if all the text in the whole document were searchable.

Could you please repost the document with *all* the text searchable?

Thanks!

Dana Trout
Letter 3

COMMENTER: Dana Trout

DATE: June 14, 2014

Response 3.1

The commenter states that there is a hump located at the juncture of Segments 5 and 6, in a path at the southern end of Ellwood Beach Drive that should be removed to make the path easier to navigate for bicyclists. This topographic feature is located within Segment 6 and therefore is not proposed for removal, as its removal could result in impacts to biological habitat.
Oops!

I said
"There is a well-used dirt path connecting the southern end of Mathilda Drive ..."
I should have said
"There is a well-used dirt path connecting the southern end of Ellwood Beach Drive ..."

Sorry about that.

Dana Trout

On Sat, Jun 14, 2014 at 3:44 PM, Dee Tee <dee3.tee@gmail.com> wrote:
Re Line 96 MND

Hi Anne,

I did think of one thing I would like to see done.

There is a well-used dirt path connecting the southern end of Mathilda Drive with the western end of Phelps Road. At the juncture of Segments 5 and 6, at the eucalyptus windrow, there is a "hump" in the path to cross over the pipeline -- this hump is difficult to navigate with bicycle and is an impediment to pedestrians as well.

I can't tell from the drawings or description whether this hump is part of Segment 5, where the pipeline will be removed, or part of Segment 6, where the pipeline will not be removed.

I would really like to see this hump removed. Its removal would make it easier to upgrade the pathway so bicyclists that travel between UCSB and the apartments on Mathilda and Ellwood Beach Drives could use it to connect with the campus bike path and avoid the high-speed and heavy traffic on Hollister, as well as the rather dangerous curvy Cannon Green Drive.

Could you check whether this hump is slated to be removed?

Thank you,

Dana Trout
Letter 4

COMMENTER: Shari Hammond, Principal Planner, University of California at Santa Barbara

DATE: July 1, 2014

Response 4.1

The commenter states that the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) has an interest in the project because portions of the proposed project are located on UCSB owned property. This comment is noted.

Response 4.2

The commenter states that Pipeline Segment 5 (Work Area 4) is located beneath a future phase of UCSB’s North Campus housing project and that the photo on Page 10 is not an accurate photo of Work Area 4 and suggests providing a more accurate photo of Work Area 4 and a description of the pipeline removal work area located in Segment 5. A more accurate photo of the Segment 5 work area has been included on Page 10. Additionally, the Final IS-MND has been amended as follows:

**Work Area No. 4.** This area includes Pipeline Segment 5, which parallels the Phelps Road right-of-way and traverses beneath the northern portions of the 157.32 167.65-acre property owned by UCSB. Segment 5 is located approximately 30 feet west of the constructed wetlands is immediately south of the existing pedestrian trail connecting to the Ellwood open space. The proposed construction activities include pipeline excavation, pipeline removal/demolition, off-site disposal of pipeline material, and site restoration. Pipeline removal would only occur within the northern and western portions of this property, which have been rough graded to prepare for future development. Access to this work area would be provided by unpaved access roads that extend west from the intersection of Phelps Road and Cannon Green Drive.

Response 4.3

The commenter states that on pages 6 and 19 of the IS –MND the following should be specified as part of the site restoration in Work Area 4 (Pipeline Segment 5): The soils will be compacted to the same level of the compaction as existed prior to pipeline removal and to match compaction of the soils immediately adjacent to area of work, (ii) the moisture content shall match that of the immediately adjacent soils, (iii) fill may be native soil, provided that its free of contamination, and (iv) soil stabilization/erosion controls to reduce runoff and dust will be implement in accordance with UCSB’s policies. This clarifying language has been included in Development Plan/Conditional Use Permit Condition No. 10.

Response 4.4

The commenter states that that UCSB should be notified in writing at least 60 days prior to commencement of any activities on UCSB-owned land, a demolition plan shall be submitted to the University’s Representative for review and approval, and UCSB may have representatives
present to observe and monitor work. This comment is noted and has been included in Development Plan and Conditional Use Permit Condition No. 22.

Response 4.5

The commenter requests the IS-MND include protocol in the event there is a release of oil or other hazardous substance during the excavation and removal activities, that UCSB be given at least 60 days’ notice prior to excavation work, if visual or odor evidence is observed, the applicant will notify UCSB, and if contamination is found procedure for remediation is outlined. This comment has been noted and included as Development Plan and Conditional Use Permit Condition No. 21.

Response 4.6 – 4.7

The commenter states that Pipeline Segment 4 is located under UCSB’s North Campus housing project and will be decommissioned in place and requests that the IS-MND include language stating this is because of impacts to wetlands and the recently constructed entrance improvements of the North Campus housing project. The Final IS-MND has been amended as follows:

Pipeline Segment 4. This segment traverses the western portion of UCSB’s North Campus housing project and would be decommissioned in place to minimize impacts to ongoing construction, impacts to wetlands, and the recently constructed entrance improvements of the North Campus housing project.

Response 4.8

The commenter requests that references mistakenly identifying Pipeline Segment 4 for removal be removed from the document on pages 18, 19, 29, 30, 31, 42, 45, and 61. All references stating Pipeline Segments 3-5 have been update to state “Pipeline Segments 3 and 5”. The Final IS-MND has been amended as follows:

Page 18 - The removal of Pipeline Segments 3, 4 and 5 and decommissioning of Pipeline Segment 4 would require short-term construction and equipment staging for up to 10 working days.

Page 19 - The removal of Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 would involve physical ground disturbance within the property owned by the Goleta Union School District and the western eastern segments of the UCSB parcel.

Page 29 - The following discussion of potential impacts to biological resources is therefore limited to the construction activities required for the removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 beneath the properties owned by the Goleta Union School District and UCSB and the demolition of Vault Box 1291 at the end of Pipeline Segment 6.

Page 30 - The removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 would involve the excavation, removal and disposal of pipeline segments located beneath the northern portions of the properties owned by the Goleta Union School District and UCSB.

Page 31 - The removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 would occur directly adjacent to the Phelps Road right-of-way, south of the existing pavement.
Page 42/43 - The risks associated with the release of hazardous materials during the physical removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 or during grout pumping activities are minimal, as the pipeline has been thoroughly cleaned and is no longer in service.

Page 45/46 - Pipeline Segments 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 are proposed to be decommissioned in place. Therefore, no impacts would occur. Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 are proposed for removal and Vault Box 1291 is proposed for demolition and restoration. Therefore, no impacts would occur. Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 are proposed for removal and Vault Box 1291 is proposed for demolition and restoration.

Page 46 - The removal of Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 would involve trenching, soil excavation, and debris staging near Devereux Creek and the newly established wetland areas constructed as part of the UCSB North Campus project.

Page 61 - The removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5, as well as removal of Vault Box 1291, has the potential to obstruct existing trails located within the Ellwood Mesa Open Space area.

Response 4.9

The commenter requests the addition of clarifying language regarding the location of the restored wetlands located beneath pipeline segment 4 and the location of proposed pipeline removal activities in relation to this wetland area. The Final IS-MND has been amended as follows:

Page 30 (b,c) - The removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 beneath the northern portions of the Goleta Union School District and UCSB properties would not impact existing riparian habitat. Pipeline removal activities would occur approximately 50 feet away from the existing channelized portions of Devereux Creek and over approximately 30 feet west away from the constructed wetland areas proposed as part of UCSB’s North Campus housing project. Nevertheless, the soil and/or construction debris stockpile areas have the potential to cause indirect adverse water quality impacts on these biological resources as a result of sedimentation or inadvertent debris deposits. The project would be required to comply with all local and state mandated stormwater best management practices which would ensure impacts to riparian habitats would be less than significant. For further discussion of this issue, please refer to Section IX(a), Hydrology and Water Quality.

Page 45 (a) - Pipeline Segments 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 are proposed to be decommissioned in place. Therefore, no impacts would occur. Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 are proposed for removal and Vault Box 1291 is proposed for demolition and restoration. The removal of Pipeline Segments 3 and 5 would require excavation and would require the temporary staging of construction debris and/or excavated soils within areas near Devereux Creek and the newly constructed wetlands located on the UCSB parcel.

Page 45 (b-d) - The proposed projects does not involve the construction of a new land use that would require water service. Therefore, no impact on groundwater supplies would occur.
The removal of Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5 would involve trenching, soil excavation, and debris staging near Devereux Creek and the newly established wetland areas constructed as part of the UCSB North Campus project. Although the pipeline removal areas would ultimately be restored to their original grade upon disposal of the excavated pipeline segments, project construction and staging could temporarily alter runoff rates, percolation rates, or drainage patterns in the vicinity of Devereux Creek, Devereux Slough, and the UCSB constructed wetlands. As described above, preparation of a SWPPP must include erosion and sediment control BMPs, as well as BMPs that control other potential construction-related stormwater discharges. Furthermore, the temporary construction areas would be restored to their pre-project conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Response 4.10

The commenter requests the addition of clarifying language in mitigation measure BIO-1 regarding Pipeline Segments 3, 4, and 5. Mitigation Measure BIO_1 in the Final IS-MND has been amended as follows:

**BIO-1 Protection of Sensitive Species.** The project engineer shall submit a demolition plan for Vault Box 1291, Pipeline Segment 3, and Pipeline Segment 4 subject to review and approval by the City’s Building Official, the City’s Planning Director, and representatives of the Goleta Union School District and UCSB. The plan shall clearly designate “SENSITIVE RESOURCE ZONE(S)” on the demolition plan in the vicinity of Vault Box 1291, Pipeline Segment 3, Pipeline Segment 4, and Pipeline Segment 5. The SENSITIVE RESOURCE ZONE(S) shall be clearly established in the field and shall be clearly marked with flagging and stakes, or construction fencing. No construction or demolition activity or equipment staging shall occur within these designated sensitive resource zones.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** This condition must be printed on project plans submitted for Coastal Development Permit, Land Use Permit, and Building Permit/Demolition Permit approval. Fencing must be graphically depicted on all project plans submitted for approval of any Land Use Permit and/or Building Permit/Demolition Permit Approval.

**Monitoring:** City Planning and Environmental Review staff, Goleta Union School District representatives, and UCSB representatives must review plans and confirm fence installation before Building Permit/Demolition Permit issuance. City Planning and Environmental Review staff must conduct site inspections to ensure compliance during all construction activities.

Response 4.11

The commenter indicates that Pipeline Segment No. 7 is located on both City-owned and UCSB-owned parcels. In addition, the commenter indicates that Venoco is in the process of making an application with the County for decommissioning and reclamation of the EMT and this application may involve removal of the portion of Pipeline Segment No. 7 located on UCSB owned property. This comment is noted. The removal of Pipeline Segment No. 7 is not proposed as part of this current application and therefore no impact was identified.
Response 4.12

The commenter requests clarifying language regarding the location of Line 96 in relation to the UCSB owned property. The Final IS-MND has been amended as follows:

Page 12 - Parcel No. 073-090-068-074 is owned by UCSB. The northern portion of this parcel is currently being developed as the North Campus university housing project. Line 96 traverses beneath the northern portion of this parcel and the southern portion of the parcel as it extends east from Vault Box 1291 to the grout pumping location near the EMT. The property is currently in the residential construction stage.

Response 4.13

The commenter requests modification of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, to require the use of “seed from the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space native plant stock.” Mitigation Measure BIO-2 has been revised as follows:

BIO-2 Habitat Restoration. The sand/soil mixture proposed to fill the abandoned vault box shall include a hydroseed mix consisting only of native seed obtained from the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space native plant stock, plants known to thrive in the region. The mixture shall prevent the invasion and/or spread of undesired plant species and shall result in the restoration of native wildlife habitat and a plant palette consisting of entirely native species.

Response 4.14

The commenter indicates that erosion controls will be required for all work completed on UCSB owned land consistent with the SWPPP prepared for the North Campus Faculty Housing project. This comment is noted. Condition No. 10 of the Development Permit/Conditional Use Permit Conditions of Approval requires the preparation of a SWPPP for pipeline removal activities proposed in segments 3 and 5. Best Management Practices are required, consistent with those implemented as part of the UCSB North Campus Faculty Housing project.
Anne Wells  
City of Goleta  
Planning and Environmental Review  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, CA 9117

Re: University of California, Santa Barbara—Comments on the Draft Initial Study-Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Proposed Line 96 Decommissioning Project

Dear Ms. Wells:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Initial Study-Mitigated Negative Declaration (Draft IS/MND) for the Proposed Line 96 Decommissioning Project. Since portions of the proposed project are located on UCSB-owned property, UCSB has an interest in coordination with the City of Goleta, representatives from Venoco, Inc., and other responsible agencies and jurisdictions on this project.

The Line 96 Decommissioning Project (the Project) proposes to decommission the majority of the subsurface pipeline in place and remove portions of the pipeline that traverse private property owned by Goleta Union School District and The Regents of the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB). UCSB has reviewed the Draft IS/MND and has the following comments:

1) Pipeline Segment 5 (Work Area 4): As described on Page 4, this pipeline segment is located beneath a future phase of UCSB's North Campus housing project and would be removed as requested by UCSB. UCSB requests that the Draft IS/MND be revised to address the following comments:

(a) The photo on Page 10 showing Work Area 4 is not an accurate location of Work Area 4. This photo shows the entrance to Ocean Walk at North Campus Faculty Housing and the restored wetland. These two areas are to be avoided and are not included in Work Area 4. Suggest replacing the photo with an accurate picture of the proposed work area. Additionally, please describe the exact point of demarcation between Segments 4 and 5.

(b) Page 19 of the Draft IS/MND provides that this pipeline removal will require “excavation, pipeline removal, demolition and off-site disposal of pipeline, equipment staging, and site restoration to existing grades.” Please specify here and in the Work Area No.4 description on Page 6 that as part of the site restoration in Work Area 4 (Pipeline Segment 5): (i) the soils will be compacted to the same level of compaction as existed prior to pipeline removal and to match compaction of the soils immediately adjacent to area of work, (ii) the moisture content shall match that of the immediately adjacent soils, (iii) fill may be...
native soil, provided that its free of contamination, and (iv) soil stabilization/erosion controls to reduce runoff and dust will be implemented in accordance with UCSB’s policies.

(c) UCSB should be notified, by written notice, at least 60 days’ prior to commencement of any decommissioning activities on UCSB-owned land. Applicant shall submit a demolition plan for the work to be done on UCSB land (Work Area 4) to the University’s Representative for review and approval. Representatives of UCSB may be present to observe and monitor the work.

(d) According to the Draft IS/MND, hydrotest records indicate that Line 96 has been leak free, and the pipeline has been pigged and flushed with water and filled with nitrogen. Page 42 concludes that “while some risk of minor oil release during removal, it is minimal.” The Draft IS/MND should include a protocol in the event that there is evidence of a release of oil or other hazardous substance during the excavation and removal activities. Please require at least 60 days’ prior written notification to UCSB when the excavation work is scheduled to begin and provide that representatives of UCSB may be present to observe and monitor conditions. If staining or other visual or odor evidence of a release is observed, the applicant will notify the UCSB Environmental Health and Safety Department. If contamination is found, procedure for remediation should be clearly outlined in the Draft IS/MND. In addition, investigation into the extent of contamination, including soil sampling, shall be required prior to backfill of excavation. All excavated contaminated soil will be removed by the applicant for proper disposal.

(2) Pipeline Segment 4: This pipeline segment is located under UCSB’s North Campus housing project, and will be decommissioned in place as described in the Draft IS/MND. However, there are several discrepancies in the Draft IS/MND that we request be revised:

(a) Revise description of Pipeline Segment 4 (Page 4) to add that it is being decommissioned in place because of impacts to wetlands as well as the recently constructed entrance improvements of the North Campus housing project.

(b) Delete references in the Draft IS/MND that mistakenly identify Pipeline Segment 4 as being removed. There are multiple references, found on pages 18, 19 and 30. Additionally, there are several references to removal of “Pipeline Segments 3-5”. It would be clearer to change these references to “Pipeline Segments 3 and 5”. There are multiple references on pages 29, 30, 31, 42, 45 and 61.

(c) Paragraph 4 on Page 30 states “Pipeline removal activities would occur 50 feet away from the existing channelized portions of Devereux Creek and over 180 feet away from the wetland areas proposed as part of UCSB’s North Campus Housing project.” Pipeline Segment 4, which would be decommissioned in place, passes underneath the restored wetland and is adjacent to Pipeline Segment 5 which would be removed. Removal activities in connection with Pipeline Segment 5 are less than 180 feet from the restored wetland. Revise text accordingly and include analysis on wetland protection.

(d) Include protection of the Segment 4 wetland in the vicinity of Segment 5 (Work Area 4) under Mitigation Measure BIO-1 (Page 31). Include fencing or clearly marking the wetland buffer so that no demolition or construction activities or equipment staging occurs within the designated buffer area. Venoco shall submit a demolition plan for the work to be done on UCSB land (Work Area 4) to the University’s Representative for review and approval.
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(3) **Pipeline Segment 7**: As indicated in the Draft IS/MND, Pipeline Segment 7 traverses under both City-owned and UCSB-owned parcels. The Draft IS/MND provides for this pipeline segment to be decommissioned in place. While UCSB has no objections to this pipeline being grouted and remaining in place under the scope of the Line 96 Decommissioning Project, UCSB will be reviewing the ultimate disposition of the pipeline within UCSB’s parcel as part of the EMT Decommissioning Project. Venoco is in the process of making application with the County for a decommissioning and reclamation permit, and it is anticipated that part, or all, of the pipeline located on UCSB’s parcel may be required to be removed as part of the EMT Decommissioning Project.

(4) **Table 1 – Summary of Parcels Affected by Proposed Project (Section 6.4, Page 12)**: Note that the APN for UCSB land has been changed to 073-090-074 and the corresponding acreage for that parcel is now 157.32 Acres. Revise Table 1 and the second paragraph below Table 1 to correct the APN and to indicate that the parcel also includes a portion of pipeline on UCSB’s land that runs from the City’s property line near the Vault Box 1291 to the grout pumping location in the EMT site.

(5) **Mitigation Measure BIO-2 (Page 32) – Seed stock from the Ellwood-Devereux Coast**: Mitigation Measure BIO-2 requires “a hydroseed mix consisting only of native plants known to thrive in the region.” UCSB requires the use of seed be from the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space native plant stock.

(6) **Compliance with SWPPP**: Erosion controls will be required for any work done on UCSB land. This would include waddle and silt fencing installed in a manner consistent with the SWPPP on the North Campus Faculty Housing parcel for the purpose of managing potential runoff, avoiding storm water pollution, and protecting the wetland areas, including those under restoration. The University Representative will provide pertinent provisions of North Campus Faculty Housing development’s SWPPP to Venoco for this purpose.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this submittal please do not hesitate to telephone me at (805) 893-3796 or send e-mail to shari.hammond@planning.ucsb.edu.

Sincerely,

Shari Hammond
Principal Planner

cc: Marc Fisher, UCSB Administrative Services
Alissa Hummer, UCSB Office of Campus Planning and Design
Robert Silsbee, UCSB Administrative Services
Karen Rothberg, UCSB Office of Budget and Planning
Letter 5

COMMENTER: Bruce Carter, Venoco Inc.

DATE: July 1, 2014

Response 5.1

The commenter requests that the IS-MND be amended to describe the original Line 96 Decommissioning Project Description, which only included the decommissioning in place of all pipeline segments and not the removal of pipeline segments 3 and 5. Furthermore, Venoco requests the ability to decommission all pipeline segments in place subject to receiving approval from the underlying landowner. This comment is noted. The text on page 4 of the Final IS-MND has been amended to clarify the original project description. Given that the current preference of UCSB and Goleta Union School District is pipeline removal, the IS-MND considers the potential impacts associated with decommissioning in place and pipeline removal.

Response 5.2

The commenter notes that no above-ground valves will be removed as part of the project. All references to above-ground valve removal have been removed from the Final IS-MND.

Response 5.3

The commenter requests clarification that the 10-day window for pipeline removal be separate from the 2-day grout pumping period. This clarification has been made throughout the Final IS-MND.

Response 5.4

The commenter requests clarification that asphalt and pavement demolition within Work Area No. 2 would not be required. This comment is noted and the Final IS-MND has been amended accordingly.

Response 5.5

The commenter requests clarification that equipment staging would occur within the fenced areas of the EMT currently used for driving and/or parking. This comment is noted and the Final IS-MND has been amended accordingly.

Response 5.6

The commenter requests clarification that roadway detours would last as long as necessary within one or two work days. This comment is noted and the Final IS-MND has been amended accordingly.

Response 5.7

The commenter requests clarification that pipeline segment 4 is not proposed for removal. This comment is noted the Final IS-MND text throughout the document has been modified accordingly.
Response 5.8

The commenter requests modifications to Mitigation Measure N-1 to allow grout pumping activities, which are located away from sensitive receptors, to occur within 12-14 hour work days. This comment is noted. Mitigation Measure N-1 has been amended in the Final IS-MND as follows:

**N-1 Construction Timing.** Noise generating construction activity and equipment maintenance must be limited to the hours between 8 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday. No construction can occur on State holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day). Non-Low noise generating construction activities such as pipeline grouting or similar activities which are located away from sensitive receptors or interior painting are not subject to these restrictions and can occur within a 12-14 hour workdays.

Response 5.9

The commenter requests modifications to Mitigation Measure N-3 to allow for the use of diesel generators to provide power for power tools. This comment is noted. Mitigation Measure N-3 has been amended in the Final IS-MND as follows:

**N-3 Power.** Electrical power must be used to run air compressors and similar power tools. If a diesel generator is used to provide electrical power for air compressors and similar power tools, the appropriate level of acoustical shielding shall be utilized.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** The equipment area with appropriate acoustic shielding must be designated on all building and grading and/or demolition plans. Equipment and any required acoustical shielding must remain in the designated location throughout construction activities.
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Anne Wells, Planning Manager
City of Goleta
Plng. & Envt’l. Rvw.
130 Cremona Dr.
Goleta, Ca 93117

RE: Venoco Line 96 Decommissioning Project, Case No. 12-045-DP-CUP
Comments on Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

Dear Ms. Wells,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above referenced MND for our Line 96 Decommissioning Project. We have the following comments:

1. The proposed project originally did not specify that any portion of the line would be removed. This must be included in the MND as an alternative to allow for the permanently grouted pipeline to be left entirely in place as the preferred alternative based on de-minimus risk. Venoco requests the capability to leave the grouted pipeline segments 3 and/or 5 in place if we are successful in securing landowner approval as the preferred project alternative.

2. Please note that there will be no aboveground valves removed. No such valves exist within the Goleta City limits on the line to be decommissioned.

3. The 10 working day construction window is for work to remove pipeline segments 3 & 5. Any discussion of this 10 day window should not apply to the separate two day window for the grouting procedure.

4. Global statement for Work Area No.2: There is no plan to include asphalt and pavement demolition in this work area.

5. Global statement for Work Area No.6: We would use the area inside the fenced EMT as a staging area. Not the paved road leading to the EMT. The equipment would be staged within EMT on space currently designated for driving and/or parking.

6. Page 7 & 8. Work areas 1 & 2 (EOF and Hollister at valve box) detours would last as long as necessary to complete the grouting in one or two 12 to 14 hour days.
7. Page 45 under Project Specific Impacts, paragraph a), b-d), Page 48, 1st paragraph, page 54, page 61, etc. states that pipeline segments 3, 4 & 5 are proposed for removal. Pipeline segment 4 is NOT proposed for removal.

8. Page 55, Condition N-1 Construction timing for the grouting activities needs to allow for 12 – 14 hour workdays. Grouting will occur at either EMT or the EOF, away from noise receptors.

9. Page 56, Condition N-3 Electrical power tools, if needed, will be powered from an onsite diesel powered electrical generator.

Please contact me at 745-2184 should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

BRUCE CARTER
Venoco, Inc.

cc: B. VanNostrand, Venoco, Inc.
Stephen Greig, Venoco Inc.
Letter 6

COMMENTER: Scott Morgan, Director, Office of Planning and Research

DATE: July 2, 2014

Response 6.1

The commenter noted that no state agencies submitted comments to the State Clearinghouse received during the 30-day review period and that the City has complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. This comment is noted.
July 2, 2014

Anne Wells  
City of Goleta  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, CA 93117

Subject: Line 96 Decommissioning Project  
SCH#: 2014061009

Dear Anne Wells:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on July 1, 2014, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Scott Morgan  
Director, State Clearinghouse
SCH# 2014061009
Project Title Line 96 Decommissioning Project
Lead Agency Goleta, City of

Type MND Mitigated Negative Declaration
Description The proposed project consists of the decommissioning and/or removal of an oil production pipeline. The majority of the subsurface pipeline would be decommissioned in place while portions of the pipeline that traverse private properties owned by Goleta Union School District and the University of California Santa Barbara (UCSB) would be removed. Overall, a total of seven pipeline segments are proposed for decommissioning in place or removal. Segments 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 would be decommissioned in place and segments 3 and 5 would be removed. Although the majority of the pipeline segments would be decommissioned in place, construction activity would occur within selected pipeline segments. Grouting would be used for segments decommissioned in place.

Lead Agency Contact
Name Anne Wells
Agency City of Goleta
Phone 805 961 7557
Fax
email
Address 130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
City Goleta State CA Zip 93117

Project Location
County Santa Barbara
City Goleta
Region
Lat / Long 34° 25' 47.97" N / 119° 52' 39.66" W
Cross Streets Hollister Ave & Pacific Oaks Rd and Pacific Oaks Rd & Phelps Rd.
Parcel No. 073-090-026, 068, 079-210-024
Township
Range
Section
Base

Proximity to:
Highways Hwy 101
Airports Santa Barbara
Railways UPRR
Waterways
Schools Ellwood ES
Land Use Recreation, Open Space, Planned Development, Vacant, Oil Production, University

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Coastal Zone; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; California Coastal Commission; Cal Fire; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 5; Air Resources Board; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 3; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; CA Department of Public Health; State Lands Commission; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5

Date Received 06/02/2014 Start of Review 06/02/2014 End of Review 07/01/2014
APPENDIX A
Permit No. 09-088-DP Conditions of Approval
EXHIBIT 2
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
LINE 96 MODIFICATION PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PLAN
U.S. HIGHWAY 101 RIGHT-OF-WAY, UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY,
HOLLISTER AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY, 7925 HOLLISTER AVENUE (APN 079-210-059) AND
7979 HOLLISTER AVENUE (APN 079-210-042); CASE #09-088-DP

1. AUTHORIZATION

This Development Plan Case No. 09-088-DP (permit), authorizes implementation of “August 22, 2010, Exhibit #1” (attached to these Conditions of Approval) subject to these Conditions of Approval (project). All construction, improvements, implementation and/or any other actions taken pursuant to this permit shall be in substantial conformance with the project. Any deviations from the project must be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta (City). The City shall determine whether any deviation substantially conforms to the project. Any deviation determined to not be in substantial conformance with the project requires the permittee to seek additional approval, permits, or other action by the City. Any deviation from the project made without the above-described review and approval of the City is a violation of this permit.

2. AUTHORIZED USES/DEVELOPMENT

The project is limited to the project description for only that portion within the City in the application submitted to the City by Ellwood Pipeline, Inc. on May 13, 2009, the supplemental application dated June 23, 2011 and the plans and documents subsequently submitted to the City to further define and clarify the portion within the City. A summary of the project follows:

a) The installation and operation of approximately 585 feet of the Project, which is the 8.5-mile, 6-inch diameter oil pipeline from outside the EOF to the Plains Pipeline, L.P. Coastal Pipeline west of Las Flores Canyon. The project will begin immediately north of the EOF located at 7979 Hollister Avenue at a new vault located underground in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way that serves as the EOF driveway outside of the EOF. The new vault will be approximately 12-feet by 8-feet by 9-feet;
b) The new vault will facilitate the switchover from the existing 10-inch pipeline;
c) A new pig launcher will be permanently installed entirely inside the new vault to perform periodic cleaning and a temporary pig launcher will be connected periodically to perform line inspection runs on the pipeline. The inspection pig launcher will be connected to the pipeline through a bolt-on extension, which will be partially within the vault and extending out of the vault approximately ten feet beyond the top of the vault. The inspection pig launcher will be connected to the pipeline and operated every 2 to 5 years according to the California State Fire Marshal;
d) The new 6-inch diameter pipeline will be connected to the existing, 10-inch Line 96 within the Hollister Avenue right-of-way that serves as the EOF driveway at a point immediately outside of, and adjacent to, the primary EOF entrance gate located on the northwest side of the EOF;
e) The pipeline will be installed via horizontal, directional drilling that will be conducted from a property within the County’s jurisdiction just north of U.S. Highway 101 and Calle Real;
f) Mainline Block Valves (MBVs) will be installed at the start of the pipeline;
g) There is no new construction within the EOF. The only activities to occur within the EOF will be control and communications modifications to the existing control and communications systems to support the pipeline from the EOF. These modifications are limited to the installation of two Programmable Logic Controllers (PLCs), a flow transmitter and a satellite dish to communicate with the Plains Pipeline, L.P. Coastal Pipeline system to receive Lease Automatic Custody Transfer (LACT) metering information from the existing EOF LACT.
system for custody transfer, operational monitoring purposes, leak detection and emergency shutdown capabilities. The PLCs will be installed inside an existing control panel.

h) A passive sacrificial anode system will be installed for cathodic protection to the pipeline. The system will have one sacrificial anode within the Hollister Avenue right-of-way serving as the EOF driveway to protect the new vault and pipe crossing under the U.S. Highway 101.

i) During construction only, non-essential mobile equipment will be stored within the confines of the existing EOF fence. Contractors will be directed to carpool to the worksite and/or park employee vehicles within the EOF fence within the limitation of EOF parking capacity. Any other construction staging will occur at or on property within the County.

j) Some construction staging and construction activities involving pulling the new pipeline through the directional bore hole will occur outside of the EOF and immediately west of the EOF in a private road easement on property owned by Sandpiper Golf Course (7925 Hollister Avenue; APN 079-210-059).

MITIGATION MEASURES

3. GEO-3 Expansive Soil Control Measures; GEO-4a Implementation of Site-Specific Geotechnical and Seismic Studies Results; GEO-4b. Seismic Resistant Design. Plan Requirements and Timing; and WQ-3a. Perform Geotechnical Investigation prior to HDD drilling: The permittee shall complete a site-specific geotechnical and seismic-hazard studies for the project route. The geotechnical investigation and associated recommendations shall be prepared by a licensed geotechnical engineer, subject to review and approval by the City to verify that soil expansion remedial measures comply with the existing geologic setting and current California Building Code (CBC), as adopted by the City in Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code, construction standards. Based on the results of the investigation, standard engineering construction-related soil expansion measures, such as pipeline trench backfilling with sandy, non-expansive soils, or a mixture of expansive material with non-expansive material, shall be implemented in the Project design as needed to minimize impacts associated with potentially expansive soils. Plan Requirements:

a. The study results shall summarize risks from faulting, ground shaking, liquefaction hazards, landslides and slope stability issues.

b. The permittee shall perform seismic evaluation and design of the proposed pipelines and employ current industry seismic design guidelines including but not limited to: (1) “Guidelines for the Design of Buried Steel Pipe,” 2001, by American Lifeline Alliance and (2) “Guidelines for the Seismic Design and "Assessment of Natural Gas and Liquid Hydrocarbon Pipelines," 2004, by PRCI for seismic resistant design of the pipeline.

c. All engineered structures, including pipeline alignment and profile drawings, buildings, other structures, other appurtenances and associated facilities, shall be designed, signed, and stamped by California registered professionals certified to perform such activities in their jurisdiction such as Civil, Structural, Geotechnical, Electrical and Mechanical Engineering. Preliminary geotechnical borings shall be drilled to verify that the proposed depth of horizontal directional drilling is appropriate to avoid frac-outs (i.e., the depth of finest grained sediments and least fractures) and to determine appropriate horizontal directional drilling methods (i.e., appropriate drilling mud mixtures for specific types of sediments).
The investigation shall include results from at least three borings, a geologic cross section, a discussion of drilling conditions and a history and recommendations to prevent frac-outs.

**Timing:** The permittee shall submit certified copies of these reports to the City and SSRRC for review and approval prior to LUP issuance. The permittee shall implement all recommendations from the Geotechnical and Seismic studies as directed by the City and SSRRC for their respective jurisdictions.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall perform site inspections throughout the construction phase.

4. **GEO-4c. Seismic Inspection.** The permittee shall cease pipeline operations and inspect all project-related pipelines and storage tanks following any seismic event in the City that exceeds a ground acceleration of 13 percent of gravity (0.13 g). The permittee shall report the findings of such inspection to the City and the County. The permittee shall not reinstate operations of the pipeline within the City until authorized by the City. The permittee shall not reinstate operations of the pipelines and associated operations within the City until authorized by the City. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be included in the Safety, Inspection, Maintenance, and Quality Assurance Plan (SIMQAP) as required under Condition #20.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall monitor the implementation of this condition through the System, Safety Review and Reliability Committee (SSRRC) process as required under Condition #19.

5. **HM-3 Automated Block Valves and an Additional Check Valve on the Proposed Pipeline.** The permittee shall ensure that all block valves on the pipeline are remotely actuated from a central location, including the block valves at the EOF. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be included in the pipeline design and shall be in effect for the lifetime of pipeline operations.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall monitor the implementation of this condition through the System, Safety Review and Reliability Committee (SSRRC) process as required under Condition #19.

6. **AQ-1a. Measures to reduce dust emissions from construction.** Best Available Control Measures shall be implemented to control PM10 generation during construction of the Project. **Plan Requirements:**
   a. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems should be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water shall be used.
   b. Minimize the amount of disturbed area and reduce onsite vehicle speeds to 15 mph per hour or less;
   c. Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads;
   d. If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material are involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist or treated with soil.
binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the Project site shall be covered with a tarp from the point of origin;
e. After clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, revegetating, or spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur;
f. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off site. 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 Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District prior to land use clearance for any grading activities for the project; and
g. Prior to any land clearance, the permittee shall include, as a note on a separate informational sheet to be recorded as required by the City, these dust control requirements. All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans.

Timing: All requirements shall be noted on all plans submitted for LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure measures are printed on plans and shall periodically site inspect to ensure compliance. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.

7. AQ-1b. Measures to reduce NOx emissions from construction. Diesel emissions shall be reduced during construction. Plan Requirements:
   a. Diesel construction equipment meeting the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used. Equipment meeting CARB Tier 2 or higher emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible;
   b. Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible;
   c. If feasible, diesel construction equipment shall be equipped with selective catalytic reduction systems, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California Air Resources Board.
   d. Construction equipment shall be maintained per the manufacturers’ specifications;
   e. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible;
   f. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size;
   g. 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;
   h. Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

Timing: All requirements shall be noted on all plans submitted for LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure measures are printed on plans and shall periodically site inspect to ensure compliance. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.

8. WQ-2a. Implement a Construction-Related Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program and GEO-2 Erosion Control Measures. A Project-specific Storm Water
Pollution Prevention Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region and City, to prevent adverse impacts to nearby waterways associated with construction-related incidental spills not covered under the existing Oil Spill Contingency Plan or National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit. Best Management Practices such as temporary berms and sedimentation traps, including silt fencing, straw bales, and sand bags, shall be installed prior to work involving ground disturbance. The Best Management Practices shall include maintenance and inspection of the berms and sedimentation traps during rainy and non-rain periods, as well as re-vegetation of impacted areas. Re-vegetation shall address plant type as well as monitoring to ensure appropriate covering of exposed areas. **Plan Requirements:** The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. Best management practices (BMPs), such as temporary berms and sedimentation traps (such as silt fencing, straw bales, and sand bags), shall be installed in association with project grading. The BMPs shall be placed at the base of all cut/fill slopes and soil stockpile areas where potential erosion may occur and shall be maintained to ensure effectiveness. The sedimentation basins and traps shall be cleaned periodically and the silt shall be removed and disposed of in a location approved by the City.

b. Non-paved areas shall be revegetated or restored (i.e. geotextile binding fabrics) immediately after grading and installation of utilities, to minimize erosion and to re-establish soil structure and fertility. Revegetation shall include drought-resistant, fast-growing vegetation that would quickly stabilize exposed ground surfaces. Alternative materials rather than reseeding (e.g., gravel) may be used, subject to review and approval by the City.

c. Runoff shall not be directed across exposed slopes. All surface runoff shall be conveyed in accordance with the approved drainage plans.

d. Energy dissipaters or similar devices shall be installed at the end of drainpipe outlets to minimize erosion during storm events.

e. Grading shall occur during the dry season (April 15th to November 1st) unless a City approved erosion control plan is in place and all erosion control measures are in effect. Erosion control measures shall be identified on an erosion control plan and shall prevent runoff, erosion, siltation, and tracking of mud and soil onto City streets. All exposed graded surfaces shall be reseeded with ground cover vegetation to minimize erosion. Graded surfaces shall be reseeded within four (4) weeks of grading completion, with the exception of surfaces graded for the placement of structures. These surfaces shall be reseeded if construction of structures does not commence within four (4) weeks of grading completion.

f. Site grading shall be completed such that permanent drainage away from foundations and slabs is provided and so that water shall not pond near proposed structures or pavements.

**Timing:** Final grading, drainage, and erosion control plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance. BMPs and erosion control measures shall remain in place/shall be implemented for the duration of grading and construction.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance during grading and construction activities.

9. **WQ-2b. Truck Pipeline Cleaning Water to an Offsite Licensed Disposal Facility.** The permittee shall truck all water used for pipeline cleaning and hydrostatic testing to an offsite licensed disposal facility. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** All requirements
shall be noted on all plans submitted for LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall ensure measures are printed on plans and shall site inspect to ensure compliance.

10. **WQ-3b. Frac-Out Contingency Plan.** A frac-out contingency plan shall be completed and include measures for prevention, containment, clean up, and disposal of released drilling muds. Preventative measures would include incorporation of the recommendations of the geotechnical investigation to determine the most appropriate horizontal directional drilling depth and drilling mud mixture. In addition, drilling pressures shall be closely monitored so that they do not exceed those needed to penetrate the formation. Containment shall be accomplished through construction of temporary berms/dikes and use of silt fences, straw bales, absorbent pads, straw wattles, and plastic sheeting. Clean up shall be accomplished with plastic pails, shovels, portable pumps, and vacuum trucks. Frac-out contingency plan shall be submitted to the City. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Frac-Out Contingency Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall conduct site inspections, monitor plan implementation, and review monitoring reports to ensure compliance with the provisions of the plan.

11. **BIO-2a. Native Habitat and Special Status Species Protection Plans.** Prior to construction, the permittee shall prepare and implement a City-approved Native Habitat and Special Status Species Protection Plan to avoid or reduce impacts to sensitive biological resources, including drainages, during pipeline construction. **Plan Requirements:** Protection measures shall include, at a minimum:

   a. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted within 30 days of the start of construction by a City approved biologist to determine the presence of any sensitive species and habitats. This mitigation measure is not a requirement for exhaustive species-specific protocol surveys, but an effort to determine presence/absence for the purpose of implementing measures to avoid and minimize impacts in accordance with Species Protection Plan and any agency take authorization requirements.

   b. The City approved biologist shall be present daily during construction (including during borings under drainages and wetlands) in locations known to support sensitive species, including California red-legged frogs and tidewater gobies, and to monitor for these species. The biologist will be authorized to stop work if threats to any sensitive species are identified during monitoring.

   c. Construction shall be scheduled to avoid the breeding seasons of special status species that are found to be present in the construction area.

   d. All HDD activities shall be conducted outside of the wet season, December 1 through March 31, and will not occur within 12 hours of any rain forecasted at 50% chance or greater;

   e. The silt fencing to be constructed in accordance with the project Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will also serve as exclusionary fencing to prevent red legged frogs from entering the construction area. The project biologist employed by the permittee and the Monitoring and Compliance Program Contract Biologist will be on site during all night work and shall frequently monitor for the presence of any red legged frogs.
f. All excavated areas shall be secured at the end of the work day, with the exception of the Horizontal Directional Drill hole, to ensure that animals do not fall into excavated areas, and/or that they can extricate themselves in the event that they do fall in. Project biologists shall inspect excavated areas daily prior to the start of work.

g. If any red legged frogs or other federally listed species are discovered near the project site, all work in the area shall cease and Fish and Wildlife shall be contacted to assess any potential effects to listed species and the possible need for further coordination.

h. All pipes stored in the Bell Creek corridor buffer area shall be capped.

i. In the event of a frac-out or any incident that affects the Bell Creek riparian corridor, all work in the area shall cease, any spills shall be contained to the extent feasible in accordance with approved plans and the permittee shall simultaneously contact Fish and Wildlife to assess any potential effects to listed species and the possible need for further coordination.

j. The project biologist and the project engineer shall clearly designate "sensitive resource zones" on the project maps, construction plans, and at the construction site, consistent with the results of preconstruction surveys conducted for the presence of sensitive species. Sensitive resource zones are defined as areas where construction would be limited to a 15- to 30-foot corridor, depending on the particular construction requirements, to avoid impacts to special status biological resources. Similarly, staging areas would not be placed in areas where sensitive resources are present.

k. All machinery shall be stored and fuelled in designated locations at least 100 ft (30.5 m) way from any sensitive habitats. Heavy equipment and construction activities shall be restricted to the defined construction area. Vehicles and personnel shall use existing access roads to the maximum degree feasible.

l. Disposal or temporary placement of excess fill shall be prohibited within 50 ft (15.2 m) from the top of the banks for all drainages and other areas known to support special status species. All equipment used in or near drainages shall be clean and free of leaks and/or grease. Emergency provisions shall be in place prior to the onset of construction to deal with accidental spills from construction activities or equipment.

m. All trash receptacles on site shall be designed with secure lids (wildlife proof) to contain food, wrappers, and other miscellaneous trash.

n. No pets shall be permitted on site.

o. No hunting shall be authorized during construction.

p. All personnel shall undergo training from the project biologist regarding onsite sensitive resources, and proper protocols and notification in the event that they encounter sensitive resources.

Timing: The plan shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of an LUP. Implementation shall be completed prior to final clearance.

Monitoring: City staff shall site inspect during construction to monitor plan implementation and will review monitoring reports to ensure compliance.

12. BIO-4a. Update the Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) to Protect Sensitive Resources. The Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) shall be revised and updated to address protection of sensitive biological resources and revegetation of any areas
disturbed during an oil spill from the pipeline or cleanup activities. **Plan Requirements:**

The revised OSCP shall, at a minimum, include:

a. Specific measures to avoid impacts on Federal- and State-listed endangered and threatened species and any Federal, State, or City designated environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHAs) during response and cleanup operations. Where feasible, low-impact, site-specific techniques such as hand-cutting contaminated vegetation and using low-pressure water flushing from vessels to remove spilled material from particularly sensitive wildlife habitats, such as coastal estuaries, i.e., Devereux Slough, because procedures such as shoveling, bulldozing, raking, and drag-lining can cause more damage to a sensitive habitat than the oil spill itself. The OSCP shall also evaluate the non-cleanup option for ecologically vulnerable habitats such as coastal estuaries.

b. Specific measures requiring spill response personnel to be adequately trained for response in terrestrial environments and spill containment and recovery equipment to be maintained in full readiness. Inspection of equipment and periodic drills shall be conducted at least annually and the results evaluated so that spill response personnel are familiar with the equipment and with the project area including sensitive biological resources.

c. When habitat disturbance cannot be avoided, stipulations for development and implementation of site-specific habitat restoration plans and other site-specific and species-specific measures appropriate for mitigating impacts on local populations of sensitive wildlife species and to restore native plant and animal communities to pre-spill conditions. Access and egress points, staging areas, and material stockpile areas that avoid sensitive habitat areas shall be identified. The Oil Spill Contingency Plan shall include species- and site-specific procedures for collection, transportation and treatment of oiled wildlife, particularly for sensitive species.

d. Procedures for timely re-establishment of disturbed habitats dominated by non-native species, replaces them with suitable native species) including: measures preventing invasion and/or spread of invasive or undesired plant species; restoration of wildlife habitat; restoration of native communities and native plant species propagated from local genetic sources including any sensitive plant species (such as the southern tarplant); and replacement of trees at the appropriate rate in accordance with any agency’s with jurisdiction, applicable requirements (i.e. the City’s General Plan).

e. Financial documentation of available funding and/or assurances of permittee’s ability to obtain funding that shall be available to implement the OSCP.

f. Monitoring procedures and minimum success criteria to be satisfied for restoration areas. The success criteria shall consider the level of disturbance and condition of the adjacent habitats. Monitoring shall continue for five years, depending on habitat, or until success criteria are met. Appropriate remedial measures, such as replanting, erosion control or control of invasive plant species, shall be identified and implemented if it is determined that success criteria are not being met.

**Timing:** The plan shall be submitted to, and approved by, the City prior to the approval of any LUP. The requirements shall be enforced throughout all construction periods and for the life of the project.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall conduct site inspections, monitor plan implementation and review monitor reports to ensure compliance during construction and throughout the life of the project.
13. **T-1c. Construction Traffic Control Plan.** The permittee shall prepare, provide funding for, and implement a Construction Traffic Control Plans for approval by the City. **Plan Requirements:** The plan shall include, but not be limited to the following:
   a. Provide traffic controls when lanes are closed due to construction, e.g., flaggers, detour signs, orange safety cones;
   b. Provide traffic controls at the EMT access road and Storke Road to allow for left hand turning in a safe manner, e.g., flaggers;
   c. Close the pipeline trench for the non-work hours with approved plating, and surround the trench with safety barriers if necessary;
   d. Provide detours for emergency vehicles;
   e. Provide alternative routes for bicycles and pedestrians if feasible;
   f. Notify the residents or owners of any properties within 1,000 feet and/or adjacent to the project route of the construction schedule at least one week before construction in their vicinity;
   g. Provide access to the affected properties during the construction; if access to businesses is not possible during the work hours, provide lost sales compensation;
   h. Monitor for road damage from construction-related activities and compare the affected roads at the end of the construction to the preconstruction conditions; repair any visible construction-caused damage to restore the road to its pre-construction condition or better; and
   i. No construction parking will occur in public parking lots (i.e. Haskells Beach and Ellwood Mesa/Sperling Preserve lots).
   j. For construction, the permittee shall limit truck deliveries and commuters/personnel to the west Hollister-Highway 101 on and off ramps and shall not utilize the Storke Road and Hollister Avenue intersection or the Storke Road Highway 101 on/off ramps during peak hours (peak hours are defined as 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 6 p.m).

   **Timing:** The plan shall be submitted to, and approved by, the City prior to any LUP issuance. The requirements of the plan shall be enforced throughout construction.

   **Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall conduct site inspections, monitor plan implementation, and review monitoring reports to ensure compliance.

14. **N-1a. Noise Reduction Plan.** The permittee shall prepare a noise reduction plan which shall be approved by the City. **Plan Requirements:** The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following measures:
   a. Post notifications to the residents and landowners about the planned construction near their residence/land at least one week before construction at that location;
   b. Ensure that construction activities do not occur in the City between 4:00 pm and 7:00 am on weekdays in nonresidential areas away from sensitive receivers, and 5:00 pm and 8:00 am on weekdays near or adjacent to residential buildings and neighborhoods or other sensitive receptors, and not at all on Saturdays, Sundays or holidays, unless specifically required by permits or at the direction of the City staff;
   c. Ensure that all internal combustion engines are properly maintained and that mufflers, silencers, or other appropriate noise-control measures function properly.
   d. If boring under Highway 101 or any other noise-producing activity during the construction is required to be conducted during the evening or night hours (from 5 p.m. to 8 a.m.), the Permittee shall install appropriate mufflers and/or temporary noise barriers to minimize noise at the residences and the Bacara Resort.
Timing: The plan shall be submitted to, and approved by, the City prior to any LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall conduct site inspections, monitor plan implementation, and review monitoring reports to ensure compliance.

**GENERAL CONDITIONS**

15. The permittee shall not use/operate the existing Line 96 from the Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) to the Ellwood Marine Terminal (EMT) thirty (30) days from initial operation of the project. Any and all decommissioning, abandonment and other activities related to the existing Line 96 shall be included in the application for decommissioning and/or abandonment and subject to appropriate permit requirements. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This requirement shall be included in the SIMQAP as required under Condition #20.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall conduct site inspections and review pipeline operational logs to ensure compliance.

16. The project shall be subject to an annual safety audit by the City and SSRRC. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** This condition shall be noted on any final approvals.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall monitor the implementation of this condition through the System, Safety Review and Reliability Committee (SSRRC) process as required under Condition #19.

17. The South Ellwood Field Emergency Action Plan (EAP) shall be updated to include the project. **Plan Requirements:** The plan shall be consistent with the County "Model Emergency Response Plan" and County Office of Emergency Services requirements in addition to all applicable City requirements. The plan shall be based on a comprehensive risk analysis reviewed and approved all signatory agencies of the EAP. The permittee shall demonstrate the effectiveness of the EAP by responding to not more than two surprise drills each year which may be called by the signatory agencies of the EAP. If critical operations are underway, the permittee need not respond, but shall explain the nature of the critical operations and why response is not possible. **Timing:** The revised EAP shall be submitted to and approved by the City and all other EAP signatory agencies prior to LUP issuance. The requirements shall be enforced throughout all construction periods and throughout the life of the project. The plan shall be reviewed and revised as appropriate every two years or when warranted as determined by the signatory agencies to the EAP to incorporate new planning strategies or changes, new technologies, and the acquisition and implementation of more effective feasible recovery and containment equipment as it becomes available.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall ensure plan submittal and approval prior to LUP issuance. City staff and all other signatory agencies to the plan will monitor plan implementation for the life of the project.

18. The permittee shall prepare a Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) for the project. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The scope of the assessment should include any facilities/equipment associated with or serving the project. The QRA shall identify and
quantify any new or substantially changed risks and show any substantial changes to hazard footprints, such that any potential impacts to surrounding development and uses can be assessed and mitigated. The QRA shall also recommend any appropriate mitigation measures to limit exposure of new or expanded hazards to surrounding development and uses. The scope-of-work of the QRA shall be approved by City staff prior to LUP issuance. The QRA shall be approved prior to any final clearance.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure compliance prior to LUP issuance and during compliance review.

19. The permittee shall submit all project design and construction details to the Systems Safety and Reliability Review Committee (SSRRC) for review and approval. The committee may employ a third-party technical review to help identify and correct possible design and construction hazards and to ensure mitigation of potential public risk prior to construction and subsequent design modifications. This review shall also evaluate all mitigations identified in the project permit application and environmental review documents, as described in these conditions of approval. All reasonable costs associated with any review shall be borne by the permittee. The permittee shall be entitled to participate fully in the review process. Plan Requirements: Design and construction details shall include, but not limited to, Process Flow Diagrams, P&IDs, Cause & Effect Charts, pipeline start-up, commissioning and operating procedures including the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system, and a Process and Hazard Analysis (PHA). Timing: The pipeline system design details, SCADA system and PHA shall be reviewed by the SSRRC and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance. Design recommendations resulting from SSRRC review shall be incorporated into the permittee’s plans prior to construction or other appropriate time as determined by the SSRRC. Recommendations concerning the start up, commissioning and operating procedures shall be implemented for the facilities prior to commencing operations. The SSRRC shall require as-built inspections and the submittal of as-built drawings for approval prior to operations and for any modifications.

Monitoring: City staff, or their designee, shall monitor the implementation of this condition through the oversight of the SSRRC.

20. The project shall be subject to a Safety Inspection, Maintenance, and Quality Assurance Program (SIMQAP) to ensure adequate ongoing inspection, maintenance, and other operating procedures. Plan Requirements and Timing: The SIMQAP shall be subject to City approval prior to commencement of project operations and provide for systematic updates as appropriate. Requirements shall be commensurate with the level and anticipated duration of the risk.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure compliance prior to commencement of project operations and during compliance review.

21. The permittee shall submit a construction night lighting plan. Plan Requirements: The plan shall include measures to ensure any construction night lighting shall be of low intensity, low glare design, and shall be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels. Construction lighting fixtures shall be kept to the minimum number and intensity needed to ensure construction and worker safety. Lighting shall be not directed towards any Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area or any neighboring properties to the maximum extent feasible as determined by the
MCP. Upward directed exterior lighting is prohibited. **Timing:** The Night Lighting Plan shall be submitted to, and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall ensure compliance prior to LUP issuance and through inspections during construction.

22. The permittee shall provide Pipeline Construction Quality Control and Quality Assurance (QA/QC). The permittee shall submit Welding Procedure Specifications (WPSs), Procedure Qualification Records (PQRs) and Welder Qualification Records (WQRs) to City of Goleta Building & Safety for review and approval. During construction, the permittee shall submit weld x-rays and other Non Destructive Testing (NDT) inspection details including the weld maps for review and approval. The permittee shall submit all pertinent Quality Control/Quality Assurance (QA/QC) documents for review and approval during construction. **Plan Requirement:** WPSs, PQRs, WQRs, weld x-rays, other NDT inspection reports, and QA/QC documents shall be submitted to City of Goleta Building and Safety for review and approval. **Timing:** WPSs, PQRs and WQRs shall be submitted and approved prior to LUP issuance. The weld x-rays and other NDT inspection reports and QA/QC documents shall be submitted during construction as they become available.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall conduct site inspections throughout the construction period for implementation of these requirements.

23. The permittee shall assess burial depths every five years, or at a more frequent interval when geologic characteristics, flooding, and other circumstances indicate a prudent need for special monitoring as determined by the City. A minimum burial depth shall be identified and maintained for the entire operating life of the project. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall substantiate and submit the minimum burial depth to the City for approval prior to the issuance of the LUP.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall ensure compliance prior to LUP issuance.

24. The permittee shall submit a Pipeline Marking and Warning Plan to the City for approval. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The plan shall include measures to clearly warn outside parties about the presence of the project, including proper marking of the project route with signage and use of brightly colored warning tape approximately 1 foot above buried pipelines where feasible. The plan shall be submitted and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall ensure compliance prior to LUP issuance.

25. The permittee shall develop and implement a Solid Waste Management Program. The program shall identify the amount of waste generation estimated during processing of the project.

**Plan Requirements:** The program shall include, but is not limited to, the following measures:

a. Provision of a recyclable materials storage area of at least 50 SF within the project site that is approved by Marborg.
b. Implementation of a green waste source reduction program focusing on recycling of all green waste generated onsite.

c. Development of a Source Reduction Plan (SRP), describing the recommended program(s) and the estimated reduction of the solid waste disposed by the project. For example, the SRP may include a description of how fill will be used on the construction site, instead of landfiling, or a detailed set of office procedures such as use of duplex copy machines and purchase of office supplies with recycled content.

d. Implementation of a program to purchase materials that have recycled content for project construction and/or operation (i.e., plastic lumber, office supplies, etc.). The program could include requesting suppliers to show recycled materials content. To ensure compliance, the permittee shall develop an integrated solid waste management program, including recommended source reduction, recycling, composting programs, and/or a combination of such programs.

Timing: The permittee shall submit a Solid Waste Management Program to the City for review and approval prior to LUP issuance. All program components shall be implemented prior to occupancy clearance and shall be maintained for the life of the project.

Monitoring: Prior to final inspection, City staff shall ensure compliance with the Solid Waste Management Plan.

26. In the event archaeological resources are encountered during grading, work shall be stopped immediately or redirected until the City-approved archaeologist and local Chumash observer can evaluate the significance of the find pursuant to Phase 2 investigation standards set forth in the City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 2 shall be funded by the permittee. If resources are found to be significant, they shall be subject to a Phase 3 mitigation program consistent with City Archaeological Guidelines. The Phase 3 shall be funded by the permittee. Plan Requirements and Timing: This requirement shall be printed on all plans submitted for any LUP, building, grading, or demolition permits.

Monitoring: City staff shall conduct periodic field inspections to verify compliance during ground disturbing activities and shall ensure preparation of any necessary Phase 2 and/or Phase 3.

27. All new utility service connections and above-ground mounted equipment such as backflow devices, etc, shall be shall be screened from public view and/or painted in a soft earth-tone color(s) (red is prohibited) so as to blend in with the project. Screening may include a combination of landscaping and/or fencing/walls. Whenever possible, utility transformers shall be placed in underground vaults. All gas and electrical meters shall be concealed and/or painted to match the building. All gas, electrical, backflow prevention devices and communications equipment shall be completely concealed in an enclosed portion of the building, on top of the building, or within a screened utility area. All transformers and vaults that must be located within the right-of-way shall be installed below grade unless otherwise approved by the City, and then must be completely screened from view. Plan Requirements and Timing: The plans submitted for City staff and DRB Preliminary/Final review shall identify the type, location, size, and number of utility connections and above-ground mounted equipment as well as how such equipment would be screened from public view and the color(s) that it would be painted so as to blend in with the project and surrounding area.
Monitoring: Prior to final inspection, City staff shall verify that all above-ground utility connections and equipment is installed, screened, and painted per the approved plans.

28. A Monitoring and Compliance Program (MCP) shall be funded by the permittee and submitted to the City of Goleta at least five (5) days prior to the start of construction activities. The MCP shall, at minimum, include the following:
   a. All conditions imposed on this project and the impact areas they are mitigating by subject area.
   b. A plan for coordination and implementation of all conditions and the plans and programs required therein.
   c. A description of all measures that will be implemented to assure compliance, including pre-construction and construction requirements, field monitoring, data collection, management and coordination of all field personnel and feedback to field personnel and affected agencies. MCP Contractor feedback responsibilities include weekly, monthly and/or as specified in the MCP reports to be prepared throughout construction. These shall include status of development, status of conditions, incidents of noncompliance and their results and any other relevant or requested data. Further, a final report summarizing project compliance or noncompliance and the results of such, and any other relevant or requested data shall be submitted to the City within 30-days of construction completion.

The MCP preparer and contractor shall be selected by the City. These individuals shall be under contract and responsible to the City. All costs shall be funded by the permittee. The MCP contractor shall appoint at least one Onsite Monitor (OM) responsible for overall monitoring, but shall employ as many qualified specialists as necessary (as determined by the City) to oversee specific conditions (e.g., archaeologists, biologists). In addition, the OM has the authority and the ability to ensure compliance with all project conditions and to stop work in an emergency. The MCP shall also provide for any appropriate procedures not specified in the conditions of approval to be carried out if they are necessary to avoid environmental impacts. Planning and Environmental Services Permit Compliance shall oversee the MCP. In addition to funding the MCP, the permittee shall pay Permit Compliance fees for project construction/implementation.

The decision of the Director shall be final in the event of any dispute.

29. The permittee shall schedule a pre-construction meeting at the project site with City staff. The pre-construction meeting shall be attended by the permittee and/or its agent, key construction personnel and other pertinent agency representatives. The construction conference shall include a review of all resource protection and other mitigation measures and project conditions. Plan Requirements and Timing: The permittee shall schedule this meeting at least 5 days in advance of the start of construction. Pre-construction meetings shall occur in an as-needed basis to address the various phases of construction and site clean-up at the discretion of the City qualified biological monitor.

Monitoring: City staff shall verify compliance prior to the start of construction activities.

30. If determined necessary by the MCP preparer and contractor, the permittee shall submit a Habitat Restoration Plan to address project-generated impacts on environmentally sensitive resources. The Mitigation Plan shall be prepared by a City, California Coastal Commission, California Department of Fish and Game, Army Corps of Engineers and
Fish and Wildlife Service approved biologist or restoration ecologist. The Mitigation Plan shall include a Plan to restore and revegetate all environmentally sensitive areas disturbed by construction activities. The plan shall include provisions for the enhancement (restoration and/or revegetation) of environmentally sensitive biological resources within the coastal zone (or adjacent to it if necessary as determined by the City in the City). A map shall be included to show the existing and proposed habitat polygons to ensure that the restoration (a) shall connect with existing wetland resources; (b) shall replace existing disturbed upland habitat; and (c) is feasibly located for long term success. Additionally, the Habitat Restoration Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. The date prepared, author, and any revision dates.
b. The project description.
c. The site description and past use.
d. Discussion of vegetation and any special status plant and tree species in the vicinity of disturbance sites.
e. Discussion of the amount of vegetation and trees lost, and recommendations by the City approved biologist for restoration, and recommended native species to use in such restoration and at what replacement ratios.
f. Objectives of restoration.
g. Site preparation methods.
h. Identification of suitable locations for wetland and buffer restoration/enhancement. Onsite restoration is required unless otherwise approved by the City Planning and Environmental Services Director and other agencies with jurisdiction.
i. A minimum 3:1 replacement ratio is required to mitigate all permanent impacts to wetland habitat resulting from the proposed project.
j. A provision that the restoration related management and maintenance activities within ESHA and the buffer zones shall be performed in accordance with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Conservation Element Policy CE 1.10, which restricts the use of insecticides, herbicides, and artificial fertilizers within these areas and requires use of low-impact weed abatement and brush clearing methods.
k. A list and number of plants and seed mixtures (lbs/acre) to be used shall be provided. The seed stock used should be collected from the affected watershed if feasible. If seed quantities are not available, seed collection shall be conducted within the local region limited to the South Coast area.
l. Irrigation requirements.
m. Weeding requirements and list of non-native species to be removed and methods for removal.
n. Provisions for short-term and long-term maintenance with performance criteria to be implemented by a qualified biologist or restoration ecologist.
o. Establishment of performance securities and a monitoring period of a least (5) years.
p. Detailed maps illustrating restoration areas.
q. Detailed cost estimate to implement all planning, construction, and other phases of the restoration efforts, including maintenance and monitoring periods.
r. Detailed cost estimate to implement the restoration plan, including installation as well as maintenance and monitoring requirements.
s. Detailed schedule for restoration through the end of the five (5) year monitoring period.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Habitat Restoration Plan shall be consistent with these requirements and the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City, California Coastal Commission, Department of
Fish and Game, the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife and any other applicable agencies prior to issuance of the required Development Plan Amendment.

**Monitoring:** The City qualified biological monitor shall inspect periodically throughout the construction phase. The quantification (acreage) of final impacts to be restored in accordance with the restoration plan shall be determined upon completion of the work. The approved monitoring plan shall be implemented, and annual reports submitted to City staff for review. Corrective actions identified in the monitoring reports and by City staff shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City prior to the termination of monitoring and release of performance securities.

31. If the Habitat Restoration Plan is determined necessary by the environmental monitor, the permittee shall provide performance securities and enter into agreements for installation and maintenance of the restoration plan (if determined necessary by the environmental monitor). The maintenance period shall be a minimum of five (5) years.

**Plan Requirements and Timing:** The performance securities shall be provided and agreements signed, prior to approval of the required follow-up Development Plan Amendment.

**Monitoring:** City staff or the City qualified biological monitor shall site inspect to ensure installation according to the restoration plan. City staff/the City qualified biological monitor shall check maintenance as needed. Release of any performance security requires appropriate documentation and City staff signature.

32. The permittee shall comply with the following Santa Barbara County Fire Department (SBCFD) conditions:
   a. If visual contamination or chemical odors are detected while implementing approved work, the permittee shall stop work immediately and contact the SBCFD Hazardous Materials Unit (HMU). Resumption of work requires approval of the HMU.
   b. A hot work program must be submitted to, and approved by, the SBCFD prior to construction.
   c. The permittee shall apply for and obtain permits from SBCFD for the use and storage of hazardous material/hazardous wastes are required prior to operation of the project.

33. The permittee shall locate the new vault the maximum feasible distance from Bell Creek in coordination with and subject to the satisfaction of the City. The permittee shall identify the approximate location through plans or any other documentation required by the City prior to the issuance of any Land Use Permit or Building, Electrical, Well or other Permit required under Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code for the project.

34. Prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit, the permittee shall secure all other necessary federal, state and local permits needed for this project and provide copies of said permits to the City.

35. Prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit, the permittee shall secure all required property owner authorizations or other documentation, including encroachment permits or easements to the satisfaction of the City allowing the project on or within property not owned by the permittee, including, but not limited to property owned by Sandpiper Golf Trust, CalTrans, the City, and Union Pacific Railroad.
36. The permittee shall obtain from the City's Planning and Environmental Services Department a Land Use Permit prior to commencement of any uses and/or development authorized by this permit.

37. The permittee shall obtain from the City's Planning and Environmental Services Department all Building, Electrical, Well or other Permits required by Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code prior to the construction, erection, moving, alteration, enlarging, rebuilding of any building, structure, or improvement, or any other action(s) requiring a Building Permit pursuant to Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code.

38. The permittee shall obtain from the City's Community Services Department all Encroachment Permits required by Title 12 of the Goleta Municipal Code prior to the construction, erection, moving, alteration, enlarging, rebuilding of any building, structure, or improvement, or any other action(s) requiring an Encroachment Permit pursuant to Title 12 of the Goleta Municipal Code.

39. These Conditions of Approval shall be printed in their entirety on all plans submitted for issuance of any LUP or Building, Electrical, Well or other Permit required under Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code for the project.

40. This permit shall expire five (5) years after the approval date, unless within such period substantial physical construction of the project has been completed or a time extension has been applied for by the permittee. The approving decision-maker of the project may, upon good cause shown, grant a time extension for one (1) year. In the event that a request for a time extension is made by the permittee, these Conditions of Approval may be revised and/or additional Conditions of Approval may be imposed if determined necessary by the City.

41. This permit runs with the land and the rights and obligations thereof, including the responsibility to comply with these Conditions of Approval and shall be binding upon successors in interest unless or until this permit expires pursuant to Condition #40 or is expressly abandoned in writing by the permittee.

42. This permit is granted for the property/parcel(s) of record on which the project is located and shall not be transferred.

43. Violation of any of these Conditions of Approval is unlawful, prohibited and a violation of the Goleta Municipal Code. The City reserves the right to initiate civil, criminal and/or administrative enforcement, or after notice and a public hearing, to revoke this permit or modify these Conditions of Approval if it is found that there is a violation of these Conditions of Approval or the Goleta Municipal Code or that the project operates as or causes a public nuisance. This Condition of Approval is not intended to, nor does it limit in any manner whatsoever the ability of the City to take appropriate enforcement actions.

44. The permittee shall be responsible for the completeness and accuracy of all plans, forms and supporting materials submitted in connection with the project. Any errors or discrepancies found therein are a violation of this permit.

45. Any new, expanded, or changed use on the project site shall be subject to City review and approval. The City shall determine whether the new, expanded, or changed use on the project site requires the permittee to seek additional approval, permits, or other
action by the City. Failure of the permittee to obtain the above-described review and approval of the City is a violation of this permit.

46. The permittee shall, at permittee's expense, defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul, in whole or in part, the City approval of this permit or any condition attached hereto or any proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done, or made prior to the approval of this permit that were part of the approval process.

47. In the event that any Condition of Approval imposing a fee, exaction, dedication or other mitigation measure is challenged by the permittee in an action filed in a court of law or threatened to be filed therein which action is brought within the time period provided by law, this permit shall be suspended pending dismissal of such action, the expiration of the limitation period applicable to such action, or final resolution of such action. If any Condition of Approval is invalidated by a court of law, the project shall be reviewed by the City and substitute Conditions of Approval may be imposed.
EXHIBIT 3
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
ELWOOD COMPANY LINE 96 MODIFICATION PROJECT CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
U.S. HIGHWAY 101 RIGHT-OF-WAY, UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY,
HOLLISTER AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY, 7925 HOLLISTER AVENUE (APN 079-210-059) AND
7979 HOLLISTER AVENUE (APN 079-210-042); CASE #09-088-CUP

1. AUTHORIZATION

This Conditional Use Permit Case No. 09-088-CUP (permit), authorizes implementation of "August 25, 2010, Exhibit #1" (attached to these Conditions of Approval) subject to these Conditions of Approval (project). All construction, improvements, implementation and/or any other actions taken pursuant to this permit shall be in substantial conformance with the project. Any deviations from the project must be reviewed and approved by the City of Goleta (City). The City shall determine whether any deviation substantially conforms to the project. Any deviation determined to not be in substantial conformance with the project requires the permittee to seek additional approval, permits, or other action by the City. Any deviation from the project made without the above-described review and approval of the City is a violation of this permit.

2. AUTHORIZED USES/DEVELOPMENT

The project is limited to the project description for only that portion within the City in the application submitted to the City by Ellwood Pipeline, Inc. on May 13, 2009, the supplemental application dated June 23, 2011 and the plans and documents subsequently submitted to the City to further define and clarify the portion within the City. A summary of the project follows:

a) The installation and operation of approximately 585 feet of the Project, which is the 8.5-mile, 6-inch diameter oil pipeline from outside the EOF to the Plains Pipeline, L.P. Coastal Pipeline west of Las Flores Canyon. The project will begin immediately north of the EOF located at 7979 Hollister Avenue at a new vault located underground in the Hollister Avenue right-of-way that serves as the EOF driveway outside of the EOF. The new vault will be approximately 12-feet by 8-feet by 9-feet;

b) The new vault will facilitate the switch over from the existing 10-inch pipeline;

c) A new pig launcher will be permanently installed entirely inside the new vault to perform periodic cleaning and a temporary pig launcher will be connected periodically to perform line inspection runs on the pipeline. The inspection pig launcher will be connected to the pipeline through a bolt-on extension, which will be partially within the vault and extending out of the vault approximately ten feet beyond the top of the vault. The inspection pig launcher will be connected to the pipeline and operated every 2 to 5 years according to the California State Fire Marshal;

d) The new 6-inch diameter pipeline will be connected to the existing, 10-inch Line 96 within the Hollister Avenue right-of-way that serves as the EOF driveway at a point immediately outside of, and adjacent to, the primary EOF entrance gate located on the northwest side of the EOF;

e) The pipeline will be installed via horizontal, directional drilling that will be conducted from a property within the County’s jurisdiction just north of U.S. Highway 101 and Calle Real;

f) Mainline Block Valves (MBVs) will be installed at the start of the pipeline;

g) There is no new construction within the EOF. The only activities to occur within the EOF will be control and communications modifications to the existing control and communications systems to support the pipeline from the EOF. These modifications are limited to the installation of two Programmable Logic Controllers (PLCs), a flow transmitter and a satellite dish to communicate with the Plains Pipeline, L.P. Coastal Pipeline system to receive Lease Automatic Custody Transfer (LACT) metering information from the existing EOF LACT
system for custody transfer, operational monitoring purposes, leak detection and emergency shutdown capabilities. The PLCs will be installed inside an existing control panel.

h) A passive sacrificial anode system will be installed for cathodic protection to the pipeline. The system will have one sacrificial anode within the Hollister Avenue right-of-way serving as the EOF driveway to protect the new vault and pipe crossing under the U.S. Highway 101.

i) During construction only, non-essential mobile equipment will be stored within the confines of the existing EOF fence. Contractors will be directed to carpool to the worksite and/or park employee vehicles within the EOF fence within the limitation of EOF parking capacity. Any other construction staging will occur at or on property within the County.

j) Some construction staging and construction activities involving pulling the new pipeline through the directional bore hole will occur outside of the EOF and immediately west of the EOF in a private road easement on property owned by Sandpiper Golf Course (7925 Hollister Avenue; APN 079-210-059).

MITIGATION MEASURES

3. GEO-3 Expansive Soil Control Measures; GEO-4a Implementation of Site-Specific Geotechnical and Seismic Studies Results; GEO-4b. Seismic Resistant Design. Plan Requirements and Timing; and WQ-3a. Perform Geotechnical Investigation prior to HDD drilling: The permittee shall complete a site-specific geotechnical and seismic-hazard studies for the project route. The geotechnical investigation and associated recommendations shall be prepared by a licensed geotechnical engineer, subject to review and approval by the City to verify that soil expansion remedial measures comply with the existing geologic setting and current California Building Code (CBC), as adopted by the City in Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code, construction standards. Based on the results of the investigation, standard engineering construction-related soil expansion measures, such as pipeline trench backfilling with sandy, non-expansive soils, or a mixture of expansive material with non-expansive material, shall be implemented in the Project design as needed to minimize impacts associated with potentially expansive soils. Plan Requirements:

a. The study results shall summarize risks from faulting, ground shaking, liquefaction hazards, landslides and slope stability issues.

b. The permittee shall perform seismic evaluation and design of the proposed pipelines and employ current industry seismic design guidelines including but not limited to: (1) "Guidelines for the Design of Buried Steel Pipe," 2001, by American Lifeline Alliance and (2) "Guidelines for the Seismic Design and "Assessment of Natural Gas and Liquid Hydrocarbon Pipelines," 2004, by PRCI for seismic resistant design of the pipeline.

c. All engineered structures, including pipeline alignment and profile drawings, buildings, other structures, other appurtenances and associated facilities, shall be designed, signed, and stamped by California registered professionals certified to perform such activities in their jurisdiction such as Civil, Structural, Geotechnical, Electrical and Mechanical Engineering. Preliminary geotechnical borings shall be drilled to verify that the proposed depth of horizontal directional drilling is appropriate to avoid frac-outs (i.e., the depth of finest grained sediments and least fractures) and to determine appropriate horizontal directional drilling methods (i.e., appropriate drilling mud mixtures for specific types of sediments).

d. The investigation shall include results from at least three borings, a geologic cross section, a discussion of drilling conditions and a history and recommendations to prevent frac-outs.
Timing: The permittee shall submit certified copies of these reports to the City and SSRRC for review and approval prior to LUP issuance. The permittee shall implement all recommendations from the Geotechnical and Seismic studies as directed by the City and SSRRC for their respective jurisdictions.

Monitoring: City staff, or their designee, shall perform site inspections throughout the construction phase.

4. HM-3 Automated Block Valves and an Additional Check Valve on the Proposed Pipeline. The permittee shall ensure that all block valves on the pipeline are remotely actuated from a central location, including the block valves at the EOF. Plan Requirements and Timing: This requirement shall be included in the pipeline design and shall be in effect for the lifetime of pipeline operations.

Monitoring: City staff, or their designee, shall monitor the implementation of this condition through the System, Safety Review and Reliability Committee (SSRRC) process as required under Condition #19.

5. AQ-1a. Measures to reduce dust emissions from construction. Best Available Control Measures shall be implemented to control PM10 generation during construction of the Project. Plan Requirements:

a. During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems should be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this should include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph. Reclaimed water shall be used.

b. Minimize the amount of disturbed area and reduce onsite vehicle speeds to 15 mph per hour or less;

c. Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads;

d. If importation, exportation, and stockpiling of fill material are involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting fill material to and from the Project site shall be covered with a tarp from the point of origin;

e. After clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation is completed, the disturbed area shall be treated by watering, revegetating, or spreading soil binders until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur;

f. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off site. 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 Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District prior to land use clearance for any grading activities for the project; and

g. Prior to any land clearance, the permittee shall include, as a note on a separate informational sheet to be recorded as required by the City, these dust control requirements. All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans.

Timing: All requirements shall be noted on all plans submitted for LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.
Monitoring: City staff shall ensure measures are printed on plans and shall periodically site inspect to ensure compliance. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.

6. **AQ-1b. Measures to reduce NOx emissions from construction.** Diesel emissions shall be reduced during construction. **Plan Requirements:**
   a. Diesel construction equipment meeting the California Air Resources Board (CARB) Tier 1 emission standards for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines shall be used. Equipment meeting CARB Tier 2 or higher emission standards should be used to the maximum extent feasible;
   b. Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible;
   c. If feasible, diesel construction equipment shall be equipped with selective catalytic reduction systems, diesel oxidation catalysts and diesel particulate filters as certified and/or verified by EPA or California Air Resources Board.
   d. Construction equipment shall be maintained per the manufacturers’ specifications;
   e. Catalytic converters shall be installed on gasoline-powered equipment, if feasible;
   f. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size;
   g. 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;
   h. Construction worker trips should be minimized by requiring carpooling and by providing for lunch onsite.

Timing: All requirements shall be noted on all plans submitted for LUP issuance. Requirements shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure measures are printed on plans and shall periodically site inspect to ensure compliance. APCD inspectors will respond to nuisance complaints.

7. **WQ-2a. Implement a Construction-Related Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program and GEO-2 Erosion Control Measures.** A Project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan shall be prepared and submitted to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region and City, to prevent adverse impacts to nearby waterways associated with construction-related incidental spills not covered under the existing Oil Spill Contingency Plan or National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit. Best Management Practices such as temporary berms and sedimentation traps, including silt fencing, straw bales, and sand bags, shall be installed prior to work involving ground disturbance. The Best Management Practices shall include maintenance and inspection of the berms and sedimentation traps during rainy and non-rain periods, as well as re-vegetation of impacted areas. Re-vegetation shall address plant type as well as monitoring to ensure appropriate covering of exposed areas. **Plan Requirements:** The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

   a. Best management practices (BMPs), such as temporary berms and sedimentation traps (such as silt fencing, straw bales, and sand bags), shall be installed in association with project grading. The BMPs shall be placed at the base of all cut/fill slopes and soil stockpile areas where potential erosion may occur and shall be maintained to ensure effectiveness. The sedimentation basins and traps shall be cleaned periodically and the silt shall be removed and disposed of in a location approved by the City.
b. Non-paved areas shall be revegetated or restored (i.e. geotextile binding fabrics) immediately after grading and installation of utilities, to minimize erosion and to re-establish soil structure and fertility. Revegetation shall include drought-resistant, fast-growing vegetation that would quickly stabilize exposed ground surfaces. Alternative materials rather than reseeding (e.g., gravel) may be used, subject to review and approval by the City.

c. Runoff shall not be directed across exposed slopes. All surface runoff shall be conveyed in accordance with the approved drainage plans.

d. Energy dissipators or similar devices shall be installed at the end of drainpipe outlets to minimize erosion during storm events.

e. Grading shall occur during the dry season (April 15th to November 1st) unless a City approved erosion control plan is in place and all erosion control measures are in effect. Erosion control measures shall be identified on an erosion control plan and shall prevent runoff, erosion, siltation, and tracking of mud and soil onto City streets. All exposed graded surfaces shall be reseeded with ground cover vegetation to minimize erosion. Graded surfaces shall be reseeded within four (4) weeks of grading completion, with the exception of surfaces graded for the placement of structures. These surfaces shall be reseeded if construction of structures does not commence within four (4) weeks of grading completion.

f. Site grading shall be completed such that permanent drainage away from foundations and slabs is provided and so that water shall not pond near proposed structures or pavements.

**Timing:** Final grading, drainage, and erosion control plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance. BMPs and erosion control measures shall remain in place/shall be implemented for the duration of grading and construction.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance during grading and construction activities.

8. **WQ-3b. Frac-Out Contingency Plan.** A frac-out contingency plan shall be completed and include measures for prevention, containment, clean up, and disposal of released drilling muds. Preventative measures would include incorporation of the recommendations of the geotechnical investigation to determine the most appropriate horizontal directional drilling depth and drilling mud mixture. In addition, drilling pressures shall be closely monitored so that they do not exceed those needed to penetrate the formation. Containment shall be accomplished through construction of temporary berms/dikes and use of silt fences, straw bales, absorbent pads, straw wattles, and plastic sheeting. Clean up shall be accomplished with plastic pails, shovels, portable pumps, and vacuum trucks. Frac-out contingency plan shall be submitted to the City. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The Frac-Out Contingency Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall conduct site inspections, monitor plan implementation, and review monitoring reports to ensure compliance with the provisions of the plan.

9. **BIO-2a. Native Habitat and Special Status Species Protection Plans.** Prior to construction, the permittee shall prepare and implement a City-approved Native Habitat and Special Status Species Protection Plan to avoid or reduce impacts to sensitive biological resources, including drainages, during pipeline construction. **Plan Requirements:** Protection measures shall include, at a minimum:
a. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted within 30 days of the start of construction by a City approved biologist to determine the presence of any sensitive species and habitats. This mitigation measure is not a requirement for exhaustive species-specific protocol surveys, but an effort to determine presence/absence for the purpose of implementing measures to avoid and minimize impacts in accordance with Species Protection Plan and any agency take authorization requirements.

b. The City approved biologist shall be present daily during construction (including during borings under drainages and wetlands) in locations known to support sensitive species, including California red-legged frogs and tidewater gobies, and to monitor for these species. The biologist will be authorized to stop work if threats to any sensitive species are identified during monitoring.

c. Construction shall be scheduled to avoid the breeding seasons of special status species that are found to be present in the construction area.

d. All HDD activities shall be conducted outside of the wet season, December 1 through March 31, and will not occur within 12 hours of any rain forecasted at 50% chance or greater;

e. The silt fencing to be constructed in accordance with the project Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will also serve as exclusionary fencing to prevent red legged frogs from entering the construction area. The project biologist employed by the permittee and the Monitoring and Compliance Program Contract Biologist will be on site during all night work and shall frequently monitor for the presence of any red legged frogs.

f. All excavated areas shall be secured at the end of the work day, with the exception of the Horizontal Directional Drill hole, to ensure that animals do not fall into excavated areas, and/or that they can extricate themselves in the event that they do fall in. Project biologists shall inspect excavated areas daily prior to the start of work.

g. If any red legged frogs or other federally listed species are discovered near the project site, all work in the area shall cease and Fish and Wildlife shall be contacted to assess any potential effects to listed species and the possible need for further coordination.

h. All pipes stored in the Bell Creek corridor buffer area shall be capped.

i. In the event of a frac-out or any incident that affects the Bell Creek riparian corridor, all work in the area shall cease, any spills shall be contained to the extent feasible in accordance with approved plans and the permittee shall simultaneously contact Fish and Wildlife to assess any potential effects to listed species and the possible need for further coordination.

j. The project biologist and the project engineer shall clearly designate "sensitive resource zones" on the project maps, construction plans, and at the construction site, consistent with the results of preconstruction surveys conducted for the presence of sensitive species. Sensitive resource zones are defined as areas where construction would be limited to a 15- to 30-foot corridor, depending on the particular construction requirements, to avoid impacts to special status biological resources. Similarly, staging areas would not be placed in areas where sensitive resources are present.

k. All machinery shall be stored and fuelled in designated locations at least 100 ft (30.5 m) way from any sensitive habitats. Heavy equipment and construction activities shall be restricted to the defined construction area. Vehicles and personnel shall use existing access roads to the maximum degree feasible.

l. Disposal or temporary placement of excess fill shall be prohibited within 50 ft (15.2 m) from the top of the banks for all drainages and other areas known to support...
special status species. All equipment used in or near drainages shall be clean and free of leaks and/or grease. Emergency provisions shall be in place prior to the onset of construction to deal with accidental spills from construction activities or equipment.

m. All trash receptacles on site shall be designed with secure lids (wildlife proof) to contain food, wrappers, and other miscellaneous trash.

n. No pets shall be permitted on site.

o. No hunting shall be authorized during construction.

p. All personnel shall undergo training from the project biologist regarding onsite sensitive resources, and proper protocols and notification in the event that they encounter sensitive resources.

**Timing:** The plan shall be reviewed and approved by City staff prior to issuance of an LUP. Implementation shall be completed prior to final clearance.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall site inspect during construction to monitor plan implementation and will review monitoring reports to ensure compliance.

10. **BIO-4a. Update the Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) to Protect Sensitive Resources.** The Oil Spill Contingency Plan (OSCP) shall be revised and updated to address protection of sensitive biological resources and revegetation of any areas disturbed during an oil spill from the pipeline or cleanup activities. **Plan Requirements:** The revised OSCP shall, at a minimum, include:

a. Specific measures to avoid impacts on Federal- and State-listed endangered and threatened species and any Federal, State, or City designated environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHAs) during response and cleanup operations. Where feasible, low-impact, site specific techniques such as hand-cutting contaminated vegetation and using low-pressure water flushing from vessels to remove spilled material from particularly sensitive wildlife habitats, such as coastal estuaries, i.e., Devereux Slough, because procedures such as shoveling, bulldozing, raking, and drag-lining can cause more damage to a sensitive habitat than the oil spill itself. The OSCP shall also evaluate the non-cleanup option for ecologically vulnerable habitats such as coastal estuaries.

b. Specific measures requiring spill response personnel to be adequately trained for response in terrestrial environments and spill containment and recovery equipment to be maintained in full readiness. Inspection of equipment and periodic drills shall be conducted at least annually and the results evaluated so that spill response personnel are familiar with the equipment and with the project area including sensitive biological resources.

c. When habitat disturbance cannot be avoided, stipulations for development and implementation of site-specific habitat restoration plans and other site-specific and species-specific measures appropriate for mitigating impacts on local populations of sensitive wildlife species and to restore native plant and animal communities to pre-spill conditions. Access and egress points, staging areas, and material stockpile areas that avoid sensitive habitat areas shall be identified. The Oil Spill Contingency Plan shall include species- and site-specific procedures for collection, transportation and treatment of oiled wildlife, particularly for sensitive species.

d. Procedures for timely re-establishment of disturbed habitats dominated by non-native species, replaces them with suitable native species) including: measures preventing invasion and/or spread of invasive or undesired plant species; restoration of wildlife habitat; restoration of native communities and native plant species propagated from local genetic sources including any sensitive plant
species (such as the southern tarplant); and replacement of trees at the appropriate rate in accordance with any agency’s with jurisdiction, applicable requirements (i.e. the City’s General Plan).

e. Financial documentation of available funding and/or assurances of permittee’s ability to obtain funding that shall be available to implement the OSCP.

f. Monitoring procedures and minimum success criteria to be satisfied for restoration areas. The success criteria shall consider the level of disturbance and condition of the adjacent habitats. Monitoring shall continue for five years, depending on habitat, or until success criteria are met. Appropriate remedial measures, such as replanting, erosion control or control of invasive plant species, shall be identified and implemented if it is determined that success criteria are not being met.

**Timing:** The plan shall be submitted to, and approved by, the City prior to the approval of any LUP. The requirements shall be enforced throughout all construction periods and for the life of the project.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall conduct site inspections, monitor plan implementation and review monitor reports to ensure compliance during construction and throughout the life of the project.

11. **N-1a. Noise Reduction Plan.** The permittee shall prepare a noise reduction plan which shall be approved by the City. **Plan Requirements:** The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following measures:

a. Post notifications to the residents and landowners about the planned construction near their residence/land at least one week before construction at that location;

b. Ensure that construction activities do not occur in the City between 4:00 pm and 7:00 am on weekdays in nonresidential areas away from sensitive receivers, and 5:00 pm and 8:00 am on weekdays near or adjacent to residential buildings and neighborhoods or other sensitive receptors, and not at all on Saturdays, Sundays or holidays, unless specifically required by permits or at the direction of the City staff;

c. Ensure that all internal combustion engines are properly maintained and that mufflers, silencers, or other appropriate noise-control measures function properly.

d. If boring under Highway 101 or any other noise-producing activity during the construction is required to be conducted during the evening or night hours (from 5 p.m. to 8 a.m.), the Permittee shall install appropriate mufflers and/or temporary noise barriers to minimize noise at the residences and the Bacara Resort.

**Timing:** The plan shall be submitted to, and approved by, the City prior to any LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall conduct site inspections, monitor plan implementation, and review monitoring reports to ensure compliance.

**GENERAL CONDITIONS**

12. The permittee shall not use/operate the existing Line 96 from the Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) to the Ellwood Marine Terminal (EMT) thirty (30) days from initial operation of the project. Any and all decommissioning, abandonment and other activities related to the existing Line 96 shall be included in the application for decommissioning and/or abandonment and subject to appropriate permit requirements.
Plan Requirements and Timing: This requirement shall be included in the SIMQAP as required under Condition #20.

Monitoring: City staff, or their designee, shall conduct site inspections and review pipeline operational logs to ensure compliance.

13. The project shall be subject to an annual safety audit by the City and SSRRC. Plan Requirements and Timing: This condition shall be noted on any final approvals.

Monitoring: City staff, or their designee, shall monitor the implementation of this condition through the System, Safety Review and Reliability Committee (SSRRC) process as required under Condition #19.

14. The permittee shall submit all project design and construction details to the Systems Safety and Reliability Review Committee. (SSRRC) for review and approval. The committee may employ a third-party technical review to help identify and correct possible design and construction hazards and to ensure mitigation of potential public risk prior to construction and subsequent design modifications. This review shall also evaluate all mitigations identified in the project permit application and environmental review documents, as described in these conditions of approval. All reasonable costs associated with any review shall be borne by the permittee. The permittee shall be entitled to participate fully in the review process. Plan Requirements: Design and construction details shall include, but not limited to, Process Flow Diagrams, P&IDs, Cause & Effect Charts, pipeline start-up, commissioning and operating procedures including the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system, and a Process and Hazard Analysis (PHA). Timing: The pipeline system design details, SCADA system and PHA shall be reviewed by the SSRRC and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance. Design recommendations resulting from SSRRC review shall be incorporated into the permittee's plans prior to construction or other appropriate time as determined by the SSRRC. Recommendations concerning the start up, commissioning and operating procedures shall be implemented for the facilities prior to commencing operations. The SSRRC shall require as-built inspections and the submittal of as-built drawings for approval prior to operations and for any modifications.

Monitoring: City staff, or their designee, shall monitor the implementation of this condition through the oversight of the SSRRC.

15. The project shall be subject to a Safety Inspection, Maintenance, and Quality Assurance Program (SIMQAP) to ensure adequate ongoing inspection, maintenance, and other operating procedures. Plan Requirements and Timing: The SIMQAP shall be subject to City approval prior to commencement of project operations and provide for systematic updates as appropriate. Requirements shall be commensurate with the level and anticipated duration of the risk.

Monitoring: City staff shall ensure compliance prior to commencement of project operations and during compliance review.

16. The permittee shall submit a construction night lighting plan. Plan Requirements: The plan shall include measures to ensure any construction night lighting shall be of low intensity, low glare design, and shall be hooded to direct light downward onto the subject parcel and prevent spill-over onto adjacent parcels. Construction lighting fixtures shall be kept to the minimum number and intensity needed to ensure construction and worker
safety. Lighting shall be not directed towards any Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area or any neighboring properties to the maximum extent feasible as determined by the MCP. Upward directed exterior lighting is prohibited. **Timing:** The Night Lighting Plan shall be submitted to, and approved by the City prior to LUP issuance.

**Monitoring:** City staff, or their designee, shall ensure compliance prior to LUP issuance and through inspections during construction.

17. The permittee shall assess burial depths every five years, or at a more frequent interval when geologic characteristics, flooding, and other circumstances indicate a prudent need for special monitoring as determined by the City. A minimum burial depth shall be identified and maintained for the entire operating life of the project. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall substantiate and submit the minimum burial depth to the City for approval prior to the issuance of the LUP.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall ensure compliance prior to LUP issuance.

18. A Monitoring and Compliance Program (MCP) shall be funded by the permittee and submitted to the City of Goleta at least five (5) days prior to the start of construction activities. The MCP shall, at minimum, include the following:
   a. All conditions imposed on this project and the impact areas they are mitigating by subject area.
   b. A plan for coordination and implementation of all conditions and the plans and programs required therein.
   c. A description of all measures that will be implemented to assure compliance, including pre-construction and construction requirements, field monitoring, data collection, management and coordination of all field personnel and feedback to field personnel and affected agencies. MCP Contractor feedback responsibilities include weekly, monthly and/or as specified in the MCP reports to be prepared throughout construction. These shall include status of development, status of conditions, incidents of noncompliance and their results and any other relevant or requested data. Further, a final report summarizing project compliance or non-compliance and the results of such, and any other relevant or requested data shall be submitted to the City within 30-days of construction completion.

The MCP preparer and contractor shall be selected by the City. These individuals shall be under contract and responsible to the City. All costs shall be funded by the permittee. The MCP contractor shall appoint at least one Onsite Monitor (OM) responsible for overall monitoring, but shall employ as many qualified specialists as necessary (as determined by the City) to oversee specific conditions (e.g., archaeologists, biologists). In addition, the OM has the authority and the ability to ensure compliance with all project conditions and to stop work in an emergency. The MCP shall also provide for any appropriate procedures not specified in the conditions of approval to be carried out if they are necessary to avoid environmental impacts. Planning and Environmental Services Permit Compliance shall oversee the MCP. In addition to funding the MCP, the permittee shall pay Permit Compliance fees for project construction/implementation.

The decision of the Director shall be final in the event of any dispute.

19. The permittee shall schedule a pre-construction meeting at the project site with City staff. The pre-construction meeting shall be attended by the permittee and/or its agent, key construction personnel and other pertinent agency representatives. The construction
conference shall include a review of all resource protection and other mitigation measures and project conditions. **Plan Requirements and Timing:** The permittee shall schedule this meeting at least 5 days in advance of the start of construction. Pre-construction meetings shall occur in an as-needed basis to address the various phases of construction and site clean-up at the discretion of the City qualified biological monitor.

**Monitoring:** City staff shall verify compliance prior to the start of construction activities.

20. If determined necessary by the MCP preparer and contractor, the permittee shall submit a Habitat Restoration Plan to address project-generated impacts on environmentally sensitive resources. The Mitigation Plan shall be prepared by a City, California Coastal Commission, California Department of Fish and Game, Army Corps of Engineers and Fish and Wildlife Service approved biologist or restoration ecologist. The Mitigation Plan shall include a Plan to restore and revegetate all environmentally sensitive areas disturbed by construction activities. The plan shall include provisions for the enhancement (restoration and/or revegetation) of environmentally sensitive biological resources within the coastal zone (or adjacent to it if necessary) as determined by the City in the City. A map shall be included to show the existing and proposed habitat polygons to ensure that the restoration (a) shall connect with existing wetland resources; (b) shall replace existing disturbed upland habitat; and (c) is feasibly located for long term success. Additionally, the Habitat Restoration Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. The date prepared, author, and any revision dates.
b. The project description.
c. The site description and past use.
d. Discussion of vegetation and any special status plant and tree species in the vicinity of disturbance sites.
e. Discussion of the amount of vegetation and trees lost, and recommendations by the City approved biologist for restoration, and recommended native species to use in such restoration and at what replacement ratios.
f. Objectives of restoration.
g. Site preparation methods.
h. Identification of suitable locations for wetland and buffer restoration/enhancement. Onsite restoration is required unless otherwise approved by the City Planning and Environmental Services Director and other agencies with jurisdiction.
i. A minimum 3:1 replacement ratio is required to mitigate all permanent impacts to wetland habitat resulting from the proposed project.
j. A provision that the restoration related management and maintenance activities within ESHA and the buffer zones shall be performed in accordance with General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Conservation Element Policy CE 1.10, which restricts the use of insecticides, herbicides, and artificial fertilizers within these areas and requires use of low-impact weed abatement and brush clearing methods.
k. A list and number of plants and seed mixtures (lbs/acre) to be used shall be provided. The seed stock used should be collected from the affected watershed if feasible. If seed quantities are not available, seed collection shall be conducted within the local region limited to the South Coast area.
l. Irrigation requirements.
m. Weeding requirements and list of non-native species to be removed and methods for removal.
n. Provisions for short-term and long-term maintenance with performance criteria to be implemented by a qualified biologist or restoration ecologist.
o. Establishment of performance securities and a monitoring period of at least (5) years.
p. Detailed maps illustrating restoration areas.
q. Detailed cost estimate to implement all planning, construction, and other phases of the restoration efforts, including maintenance and monitoring periods.
r. Detailed cost estimate to implement the restoration plan, including installation as well as maintenance and monitoring requirements.
s. Detailed schedule for restoration through the end of the five (5) year monitoring period.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The Habitat Restoration Plan shall be consistent with these requirements and the Goleta General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City, California Coastal Commission, Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife and any other applicable agencies prior to issuance of the required Development Plan Amendment.

Monitoring: The City qualified biological monitor shall inspect periodically throughout the construction phase. The quantification (acreage) of final impacts to be restored in accordance with the restoration plan shall be determined upon completion of the work. The approved monitoring plan shall be implemented, and annual reports submitted to City staff for review. Corrective actions identified in the monitoring reports and by City staff shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City prior to the termination of monitoring and release of performance securities.

21. If the Habitat Restoration Plan is determined necessary by the environmental monitor, the permittee shall provide performance securities and enter into agreements for installation and maintenance of the restoration plan (if determined necessary by the environmental monitor). The maintenance period shall be a minimum of five (5) years.

Plan Requirements and Timing: The performance securities shall be provided and agreements signed, prior to approval of the required follow-up Development Plan Amendment.

Monitoring: City staff or the City qualified biological monitor shall site inspect to ensure installation according to the restoration plan. City staff/the City qualified biological monitor shall check maintenance as needed. Release of any performance security requires appropriate documentation and City staff signature.

22. The permittee shall locate the new vault the maximum feasible distance from Bell Creek in coordination with and subject to the satisfaction of the City. The permittee shall identify the approximate location through plans or any other documentation required by the City prior to the issuance of any Land Use Permit or Building, Electrical, Well or other Permit required under Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code for the project.

23. Prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit, the permittee shall secure all other necessary federal, state and local permits needed for this project and provide copies of said permits to the City.

24. Prior to issuance of any Land Use Permit, the permittee shall secure all required property owner authorizations or other documentation, including encroachment permits or easements to the satisfaction of the City allowing the project on or within property not owned by the permittee, including, but not limited to property owned by Sandpiper Golf Trust, CalTrans, the City, and Union Pacific Railroad.
25. The permittee shall obtain from the City’s Planning and Environmental Services Department a Land Use Permit prior to commencement of any uses and/or development authorized by this permit.

26. The permittee shall obtain from the City’s Planning and Environmental Services Department all Building, Electrical, Well or other Permits required by Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code prior to the construction, erection, moving, alteration, enlarging, rebuilding of any building, structure, or improvement, or any other action(s) requiring a Building Permit pursuant to Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code.

27. The permittee shall obtain from the City’s Community Services Department all Encroachment Permits required by Title 12 of the Goleta Municipal Code prior to the construction, erection, moving, alteration, enlarging, rebuilding of any building, structure, or improvement, or any other action(s) requiring an Encroachment Permit pursuant to Title 12 of the Goleta Municipal Code.

28. These Conditions of Approval shall be printed in their entirety on all plans submitted for issuance of any LUP or Building, Electrical, Well or other Permit required under Title 15 of the Goleta Municipal Code for the project.

29. This permit shall expire five (5) years after the approval date, unless within such period substantial physical construction of the project has been completed or a time extension has been applied for by the permittee. The approving decision-maker of the project may, upon good cause shown, grant a time extension for one (1) year. In the event that a request for a time extension is made by the permittee, these Conditions of Approval may be revised and/or additional Conditions of Approval may imposed if determined necessary by the City.

30. This permit runs with the land and the rights and obligations thereof, including the responsibility to comply with these Conditions of Approval and shall be binding upon successors in interest unless or until this permit expires pursuant to Condition #40 or is expressly abandoned in writing by the permittee.

31. This permit is granted for the property/parcel(s) of record on which the project is located and shall not be transferred.

32. Violation of any of these Conditions of Approval is unlawful, prohibited and a violation of the Goleta Municipal Code. The City reserves the right to initiate civil, criminal and/or administrative enforcement, or after notice and a public hearing, to revoke this permit or modify these Conditions of Approval if it is found that there is a violation of these Conditions of Approval or the Goleta Municipal Code or that the project operates as or causes a public nuisance. This Condition of Approval is not intended to, nor does it limit in any manner whatsoever the ability of the City to take appropriate enforcement actions.

33. The permittee shall be responsible for the completeness and accuracy of all plans, forms and supporting materials submitted in connection with the project. Any errors or discrepancies found therein are a violation of this permit.

34. Any new, expanded, or changed use on the project site shall be subject to City review and approval. The City shall determine whether the new, expanded, or changed use on the project site requires the permittee to seek additional approval, permits, or other
action by the City. Failure of the permittee to obtain the above-described review and approval of the City is a violation of this permit.

35. The permittee shall, at permittee's expense, defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City and its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the City or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul, in whole or in part, the City approval of this permit or any condition attached hereto or any proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done, or made prior to the approval of this permit that were part of the approval process.

36. In the event that any Condition of Approval imposing a fee, exaction, dedication or other mitigation measure is challenged by the permittee in an action filed in a court of law or threatened to be filed therein which action is brought within the time period provided by law, this permit shall be suspended pending dismissal of such action, the expiration of the limitation period applicable to such action, or final resolution of such action. If any Condition of Approval is invalidated by a court of law, the project shall be reviewed by the City and substitute Conditions of Approval may be imposed.
APPENDIX B
LINE 96 PROJECT DESCRIPTION
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1.0 BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The original Line 96 pipeline carried oil production fluids between Venoco, Inc.’s (Venoco’s) Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) and the Ellwood Marine Terminal (EMT). The pipeline is located within city streets and open space in the City of Goleta, and terminates at a valve vault in the southeast corner of the City-owned Ellwood Mesa property, west of the EMT. The pipeline is currently out of service as a result of the recently completed Line 96 Modification Project, which transports Ellwood production from the EOF to a connection point on the Plains All American Pipeline near Las Flores Canyon.

The Line 96 Modification Project was placed into service on February 15, 2012.

This document describes the work plan for abandonment of the original Line 96 pipeline in the City of Goleta. The project is limited to the City of Goleta and does not address the Ellwood Marine Terminal.

1.1 Permit Conditions

As a condition of the City of Goleta’s approval of the Line 96 Modification Project, Ellwood Pipeline, Inc. will decommission and abandon the original Line 96. The following permit conditions from the Line 96 Modification Project apply to the original Line 96:

City of Goleta Land Use Permit condition 15 reads:

The permittee shall not use/operate the existing L96 from the EOF to the EMT 30 days from initial operation of the project. Any and all decommissioning, abandonment and other activities related to the existing L96 shall be included in the application for decommissioning and/or abandonment and subject to appropriate permit requirements. This requirement shall be included in the SIMQAP as required under Condition #20.

City of Goleta Franchise Agreement condition 9b reads:

Within 30 days following the later of (1) completion of installation and testing of the franchise property and delivery of hydrocarbons for sale through the franchise property, and (2) evacuation of all hydrocarbons from the existing L96 pipeline, identified by and under the gas, oil, and water franchise awarded by the County of Santa Barbara via Ordinance 3238 and inherited by the City upon incorporation (hereafter “existing Line 96 pipeline”) and storage tanks at the EMT in preparation for abandonment, the Grantee shall cease use of and shall no longer transport oil, gas, gasoline, petroleum, or any other hydrocarbon substances or water in or through the existing L96 pipeline and Grantee shall within the same time period file a written application with the City to: (1) abandon all, or a portion, of the existing Line 96 pipeline in place, and/or (2) remove all, or a portion, of the existing Line 96 pipeline as the Community Services Director, in his/her discretion, shall consider to be appropriate. Such application shall describe the existing L96 pipeline to be removed and/or abandoned by reference to the map(s) required by this Franchise and shall also describe with reasonable accuracy the relative physical condition of existing L96 pipeline. At the Grantee’s expense, the City shall conduct all environmental review, study and analysis as may be required by CEQA. Thereafter, the City shall determine whether any abandonment and/or removal which is thereby proposed may be effected without detriment to the public interest or under what conditions such proposed abandonment and/or removal may be safely effected. The City shall then provide written notification to the Grantee of the determination, including specified requirements with which the Grantee shall comply, and shall require the Grantee, within eighteen (18) months thereafter, to:

(a) Remove all or a portion of the existing Line 96 pipeline, and/or
(b) Abandon in place all or a portion of the existing Line 96 pipeline.
If any portion of the existing Line 96 pipeline is to be abandoned in place subject to prescribed requirements and not abandoned in accordance with all such requirements, then the Community Services Director may impose additional appropriate requirements, including, if he/she deems desirable, that the Grantee shall remove all of the existing Line 96 pipeline in accordance with applicable requirements. The requirements of this Section are in addition to, and the Grantee shall comply with and obtain any and all additional required City permits necessitated by the removal and/or abandonment of the existing Line 96 pipeline or any portion thereof.

1.2 Assessor’s Parcel Numbers that Intersect Line 96
Two APN’s intersect the original Line 96. They are listed below and included as an attachment to this document as response to Incompleteness Item No.1.

- 079-210-024
- 079-210-067 (or 079-210-068 as is shown on the current APN map)

1.3 Intersecting Easements
All easements of record that intersect Line 96 will be listed in the public records or the County of Santa Barbara and/or the city of Goleta. Further detail is provided as an attachment to this document as response to Incomplete Item No 2.

1.4 List of known wells in the vicinity of Line 96
EPI is aware of three wells located in the vicinity of the original Line 96. These wells are listed below and included as an attachment to this document as response to Incompleteness Item No 6.

- Ellwood WD #1
- Archembault & Doty #1
- Bishop #1
2.0 PIPELINE ABANDONMENT WORK PLAN

The original Line 96 pipeline extends 3.3 miles between Venoco’s Ellwood Onshore Facility (EOF) and the Ellwood Marine Terminal (EMT). Figure 1 shows the pipeline route. The line is buried in City of Goleta streets along Hollister Avenue (about 2.0 miles from the EOF to Pacific Oaks Road), Pacific Oaks Road (about 0.3 miles), and Phelps Road (about 0.5 miles). The unpaved western segment of Phelps Road is adjacent to UCSB housing that is currently under construction. The pipeline then runs south along the eastern perimeter of the city-owned Ellwood Mesa property (about 0.5 miles). The pipeline has (3) valves; one at EOF, one along Hollister Avenue near Lowell Way, and at the southern terminus where the line transitions to the EMT piping. Alignment sheets are attached.

2.1 Relative Physical Condition of the Original Line 96

The original Line 96 was installed by Mobil Pacific Pipeline Company around 1982. The pipeline was installed at a nominal 6 foot from grade to top of pipe, as shown on the pipeline alignment sheets. Venoco became the operator of Line 96 in 1997. In 2001 ExxonMobil installed a leak detection system on Line 96. In 2003 Ellwood Pipeline Company assumed ownership of the pipeline, with Venoco continuing to operate the line.

With the exception of one small pinhole leak outlined here, the entire service history of Line 96 has been demonstrated to be leak free. In 2009, a pinhole leak was discovered inside Vault Box 1293, outside the EOF entrance. Venoco immediately took action to contain the small leak volume, and repaired the line in accordance with DOT requirements. All oil from this small leak was contained within the valve box. The mechanism for the pinhole leak was determined to be due to condensed water dripping from the valve box roof to the line below. This mechanism was determined to not be present in any other portion of the line. The other vault boxes were inspected, with no pitting corrosion noted. The final repair was approved by the Office of the State Fire Marshal as the DOT representative.

In addition to the leak detection system installed in 2001, Line 96 has been hydrotested per DOT requirements at regular intervals. The most recent hydrotest was performed in 2011. Records from all of these hydrotests indicate the line to be leak free and suitable for continued service. Venoco has enclosed copies of the hydrotest results. Test dates are listed in the table to the right.

The entire line has been pigged and flushed with water in preparation for abandonment. The line was then dewatered using air and additional pigs, and then set in an inert atmosphere of nitrogen. The line is now decommissioned, out of service, set in nitrogen, awaiting final abandonment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Date</th>
<th>Test Pressure</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/9/1982</td>
<td>1,751 PSIG</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/1989</td>
<td>899 PSIG</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/1999</td>
<td>905 PSIG</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2002</td>
<td>900 PSIG</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5/2008</td>
<td>924 PSIG</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/2011</td>
<td>474 PSIG</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Pipeline Abandonment

The abandonment procedure presented here represents standard best practices currently used for pipeline abandonment, and is designed to be in compliance with the City of Goleta’s General Plan Policies and Coastal Zoning Ordinance requirements for the protection of ESHAs and ESHA buffers. Figure 1 shows the Original Line 96 route, complete with locations of various features.
The attached Technical Memorandum titled “Original Line 96 Pipeline Abandonment” analyzes the original Line 96 corridor and provides recommendations on abandonment based on environmental issues. The majority of the line is buried 5 to 6 feet deep in either roads, sidewalks, or designated ESHAs. The exceptions account for less than 2000 feet of the 3.3 mile line, and even these short sections are near ESHA’s or located adjacent to property that may be adversely impacted by the act of removing the line.

Ellwood Pipeline, Inc. proposes to grout the entire pipeline in place, using a specialty non-hazardous pipeline abandonment grout mixture. The grout abandonment mixture will typically consist of a fluid-like, workable mixture of bentonite, cement, and water, designed to offer hydraulic pumping characteristics so as to allow it to be pumped completely and fully (without void space) through the entire lengths of line to be grouted without risk of over pressurization. The grout cures into a solid, concrete-like material. Appropriate traffic control measures will be in place.

At this time EPI anticipates grouting the entire 10” Line 96 in one application, by introducing grout at vault box 1293 near EOF. Depending on selection of grouting equipment and contractors, the grout procedure may be split up to complete the job in two fairly equal segments. The write-up below reflects the more conservative procedure to grout in two segments.

Grout will be introduced into the line from Valve Box 1292 located in Hollister Avenue near Lowell Way. The grout will be pumped into the pipeline through the existing 3” drain connections located within this valve vault. The grout will continue to be pumped until it emerges out the end of the line on either end. At Valve Box 1293 near EOF, the grout will emerge from a 2” valve and line attached to the blind flange that now marks the beginning of the original Line 96. At Vault Box 1291, the grout will flow past the vault box, through the connecting 6” line, to a point near the metering skid inside EMT. It is anticipated to take one 12 to 14 hour day to pump the grout to either end; or two days total for pumping grout.

Equipment used for the grouting will be as follows.

- **Valve Vault 1292**
  - One slurry pump truck, approximately 30 feet long
  - One vacuum truck at a time, approximately 40 feet long
  - One pickup truck for foreman (shared resource)

- **Grout destination at Valve Vault 2191 or 1203.**
  - One vacuum truck equipped with carbon canister for odor control
  - One pickup truck for foreman (shared resource)

If the line will be grouted entirely from one end, then the grout equipment will be setup at EOF, along the access road in front of EOF. One 30 foot long slurry pump truck will be connected to the pipeline via a 2” or 3” drain valve. This pumper truck will be fed via a series of 100 BBL vacuum trucks, and grout will be introduced into the line until it flows past valve vault 1291, into the 6” line to EMT, where it will exit near the metering skid inside EMT.

Venoco anticipates approximately 18 vacuum truck loads of grout will be delivered to the pumper truck over the course of two days; 100 BBL grout per load. If the pumper truck is stationed at valve box 1292 in Hollister Avenue, the vacuum trucks will exit at Storke road, then travel to valve box 1292 via Hollister Avenue. The empty vacuum trucks will then return to Highway 101 via the Hollister Avenue entrance ramp. If the pumper truck is stationed at valve
box 1293 near EOF, the vacuum trucks will exit at Hollister Avenue, then travel to Valve Box 1293 via Hollister Avenue. The empty vacuum trucks will then return to Highway 101 via the Hollister Avenue entrance ramp.

2.3 Valve Box Abandonment

Line 96 Valve Box 1291, located outside of the EMT and immediately west of the Ellwood Mesa eastern property boundary, is part of the abandonment scope. This box is located within the confines of an ESHA (within the drip line of the north-south oriented eucalyptus windrow). The entire lid and roof structure will be removed, followed by demolition of the box walls to a minimum depth of 18” below existing grade. Holes will be knocked through the bottom of the vault to permit drainage of any impounded moisture. The entire box will then be filled with an approved sand/soil mixture and compacted per City of Goleta requirements.

Line 96 Valve Box 1292 is located under Hollister Avenue near Lowell Way and will be left in place.

Line 96 Valve Box 1293 is located immediately outside EOF, and contains a short section of the still active Line 96. This valve box will be left in place.

2.4 Cathodic Protection Rectifier Abandonment

An existing cathodic protection rectifier located at 97 + 47.00, near Lowell Way, will remain in service until the abandonment of the pipeline is completed. This rectifier will then be disconnected from power and the pipeline, and will be physically removed. The associated deep bed anode well will also be abandoned in place in accordance with the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) requirements for abandonment.

1. Once the pipeline has been confirmed to be abandoned, EPI will arrange with Edison Electric to disconnect power to the rectifier.
2. Once power has been confirmed removed, EPI will physically remove the rectifier box and its appurtenances, to 2 feet below grade.
3. Once the rectifier has been removed, EPI will re-compact the soil and re-plant as necessary vegetation to blend in with the existing ornamental vegetation currently in place.
4. EPI anticipates the use of one crane truck and one work pickup truck for up to one day of removal work once power has been removed from the rectifier.
2.5 Demolition Schedule and Equipment.

The estimated length of time for carrying out all of the Line 96 abandonment work (field only, not including permitting or engineering) is 6 weeks.

The anticipated personnel requirements are:

- 1 Project Manager/Superintendent
- 1 Quality Control/Records Clerk
- 1 Construction foreman
- 1 Welders/burners
- 3 Laborers/Roustabouts
- 6 Equipment operators/drivers (as necessary)

13 Total

The anticipated equipment consists of the following:

- 1 Light Duty Crane with Operator (nominal 30 ton)
- 1 Backhoe with Operator (Case 530)
- 1 Concrete Breaker (attached to Backhoe)
- 1 Vacuum Truck
- 1 Mud pump and mixing tank, trailer mounted with Tractor
- 1 Welding machine
- 1 Gang Truck
- 1 Concrete Saw
- 1 Generator
- 1 Pick-up Truck

Ellwood Pipeline, Inc. is committed to recycling construction waste to the maximum extent feasible.
3.0 TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN

The following traffic management measures will be implemented during pipeline abandonment work. The attached drawing indicates the location of the four abandonment work areas described below.

3.1 Notifications

A limited number of commercial properties are located along the original Line 96 alignment where abandonment work will occur near EOF (grouting at Valve box 1293) and on Hollister Avenue (grouting at Valve box 1292 and rectifier demolition). There are no residences or commercial uses near the Ellwood Mesa work site (grouting at Valve box 1291 and valve box demolition).

Advance notification will be provided to any properties within 1,000 feet and/or adjacent to these work areas one week prior to construction in their vicinity. Notification will also be provided to the City of Goleta for work related to the Ellwood Mesa valve site.

3.2 Property Access

During pipeline abandonment, EPI will not obstruct property access. In the unlikely event that property access is temporarily obstructed, EPI will provide access to the affected properties to the extent practical. If access to affected properties is limited during abandonment work, EPI will provide lost-sales compensation to property owners, as necessary.

3.3 Temporary Lane / Trail Closures

Work Area 1. Valve 1293, located at the EOF, will be accessed during the grouting procedure. This valve box is located immediately outside EOF in the paved area between the EOF fenceline and Hollister Avenue. Grouting equipment will be staged in this area, and will not require temporary lane closure of Hollister Avenue, or obstruct bicycle or pedestrian access. See Valve Vault 1293 Equipment Staging Diagram. EPI will provide appropriate traffic controls (i.e., flaggers, detour signs, orange safety cones, etc.) in this area to the extent needed to avoid conflicts with EOF operations.

Work Area 2. Valve Vault 1292 is accessible through a manway located in the northernmost lane of Hollister Avenue. During any grouting work at this location, EPI will close off this lane for approximately 100 feet as shown in the attached Valve Vault 1292 Equipment Staging Diagram. EPI will provide appropriate traffic controls (i.e., flaggers, detour signs, orange safety cones, etc.) and detours and/or alternative routes for local traffic and emergency vehicles. If the sidewalk is obstructed, then an alternative pedestrian route is available in the adjacent property parking area. EPI will work with the property owner to ensure safe pedestrian use of any detour through the property.

Work Area 3. The pipeline rectifier is located near the sidewalk on the north side of Hollister Avenue. The adjacent commercial property (7272 Hollister Avenue) provides driveway access that can likely be used for equipment access and staging. Temporary lane closures will not be required. If the property driveway is used, sufficient space will be made available for vehicle passage. If the sidewalk is obstructed, then an alternative pedestrian route is available in the adjacent property parking area. EPI will work with the property owner to ensure safe pedestrian use of any detour through the property.
Work Area 4. Valve box 1291 is located in the southeast corner of the Ellwood Mesa, near the eucalyptus windrow and property fenceline. This site will be accessed via the EMT access road from Storke Road. Grouting and demolition equipment will traverse the EMT site and use the existing unpaved trail to cross into the Ellwood Mesa site. Vehicles and equipment will cross the property line at an existing recreational trail located approximately 50 to 100 feet south of the valve box, where there is sufficient space to allow equipment passage without impacting trees or vegetation. The east-west recreational trails will not be obstructed. Equipment will be staged at the valve box, adjacent to the north-south trail, and may partially obstruct the trail in order to avoid vegetation impacts. To the extent that the trail is temporarily obstructed, EPI will provide appropriate pedestrian, bicyclist and equestrian trail safety measures (i.e., warning signs, trail detour signs [if needed], orange safety cones, etc.) in this area. EPI will work with the City to identify temporary re-routing and placement of signs and other measures.

3.4 Hours
During non-work hours, the pipeline work areas will be closed with approved plating and surrounded with safety barriers, if necessary.

3.5 Road / TRAIL Repair
At the end of abandonment work, road or trail damage from construction-related activities will be assessed and compared to pre-construction conditions. If visible construction-caused damage is noted, the road or trail will be repaired to its pre-construction condition or better.
4.0 EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS AND POST-CONSTRUCTION RESTORATION

As noted above, the entire pipeline will be grouted in place, and will therefore not require post-construction restoration. Valve Box 1291 at the pipeline terminus will be partially removed and backfilled. Existing site conditions and restoration methods for this location are summarized below.

Valve Box 1291 is located within the dripline of the north-south oriented eucalyptus windrow, along the eastern property line of Ellwood Mesa. Ground level vegetation is lacking due to the allelopathic effect of eucalyptus oils on the understory, with the exception of very sparse non-native grasses.

The valve vault is located about 10 feet from the nearest tree canopy, and about 25 feet from the nearest major branch. Excavation equipment will avoid tree damage, and the work area will be minimized to the extent practical. Equipment access will be via existing unpaved maintenance roads from the EMT facility.

Once the vault is backfilled, native topsoil will be placed in the disturbance area and the site will be stabilized. The existing seed bank will be sufficient to revegetate the site, and additional revegetation activities will not be necessary.

Attachments

- Responses to Incompleteness Letter on Line 96 Pipeline Abandonment Project
  - Response to Item No. 1, Notice of Application Incompleteness
  - Response to Item No. 2, Notice of Application Incompleteness
  - Response to Item No. 6, Notice of Application Incompleteness
- Line 96 Hydrotest Reports
- The following attachments were included in original submittal, and are incorporated here by reference
  - March 14, 2012 Biological Resources Technical Memorandum titled “Original Line 96 Pipeline Abandonment” (includes site photos taken in February 2012)
  - Old Line 96 Alignment Drawings
APPENDIX C
AIR QUALITY MODELING RESULTS
1.0 Project Characteristics

1.1 Land Usage

1.2 Other Project Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urbanization</th>
<th>Wind Speed (m/s)</th>
<th>Climate Zone</th>
<th>Precipitation Freq (Days)</th>
<th>Utility Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Southern California Edison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 User Entered Comments

- Project Characteristics -
- Land Use -
- Construction Phase - Schedule Based Upon Applicant Provided Information
- Off-road Equipment - Based upon applicant provided information
- Trips and VMT - Based upon applicant provided information
- Construction Off-road Equipment Mitigation -

2.0 Emissions Summary
### 2.1 Overall Construction (Maximum Daily Emission)

#### Unmitigated Construction

| Year | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | Fugitive PM10 | Exhaust PM10 | PM10 Total | Fugitive PM2.5 | Exhaust PM2.5 | PM2.5 Total | Bio-CO2 | NBio-CO2 | Total CO2 | CH4 | N2O | CO2e |
|------|-----|-----|----|-----|---------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|-----|-----|-----|
| 2014 | 1.92| 13.12| 10.20| 0.02| 0.15| 0.94| 1.09| 0.01| 0.94| 0.95| 0.00| 1,571.58| 0.00| 0.17| 0.00| 1,575.19|
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

#### Mitigated Construction

| Year | ROG | NOx | CO | SO2 | Fugitive PM10 | Exhaust PM10 | PM10 Total | Fugitive PM2.5 | Exhaust PM2.5 | PM2.5 Total | Bio-CO2 | NBio-CO2 | Total CO2 | CH4 | N2O | CO2e |
|------|-----|-----|----|-----|---------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|-----|-----|-----|
| 2014 | 1.92| 13.12| 10.20| 0.02| 0.01| 0.94| 0.95| 0.01| 0.94| 0.95| 0.00| 1,571.58| 0.00| 0.17| 0.00| 1,575.19|
| Total | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
2.2 Overall Operational

### Unmitigated Operational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG lb/day</th>
<th>NOx lb/day</th>
<th>CO lb/day</th>
<th>SO2 lb/day</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10 lb/day</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10 lb/day</th>
<th>PM10 Total lb/day</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5 lb/day</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5 lb/day</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total lb/day</th>
<th>Bio-CO2 lb/day</th>
<th>NBio-CO2 lb/day</th>
<th>Total CO2 lb/day</th>
<th>CH4 lb/day</th>
<th>N2O lb/day</th>
<th>CO2e lb/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mitigated Operational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG lb/day</th>
<th>NOx lb/day</th>
<th>CO lb/day</th>
<th>SO2 lb/day</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10 lb/day</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10 lb/day</th>
<th>PM10 Total lb/day</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5 lb/day</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5 lb/day</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total lb/day</th>
<th>Bio-CO2 lb/day</th>
<th>NBio-CO2 lb/day</th>
<th>Total CO2 lb/day</th>
<th>CH4 lb/day</th>
<th>N2O lb/day</th>
<th>CO2e lb/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 Construction Detail

3.1 Mitigation Measures Construction
### 3.6 Site Preparation - 2014

#### Unmitigated Construction On-Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>Bio-CO2</th>
<th>NBio-CO2</th>
<th>Total CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Road</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1,402.64</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1,405.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1,402.64</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1,405.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>Bio-CO2</th>
<th>NBio-CO2</th>
<th>Total CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hauling</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.6 Site Preparation - 2014

#### Mitigated Construction On-Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>Bio-CO2</th>
<th>NBio-CO2</th>
<th>Total CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Road</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,402.64</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1,405.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,402.64</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1,405.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mitigated Construction Off-Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>Bio-CO2</th>
<th>NBio-CO2</th>
<th>Total CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hauling</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.7 Demolition - 2014

#### Unmitigated Construction On-Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>Bio-CO2</th>
<th>NBio-CO2</th>
<th>Total CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Road</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1,476.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,479.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1,476.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,479.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unmitigated Construction Off-Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>Bio-CO2</th>
<th>NBio-CO2</th>
<th>Total CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hauling</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>95.61</td>
<td>95.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>95.61</td>
<td>95.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.7 Demolition - 2014

#### Mitigated Construction On-Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>Bio- CO2</th>
<th>NBio- CO2</th>
<th>Total CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Road</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,476.12</td>
<td>1,479.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,476.12</td>
<td>1,479.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mitigated Construction Off-Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>Bio- CO2</th>
<th>NBio- CO2</th>
<th>Total CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hauling</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>95.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>95.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.0 Mobile Detail

#### 4.1 Mitigation Measures Mobile
### 4.2 Trip Summary Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Average Daily Trip Rate</th>
<th>Unmitigated Annual VMT</th>
<th>Mitigated Annual VMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Trip Type Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Trip %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H-W or C-W</td>
<td>H-S or C-C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.0 Energy Detail

#### 5.1 Mitigation Measures Energy

### 6.0 Area Detail

#### 6.1 Mitigation Measures Area
### 6.2 Area by SubCategory

#### Unmitigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SubCategory</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>Bio-CO2</th>
<th>NBio-CO2</th>
<th>Total CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 Area by SubCategory

Mitigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SubCategory</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>Fugitive PM10</th>
<th>Exhaust PM10</th>
<th>PM10 Total</th>
<th>Fugitive PM2.5</th>
<th>Exhaust PM2.5</th>
<th>PM2.5 Total</th>
<th>Bio-CO2</th>
<th>NBio-CO2</th>
<th>Total CO2</th>
<th>CH4</th>
<th>N2O</th>
<th>CO2e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Coating</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Products</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.0 Water Detail

7.1 Mitigation Measures Water

8.0 Waste Detail

8.1 Mitigation Measures Waste

9.0 Vegetation
APPENDIX D
CULTURAL RESOURCES ASSESSMENT
March 26, 2013  
Project Number 11-68800  

**Internal Memorandum**

**Subject:** Cultural Resources Records Search for the Goleta EPI Line 96 Abandonment Project, Goleta, Santa Barbara County, California

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) conducted a cultural resources background study for the City of Goleta’s EPI Line 96 Abandonment Project, in Goleta, Santa Barbara County, California (project). Specifically, Rincon was tasked with conducting a cultural resources records search for the project alignment and summarizing the findings in a letter report.

Rincon understands that the project proposes to abandon 3.2 miles of oil pipeline located primarily along Hollister Avenue in the city of Goleta. The majority of the pipeline would be abandoned in place with only two portions parallel to Phelps Road where removal of the pipeline may be required.

**Cultural Resources Records Search**

**Methods**

Rincon Cultural Resources Specialist Tara Giuliano conducted an in-person search on March 14, 2013, of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) located at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The search was conducted to identify all previously conducted cultural resources work within 0.25 mile of the approximately 3.2-mile-long project alignment, as well as to identify previously recorded cultural resources within or adjacent to the alignment. The portions of the CHRIS search included a review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the California Points of Historical Interest list, the California Historical Landmarks list, the Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility list, and the California State Historic Resources Inventory list. The records search also included a review of all available historic USGS 7.5- and 15-minute quadrangle maps.

**Findings**

The CCIC records search identified a total of 40 previous studies (Table 1) and 17 recorded resources (Table 2) within the 0.25 mile project buffer area. Five (5) of the 40 studies included or intersected a portion of the project alignment and an additional four are adjacent to the project alignment. Sixteen (16) of these studies were conducted as a result of a proposed pipeline, underground utilities, or well-drilling activities. Seven (7) studies were conducted for residential development projects. The seventeen (17) remaining studies were
conducted for various other project types. The majority of the studies are Phase I archaeological surveys and all of the studies were completed before 2003.

### Table 1
Previous Studies Within a 0.25-Mile Radius of the Project Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCIC Report No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Relationship to Project Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-45</td>
<td>Moore, J.</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Investigations, Aminoil Pipeline Project, Goleta, CA</td>
<td>Partially within project alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-46</td>
<td>Erlandson, J.</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Phase I Cultural Resources Evaluation of the Proposed Coastal Housing Project, APN 73-090-13,-50, Goleta, CA</td>
<td>Adjacent to project alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-47</td>
<td>Erlandson, J.</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Letter Report: Results of the Archaeology Monitoring of the Ellwood-Aminoil Oil pipeline Route</td>
<td>Partially within project alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-49</td>
<td>Ehmann, M.; Perez, M.</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Archaeological Reconnaissance of Areas Affected by the proposed Burmah Oil Pipeline and Tank Lots</td>
<td>Within buffer zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-51</td>
<td>Craig, S.</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey of A.P. Nos. 77-141-25 &amp; 41</td>
<td>Within buffer zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-57</td>
<td>Erlandson, J.; Stone, D.</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring of Well-Drilling Activity in Goleta, CA</td>
<td>Within buffer zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-62</td>
<td>Swenson, J.</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>A Descriptive Report of an Archaeological Surface Reconnaissance of a Pipeline Corridor between Coal Oil Point and Lower Corral Canyon, Santa Barbara County, CA</td>
<td>Partially within project alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-702</td>
<td>Wilcoxon, L.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>A Phase I Archaeological Resource Evaluation Santa Barbara Water Reclamation Project Elements at the Santa Barbara Zoo, Santa Barbara, CA</td>
<td>Within buffer zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-751</td>
<td>Woodman, C.</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>A Phase I Archaeological Survey on the Sandpiper Golf Course, Goleta, CA</td>
<td>Within buffer zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-752</td>
<td>Macko, M.</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Results of a Supplementary Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Winchester Common Residential Development Project Site and Recommendations for Phase II</td>
<td>Within buffer zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-753</td>
<td>Harmon, J.; Snethkamp, P.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Arroyo Vista Phase I Archaeological Survey</td>
<td>Within buffer zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1
Previous Studies Within a 0.25-Mile Radius of the Project Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCIC Report No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Relationship to Project Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-757</td>
<td>Erlandson, J.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Supplemental Reconnaissance and STP Testing of CA-SBA-71, Hyatt Goleta Development, Santa Barbara, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-758</td>
<td>Berry, S.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Assessment: Empty Field on the Cliffs above Ellwood Beach</td>
<td>Adjacent to project alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-760</td>
<td>Macko, M.</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Results of Boundary Testing at Sites CA-SBS-69 &amp; CA-SBA-70 within the Winchester Common Residential Development and Cathedral Oaks Road Extension Project Site</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-763</td>
<td>Bowser, B.</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Letter Report: Phase I Archaeological Survey of Assessor’s Blocks 42 (Proposed Harz Lot); 33 &amp; 34 (Proposed Cordero Lot); 31 (Proposed Burden Lot); and 28, 29, &amp; 30 (Proposed Vibar Lot) In Goleta, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-777</td>
<td>Enviroplan</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>West Devereux Specific Plan and Tract Map: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report 89-SD-3</td>
<td>Adjacent to project alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-965</td>
<td>Stone, D.</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Assessment at Moss Motors, 7200 Hollister Ave</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1029</td>
<td>Wilcoxon, L.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>A Phase I Cultural Resources Evaluation for a portion of Goleta Water District’s Proposed Reclaimed Water Pipeline Network</td>
<td>Partially within project alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1181</td>
<td>Wilcoxon, L.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>A Supplemental Phase I Cultural Resource Evaluation for Selected Portions of Goleta Water District’s Proposed Reclaimed Water Pipeline Network, Goleta, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1447</td>
<td>Peak and Associates</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Report on the Shovel Testing of 24 Prehistoric Period Cultural Resources and the Class 3 Reassessment- Pacific Coast Pipeline Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles Counties</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1724</td>
<td>Waldron, W.</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Historic Properties Clearance Report for a Drainage Improvement Project at the Intersection of Cabrillo Boulevard and Castillo St., Santa Barbara, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1728</td>
<td>Eisentraut, P.</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Letter Report: Monitoring of Construction, Utility Undergrounding along 7900 Block of Hollister Avenue, Santa Barbara County, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1785</td>
<td>Woodman, C.</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Resource Investigation of Proposed Cable Installation Location in Santa Barbara County</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2071</td>
<td>Price, B.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Archaeologist Monitoring of Soil Remediation at Santa Barbara Shores Park</td>
<td>Adjacent to project alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCIC Report No.</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Relationship to Project Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2350</td>
<td>Anderson, K.; David, S.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Phase 3 Archaeological Investigations of CA-SBS-69 and CA-SBA-70 for the Winchester Common Residential Development Project and Extension of Cathedral Oaks Road</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2454</td>
<td>Gerber, J.</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Study Assessor's Parcel Number 077-490-39, Goleta, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2454</td>
<td>Gibson, R.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Results of Phase I Archaeological Surface Survey and Archival Records Search for the GTE Utilities Project along Highway 166 from P.M 6.5 to P.M. 7.7, City of Santa Maria, Santa Barbara County, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2739</td>
<td>Stone, D.; Pfeiffer, P.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring of CA-SBA-1327 for the Mobil Line Leak Detection System, 695 Storke Road, Goleta, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-61</td>
<td>Chambers Group</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Administrative Draft EIR: Coal Oil Point: Technical Appendix 7 Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Partially within project alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-43</td>
<td>Moore, J.; English, J.; Hudson J</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Archaeological Excavations SBA-73 North Santa Barbara County, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-50</td>
<td>Coombs, G.</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>An Archaeological Resources Report for a Tract of Land Between Winchester and Tecolote Canyons, Santa Barbara County, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-56</td>
<td>Wlodarski, R.; Pence, R.</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Archaeological Survey Report Winchester Canyon Santa Barbara County, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-724</td>
<td>Waldron, W.</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>CALTRANS Phase I Report, Freeway Interchange Rehabilitation between Glen Annie and Hollister Rds.</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-770</td>
<td>Erlandson, J.</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Letter Report: Boundary Definitions and Significance Evaluation of Low and Moderate Sensitivity Areas at CA-SBA-73, Tecolote Canon, Santa Barbara County, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-771</td>
<td>Walker, P.</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>Human Skeletal Remains Found During Excavations at SBA-73 and SBA-72</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1079</td>
<td>Stone, D.</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Assessment for the Shannon Mobile Home Unit</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2494</td>
<td>Stone, D.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Extended Phase I Testing of CA-SBA-1327 Mobil Line Leak Detection System, Goleta</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1

**Previous Studies Within a 0.25-Mile Radius of the Project Alignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCIC Report No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Relationship to Project Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-2478</td>
<td>Duke, C.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Assessment for Pacific Bell Mobil Services Facility LA 527-01, County of Santa Barbara, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2954</td>
<td>Carbone, C.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>A Modified Phase I Archaeological Letter Report for Proposed Residence Demolition and New Construction 502 East Micheltorena, City of Santa Barbara, CA</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Central Coast Information Center, March 2013

Of the seventeen (17) previously recorded resources, fourteen (14) are categorized as prehistoric, while three (3) are categorized as historic (Table 2). The prehistoric resources identified include prehistoric middens (2), shell, faunal, and lithic scatters (9), and prehistoric habitation sites with identified human remains (3). A high concentration of sensitive prehistoric sites, including habitation sites with human remains, were recorded in the vicinity of the project’s westernmost extent; however, none of these sites is located immediately adjacent to the project alignment and all are either across a canyon or Highway 101 from the project site.

**P-42-001750-H (CA-SBA-1750H)**

This site is an early twentieth century refuse scatter recorded by Erlandson in 1982. The historic archaeological site is mapped adjacent to the project alignment and was described as having been identified during excavation of the Ellwood – Aminoil Oil pipeline route. No detailed map or locational description is provided within the site record and the site may, in fact, be or have been present within the project alignment. However, the 1982 site record describes the site as extensively disturbed and eroding into a creek that is now channelized to pass under Hollister Avenue and through the neighborhood to the south. The site was composed of domestic refuse and building materials. It is unlikely that the site retains significant data potential (i.e., it is unlikely to be eligible for CRHR listing). In addition, the abandonment in place of the pipeline would not impact the site.

No historic addresses were identified within 0.25-mile of the project alignment during the records search.
### Table 2
Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within 0.25 Mile of the Project Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHP/CRHR Eligibility Status</th>
<th>Recorded By and Year</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-42-000070</td>
<td>Prehistoric habitation site with structures and human remains</td>
<td>Presumed eligible</td>
<td>Rogers, 1929</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-000071</td>
<td>Prehistoric habitation site Many burials and prehistoric artifacts</td>
<td>Presumed eligible</td>
<td>Rogers, 1929</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-000072</td>
<td>Prehistoric habitation site with midden deposits and burials</td>
<td>Presumed eligible</td>
<td>D. B Rogers, 1926</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-000074</td>
<td>Prehistoric artifact scatter, possible small camp site</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Miller, 1961</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-00193-E</td>
<td>Historic remains of buildings, pre-1950 with associated midden</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Craig, 1980</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-00193-W</td>
<td>Scatter of weathered shellfish and historic debris</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Craig, 1980</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-001194</td>
<td>Scatter of Chione and Olivella fragments. May be associated with P-42-001327</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Moore, 1984</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-001195</td>
<td>Scatter of Chione and Olivella fragments. May be associated with P-42-001327</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Moore, 1984</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-001327</td>
<td>Prehistoric shell, bone, and lithic scatter</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Ehmann, 1975</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-001672</td>
<td>Prehistoric midden with shell, bone, and lithic materials</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Erlandson and Garnica, 1979</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-001688</td>
<td>Surface scatter of faunal remains (two isolated ecofacts)</td>
<td>Presumed ineligible</td>
<td>Serena, 1980</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-001689</td>
<td>Prehistoric scatter with faunal remains and lithic material</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Serena, 1980</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-001717</td>
<td>Dense - light scatter of shell</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Pence, 1981</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-001750-H</td>
<td>Historic refuse scatter (early 20th century)</td>
<td>Presumed not eligible</td>
<td>Erlandson, 1982</td>
<td>Adjacent to project alignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2
Previously Recorded Cultural Resources Within 0.25 Mile of the Project Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>NRHP/CRHR Eligibility Status</th>
<th>Recorded By and Year</th>
<th>Proximity to Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-42-002341</td>
<td>Prehistoric midden with lithic materials, faunal remains, and shells</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Toren, 1990</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-003495</td>
<td>Prehistoric shell and lithic scatter</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>L. Pfeiffer and J. Eerkens, 1998</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-42-003634-H</td>
<td>Historic hand-hewn granite paving stones</td>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>Strudwick, 2001</td>
<td>Within 0.25 mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Central Coast Information Center, March 2013

Summary
The majority of the EPI Line 96 Abandonment Project pipeline alignment has been previously surveyed for cultural resources and 17 cultural resources have been recorded within 0.25 mile of the project alignment. However, no impacts to any known cultural resources are anticipated. A single cultural resource (P-42-001750-H) is recorded adjacent to and possibly within the project alignment, but this resource was impacted by the construction of this or an adjacent oil pipeline and the abandonment in place of the pipeline in the vicinity of this site would not constitute an impact. No cultural resources are recorded along the portions of the pipeline located parallel to Phelps Road that may require removal, and therefore, no impacts are anticipated. The primary area of known cultural resources in the west end of the pipeline would not be affected as the pipeline will be abandoned in place in this area with no additional disturbance of the ground. As such, the project would not cause significant impacts to cultural resources for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please do not hesitate to contact Kevin Hunt if you have any questions regarding this records search or the above recommendations.

Sincerely,
RINCON CONSULTANTS, INC.

Kevin Hunt
Cultural Resources Program Manager

Attachments:
Attachment A. Map of Study Area
Figure 1

Project Location Map

Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors, 2013. USGS Topo, Copyright: © 2013 National Geographic Society. Goleta and Dos Pueblos Canyon Quadrangles. The topographic representation depicted in this map may not portray all of the features currently found in the vicinity today and/or features depicted in this map may have changed since the original topographic map was assembled.

City of Goleta
Technical Memorandum

Date: March 14, 2012
To: Bruce Carter, Venoco, Inc.
cc: Tim Murphy
From: Keven Ann Colgate, Cardno ENTRIX
RE: Original Line 96 Pipeline Abandonment

1.0 Introduction

Pursuant to City of Goleta Franchise Agreement condition 9b (pertaining to the recently constructed Line 96 Modification Project), Venoco, Inc. (Venoco) is required to submit an application for abandonment and/or removal of the original Line 96 pipeline, located at Ellwood Mesa in Goleta, California. As noted in the Franchise Agreement, the “application shall describe the existing Line 96 to be removed and/or abandoned by reference to the maps(s) required by this Franchise and shall also describe with reasonable accuracy the relative physical condition of existing Line 96 pipeline.” This memorandum describes vegetation communities and other sensitive resources in the vicinity of the unpaved portions of the original Line 96 pipeline corridor, i.e., from the corner of Pacific Oaks Road and Phelps Road to the pipeline terminus valve box located on the Ellwood Mesa near the Ellwood Marine Terminal (study area). The remaining pipeline segments (Hollister Avenue and Pacific Oaks Road) were not surveyed because the pipeline is buried under the paved streets. Proposed pipeline and vault abandonment methods are described based on existing site conditions.

Abandonment is also considered in the context of the City of Goleta’s General Plan policies and Coastal Zoning Ordinance requirements for the protection of ESHAs and ESHA buffers. Relevant General Plan policies include Conservation Element policy CE 1.6. Sub-part (a) of this policy specifies that “no development, except as otherwise allowed by this element, shall be allowed within ESHAs and/or ESHA buffers.” Policy CE 1.8 (ESHA Buffers) specifies that “development adjacent to an ESHA shall minimize impacts to habitat values or sensitive species to the maximum extent feasible. Native vegetation shall be provided in buffer areas to serve as transitional habitat. All buffers shall be of a sufficient size to ensure the biological integrity and preservation of the ESHA they are designed to protect.”
2.0 Methods

A reconnaissance survey of the pipeline corridor and adjacent areas was conducted by a Cardno ENTRIX biologist and two Venoco project managers on February 14, 2012. The survey team walked the pipeline corridor from the corner of Pacific Oaks Road and Phelps Road to the pipeline terminus valve vault located at the Ellwood Mesa near the Ellwood Marine Terminal. The existing vegetation communities and sensitive resources were observed, including streams and wetlands, recreation areas, habitat for sensitive species, and designated Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) as defined by the City of Goleta. Prior to the survey, biologists reviewed City of Goleta ESHA maps (provided by City of Goleta in 2009).

The survey focused on an evaluation of various pipeline abandonment methods, and assessed potential impacts from each method to surrounding resources. An aerial map of the study area and existing pipeline alignment is provided in Appendix A. Photos of the pipeline corridor and surrounding vegetation communities are provide in Appendix B.

3.0 Existing Vegetation Communities

Following is a summary of vegetation communities present within the vicinity of the original pipeline corridor. Nomenclature follows the Jepson Manual Vascular Plants of California, Second Edition (Baldwin et al. 2012).

Eucalyptus Windrows. Eucalyptus windrows are the dominant vegetation community within the Ellwood Mesa portion of the study area. This vegetation community is dominated by mature eucalyptus (Eucalyptus sp.) with little to no understory. This community is mapped as ESHA by the City of Goleta (City et al. 2004).

Seasonal Wetlands, Riparian Areas and Semi-perennial Wetlands. Several types of riparian and wetland habitat are known to occur on the Ellwood Mesa. These include willow riparian, seasonal wetlands, and semi-perennial wetlands. Willow riparian communities are dominated by a closed canopy of arroyo willow (Salix lasiolepis) with variable understory. Semi-perennial wetlands are dominated by various annual and perennial wetland species including alkali heath (Frankenia salina), pickleweed (Salicornia sp.), and curly dock (Rumex sp.). Seasonal wetlands are typically characterized by shallow depressions that seasonally fill with water. Plant species are generally non-native annual grasses and forbs, with seasonal facultative and wetland indicator species such as curly dock. A seasonal wetland is under construction as part of the UCSB North Parcel residential development, located along the south side of Phelps Road near the intersection with Cannon Green Road. Portions of these communities are mapped as ESHA by the City of Goleta (City et al. 2004), however, all wetland and riparian communities within the Ellwood Mesa area should be considered sensitive biological habitat. Line 96 is constructed under Phelps Creek where the creek (a concretelined ditch) crosses under Phelps Road. This drainage channel is mapped as ESHA, and would be avoided accordingly.

Coyote Brush and Grasslands. Coastal sage scrub and grassland habitats are common along Ellwood Mesa. Shrubland habitats within the Line 96 pipeline corridor include coyote brush scrub,
dominated by coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*) with occasional elderberry (*Sambucus nigra* ssp. *cerulea*). Grasslands are generally dominated by non-native grasses and forbs such as various Italian rye grass (*Festuca perennis*) bromes (*Bromus* spp.), plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), and wild oat (*Avena* sp.). Native species such as beardless wild rye (*Elymus triticoides*) and purple needle grass (*Stipa pulchra*) are also present throughout Ellwood Mesa. Portions of these communities are mapped as ESHA by the City of Goleta (City et al. 2004), however, all grasslands and shrublands within the Ellwood Mesa area should be considered sensitive biological habitat.

### 4.0 Other Resources and Sensitive Areas

**Recreation Areas.** Recreation within the Ellwood Mesa area includes walking, jogging, off-road bicycling, beach access and similar recreation activities. Major trails within the study area include the Anza Trail which extends north-south parallel to the eucalyptus windrow adjacent to Line 96 (City of Goleta et al. 2004). Construction activities should consider potential impacts to recreational resources.

**Migratory Bird Nesting and Foraging Habitat.** Shrublands and wooded areas including coyote brush, eucalyptus windrows, and willow riparian vegetation communities provide suitable nesting and roosting habitat for a variety of migratory bird species. Shrublands, woodlands and grasslands also provide important foraging habitat. Any construction activities proposed for the Ellwood Mesa area should consider potential impacts to nesting birds protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

### 5.0 Description of the Proposed Pipeline Abandonment Work

**Pipeline Abandonment.** The entire line has been pigged and flushed with water in preparation for abandonment. The line was then dewatered using air and additional pigs, and then set in an inert atmosphere of nitrogen. The line is decommissioned and now out of service, set in nitrogen, awaiting final abandonment.

Abandonment in place, using grout, would avoid impacting sensitive ESHA’s in accordance with the Goleta ordinance, and would avoid impacts to recreational users and residents. Abandonment construction-related activities would be limited to only three locations: Valve Box 1291 near EMT; Valve Box 1292 in Hollister Avenue; and Valve Box 1293 near the entrance to EOF.

**Valve Box Abandonment.** The Line 96 Valve Box 1291 is located outside of the EMT and immediately west of the Ellwood Mesa eastern property boundary. This box is located within the confines of an ESHA because it is within the drip line of the north-south oriented eucalyptus windrow.

The entire lid and roof structure would be removed, followed by demolition of the box walls to a minimum depth of 18” below existing grade. Holes would be knocked through the bottom of the vault to permit drainage of any impounded moisture. The entire box would then be filled with an approved sand/soil mixture and compacted per City of Goleta requirements.
Line 96 Valve Box 1292 is located under Hollister Avenue near Lowell Way and would be left in place. Valve Box 1293 is located immediately outside EOF, and contains a short section of the active Line 96. This valve box would be left in place.

6.0 Existing Site Conditions and Proposed Construction Methods

The following table summarizes the existing site conditions along four distinct segments of the original pipeline, including sub-segment description, vegetation communities and other site features, and potential site constraints.

Table 1  Existing Conditions and Site Constraints that Favor Abandonment in Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipeline Segment</th>
<th>Pipeline Sub-Segment</th>
<th>Vegetation Community and Other Site Features</th>
<th>Site Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEGMENT 1</td>
<td>EOF, Hollister Avenue and Pacific Oaks Road to Phelps Road intersection</td>
<td>Not applicable. Pipe is buried in city streets</td>
<td>Pipe located under paved city streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phelps Creek from Pacific Oaks Road intersection to Phelps Creek</td>
<td>Non-native grassland between road edge and residences</td>
<td>Disturbance to non-native grassland over short segment; disturbance to residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGMENT 2</td>
<td>Phelps Creek to Cannon Green</td>
<td>Non-native grassland between road edge and residences (north side of Phelps)</td>
<td>Wetland feature; sensitive biological resources (designated ESHA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cannon Green to Ellwood Mesa</td>
<td>Seasonal wetland and non-native grassland; UCSB North Campus residential development (in construction)</td>
<td>Active construction site, constructed wetland; sensitive biological resources and recreation trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGMENT 3</td>
<td>Ellwood Mesa access point</td>
<td>Eucalyptus windrow, non-native grasslands; Phelps Road access point</td>
<td>Open trails, narrow access, steep slopes (not suitable for construction equipment access); sensitive biological resources (designated ESHA and ESHA buffer) and recreation trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellwood Mesa, Devereux Creek/Lowland habitat</td>
<td>Seasonal and semi-perennial wetlands, willow riparian, grassland, coyote brush scrub, eucalyptus windrow; Phelps Road access point</td>
<td>Open trails, narrow access, steep slopes (not suitable for construction equipment access); sensitive biological resources and recreation trails.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, Original Line 96 pipeline Segments 1 and 2 are located within city streets and along road edges within a residential area. A portion of Segment 2 crosses Phelps Creek (designated ESHA). Segments 3 and 4 are located within or directly adjacent to ESHA, with onsite or adjacent sensitive resources including recreation areas, streams and wetland areas, native vegetation communities and potential bird nesting habitat.

Grouting in place would avoid construction impacts to sensitive habitats (streams and wetlands, native vegetation communities, and potential bird nesting habitat) and avoid disturbance to residential and recreation uses. Grouting activities would be conducted within a paved segment of Hollister Avenue and within the developed areas of the EOF and EMT facilities, and would not require access into sensitive areas. The cemented pipeline, buried approximately 5 feet below the ground surface, would have no long-term effect on existing surface resources. Based on these considerations, grouting in place is the preferred method of pipeline abandonment.

Demolition and filling of Valve Box 1291 can be completed with minimal impact to onsite resources, as long as the eucalyptus trees are avoided. Site access would be from the east (EMT access road) along the existing Anza Trail. Line 96 Valve Box 1292 is under city streets and would both be left in place. Line 96 Valve Box 1293 is located immediately outside the entrance to EOF, and is still in use. This Valve Box would be left in place.

### 8.0 REFERENCES


City of Goleta, County of Santa Barbara, and University of California, Santa Barbara (City of Goleta et al.). 2004. Ellwood-Devereux Coast Open Space and Habitat Management Plan.
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Site Map
Segment 3: Looking west; semi-perennial wetlands and eucalyptus windrows.

Segment 3: Looking south; coyote brush scrub.

Segment 3: Looking south; eucalyptus windrows and grasslands.

Segment 4: Looking south; eucalyptus windrows and grasslands.
APPENDIX F
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

This document is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Line 96 Decommissioning Project, proposed in the City of Goleta, California. Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(1) requires that a Lead Agency adopt an MMRP before approving a project in order to mitigate or avoid significant impacts that have been identified in Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS-MND). The purpose of the MMRP is to ensure that the required mitigation measures identified in the IS-MND are implemented as part of the overall project implementation. In addition to ensuring implementation of mitigation measures, the MMRP provides feedback to agency staff and decision-makers during project implementation, and identifies the need for enforcement action before irreversible environmental damage occurs.

The following table summarizes the mitigation measures for each issue area identified in the IS-MND for the Line 96 Decommissioning project. The table identifies each mitigation measure; the action required for the measure to be implemented; the time at which the monitoring is to occur; the monitoring frequency; and the agency or party responsible for ensuring that the monitoring is performed. In addition, the table includes columns for compliance verification. Where an impact was identified to be less than significant, no mitigation measures were required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>When Monitoring to Occur</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Agency or Party</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-1 Protection of Sensitive Species.</strong></td>
<td>The project engineer shall submit a demolition plan for Vault Box 1291, Pipeline Segment 3, and Pipeline Segment 5 subject to review and approval by the City’s Building Official, the City’s Planning Director, and representatives of the Goleta Union School District and UCSB. The plan shall clearly designate “SENSITIVE RESOURCE ZONE(S)” on the demolition plan in the vicinity of Vault Box 1291, Pipeline Segment 3, Pipeline Segment 4, and Pipeline Segment 5. The SENSITIVE RESOURCE ZONE(S) shall be clearly established in the field and shall be clearly marked with flagging and stakes, or construction fencing. No construction or demolition activity or equipment staging shall occur within these designated sensitive resource zones.</td>
<td>Review plans and confirm establishment of appropriate buffer and conduct site inspection</td>
<td>Prior to the commencement of construction and ongoing during construction</td>
<td>City Planning and Environmental Review Staff</td>
<td>Initial Date Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-2 Habitat Restoration.</strong></td>
<td>The sand/soil mixture proposed to fill the abandoned vault box shall include a hydroseed mix consisting only of native seed obtained from the Ellwood-Devereux Open Space native plant stock. The mixture shall prevent the invasion and/or spread of undesired plant species and shall result in the restoration of native wildlife habitat and a plant palette consisting of entirely native species.</td>
<td>Review and approve hydroseed specification and verify restoration of site</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of the building or demolition permits</td>
<td>City Planning and Environmental Review Staff</td>
<td>Initial Date Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-3 Nesting Birds.</strong></td>
<td>If no vegetation or tree removal would occur during the avian breeding season (typically February through August), but variable based on seasonal climatic conditions, no surveys are required. If vegetation clearing and/or tree removal would occur during the avian breeding season, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted no more than three days prior to</td>
<td>Perform site inspection to confirm compliance with this mitigation measure</td>
<td>During project construction</td>
<td>City Planning and Environmental Review Staff</td>
<td>Initial Date Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>When Monitoring to Occur</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Agency or Party</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the initiation of vegetation clearance activities. If any active nests are found, all project work shall be constructed at a suitable distance (buffer area), determined by the City-approved biologist to ensure active nests are not disturbed and that any young have fledged and become independent of the adults. Project activities may encroach into the buffer only after receiving approval from the City-approved biologist. The limits of construction to avoid nests shall be established in the field with flagging and stakes or construction fencing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR-1 Human Remains.</strong> Before initiating construction, excavation, or vegetation removal, the permittee and construction crew must meet on-site with a City-approved archeologist and appropriate local Native American representative(s) and present the procedures to be followed in the unlikely event human remains are uncovered. These procedures must include those identified in California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In addition, a satisfactory deposition of the remains must be agreed upon by the City-approved archaeologist and appropriate local Native American representatives so as to limit future disturbance. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the County Coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) of the deceased Native American, who will then help determine what course of action should be taken with the remains.</td>
<td>City shall verify that construction contractor stops work if necessary, and complies with all other applicable provisions of this mitigation measure if any archaeological resources are uncovered during grading and construction.</td>
<td>During construction activities</td>
<td>Ongoing during site grading</td>
<td>Planning and Environmental Review Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*City of Goleta*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure/Condition of Approval</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>When Monitoring to Occur</th>
<th>Monitoring Frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Agency or Party</th>
<th>Compliance Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOISE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-1 Construction Timing.</strong> Noise generating construction activity and equipment maintenance must be limited to the hours between 8 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday. No construction can occur on State holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day). Low noise generating construction activities such as pipeline grouting or similar activities which are located away from sensitive receptors are not subject to these restrictions and can occur within 12-14 hour workdays.</td>
<td>Perform site inspection to confirm compliance with this mitigation measure</td>
<td>During all project site excavation and grading</td>
<td>Periodically during all project site excavation and grading</td>
<td>City Planning and Environmental Review Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-2 Construction Vehicle Travel Route.</strong> Construction vehicles and haul trucks must utilize roadways which avoid residential neighborhoods and sensitive receptors where possible.</td>
<td>Perform site inspection to confirm compliance with this mitigation measure</td>
<td>During all project site excavation and grading</td>
<td>Periodically during all project site excavation and grading</td>
<td>City Planning and Environmental Review Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-3 Electrical Power.</strong> Electrical power must be used to run air compressors and similar power tools. If a diesel generator is used to provide electrical power for air compressors and similar power tools, the appropriate level of acoustical shielding shall be utilized.</td>
<td>Perform site inspection to confirm compliance with this mitigation measure</td>
<td>During all project site excavation and grading</td>
<td>Periodically during all project site excavation and grading</td>
<td>City Planning and Environmental Review Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>