

# **2001 Clean Air Plan Supplemental EIR**

---

*Supplemental Environmental Impact Report*

**APCD – 2001 – SEIR – 01**

*Supplement to the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan EIR*

*(SCH No. 1991031045)*

**FINAL**

**December 2002**



**Santa Barbara County  
Air Pollution Control District**



**FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**  
**for the 2001 Clean Air Plan**  
**APCD-2001-SEIR-01**  
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>GLOSSARY.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>ES-1</b>
<b>TABLE ES-1 PROPOSED 2001 CAP CONTROL MEASURES .....</b>	<b>ES-3</b>
<b>TABLE ES-2 SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION .....</b>	<b>ES-4</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>1.1 Statement of Purpose.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>1.2 Lead and Responsible Agencies.....</b>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>1.3 Contents.....</b>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>2.0 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
<b>2.1 1991 Santa Barbara County Air Quality Attainment Plan .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1.1 Summary of Environmental Impacts of the 1991 AQAP .....	2-2
<b>2.2 Other Previous Environmental Documents .....</b>	<b>2-3</b>
2.2.1 1989 Air Quality Attainment Plan Environmental Impact Report .....	2-3
2.2.2 1993 Federal Rate-of-Progress Plan EIR.....	2-4
2.2.3 1994 Clean Air Plan Supplemental EIR (94-SD-3).....	2-4
2.2.4 1998 CAP Mitigated Negative Declaration (APCD-98-ND-01) .....	2-5
<b>3.0 2001 PLAN PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
<b>3.1 Project Proponent.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
<b>3.2 Project Location.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
<b>3.3 Project Objective and Characteristics.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
<b>3.4 Description of 2001 Plan Control Measures.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.4.1 R-SC-1 (Rule 323 Revision) Architectural Coatings.....	3-2
3.4.2 R-SL-2: (Rule 321 Revision) Solvent Degreasers .....	3-3
3.4.3 R-SL-2: (New Rule 362) Solvent Cleaning Operations .....	3-4

3.4.4 R-SL-4: (New Rule 358) Electronic Industry- Semiconductor Manufacturing.....	3-5
3.4.5 N-IC-1 and N-IC-3: (Rule 333 Revision) Control of Emissions from Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines.....	3-6
3.4.6 N-IC-2: (New Rule 363) Gas Turbines.....	3-6
3.4.7 N-XC-2: (New Rule 360) Large Water Heaters and Small Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters (75,000 Btu/hr to < 2 million Btu/hr heat input rating).....	3-7
3.4.8 N-XC-4: (New Rule 361) Small Industrial and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters (2 million Btu/hr to < 5 million Btu/hr heat input rating) .....	3-8

**TABLE 3-1 2001 CAP SEIR CONTROL MEASURES AND COMPLIANCE METHODS**  
..... 3-10

<b>4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING .....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
<b>4.1 Environmental Issues of Focus.....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
<b>4.2 Air Quality.....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
<b>4.3 Water Quality .....</b>	<b>4-2</b>
<b>4.4 Biological Resources .....</b>	<b>4-2</b>
<b>4.5 Noise/Nuisance .....</b>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>4.6 Risk of Upset .....</b>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>4.7 Hazardous Materials .....</b>	<b>4-3</b>
<b>4.8 Consistency with Applicable General Plans and Regional Plans.....</b>	<b>4-4</b>
<b>5.0 PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES .....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
<b>5.1 R-SC-1 Architectural Coatings (Proposed amendment to Existing Rule 323) .....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
<b>5.2 R-SL-2 Solvent Degreasing (Proposed amendment to Existing Rule 321).....</b>	<b>5-4</b>
<b>5.3 R-SL-2 Solvent Cleaning Operations (New Rule 362) .....</b>	<b>5-5</b>
<b>5.4 R-SL-4 Electronic Industry – Semiconductor Manufacturing (New Rule 358) .....</b>	<b>5-6</b>
<b>5.5 N-IC-1 and N-IC-3 Stationary Internal Combustion Engines (Proposed amendment to Existing Rule 333).....</b>	<b>5-7</b>
<b>5.6 N-IC-2 Gas Turbines (Proposed Rule 363) .....</b>	<b>5-8</b>
<b>5.7 N-XC-2 Large Water Heaters and Small Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters (New Rule 360) .....</b>	<b>5-9</b>

<b>5.8</b>	<b>N-XC-4 Small Industrial and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters (New Rule 361)</b>	<b>5-10</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</b>	<b>6-1</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT</b>	<b>7-1</b>
	Alternative 1. The No Project Alternative	7-1
	Alternative 2. The Environmentally Superior Alternative.	7-2
<b>8.0</b>	<b>OTHER CEQA TOPICS</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>8.1</b>	<b>Relationship Between Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>8.2</b>	<b>Significant Irreversible Changes</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>8.3</b>	<b>Growth Inducing Impacts</b>	<b>8-1</b>
<b>8.4</b>	<b>Socio-economic Impacts</b>	<b>8-1</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A - INITIAL STUDY</b>	<b>A-1</b>
	<b>TABLE A-1 PROPOSED APCD CONTROL MEASURES</b>	<b>A-4</b>
	<b>APPENDIX B - NOTICE OF PREPARATION</b>	<b>B-1</b>
	<b>APPENDIX C - REFERENCES</b>	<b>C-1</b>
	<b>APPENDIX D - MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN</b>	<b>D-1</b>

## GLOSSARY

APCD	Air Pollution Control District
AQAP	Air Quality Attainment Plan
AQIA	Air Quality Impact Assessment
AQMD	Air Quality Management District
ARB	(California) Air Resources Board
Btu	British thermal unit
CAP	Clean Air Plan
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	(United States) Environmental Protection Agency
FCAAA	Federal Clean Air Act Amendments
MMP	Mitigation Monitoring Plan
ND	Negative Declaration
NO <sub>x</sub>	Nitrogen oxides or oxides of nitrogen
NSCR	Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction
PEIR	Program Environmental Impact Report
ROC	Reactive Organic Compound
ROP	Rate-of-Progress (Plan)
SBCAG	Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
SCH	State Clearinghouse
SCM	Suggested Control Measure
SCR	Selective Catalytic Reduction
SEIR	Supplemental Environmental Impact Report
TAC	Toxic Air Contaminant
TCM	Transportation Control Measure

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act this document has been prepared to address the potential adverse environmental impacts of the 2001 Clean Air Plan (2001 Plan) for Santa Barbara County. The 2001 Plan, prepared by the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is a comprehensive strategy to meet the requirements of both the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 and the California Clean Air Act of 1988.

The 2001 Plan is a revision of the 1998 Clean Air Plan (1998 CAP) and addresses all federal planning requirements for “Maintenance Plans” by providing for ongoing maintenance of the federal one-hour ozone standard through the year 2015. It also formally requests that U.S. Environmental Protection Agency re-designate Santa Barbara County as an attainment area for the federal one-hour ozone standard. This 2001 Plan establishes a new on-road mobile source reactive organic compounds and oxides of nitrogen emission budgets to address federal transportation conformity requirements. It also addresses the California Clean Air Act requirements for the triennial update of the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (1991 AQAP), the 1994 Clean Air Plan (1994 CAP) and the 1998 CAP for the state ozone standard. Like the previous air quality attainment plans, the 2001 Plan includes both stationary source control measures and transportation control measures. The implementation of the control measures in the 2001 Plan will reduce emissions of the ozone precursors (reactive organic compounds and oxides of nitrogen) and help the County to make progress in attaining the state ozone standard.

The majority of the control measures evaluated for the 2001 Plan are substantially the same as the control measures in the 1998 CAP, 1994 CAP and the 1991 AQAP. However, three revised measures and five new measures are proposed in the 2001 Plan (see Table ES-1 below). These eight proposed measures are *to be adopted* as APCD rules for the purpose of attaining the state one-hour ozone standard and are identified as *contingency* measures for the purpose of maintaining the federal one-hour ozone standard. Measures classified as “further study measures” are not analyzed in this SEIR.

The APCD is the lead agency for this project under California Environmental Quality Act. Since the 2001 Plan will retain the same control measures described in the 1994 CAP and the 1991 AQAP with a few updated measures and new strategies, this document is a supplement environmental impact report (SEIR) to the environmental impact reports prepared for the 1994 CAP and the 1991 AQAP. A Notice of Preparation of a SEIR was sent to interested public and government agencies through the State Clearinghouse; no comments were received on the Notice of Preparation.

This SEIR:

- 1) summarizes the previous environmental documents (the 1991 AQAP EIR, 1994 CAP SEIR, and the 1998 CAP Negative Declaration) and incorporates them by reference,

- 2) updates the environmental setting in terms of the resources in the County which will be affected by implementing the 2001 Plan.
- 3) focuses on the new and revised control measures listed in Table ES-1 and the changes in project description from adopted, existing rules or 1991 AQAP control measures,
- 4) analyzes the potentially significant impacts of the above listed “proposed” control measures and strategies identified in the 2001 Plan and summarizes the impacts of the 2001 Plan control measures that were addressed adequately in the previous environmental documents,
- 5) updates the 1991 AQAP EIR discussion of cumulative impacts, project alternatives, growth inducing impacts and other required EIR sections.

Table ES-2 is a summary of the potential impacts of implementing the 2001 Plan control measures and mitigation measures to reduce those impacts. A draft Mitigation Monitoring Program is presented in Appendix D. Effects found to be not significant for the proposed project are described in Appendix A.



**TABLE ES-1 PROPOSED 2001 PLAN CONTROL MEASURES**

Rule #	2001 Plan Control Measure ID	Description
323	R-SC-1	Architectural Coatings (Revision)
321	R-SL-2	Solvent Degreasers (Revision)
362	R-SL-2	Solvent Cleaning Operations (Use of Low-ROC or Aqueous Solvents) (New)
358	R-SL-4	Electronic Industry - Semiconductor Manufacturing (New)
333	N-IC-1 N-IC-3	Stationary Internal Combustion Engines (Revision)
363	N-IC-2	Gas Turbines (New)
360	N-XC-2	Large Water Heaters and Small Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters (75,000 Btu/hr to < 2 million Btu/hr) (New)
361	N-XC-4	Small Industrial and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters (2 million Btu/hr to < 5 million Btu/hr) (New)

**TABLE ES-2      SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	<b>Control Measures</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance* /Residual Impacts</b>
AIR QUALITY	SCR can result in ammonia slip.	N-IC-1,2,3 N-XC-4,5,6,7,8	Systems shall be properly operated and maintained to minimize adverse impacts. To be implemented at APCD permit stage.	Class III/ Insignificant
	SCR and NSCR can result in release of heavy metals (e.g., vanadium pentoxide).	N-IC-1,2,3 N-XC-4,5,6,7,8	Systems shall be properly operated and maintained to minimize adverse impacts. To be implemented at APCD permit stage.	Class II/ Insignificant
WATER QUALITY	The ROC control measures use vapor control methods that have residual waste water or involve hazardous substances that could contaminate surface or ground water supplies.	R-PG-5,R-PP-1, R-PP-5,R-PT-1, R-PT-2	Hazardous wastes shall be minimized and operator shall be subject to federal, state and local regulations. APCD shall notify relevant jurisdictions during permit and compliance stage.	Class II/ Insignificant
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	Compliance methods which adversely impact human health or water resources will also impact flora and fauna.	R-PG-5,R-PP-1, R-PP-5,R-PT-1, R-PT-2	All mitigation measures identified under air quality, water quality, noise/nuisance and risk of upset shall be implemented.	Class II/ Insignificant

<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	<b>Control Measures</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Level of Significance* /Residual Impacts</b>
NOISE/ NUISANCE	Compliance methods that use fans, pumps or compressors may increase ambient noise levels substantially. Night-time glare from flares used to destroy vapor control residuals can impact visually sensitive areas.	R-PG-5,R-PP-1, R-PP-5,R-PT-1, R-PT-2	Noise shall be mitigated in compliance with OSHA regulations. Planned flaring in sensitive areas shall be restricted to day-time hours or enclosed flares shall be used. The operator shall be subject to the regulations of relevant jurisdictions.	Class II/ Insignificant
RISK OF UPSET	The recovery of volatile hydrocarbon vapors, saturated adsorption carbon and electrostatic sprayers create a hazard of fire and explosion.	R-PG-5,R-PP-1, R-PP-5,R-PT-1 R-PT-2,R-SC-1 R-SL-2,R-SC-2	Safe handling, operating, transportation, and disposal procedures shall be implemented consistent with federal, state and local regulations.	Class II/ Insignificant
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Some compliance methods generate hazardous waste materials such as carbon adsorption canisters, SCR or NSCR catalysts which could be disposed of improperly.	N-IC-1,2,3 N-XC-4,5,6,7,8 R-PG-5,R-PP-1, R-PP-5,R-PT-1 R-PT-2,R-SC-1 R-SL-2,R-SC-2	Hazardous wastes shall be minimized and operator shall be subject to federal, state and local regulations. APCD shall notify relevant jurisdictions during permit and compliance stage.	Class II/ Insignificant

\* Level of Significance:

Class I Unavoidable, Significant

Class II Insignificant after Mitigation

Class III Adverse, but not Significant (Adverse Impacts are described in the 1991 AQAP EIR and are not repeated here).

Class IV Beneficial (Beneficial Impacts are described in the 1991 AQAP EIR and are not repeated here).

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) proposes to update the 1998 Clean Air Plan (1998 CAP) with the 2001 Clean Air Plan (2001 Plan) to comply with both the federal Clean Air Act Amendments and the California Clean Air Act requirements. Since the County has attained the federal one-hour ozone standard during the 1997-1999 period, the 2001 Plan describes strategies for maintaining this standard. It also updates the 1998 CAP which was designed to achieve a minimum five percent per year reduction in ozone precursor emissions to demonstrate progress towards attaining the state ambient air quality standard for ozone.

This document assesses the potential environmental effects of the 2001 Plan and was prepared by the APCD as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The 2001 Plan will retain the same control measures described in the 1998 CAP with a few updated measures and new strategies. Therefore, this environmental document is a supplemental environmental impact report (SEIR) which contains information necessary to make the environmental impact report prepared for the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (1991 AQAP) adequate for the 2001 Plan (CEQA Guidelines §15163). In compliance with CEQA, this supplemental EIR (2001 Plan SEIR) will be circulated for public review without re-circulating the previous 1991 AQAP EIR. When the APCD Board of Directors acts on the 2001 Plan, they will consider the 1991 AQAP EIR as revised by the 2001 CAP SEIR and make findings on each significant effect identified in both EIRs.

### **1.1 Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this SEIR is to describe for the public and decision-makers the potential environmental consequences of implementing the proposed 2001 Clean Air Plan. CEQA also requires that projects that may significantly affect the quality of the environment be analyzed to reduce or eliminate adverse effects on the environment.

In keeping with the requirements of CEQA and its Guidelines, this document focuses only on the environmental impacts of the 2001 Plan that were not discussed in the 1991 AQAP EIR. The 2001 Plan SEIR briefly summarizes the 1989 Air Quality Attainment Plan (1989 AQAP) EIR, the 1991 AQAP program EIR, the 1993 Rate-of-Progress Plan (1993 ROP Plan) EIR, the 1994 Clean Air Plan (1994 CAP) Supplemental EIR and the 1998 Clean Air Plan (1998 CAP) Negative Declaration and incorporates by reference the analyses presented therein. These documents are available at the APCD office in Santa Barbara.

The 2001 Plan SEIR, like the 1991 AQAP EIR, is a program EIR, which assesses the impacts of the 2001 Plan and provides a general evaluation of the individual control measures. Like the 1991 AQAP EIR, it is also intended to lay the foundation for future environmental review of actions taken according to the 2001 Plan.

## **1.2 Lead and Responsible Agencies**

The Santa Barbara County APCD is responsible for the control of air emissions from stationary sources in the county and is the CEQA lead agency for this project. The APCD is responsible for the implementation of the emission control measures to be adopted as APCD rules.

The California Air Resources Board (ARB) is the primary state agency responsible for air quality in the State of California. ARB will be the agency implementing the state-wide measures listed in the 2001 Plan. ARB is also responsible for approving the 2001 Plan and submitting it as part of the State Implementation Plan to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Therefore, ARB is a CEQA responsible agency.

## **1.3 Contents**

- Section 1 provides the introduction and background, the purpose and describes the contents of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Report.
- Section 2 summarizes the previous environmental documents, especially the environmental impacts of the 1991 AQAP as determined in the 1991 AQAP EIR which this document supplements. This section also includes mitigation measures adopted to reduce or eliminate impacts of the 1991 AQAP.
- Section 3 contains the Project Description for the 2001 Plan which adds descriptions of new and revised control measures not included in the 1991 AQAP EIR.
- Section 4 includes a discussion of current conditions (the environmental setting) in the project area. The environmental setting defines the baseline for the analysis of potential impacts.
- Section 5 analyzes the environmental impacts. Criteria for determining significance are discussed and mitigation measures and residual impacts are described.
- Section 6 discusses the Cumulative Impacts of the 2001 Plan.
- Section 7 discusses the environmental impacts of alternatives to the project: the no project alternative and a more environmentally sensitive alternative. The impacts of these alternatives are evaluated in comparison to the proposed plan.
- Section 8 includes the CEQA topics of: the Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity, Significant Irreversible Changes, Growth Inducing Impacts and Socio-Economic Impacts.

- The Appendices include a copy of the Notice of Preparation, the Initial Study, references and a draft Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

## **2.0 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS**

Many of the control measures in this 2001 Plan were analyzed in the program EIR prepared for the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan. A brief summary of the 1991 AQAP EIR is provided below.

### **2.1 1991 Santa Barbara County Air Quality Attainment Plan**

The 1991 Santa Barbara County Air Quality Attainment Plan was required under the 1988 California Clean Air Act for areas that do not meet the state's air quality standards (i.e., nonattainment areas). The 1991 AQAP was intended to achieve a five percent annual reduction in emissions of both Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) until the state ozone standard is met. The 1991 AQAP presented a detailed description of the air quality of the county and meteorological conditions primarily responsible for ozone formation, an inventory of the pollutant sources, short and long term air pollution control measure strategies, and the future air quality impacts expected under current and projected growth trends.

Reductions in emissions of ozone precursors, ROC and NO<sub>x</sub>, are realized through the implementation of control measures. Table 2-3 in the 1991 AQAP EIR listed the emission control measures analyzed in the 1991 AQAP EIR along with the associated compliance methods.

The 1991 AQAP EIR identified rule requirements, compliance methods and potential environmental impacts from the compliance methods required by the APCD rules. The following compliance methods (i.e., control systems and/or control techniques) identified in the 1991 AQAP EIR could be used to comply with the APCD Rules and Regulations:

VR	Vapor Recovery
RE	Reformulation
TE	Transfer Efficiency
EC	External Combustion Modification
IC	Internal Combustion Modification
PC	Post-Combustion Modification
EL	Electric Motor Replacement
CF	Alternative Combustion Fuels
OM	Operational Modifications

In addition, the following general methods were included for use in complying with Transportation Control Measures:

TR	Trip Reduction
TF	Traffic Flow Improvement
AF	Alternative Transportation Fuels

### 2.1.1 Summary of Environmental Impacts of the 1991 AQAP

The 1991 AQAP EIR evaluated the impacts of the 1991 AQAP as a whole based on the compliance methods which would be employed to implement the 1991 AQAP. The EIR also evaluated the environmental impacts of the individual control measures that were adopted in the 1991 AQAP. A summary of the compliance methods that could be used by the affected sources to comply with individual control measures was provided in Section 2.1 of the 1991 AQAP EIR.

The environmental impacts of the 1991 AQAP are summarized below and are presented in Appendix A. No unavoidable potentially significant adverse impacts were identified (i.e., Class I impacts). The potentially significant adverse impacts of the 1991 AQAP that could be mitigated to a level of insignificance (i.e., Class II impacts) are associated with toxic and hazardous materials or other public safety concerns on a regional basis. Public safety (related to transportation and risk of upset), water resources, biological, and hazardous waste generation are areas where mitigation was required to avoid potentially significant adverse impacts. Most of the adverse environmental effects of the 1991 AQAP were classified as not significant.

One area of concern that had been identified as significant in the 1991 AQAP EIR (and the EIR on the 1989 AQAP) is the use of anhydrous ammonia. The potential for a Class I impact was avoided in the 1991 AQAP by eliminating the use of anhydrous ammonia in emission control equipment and substituting the use of urea or aqueous ammonia as a reducing agent in the selective catalytic reduction (SCR) and selective non-catalytic reduction processes (NSCR). However, the substitution creates a tradeoff where the potential for impacts to water resources and biological resources increases and the risk of upset is reduced in significance. Impacts to water and biological resources were considered insignificant after mitigation.

The effects of emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) were another area of concern associated with the 1991 AQAP that, when fully implemented, would affect a broad range of sources associated with TAC emissions. Most of ROC control measures reduce emissions by containing volatile compounds in the system. Since TACs are constituents of many of these compounds (especially ROCs from combustion), they are also reduced. However, solvents and coatings that have been reformulated to reduce ROC may be replaced with toxic compounds which are exempt from restrictions of APCD Rules and Regulations.

Nitrogen oxide ( $\text{NO}_x$ ) control measures that increase energy efficiency also reduce TAC emissions associated with combustion fuels. But other controls reduce  $\text{NO}_x$  at the expense of decreased fuel efficiency resulting in increased TAC emissions associated with fuel combustion. Thus the actual implementation of 1991 AQAP has the potential to affect TAC emissions in an opposing manner. Overall, the reductions in TAC are greater than the increases. The EIR identified the positive and negative effects of the individual compliance methods.

Transportation Control Measures were associated with the potential to result in impacts such as: the use of hazardous alternative transportation fuels, increased transit system demand, public works demands, and public safety. The use of methanol as a substitute transportation fuel was



cited as a potentially significant impact because of its physical and chemical properties and the need to transport greater quantities. The 1991 AQAP did not specify the means of achieving vehicle emission reductions. Instead, it required local jurisdictions to implement TCM plans that are appropriate for the locality by using any of a number of suggested Transportation Mitigation Measures. The use of methanol was not encouraged. Other potentially adverse effects were identified but could not be clearly tied to significance criteria on a regional basis.

Overall the 1991 AQAP, when fully implemented, will improve the quality of the environment by improving air quality and increase the efficiency of the use of natural resources and the transportation of goods and people. Long-term impacts and effects on productivity were considered beneficial or insignificant if adverse. No significant irreversible changes were identified. Growth-inducing impacts were related to improved air quality and in turn the increased desirability to live in the county. The 1991 AQAP EIR concluded that it would be highly speculative, however, to attempt to separate normal growth under the county's General Plan from that specifically resulting from the 1991 AQAP.

The 1991 AQAP EIR included a Mitigation Monitoring Plan (MMP) to implement the measures required to reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of insignificance (see Appendix D of the 1991 AQAP EIR).

The 1991 AQAP control measures have been adopted as APCD rules or are currently going through the rule adoption process. Before being adopted as rules, individual CEQA review was conducted. The 1991 AQAP EIR and those CEQA documents which are addenda to the 1991 AQAP EIR are also used as references for this 2001 Plan SEIR. A copy of the 1991 AQAP EIR is available for review at the APCD's Goleta office.

## **2.2 Other Previous Environmental Documents**

### **2.2.1 1989 Air Quality Attainment Plan Environmental Impact Report**

The 1989 AQAP EIR (SCH No. 89012511), a program EIR, was prepared by the APCD to assess the impacts of the 1989 Air Quality Attainment Plan (1989 AQAP). The 1989 AQAP applied only to the southern portion of Santa Barbara County and was required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to demonstrate attainment of the federal one-hour ozone standard in Santa Barbara County. The 1989 AQAP EIR examined the potential environmental effects of the 1989 AQAP, including the impacts of a county-wide implementation option examined in the alternatives section of the EIR. The 1989 AQAP EIR did not identify any significant impacts that could not be mitigated to insignificant levels.

The environmental impacts of greatest concern stemmed from the use of anhydrous ammonia in several control technologies for the reduction of nitrogen oxides. The potential for an accident, most likely to occur during transportation and involving a massive release of anhydrous ammonia gas, was considered to present a significant risk to public health and safety. Therefore the use of anhydrous ammonia in NO<sub>x</sub> control was prohibited in the 1989 AQAP and in subsequent documents for the implementation of the Plan through the adoption of rules. A projected increase in traffic from service and supply vehicles to multiple facilities in the same

area was also classified as a potentially significant impact to existing traffic congestion. The mitigation measure in the 1989 AQAP EIR required APCD permit conditions to specify and require documentation of delivery schedules that avoid peak traffic hours for such facilities. No other potentially significant impacts were identified.

### 2.2.2 1993 Federal Rate-of-Progress Plan EIR

The 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments required all ozone nonattainment areas classified as moderate and above to submit a Rate-of-Progress Plan (1993 ROP Plan) to the Environmental Protection Agency by November 15, 1993. The 1993 Rate-of-Progress Plan affected all of Santa Barbara County. The purpose of the 1993 ROP Plan was to develop an inventory of ozone season emissions, an adjusted "base year inventory" for 1990 and a plan showing reactive organic compound (ROC) emission reductions of at least 15% by November 15, 1996. The base year for the 15% emission reduction was 1990. Therefore, any emission reductions resulting from rules adopted from 1990 onward counted towards the 15% reduction needed under the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments. For this reason existing and pending rules were included in the 1993 ROP Plan.

The implementation of the control measures in the 1993 ROP Plan was intended to reduce emissions of ROC. The majority of the ROC control measures in the 1993 Plan were substantially the same as the ROC control measures in the 1991 AQAP. Therefore, the finding was made that the 1991 AQAP EIR adequately described the general environmental setting of the project, significant environmental impacts of the project and alternatives and mitigation measures related to each significant effect. To be sufficient, both the circumstances and the environmental impacts of the two projects (the 1991 AQAP and the 1993 ROP Plan) are required to be essentially the same. The 1991 AQAP EIR was recirculated as the draft EIR for the 1993 ROP Plan. The final 1993 ROP Plan EIR, prepared as a subsequent document under CEQA Guidelines Section 15153, concluded that no significant impacts would result from the 1993 ROP Plan.

### 2.2.3 1994 Clean Air Plan Supplemental EIR (94-SD-3)

As required by the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments, the 1994 CAP was prepared as a revision of the 1989 AQAP and the 1993 ROP Plan. In addition, the 1994 CAP contained a request for redesignation from a nonattainment area to a maintenance area for the federal one-hour ozone standard along with a plan to show maintenance of that standard through the year 2006. These components were later withdrawn by the APCD.

The 1994 CAP also addressed the California Clean Air Act requirements for the triennial update of the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (1991 AQAP). The 1994 CAP like the previous air quality attainment plans included both stationary source control measures and transportation control measures. The majority of the measures in the 1994 CAP were substantially the same as the control measures in the 1991 AQAP and the 1993 ROP Plan. The primary change in the project description in terms of the effects on the environment was the addition of Outer

Continental Shelf sources to the APCD permit jurisdiction. The new Regulatory Flexibility Program was introduced in the 1994 CAP but the environmental impacts were not analyzed.

Since the proposed 1994 CAP retained the same control measures described in the 1991 AQAP with a few updated measures and new strategies, a supplement to an EIR (SEIR) was prepared which contained information necessary to make the program Environmental Impact Report prepared for 1991 AQAP adequate for the 1994 CAP, as revised (CEQA Guidelines, § 15163). The 1994 CAP SEIR focused on the changes in project description, consisting of the control measures (some of which are now adopted as APCD rules) that are relevant to Outer Continental Shelf sources. No additional significant issues other than those identified in the 1991 AQAP EIR were identified in the 1994 CAP SEIR.

#### 2.2.4 1998 CAP Mitigated Negative Declaration (APCD-98-ND-01)

The 1998 Final Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the 1998 Clean Air Plan. No new impacts were identified nor new mitigations adopted.

### **3.0 2001 PLAN PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

#### **3.1 Project Proponent**

The project proponent is:

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District  
260 North San Antonio Road, Suite A  
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

#### **3.2 Project Location**

Geographically, the area covered by the 2001 Plan consists of the entire County of Santa Barbara including California coastal waters and the Outer Continental Shelf within 25 miles of the seaward boundary of the State and located off the coast of the County for which the APCD is the corresponding onshore area.

#### **3.3 Project Objective and Characteristics**

The 2001 Plan for Santa Barbara County, prepared by the APCD, is a comprehensive strategy to meet the requirements of both the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments and the California Clean Air Act of 1988.

The 2001 Plan is a revision of the 1998 CAP. It addresses all federal planning requirements for "Maintenance Plans" and provides for ongoing maintenance of the federal one-hour ozone standard through the year 2015. The 2001 Plan formally requests that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency re-designate Santa Barbara County as an attainment area for the federal one-hour ozone standard. In addition, this 2001 Plan re-establishes on-road mobile source reactive organic compounds (ROC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) emission budgets to address federal transportation conformity requirements.

The 2001 Plan also addresses the California Clean Air Act requirements for the triennial updates of the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan, the 1994 Clean Air Plan and the 1998 Clean Air Plan. Like the previous air quality plans, the 2001 Plan includes both stationary source control measures and transportation control measures. The implementation of the control measures in the 2001 Plan will reduce emissions of the ozone precursors (reactive organic compounds and oxides of nitrogen) and help the County to maintain the federal ozone standard and make progress in attaining the state ozone standard.

#### **3.4 Description of 2001 Plan Control Measures**

The majority of the control measures evaluated for the 2001 Plan are substantially the same as the control measures in the 1998 CAP, 1994 CAP and the 1991 AQAP. However, eight control measures (three revised and five new measures) are proposed in the 2001 Plan (Table 3-1). The first four will reduce the emissions of ROC and the last four will reduce the emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>. These proposed measures are to be adopted as APCD Rules for the purpose of attaining the state one-hour ozone standard and are identified as contingency measures for the purpose of

maintaining the federal one-hour ozone standard. A complete description of the proposed measures analyzed in this SEIR is provided in the 2001 Plan which is hereby incorporated by reference.

Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) reduce emissions from on-road motor vehicles and trucks. The 2001 CAP proposed TCMs are for the most part the same as the ones adopted in the 1991 AQAP and the 1998 CAP. Of the eight new TCMs listed in the 2001 CAP, only one is listed as a contingency measure. The rest are proposed for further study or have been rejected. The one contingency TCM is the county-wide implementation of a tier III transportation demand management program by Traffic Solutions. This TCM was also adopted in the 1998 CAP as a contingency measure and is therefore not analyzed again in this supplemental EIR.

The 1991 AQAP EIR described and analyzed the impacts of the adopted, proposed, pending and contingency control measures. All the control measures that the 2001 Plan relies on to achieve the required emission reductions were analyzed in the 1991 AQAP EIR. Further Study Measures and Rejected Measures listed in the 2001 Plan are not included in this document because they are not proposed for implementation and therefore not a part of the project. Table 3-1 shows the control measures that will be analyzed in the 2001 Plan SEIR and the compliance methods to be used in implementing them. The compliance methods are:

- Vapor Control (Vap. Con.)
- Reformulation (Reformuln.)
- Transfer Efficiency (Trans. Eff.)
- External Combustion (Ext. Comb.)
- Internal Combustion (Int. Comb.)
- Post Combustion (Post Comb.)
- Electric Motor Replacement (Electr. Rep.)
- Alternative Fuels (Alt. Fuels)
- Operation and Maintenance Methods (O and M)

### 3.4.1 R-SC-1 (Rule 323 Revision) Architectural Coatings

Architectural coatings are coatings applied to stationary structures and their appurtenances. Examples of coatings include house paints, stains, industrial maintenance coatings and traffic coatings. Painting structures with architectural coatings and related equipment cleanup release ROC and toxic air contaminant (e.g., benzene, toluene and xylene) emissions. Architectural coatings are typically non-aerosol and include lacquers, sealers, maintenance coatings, primers, stains and enamels.

The APCD originally adopted Rule 323 (Architectural Coatings) on October 18, 1971 to regulate the reactive organic compound emissions from the application of architectural coatings. Since 1971, the rule has been amended eight times: February 24, 1975, August 22, 1977, October 23, 1978, June 11, 1979, March 11, 1985, February 20, 1990, March 16, 1995, and July 18, 1996. The amendments in 1975 through 1985 revised effective dates of technology-forcing ROC content limits and clarified language. The amendments in February 1990 revised the rule to be

consistent with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) 1989 Suggested Control Measure (SCM). The 1995 and 1996 amendments dealt with general rule cleanup issues and expanded the list of compounds exempt from the definition of volatile organic compound to be consistent with EPA's definitions. ARB, in cooperation with the local air districts, again amended its SCM for architectural coatings in June 2000. According to ARB, the revised SCM reflects both the advances in coatings technologies over the past 10 years and the need for further emission reductions to attain health-based air quality standards in many air districts. The APCD's proposed rule amendment is based on ARB's SCM and will reduce existing Rule 323's allowable ROC content for several coating categories

### Compliance Methods

Because architectural coating painting operations are typically portable and are not at the same site frequently, use of add-on control equipment (e.g., carbon adsorption) is difficult to apply to the process. The most practical and efficient way to reduce ROC emissions from this source category is through the use of coatings formulated with low ROC bases such as water or exempt solvent bases. Coatings reformulated from solvent-based coatings to water-based coatings require less use of thinners and cleanup solvents. Therefore, emissions from thinner and cleanup use will also decrease.

#### 3.4.2 R-SL-2: (Rule 321 Revision) Solvent Degreasers

APCD Rule 321 (Control of Degreasing Operations) is a prohibitory rule that controls emissions of ROC from solvent degreasing operations in Santa Barbara County.

Solvent degreasing is practiced by operations such as automotive repair shops, oil well field operations, aerospace and electronic industries. Degreasing precedes operations such as painting, plating, repair and assembly. Typically an object is degreased by exposure to a synthetic or petroleum-based solvent liquid or vapor contained in tanks, trays or drums. ROC emissions can occur due to direct evaporation of solvent from tanks, spills and by evaporation of residual solvents in cracks, crevices, indentations or as a thin surface film on the cleaned part. Rule 321 reduces emissions by requiring the use of low ROC cleaning solvents, increasing the height of the sides of degreasing tanks to reduce solvent losses due to spills<sup>1</sup> and good housekeeping techniques (e.g., closed solvent containers) that reduce evaporative emissions. The use of add-on exhaust control equipment such as carbon adsorption may be used to comply with the rule requirements.

Concurrent with the adoption of a new Rule 362, Solvent Cleaning Operations, Rule 321 will be revised to include the additional control techniques outlined below:

---

<sup>1</sup> This is known as increasing the "freeboard ratio"

- Requiring air-tight or airless cleaning systems in lieu of meeting the requirements for batch-loaded cold cleaners or open-top vapor degreasers.
- Increasing the minimum freeboard ratio from 0.75 to 1 on open-top vapor degreasers and conveyORIZED degreasers.
- Requiring that the solvent have an ROC content of 50 grams per liter or less for batch-loaded cold cleaners and conveyORIZED cold cleaners.

### Compliance Methods

Current control techniques required by Rule 321 include:

1. Following general good housekeeping operating procedures for minimizing emissions.
2. Using covers, an internal draining facility (e.g., a parts basket where drained solvent is returned to the tank), low-volatility solvent and units with adequate freeboard heights, ratios and chillers.

#### 3.4.3 R-SL-2: (New Rule 362) Solvent Cleaning Operations

Solvent cleaning activities occur during the production, repair, maintenance, or servicing of products, tools, machinery and general work areas. Such cleaning may be performed at auto repair shops, garages and service stations, printing shops, metal fabrication facilities, aircraft and aerospace handling facilities, electronic manufacturing facilities, medical device manufacturing facilities, and filter manufacturing facilities. Rule 362 will not apply to certain solvent cleaning operations that are governed by other APCD rules such as Rule 321, Solvent Degreasers, and new Rule 358, Semiconductor Manufacturing.

Rule 362 will be patterned after the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1171 and will set ROC limits for specific solvent cleaning activities, require specific cleaning methods or devices and require proper storage and disposal of all ROC containing solvents.

### Control Methods

Control techniques include:

1. Limiting solvent characteristics.
2. Requiring use of cleaning devices or methods.
3. Establishing requirements for remote reservoir cleaners.
4. Requiring proper storage and transfer of the solvents.
5. Allowing use of alternative compliance through the use of add-on controls.

### 3.4.4 R-SL-4: (New Rule 358) Electronic Industry- Semiconductor Manufacturing

Semiconductor manufacturers use organic solvents in coatings, stripping materials, and cleaning operations. Use of photoresist is an integral process of semiconductor manufacturing and ROC emissions occur from the application, exposure and development of photoresist. Semiconductor manufacturers also use inorganic toxic gases called dopants in certain steps to give the devices desirable electronic characteristics. About 99 percent of the dopants diffuse into the wafers. The semiconductor manufacturers collect most of the solvents in liquid form for reclamation or waste disposal.

Rule 358 will likely be similar to the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1164 and will limit ROC emissions from semi-conductor manufacturing.

#### Control Methods

Control techniques include the use of:

1. The positive photoresist process for all semiconductor manufacturing or, if using the negative photoresist process, at least a 90 percent control of ROC emissions from the operations. To achieve the 90 percent control, semiconductor manufacturers will need to install control equipment such as incinerators or carbon adsorbers.
2. Good housekeeping procedures for photoresist operations and solvent cleaning stations to prevent spills and unnecessary evaporation.
3. Covers on all solvent reservoirs, sinks, and containers that are in place when the operators are not using the equipment.
4. Freeboards such that the freeboard ratios are greater than or equal to 1.0 for all solvent station reservoirs, sinks, and containers.
5. Low vapor pressure solvents and/or low-ROC solvents.

Rule 358 will apply to all direct, indirect, and support stations associated with the manufacturing or production of semiconductor devices. Semiconductor device manufacturing includes all processing from crystal growth through circuit separation and encapsulation, including wafer production, oxidation, photoresist operation, etching, doping and epitaxial growth operation.



### 3.4.5 N-IC-1 and N-IC-3: (Rule 333 Revision) Control of Emissions from Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines

Rule 333 requires NO<sub>x</sub> control techniques for spark-ignited (N-IC-1) and compression-ignited (N-IC-3) internal combustion engines. Spark-ignited combustion is typical of piston-type engines burning natural gas, field gas, waste gas, propane gas or gasoline. There are primarily two different types of spark-ignited engines: lean burn and rich burn. Different control methods are used for each of these types of spark-ignited engines.

Compression-ignited engines (i.e., diesel engines) operate differently in that the combustion process is not initiated until the compression stroke where fuel is injected into the combustion chamber. Upon injection, the fuel mixes with the hot air and spontaneously burns (no spark is required). Operators use both types of engines to drive rotating equipment in remote locations and the engines range in size from less than 50 to over 1,000 brake horsepower (bhp).

Existing Rule 333 will be revised to address EPA-identified deficiencies so it may be included into the State Implementation Plan. These deficiencies include inconsistent applicability cutoffs and exemptions, unenforceable provisions in the definitions and inconsistent emission limit requirements.

#### Compliance Methods

Existing Rule 333 applies to permitted, spark-ignited and compression-ignited internal combustion engines that have a horsepower rating greater than or equal to 50 bhp. Engine owners and operators have complied with the requirements of Rule 333 by switching to electric motors, installing selective catalytic reduction equipment, nonselective catalytic reduction equipment, retarding diesel engine injection timing, lean-burn tuning of rich burn spark-ignited engines, retarding the ignition on spark-ignited engines, and using other combustion modification systems. These control techniques can be used to comply with the proposed revisions to Rule 333.

### 3.4.6 N-IC-2: (New Rule 363) Gas Turbines

A gas turbine is an engine that consists of a compressor, a combustor, and a power turbine. The compressor provides pressurized air to the combustor where fuel is burned. Hot combustion gases leave the combustor and enter the turbine section. In the turbine section, the gases expand across the power turbine blades to rotate one or more shafts. The shafts provide power for the compressor and the device (usually an electric generator) being powered by the gas turbine.

Rule 363 will set NO<sub>x</sub> emission limits for stationary gas turbines.

## Compliance Methods

The ARB's Reasonably Available Control Technology/Best Available Retrofit Control Technology determination recommends the use of the following NO<sub>x</sub> control techniques:

Water or steam injection

Dry low-NO<sub>x</sub> combustors

Selective catalytic reduction and other post combustion technologies

### 3.4.7 N-XC-2: (New Rule 360) Large Water Heaters and Small Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters (75,000 Btu/hr to < 2 million Btu/hr heat input rating)

Fossil fuels are burned in water heaters, boilers, steam generators, and process heaters to transfer heat from combustion gases to water or other fluids. The only significant emissions to the atmosphere from the units in normal operation, regardless of the fluid being heated or vaporized, are those resulting from the combustion of the fuel. Differences in design and operation of these devices can affect their production of air contaminants. The combustion of fuel and air in these units cause the formation of nitric oxide (NO). In uncontrolled units, the NO is emitted to the air along with other products of combustion in the flue gas. Smaller amounts of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) form in the combustion process, and some NO oxidizes to NO<sub>2</sub> in the stack.

Commercial/industrial boilers and hot water heaters in the size range of 75,000 to 2,000,000 Btu per hour predominately burn natural gas and are used to heat water and raise steam. Typically, natural gas burns with air to release heat which is subsequently transferred to water confined in a jacket or tubes. Most of the units in this size range use the natural draft created by the combustion of the natural gas and air to transfer heat to the confined water and do not rely on fans or blower to transport either air or combustion gases.

In general, units less than 300,000 Btu per hour are larger versions of residential water heaters and businesses use them to heat potable water. For such units, an annular tank holds the water. Hot flue gases flow vertically through the annulus thereby heating the water. Larger units (greater than 300,000 Btu per hour) are usually designed with a series of tubes placed somewhat perpendicular to the exhaust flow. As the hot gases flow around the tubes, the water is heated creating hot water or steam.

The formation of NO by combustion processes is governed primarily by (1) the chemically bound nitrogen content of the fuel, (2) the oxygen concentration of the flame, (3) the temperature of the flame, and (4) the length of time that the combustion gases are held at the flame temperature.

Rule 360 will set specific emission rates (e.g., pounds of NO<sub>x</sub> per unit heat input) which will be a function of heat input rating of the boiler, heater or steam generator.

## Control Methods

To reduce the formation of thermal oxides of nitrogen, manufacturers lower the unit's peak flame temperature or reduce the amount of air flowing to the burner. Manufacturers add fans to the units to provide better mixing of the air and fuel and to better control the amount of air. Reducing excess air and other low-NO<sub>x</sub> strategies also improve fuel efficiency. This is due in part to a reduction in heat loss through the stack. By reducing the amount of combustion air, less air is heated and, therefore, less fuel is required.

Reducing peak flame temperature is a function of burner design. This is usually accomplished by limiting the amount of air in the immediate vicinity of the flame or to spread the flame out across a surface so that it burns cooler. Both of these design concepts are in operation today from manufacturers in units in the subject size range. The two primary low-NO<sub>x</sub> burner types are known as (1) forced draft low-NO<sub>x</sub>, and (2) atmospheric low-NO<sub>x</sub> burners.

### 3.4.8 N-XC-4: (New Rule 361) Small Industrial and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters (2 million Btu/hr to < 5 million Btu/hr heat input rating)

Fossil fuels are burned in boilers, steam generators, and process heaters to transfer heat from combustion gases to water or other fluids. The only significant emissions to the atmosphere from these units in normal operation, regardless of the fluid being heated or vaporized, are those resulting from the combustion of the fuel. Differences in design and operation of these devices can affect their production of air contaminants. The combustion of fuel and air in these units cause the formation of nitric oxide (NO). In uncontrolled units, the NO is emitted to the air along with other products of combustion in the flue gas. Smaller amounts of nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) form in the combustion process, and some NO oxidizes to NO<sub>2</sub> in the stack.

The design of a boiler, steam generator, or process heater is similar. They consist of a burner, firebox, heat exchanger and a means of creating and directing a flow of gases through the unit. The formation of NO by combustion processes is governed primarily by (1) the chemically bound nitrogen content of the fuel, (2) the oxygen concentration of the flame, (3) the temperature of the flame (thermal NO<sub>x</sub>), and (4) the length of time that the combustion gases are held at the flame temperature.

Similar to proposed Rule 360, Rule 361 will set specific NO<sub>x</sub> emission rates.

## Control Methods

The same control techniques in use for equipment subject to existing APCD Rule 342 (boilers, steam generators and process heaters with 5 million Btu per hour or greater heat input ratings) will work for units less than 5 million Btu per hour. The South Coast Air Quality Management District and Ventura County APCD have required NO<sub>x</sub> controls for combustion equipment in this class since the early 1990s.

The least costly NO<sub>x</sub> emission control techniques for boilers, steam generators, and process heaters can be broken down into two methods: (1) retrofitting of low-NO<sub>x</sub> emitting burners, (2) retrofitting of flue-gas-recirculation systems. These control methods are discussed below.

#### Low-NO<sub>x</sub> Burners

These burners are designed to control the combustion process with controlled air/fuel mixing and increased heat dissipation to minimize NO<sub>x</sub> formation. The low-NO<sub>x</sub> burners for atmospheric boilers actually prevent the formation of thermal NO<sub>x</sub>. The low-NO<sub>x</sub> burners for forced-draft units use a portion of the flue gas in a staged combustion process to decrease NO<sub>x</sub> emissions.

#### Flue Gas Recirculation (FGR)

This is a combustion modification that involves introducing part of the flue gas into the combustion zone to limit oxygen and peak temperatures, thus lowering NO<sub>x</sub> levels. Currently, FGR is the only technology available for reducing NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from forced-draft burners. Manufacturers refer to the addition of external recirculation equipment to an existing unit as FGR. Replacement burners with internal or built-in flue gas recirculation capability are referred to as low-NO<sub>x</sub> burners.

The APCD anticipates that most manufacturers already have low-NO<sub>x</sub> burners available for newer equipment (i.e., less than 10 years old) and that these burners can be installed relatively easily. For older equipment, complete replacement with complying equipment may be less expensive than trying to retrofit the existing equipment.

**Table 3-1 2001 Plan SEIR Control Measures and Compliance Methods**

Rule #	2001 CAP SEIR Control Measures <sup>2</sup>	Vap. Con	Reformuln	Trans. Eff.	Ext. Comb.	Int. Comb.	Post Comb	Electr Rep.	Alt Fuels	O and M.
323 (Revision)	R-SC-1 Architectural Coatings	x	x	x						x
321 (Revision)	R-SL-2 Solvent Degreasers	x	x							x
362 (New)	R-SL-2 Solvent Cleaning Operations	x	x							x
358 (New)	R-SL-4 Electronic Industry - Semiconductor Manufacturing	x	x							x
333 (Revised)	N-IC-1 and N-IC-3 Control of Emissions from Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines				x		x		x	x
363 (New)	N-IC-2 Gas-Fired Turbines					x	x			
360 (New)	N-XC-2 Large Water Heaters and Small Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters (75,000 Btu/Hr to less than 2 million Btu/Hr)				x					
361 (New)	N-XC-4 Small Industrial and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators and Process heaters (2 million Btu/Hr to less than 5 million Btu/Hr)				x					

<sup>2</sup> Proposed emission control measures are control measures to be adopted for the purpose of attaining the state 1-hour ozone standard and to be identified as *contingency* control measures for the purpose of maintaining the federal 1-hour ozone standard.

## **4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The following documents describe the existing Santa Barbara County environment setting and are incorporated herein by reference:

1. The 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan Environmental Impact Report (91-EIR-4, State Clearinghouse Number 91031045)
2. The 1994 Clean Air Plan Supplemental EIR (94-SD-3)
3. The 1998 Clean Air Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration (APCD-98-ND-01)

### **4.1 Environmental Issues of Focus**

Based on the previous environmental documents, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Hazards/Hazardous Material, Hydrology/Water Quality and Noise/Nuisance were identified as issue areas, which would potentially be affected by the implementation of this project. Issue areas with no potential to cause significant impacts are presented in Appendix A. The cumulative environmental impacts of all the proposed measures in the 2001 Plan and the potential environmental impacts of alternatives to the 2001 Plan project are discussed in Section 6 and Section 7 respectively. The following sections describe the Environmental and Regulatory Setting for each affected issue and the significance criteria used to evaluate project impacts.

### **4.2 Air Quality**

**Environmental Setting:** Based on air quality data collected in the three-year period 1997-1999, Santa Barbara County has not violated the federal one-hour ozone standard. However, the County continues to violate the state one-hour ozone and 24-hour PM<sub>10</sub> standards.

**Regulatory Setting:** The APCD has jurisdiction over the air resources of Santa Barbara County and the Outer Continental Shelf sources in the region for which the County is the corresponding onshore area.

**Significance Criteria:** A proposed project will not have a significant air quality effect on the environment if operation of the project will:

- emit (from all project sources) less than the daily trigger for offsets or AQIA set in the APCD New Source Review Rule, for any pollutant; and
- emit less than 25 pounds per day of NO<sub>x</sub> or ROC from motor vehicle trips only; and
- not cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone); and
- not exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board; and
- be consistent with adopted federal and state air quality plans.

### **4.3 Water Quality**

**Environmental Setting:** The 1991 AQAP EIR (page 3-33) discusses the existing water resources of Santa Barbara County. Water quality varies considerably from one water basin to another. In general, the water quality is being degraded due to agricultural runoff (fertilizers and pesticides); public and private sewage treatment systems (e.g., reclamation projects and septic tanks) and sea water intrusion from over pumping of aquifers.

**Regulatory Setting:** In general, discharges are also governed by regulations implemented by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Regulatory authority over waste discharges from the Outer Continental Shelf platforms into the surrounding waters lies with the U.S. Minerals Management Service and the EPA.

**Significance Criteria:** Any substantial degradation of existing water quality (marine or freshwater), contamination of a public water supply or depletion of groundwater supplies is considered to be a potentially significant adverse impact (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G).

### **4.4 Biological Resources**

**Environmental Setting:** The 1991 AQAP EIR (pages 3-33 through 3-38) discusses the existing biological resources of Santa Barbara County. Biologically sensitive offshore and coastal areas include, San Miguel Island Ecological Reserve, Channel Islands Marine Sanctuary, Santa Maria River Mouth, Santa Ynez Lagoon and many others. These areas are important habitat for numerous seabirds and shorebirds, northern fur seals and California sea lions, harbor seals, sea otters, migrating gray whales and various other marine life.

**Regulatory Setting:** Many federal, state and local regulations govern development in the offshore marine environment. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers issues permits for offshore construction activities in federal navigable waters under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act; the U.S. Minerals Management Service (MMS) Regional Manager has the primary authority to invoke a biological stipulation on certain OCS leases for the protection of marine biological habitat and populations. The MMS in conjunction with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service administer the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act and the National Ocean Pollution and Monitoring Act. At the state level, the California Coastal Commission, the California State Lands Commission, California Department of Fish and Game, the California State Water Resources Control Board have jurisdiction over the coastal areas of the County. The policies in the Santa Barbara County Local Coastal Plan and zoning ordinances, which generally conform to state and federal coastal zone management objectives, are administered by the Santa Barbara County Planning and Development Department.

**Significance Criteria:** The effects on biological resources are a function of the impacts on water quality, noise and nuisance and risk of upset. Any activity that would substantially affect a rare or endangered species of animal or the habitat of the species; interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species; or substantially diminish habitat

for fish, wildlife or plants is considered to be a significant adverse impact (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G).

#### **4.5 Noise/Nuisance**

**Environmental Setting:** The 1991 AQAP EIR discusses noise as an unwanted sound. The major sources of ambient noise in the County are from transportation on major highways, roadways, airports and the railroad. In general the noise levels in the urban, populated areas of the county range from 65 to 75 dB CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level).

**Regulatory Setting:** The County Planning and Development Department and the individual City Planning Departments issue land use permits. When a discretionary land use permit is required, noise levels at the property line are evaluated and must comply with the Noise Element of the Comprehensive Plan. In the workplace, Cal-OSHA implements and monitors their noise regulations.

**Significance Criteria:** Noise generated by a project in excess of 65 decibels CNEL that could affect sensitive receptors would be considered a significant adverse impact. A significant noise impact would also occur where interior noise could not be reduced to 45 dB CNEL or less (County Thresholds). Significant nuisance impacts would result from activities that create a public nuisance by substantially increasing vibration, odor, fugitive dust or glare.

#### **4.6 Risk of Upset**

**Environmental Setting:** Accidental releases of hazardous substances could occur during transportation. Transportation of hazardous wastes in the County includes transporting of rocket fuel to Vandenberg Air Force Base and hauling of hazardous wastes to Class I landfills outside the County. Fire/Explosion are primary hazards associated with drilling, production, bulk storage, processing and transportation of petroleum and petroleum by-products related to oil and gas facilities.

**Regulatory Setting:** The transport of hazardous wastes is regulated by the Federal Department of Transportation, the State Department of Health Services, the California Highway Patrol and Santa Barbara County. Fire/Explosion is the purview of the County fire department and the individual city/community fire departments.

**Significance Criteria:** When the frequency of an accidental event cannot be estimated, accidental releases are determined to be significant if it would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, i.e., could result in injury or death to the public (1991 AQAP EIR).

#### **4.7 Hazardous Materials**

**Environmental Setting:** The largest generator of hazardous wastes is the oil and gas industry, which generates about 68% (by weight) of the county's hazardous wastes. Other large generating industries include auto dealers and service stations (7%), utilities (5%) and the military (3%)



(1991 AQAP EIR). There are no Class I hazardous waste landfills in the County and most hazardous waste is hauled either by truck to the Chemical Waste Management Landfill at Kettleman City or by rail to Salt Lake City, Utah. Small business and household hazardous wastes are collected at the Hazardous Waste Collection Facility at the University of California's Santa Barbara campus and shipped out of the County periodically. Since the facility opened in 1992, the illegal disposal of small amounts of hazardous wastes is expected to have decreased.

**Regulatory Setting:** The California Department of Health Services Toxic Substances Control requires that hazardous waste shipped off-site be documented by a filed manifest identifying the type and quantity of wastes in the shipment and the origination and destination points.

**Significance Criteria:** The production, use or disposal of hazardous waste materials, which may pose a hazard to public or biological health, is considered to be a significant adverse impact (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G).

#### **4.8 Consistency with Applicable General Plans and Regional Plans**

CEQA Guidelines § 15125 requires a discussion of any inconsistencies between the project and applicable local and regional plans. Consistency of the 2001 Plan with applicable plans such as the County's Comprehensive Plan, local General Plans, the Congestion Management Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan is discussed below. The 2001 Plan is the County's air quality plan with which all other local and regional plans are also required to be consistent.

The County's Comprehensive Plan and the local General Plans are blueprints for future growth in the County. Consistency between the 2001 Plan and these plans means that stationary and vehicle emissions associated with the existing and future land use development and resulting population and traffic increases are accounted for in the 2001 Plan's emissions growth assumptions. The 2001 Plan generally relies on the land use and population projections provided in the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments' Regional Growth Forecast. This forecast is generally consistent with the local plans; therefore, the 2001 Plan is consistent with local general plans.

The air quality policies in the Air Quality Supplement of the County's Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan encourage mixed use development and alternative transportation modes. The 2001 CAP includes these policies in the transportation control measures section. Therefore, the 2001 Plan is consistent with the Air Quality Supplement.

The Congestion Management Plan and the Regional Transportation Plan are prepared by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). The Congestion Management Plan is a regional planning document that identifies and addresses congestion on designated roadways in the County. The Congestion Management Plan sets level of service standards for designated roadways in the County, and identifies the responsibilities of local jurisdictions in implementing the policies in the Congestion Management Plan. The responsibilities of the APCD include preparing a list of measures that could contribute to significant improvements in air quality for use by local jurisdictions in developing deficiency plans, and developing transportation control measures (TCM) in response to the federal and state Clean Air Acts. The

list of measures has been prepared and provided to SBCAG. Chapter 5 of the 2001 Plan presents TCMs designed to reduce ozone levels in the County. Therefore, the 2001 Plan is consistent with the Congestion Management Plan. The Regional Transportation Plan is a multi-modal regional planning document which identifies policies and capital improvements to meet the short-term and long-term needs of the County. The programs identified in the Regional Transportation Plan are required to be consistent with the transportation control strategies in the 2001 Plan as well as meeting federal transportation conformity requirements in order to be approved. In general, the Regional Transportation Plan programs result in a reduction in daily vehicle emission rates. Therefore, the 2001 Plan is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

## **5.0 PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Section 5 analyzes the environmental impacts of only those control measures that are new or modified in the 2001 Plan. The environmental impact analysis in this document supplements the analysis of control measures and compliance methods performed in the 1991 AQAP EIR. For a description of the environmental impacts of all the control measures (previously adopted) in the 2001 Plan please refer to the 1991 AQAP EIR. The project environmental impacts and residual impacts are classified as follows:

- a. Class I Impacts - Significant unavoidable adverse impacts for which the decision maker must adopt a statement of Overriding Consideration.
- b. Class II Impacts - Significant environmental impacts that can be feasibly mitigated or avoided for which the decision maker must adopt findings and recommended mitigation measures.
- c. Class III Impacts - Adverse impacts found not to be significant for which the decision maker does not have to adopt findings under CEQA.
- d. Class IV Impacts - Beneficial impacts (Beneficial impacts are described in detail in the 1991 AQAP EIR and are not reiterated in this document).

### **5.1 R-SC-1 Architectural Coatings (Proposed amendment to Existing Rule 323)**

Architectural coatings are coatings applied to stationary structures and their appurtenances. Examples include house paints, stains, industrial maintenance coatings, and traffic coatings. The painting of structures with architectural coatings and related equipment cleanup cause the release of ROC and toxic air contaminants (e.g., benzene, toluene and xylene) emissions. Architectural coatings are typically non-aerosol and include lacquers, sealers, maintenance coatings, primers, stains and enamels.

The APCD originally adopted Rule 323 (Architectural Coatings) on October 18, 1971 to regulate the reactive organic compound emissions from the application of architectural coatings. Since 1971, the rule has been amended eight times. The proposed rule amendment is based on ARB's June 2000 architectural coatings Suggested Control Measure (SCM) and limits the amount of ROC per liter in various architectural coatings that may be supplied, sold, offered for sale, applied, solicited for application, or manufactured for use within Santa Barbara County. The ROC content varies depending on coating application (e.g., primers, enamels, and stains).

The most practical and efficient way to reduce ROC emissions from this source category is through the use of coatings formulated with water, low solvent or exempt solvent bases. Coatings reformulated from solvent-based coatings to water-based coatings require less use of thinners and cleanup solvents. Therefore, emissions from thinner and cleanup use will also decrease.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, ARB, as lead agency, prepared a Program EIR (SCH No. 99062093) for the June 2000 SCM. This Program EIR, or PEIR, is incorporated by reference. The state CEQA Guidelines allow for the subsequent use of a PEIR

when agencies are evaluating the issuance of “rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria”. ARB anticipated that local air districts would rely upon the PEIR when deciding conducting their own environmental evaluation of adopting the SCM as a rule. The ARB PEIR included an analysis of environmental impacts that could potentially result from implementation of architectural coatings rules based on the SCM.

**Impacts:** The 1991 AQAP EIR discussed impacts as follows: Reformulation would reduce the emissions of toxic compounds such as benzene, toluene and xylene. Reformulation, however, could result in the use of other potentially toxic or carcinogenic exempt compounds (such as 1,1,1-trichloroethane (TCA), methylene chloride and trichlorotrifluoroethane). The release of toxic air contaminants may pose a hazard to public health. The manufacture of TCA and other compounds which are stratospheric ozone-depleting compounds will be phased out by the year 1996 to comply with the federal Clean Air Act. The potential impact to public health was classified as an adverse, but insignificant impact in the 1991 AQAP EIR (Class III). No mitigations were identified in the 1991 AQAP EIR.

The APCD reviewed the ARB PEIR to determine the scope of the EIR for this amendment to Rule 323 and determined that a tiered EIR should be prepared. The tiered EIR is under preparation and will address potential adverse effects on the following environmental categories: air quality, water, public services, transportation/ circulation, solid waste/hazardous waste, and hazards. A brief summary of the ARB PEIR and draft Rule 323 EIR is given below. When released for public review, the Rule 323 DEIR will discuss these impacts in more detail.

**Air Quality:** Reactive organic compound limits are proposed to be relaxed for nine of the coating categories, calculated to result in an 8.54 ton per year short-term emission increase beginning on the date of adoption of the proposed amendments to Rule 323. This temporary emission increase will be offset by subsequent emission reductions resulting in a net emission decrease of 45.37 tons per year beginning January 1, 2003 and a net emission decrease of 68.93 tons per year beginning January 1, 2004. This emission reduction estimate is based on the Suggested Control Measure reductions developed by the Air Resources Board staff corrected by the population of Santa Barbara County.

Some companies in the architectural coatings industry have claimed that lowering the ROC content of coatings results in increased ROC emissions for a variety of reasons: increased coating thickness, more thinning, more topcoats, more touch-ups, more priming, more frequent re-coating, more substitution with higher ROC coatings, and greater reactivity. Basically, these companies claim that new formulations result in more coating use, resulting in an overall increase in ROC emissions for a specific area covered or over time. Industry also asserts that more reactive solvents will be used in compliant formulations than those used in existing coatings, thus contributing to increased ozone formation. The draft EIR for Rule 323 will discuss these concerns. The PEIR concluded the claimed adverse impacts would not occur.

Another claim made by some companies is that increased application of acetone-based coatings has the potential to increase objectionable odors. However, acetone used as a replacement for other traditional solvents may have fewer odor impacts because it has a higher odor threshold than many other solvents currently used in coatings. Given that the proposed rule amendments

allow sufficient time for manufacturers to develop compliant coatings and solve any odor problems associated with reformulated coatings, no significant adverse odor impacts are expected from lowering the ROC content limits.

**Water:** The ARB PEIR analyzed the impacts of water demand if compliant coatings are reformulated with water. There could be increased demand for water use in manufacturing, surface preparation (power washing) and clean-up of coatings. Under a worst-case scenario, the projected water demand for reformulated coatings in the South Coast area was estimated to be 56,684 gallons per day (ARB Final PEIR, page IV-87). While there are projected drought-year shortages in some regions of California, these shortages would occur regardless of Rule 323. Surface preparation requirements are unlikely to change as a result of reformulation. Therefore, no significant additional water demand impacts, including the lowering of water tables or the depletion of groundwater, are expected as a result of implementing the amendments to Rule 323. The cumulative effects of the increased but insignificant water demand are also not considered significant because the threshold of significance is not exceeded. Therefore, cumulative impacts are also considered not significant.

Regarding improper disposal of the waste generated from water-borne coatings, the ARB PEIR analyzed various scenarios and concluded that current disposal practices are not expected to change as a result of amending Rule 323. Even if some users improperly disposed of their unused paint, the impacts are expected to be insignificant. Use of exempt solvents (solvents not considered to be ROCs, such as acetone and Oxsol 100) is expected to result in equivalent or fewer water quality impacts than currently used solvents (such as toluene, xylenes, mineral spirits and methyl ethyl ketone) since the exempt solvents are less toxic. Secondly, because currently available compliant coatings are already using water-borne technology, no additional water quality impacts from future compliant water-borne coatings are expected. The current manufacturing and cleanup practices associated with water-borne coatings are not expected to change as a result of the proposed rule amendments. Lastly, the proposed rule amendments are not expected to promote the use of compliant coatings formulated with hazardous solvents that could create water quality impacts.

The ARB PEIR states that the projected increase in wastewater flow from reformulated coatings to Publicly Owned Treatment Works in Santa Barbara County, under a worst case scenario would be 623 gallons per day or 0.0023% of the 1999 average daily wastewater flow. This is a negligible amount and will not result in the need for new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities.

**Public Services:** According to the National Fire Protection Association, acetone is considered to have the same flammability classification as the solvents it would replace when formulating low-ROC coatings. Since there would be no increased risk of fire hazard due to increased use of acetone, there will be no significant impact to fire protection services in Santa Barbara County, and no significance threshold will be exceeded.

**Transportation/Circulation:** The potential additional vehicle trips caused by the disposal of coatings due to the possibility of shorter shelf or pot lives or lesser freeze-thaw capabilities were

evaluated. The ARB PEIR analysis concluded that transportation/circulation impacts associated with the proposed rule amendments will be insignificant.

**Solid Waste/Hazardous Waste:** Some compliant coatings may be landfilled due to freeze-thaw, shelf life, or pot-life problems. However the total amount of solid waste and hazardous waste materials deposited in landfills will not create a significant solid waste or hazardous waste impact. For Santa Barbara County, anticipated solid waste impacts associated with implementing the SCM are 0.004% (Page IV-105 of ARB PEIR) of the total permitted throughput. This increase will not pose a significant impact for waste disposal.

**Hazards:** The increased use of acetone (a flammable substance) will generally be balanced by reduced usage of other equally or more hazardous materials such as methyl ethyl ketone, toluene, xylenes, etc. Further, emergency contingency plans that are already in place are expected to minimize potential hazards impacts posed by an increased use of acetone in future compliant coatings. In addition, businesses in Santa Barbara County are required to report increases in the storage of flammable and otherwise hazardous materials to local fire departments to ensure that adequate conditions are in place to protect against hazard impacts.

According to the ARB, it is also anticipated that resin manufacturers and coatings formulators will continue the trend of using less toxic or hazardous solvents such as Texanol and propylene glycol in their compliant water-borne coatings. Therefore, future compliant coatings will likely contain less hazardous or nonhazardous materials as compared to conventional coatings, a net benefit.

Lastly, while diisocyanates are more toxic than some conventional solvents, they are significantly less flammable. Thus the overall risk of upset is not significantly increased as a result of using compliant coatings containing diisocyanates.

Any increase in accidental releases of future compliant coatings materials would be expected to result in a concurrent reduction in the number of accidental releases of existing coatings materials. Further, it is anticipated that resin manufacturers and coatings formulators will continue the trend of using less hazardous solvents such as Texanol, Oxsol 100 and propylene glycol in their compliant coatings. It is expected that future compliant coatings will contain less hazardous materials as compared to conventional coatings, resulting in a net benefit and also reducing the long-term human health risks from the use of compliant coatings.

No significant impacts were identified in the ARB PEIR and no significant impacts are anticipated with the adoption of the proposed revisions to Rule 323.

## **5.2 R-SL-2 Solvent Degreasing (Proposed amendment to Existing Rule 321)**

Rule 321 requires the proper handling and disposal of cleanup solvents used in equipment cleaning. Mitigation measures were included in the Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) of the 1994 CAP SEIR to notify the applicable jurisdictions during the permit review and compliance process. Residual impacts were classified as insignificant.

Additional control techniques that could be incorporated into the proposed amendment to Rule 321 include:

1. Requiring air-tight or airless cleaning systems in lieu of meeting the requirements for batch-loaded cold cleaners or open-top vapor degreasers.
2. Increasing the minimum freeboard ratio from 0.75 to 1 on open-top vapor degreasers and conveyorized degreasers.
3. Requiring that the solvent have an ROC content of 50 grams per liter or less for batch-loaded cold cleaners and conveyorized cold cleaners.

The 1991 AQAP EIR described the environmental impacts of this measure on page 5-18. Class II (insignificant after mitigation) impacts were identified for Noise/ Nuisance, Hazardous Wastes, Risk of Upset, Water Resources, and Biological Resources as a result of the use of vapor control techniques. No additional impacts that were not discussed in previous environmental documents will occur as a result of implementing the above-mentioned additional control techniques.

No new mitigations will be required. Residual impacts are insignificant.

### **5.3 R-SL-2 Solvent Cleaning Operations (New Rule 362)**

The control measure techniques for proposed new Rule 362 will:

- Apply to wipe cleaning (currently exempt from Rule 321).
- Set solvent composite partial pressure limits and ROC limits in grams/liter (and equivalent pounds per gallon) for specific solvent cleaning activities, grouped in the following categories:
  - Product cleaning during manufacturing process or surface preparation for coating, adhesive, or ink application
  - Repair and maintenance cleaning
  - Cleaning of coatings, or adhesives application equipment
  - Cleaning of ink application equipment
  - Cleaning of polyester resin application equipment
- Require certain cleaning methods or devices (wipe cleaning, closed containers or hand held spray bottles, solvent container that can be closed, remote reservoir cleaners, approved non-atomized solvent flow, and approved solvent flushing methods).
- Require proper storage and disposal of all ROC-containing solvents. The operators will need to store the solvents in non-absorbent, non-leaking containers, which will be kept closed at all times except when filling or emptying.

The 1991 AQAP EIR (page 5-18) analyzed the environmental impacts of control measure R-SL-2 for degreasing operations and discussed impacts on air quality and water quality, biological resources, risk of upset, utilities/energy and hazardous wastes, related to vapor recovery methods. The environmental impacts were classified as Class II (insignificant, after mitigation) Class III (adverse but insignificant) or Class IV (beneficial).

Class II impacts were related to water quality degradation due to hazardous wastewater produced in the steam- regeneration of canisters used in carbon adsorption. Mitigation included ensuring proper treatment and disposal of substances, which could potentially contaminate potable water supplies. Fire hazard from carbon particles charged with solvents was also classified as Class II. Mitigation was to maintain temperatures below the Lower Explosion Limit of the compounds and to isolate potential fire and explosive hazards from flames and sparks.

The potential for the use of low-ROC substitutes which are toxic and/or associated with stratospheric ozone depletion, e.g., 1,1,1 trichloroethane as cleaning solvents was classified as an adverse but insignificant (Class III) impact in the 1991 AQAP EIR (page 4-15). Water supply impacts due to water used in steam-regeneration of used carbon canisters was classified as insignificant. Other impacts were classified as insignificant or beneficial.

#### **5.4 R-SL-4 Electronic Industry – Semiconductor Manufacturing (New Rule 358)**

Semiconductor manufacturers use organic solvents in coatings, stripping materials, and cleaning operations. Use of photoresist is an integral process of semiconductor manufacturing and ROC emissions occur from the application, exposure, and development of photoresist. Semiconductor manufacturers also use inorganic toxic gases called dopants in certain steps to give the devices desirable electronic characteristics. About 99 percent of the dopants diffuse into the wafers. The semiconductor manufacturers collect most of the solvents in liquid form for reclamation or waste disposal.

Control techniques used to implement this proposed rule will be similar to the techniques used for Solvent operations described above.

- To achieve the 90 percent control, semiconductor manufacturers will need to install control equipment, such as incinerators or carbon adsorbers.
- Good housekeeping procedures for photoresist operations and solvent cleaning stations to prevent spills and unnecessary evaporation.
- Covers on all solvent reservoirs, sinks, and containers that are in place when the operators are not using the equipment.
- Freeboards such that the freeboard ratios (freeboard height divided by the smaller of the inside length or the inside width or, if applicable, the diameter) are greater than or equal to 1.0 for all solvent station reservoirs, sinks, and containers.
- Low vapor pressure solvents and/or low-ROC solvents.

The 1991 AQAP EIR (page 5-18) analyzed the environmental impacts of control measure R-SL-2 for degreasing operations and discussed impacts on air quality and water quality, biological resources, risk of upset, utilities/energy and hazardous wastes, related to vapor recovery



methods. The environmental impacts were classified as Class II (insignificant, after mitigation) Class III (adverse but insignificant) or Class IV (beneficial).

Class II impacts were related to water quality degradation due to hazardous wastewater produced in the steam- regeneration of canisters used in carbon adsorption. Mitigation included ensuring proper treatment and disposal of substances, which could potentially contaminate potable water supplies. Fire hazard from carbon particles charged with solvents was also classified as Class II. Mitigation was to maintain temperatures below the Lower Explosion Limit of the compounds and to isolate potential fire and explosive hazards from flames and sparks.

The potential for the use of low-ROC substitutes which are toxic and/or associated with stratospheric ozone depletion, e.g., 1,1,1 trichloroethane as cleaning solvents was classified as an adverse but insignificant (Class III) impact in the 1991 AQAP EIR (page 4-15). Water supply impacts due to water used in steam-regeneration of used carbon canisters was classified as insignificant. Other impacts were classified as insignificant or beneficial.

### **5.5 N-IC-1 and N-IC-3 Stationary Internal Combustion Engines (Proposed amendment to Existing Rule 333)**

Rule 333 applies to permitted spark-ignited and compression-ignited internal combustion engines that have a horsepower rating greater than or equal to 50 bhp. Engine owners and operators have complied with the requirements of Rule 333 by switching to electric motors, installing selective catalytic reduction equipment, nonselective catalytic reduction equipment, retarding diesel engine injection timing, lean-burn tuning of rich burn spark-ignited engines, retarding the ignition on spark-ignited engines, and using other combustion modification systems. These control techniques can be used to comply with the amended Rule 333.

**Impacts:** Rule 333 was adopted in November 1991. The 1991 AQAP EIR identified potentially significant impacts which were mitigated fully (Class II) in the areas of Air Quality, Water Resources, Biological Resources and Hazardous Materials.

**Air Quality:** The air quality impacts stem from the use of post combustion treatment processes which require the use of a catalyst (Selective Catalytic Reduction and Non Selective Catalytic Reduction) which can result in the release of heavy metals, such as vanadium pentoxide. Ammonia slip (release of unused ammonia gas) is also a potential impact. However, SCR and NSCR are unlikely to be used on the Outer Continental Shelf platforms due to lack of space for the required equipment. Therefore, the impact is considered adverse but insignificant (Class III).

**Water Quality:** Ground and surface water could become contaminated by materials such as aqueous ammonia. Ammonia released into marine waters would have no significant effect since sea water has an excellent buffering capacity. Therefore, the impact on water quality is considered adverse but insignificant.

**Hazardous Wastes:** Hazardous wastes generated would include spent SCR and NSCR catalysts. California law currently requires the proper handling, transportation and disposal of hazardous wastes. The 1991 AQAP EIR encouraged waste minimization practices such as

regeneration and recycling. No new impacts are expected due to the implementation of Rule 333 on the OCS. Therefore, the impact classification remains potentially significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** In accordance with the MMP in the 1991 AQAP EIR, the APCD is required to notify the appropriate agencies of the potential hazardous waste generation as part of the permit and compliance process. This notification was extended to include appropriate federal agencies with jurisdiction over the OCS when the 1994 CAP was adopted.

**Residual Impacts:** Insignificant.

## **5.6 N-IC-2 Gas Turbines (Proposed Rule 363)**

This measure aims to reduce emissions of NO<sub>x</sub> from onshore and offshore gas turbines. Compliance methods include water injection, post combustion treatment by selective catalytic reduction (SCR) or internal combustion modification. Operational modifications by proper engine tuning may also be necessary. The use of anhydrous ammonia as a reducing agent for SCR is prohibited.

**Impacts:** This control measure would rely on one of the following control techniques to achieve emission limits: water or steam injection, dry low-NO<sub>x</sub> combustors or selective catalytic reduction and other post combustion technologies. The 1991 AQAP analyzed the impacts of controls on gas fired turbines as measure N-IC-2. Except for the issue areas of Water Resources and Hazardous Materials, all impacts are Class III (adverse but insignificant). For those two issue areas, the impacts are Class II (insignificant after mitigation) and mitigation measures are provided. The impacts are summarized below:

**Air quality** - NO<sub>x</sub> reductions resulting from this control measure may lead to localized increases in ambient ozone concentrations, also known as the “scavenging effect”. This effect is not considered significant based on the regional reduction in ozone precursor emissions that would result from the 2001 Plan. Steam or water injection will decrease turbine efficiency, thus causing increases in other criteria pollutants. Selective catalytic reduction may increase particulate matter emissions that can be minimized by using low sulfur fuels or a low oxidizing catalyst. Additionally ammonia which is toxic, can be released in relatively low concentrations (< 10 ppm) when using selective catalytic reduction control. Steam/water injection and low NO<sub>x</sub> combustors could increase fuel usage that would in turn increase emissions of toxic air contaminants. The impact is not considered to be significant because of the relatively low concentrations involved. All impacts are Class III (adverse but insignificant) and no mitigation measures are required.

**Transportation/Circulation** – post combustion technologies that use catalysts or reducing agents will require service visits for the operation and maintenance of the equipment. These visits are infrequent (bi-monthly at the most) and will not affect the level of service on roadways. Impacts are Class III.

**Water Resources** – the quantity of water is used in steam or water injection, for washing catalytic reduction systems and to produce aqueous ammonia for use in catalytic reduction

systems is expected to be minimal. Impacts to water supply are considered to be Class III. The release of hazardous substances such as aqueous ammonia could substantially degrade water quality or contaminate a public water supply and is considered to be a significant adverse impact (Class II). Mitigation measures include proper treatment and disposal of substances that could potentially contaminate potable water supplies, reducing the risk of upset and establishing appropriate clean-up procedures.

**Biological Resources** – the adverse impacts identified in the other issue areas for this control measure have the potential to affect the County’s biological resources. However none of those impacts have been identified as unavoidable if adequate mitigation measures are applied. Any adverse effects to biological resources would be localized by comparison to the regional benefits of the 2001 Plan.

**Noise/Nuisance** – post combustion techniques could increase (a) odors from the use of ammonia-based reducing agents and (b) smoke and dust from releasing titanium oxide dust. The impacts are considered to be Class III.

**Risk of Upset** – the transport, storage and use of post combustion reducing agents such as aqueous ammonia are subject to accidental release if not properly handled. Compliance with all applicable regulations will reduce the potential for impacts. The impacts are considered to be Class III.

**Public Services** – the release of post combustion reducing agents will impact public fire/emergency response services. These agencies are trained and familiar with these releases. The impacts are considered to be Class III.

**Utilities/Energy** – steam or water injection will reduce energy efficiency and require more fuel to be used. This impact is considered to be Class III.

**Hazardous Materials** – used catalysts from post combustion controls would contain heavy metals that are considered to be hazardous wastes. This is a Class II impact that can be mitigated by properly treating and disposing all hazardous wastes in a certified Class I landfill.

## **5.7 N-XC-2 Large Water Heaters and Small Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters (New Rule 360)**

The new proposed Rule 360 applies to large water heaters and small boilers, steam generators and process heaters between 75,000 Btu/hr to < 2 million Btu/hr heat input rating.

**Impacts:** The techniques to reduce the formation of nitrogen oxides are to lower the peak flame temperature or to reduce the amount of air flowing to the burner, both of which can be accomplished by appropriate design of the burner (see Appendix B of the 2001 Plan for details). The 1991 AQAP EIR (page 5-48) analyzed the impacts for commercial water heaters (Measure N-XC-2) with heat input ratings between 75,000 Btu/hour and 2 million Btu/hour. Class III (adverse but insignificant) impacts were found for air quality and utilities/energy.

**Air Quality:** With respect to air quality, lower flame temperatures could result in minor increases of ROC emissions. However, they would be offset in part by increased combustion efficiency that would reduce the quantity of fuel burned. NO<sub>x</sub> reductions resulting from this control measure may lead to localized increases in ambient ozone concentrations, also known as the “scavenging effect”. This effect is not considered significant based on the regional reduction in ozone precursor emissions that would result from the 2001 Plan.

**Utilities/Energy:** There could be increases in electricity use as manufacturers add fans and blowers to burner units to provide better mixing of the air and fuel and to better control the amount of air. These increases, however, are considered to be minor.

No mitigation measures are required.

No new impacts that were not discussed in previous environmental documents will occur due to the adoption of this control measure.

## **5.8 N-XC-4 Small Industrial and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators and Process Heaters (New Rule 361)**

New Rule 361 applies to large water heaters and small boilers, steam generators and process heaters between 2 million Btu/hr to < 5 million Btu/hr heat input.

**Impacts:** The control methods are low NO<sub>x</sub> burners and flue gas recirculation systems. Low NO<sub>x</sub> burners are designed to control the combustion process with controlled air/fuel mixing and increased heat dissipation to minimize NO<sub>x</sub> formation. Flue gas recirculation involves introducing part of the flue gas into the combustion zone to limit oxygen and peak flame temperatures, thus lowering NO<sub>x</sub> levels. The 1991 AQAP analyzed the impacts of both of these control methods as measure N-XC-4 (page 5-49). Class III (adverse but insignificant) impacts were identified in the following issue areas:

**Air quality** - lower flame temperatures could result in minor increases of ROC emissions. Any increases would be offset in part by improved combustion efficiency that would reduce the quantity of fuel burned. NO<sub>x</sub> reductions resulting from this control measure may lead to localized increases in ambient ozone concentrations, also known as the “scavenging effect”. This effect is not considered significant based on the regional reduction in ozone precursor emissions that would result from the 2001 Plan.

**Noise/Nuisance** – the fan used in flue gas recirculation would marginally increase noise and vibrations; however, these increases would be minimal relative to the existing commercial/industrial environment.

**Risk of Upset** – the improper use of flue gas recirculation and radiant ceramic low NO<sub>x</sub> burners could result in explosions. However, properly operated flame sensors and ignition controls will prevent these potential upset conditions.

**Utilities/Energy** – flue gas recirculation may result in a slight decrease in thermal efficiency and consequently greater fuel use. The flue gas recirculation fan will cause a slight increase in electricity use.

**Hazardous Waste** – the disposal of ceramic burners which contain fibers that have been associated with lung tumors and mesothelioma in laboratory animals, may require handling similar to asbestos waste.

No mitigation measures are required.

No new impacts that were not discussed in previous environmental documents will occur due to the adoption of this control measure.

## **6.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

CEQA defines cumulative impacts as "two or more individual effects which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts... The cumulative impacts from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355).

The 1991 AQAP EIR examined two primary issues of concern that involve cumulative impacts beyond county borders, air pollution transport and electric power generation. Air pollution transport is considered to occur between Santa Barbara County, adjacent counties, the South Coast Air Basin (Los Angeles), and the Outer Continental Shelf. The cumulative effect of air quality plans of other districts was considered a beneficial effect. Secondly, the cumulative effect of control measures for replacing fossil-fueled equipment with electric equipment and the resulting effect on energy demand was discussed. The 1991 AQAP EIR concluded that it would be speculative to draw any conclusions on this issue.

Since the 1991 AQAP EIR included the Outer Continental Shelf and other issues in the discussion of cumulative impacts, no further discussion is provided in this SEIR for the 2001 Plan.

## **7.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project (including the "No Project Alternative") that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. The discussion of alternatives must focus on alternatives capable of eliminating any adverse environmental effects of reducing them to a level of insignificance, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or would be more costly (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126 (d) (3)).

The key issue in determining the range of alternatives is whether the selection and discussion of alternatives fosters informed decision-making and informed public participation. The EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. A feasible alternative is one that can be "accomplished within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, legal, social and technological factors" (Public Resources Code 21061.1).

The 1991 AQAP EIR evaluated the effects of three alternatives, a No Project Alternative, a less stringent control alternative and a more stringent control alternative as compared to the effects of the 1991 AQAP. The No Project Alternative and the less stringent Alternative were not considered to meet the basic objective of the 1991 AQAP, i.e., the attainment of the state ozone standard. The more stringent alternative was assessed to have a substantially higher cost.

In this SEIR for the 2001 Plan, the alternatives analysis focuses on eliminating any adverse environmental effects of implementing the 2001 Plan as proposed or reducing the adverse effects to a level of insignificance. The adverse environmental impacts identified in the SEIR may be attributed to improper hazardous waste generation and disposal (e.g., disposal of used carbon adsorption canisters, or paints), the use and transportation of hazardous or toxic substances in air pollution control and the use of stratospheric ozone depleting substitution compounds in the solvent industry. Therefore, based on these adverse impacts, two alternatives were selected. These are the required No Project Alternative and an alternative requiring the APCD to encourage the use of less environmentally harmful compliance methods where feasible. The impacts of these alternatives are evaluated in comparison to the 2001 Plan.

Another potential alternative plan with a less stringent, market-based Regulatory Flexibility Program may be considered. However, this alternative, which was also introduced as a proposed program in the 1998 CAP, may not serve to reduce the adverse environmental effects of the proposed project, but is an alternative means of achieving the objective of the 2001 Plan based solely on economical feasibility.

### **Alternative 1. The No Project Alternative**

The No Project Alternative consists of not adopting the 2001 Plan. If the 2001 Plan is not adopted, the 1998 CAP would continue to be in effect. The 1998 CAP does not address federal planning requirements for maintenance areas. It also does not fulfill the California Clean Air Act requirements for the triennial update of the 1991 AQAP. Consequently, the primary objective of the 2001 Plan will not be met and the No Project Alternative is not viable.

## **Alternative 2. The Environmentally Superior Alternative.**

The control measures in the 2001 Plan and previous air quality attainment plans do not specify the compliance methods that must be used to achieve the specified emission limits. As discussed in the 1991 AQAP EIR and this supplemental EIR, certain compliance methods may result in potentially significant adverse impacts to air quality, water resources, biological resources, hazardous waste disposal and risk of upset. Mitigation measures to reduce these adverse impacts consist of notification of the various local, state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over these issues. However, these impacts could be avoided if compliance methods approved by the APCD for use by an operator were examined to select those with the least cross-media environmental impacts. In terms of significant environmental impacts, compared to the 2001 Plan as proposed, the Environmentally Superior Alternative will not be substantially different. The residual impacts of the 2001 Plan (after mitigation measures have been applied) are insignificant. Adopting the Environmentally Superior Alternative may not be feasible, taking into account economic, legal, social and technological factors. Therefore, this is not considered a viable option although it may be the environmentally superior alternative.



## **8.0 OTHER CEQA TOPICS**

Section 8 includes the CEQA topics of: the environmentally superior project, the Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity, Significant Irreversible Changes, Growth Inducing Impacts, Socio-Economic Impacts and Consistency with applicable Plans and Policies. The following sections summarize the discussion of these issues in the 1991 AQAP EIR. Since the 2001 Plan is similar to the 1991 AQAP the discussion has not been amended for this SEIR.

### **8.1 Relationship Between Short-term Uses and Long-term Productivity**

As required by Section 15126 (e) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the 1991 AQAP EIR discussed the cumulative and long-term effects of the 1991 AQAP which adversely affect the environment and justified why the project must be implemented now rather than in the future. The 2001 Plan is similar to the 1991 AQAP and there are some short term costs associated with the implementation of the plan in terms of commitment of financial, material and human resources. No significant environmental impacts which cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance were identified. The air quality benefits of implementing the control measures, improving the efficiency of natural resource use and transportation systems, will enhance long term productivity. The reason for considering the implementation of the 2001 Plan now, instead of in the future, is because of Federal and State Clean Air Acts mandates.

### **8.2 Significant Irreversible Changes**

The 1991 AQAP EIR did not identify any significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126 (f)). The 2001 Plan like the 1991 AQAP would require an incremental use of limited non-renewable resources, such as water, energy, minerals and land. However, the increment use due to the new and revised control measures in the 2001 Plan are not significant.

### **8.3 Growth Inducing Impacts**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(g) requires the discussion of the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. The 1991 AQAP EIR stated it is plausible that the improved air quality in the county could encourage people to move to the area as a healthier place to live, but it would be highly speculative to attempt to separate normal growth under the County's General Plan from that specifically resulting from the clean air plan.

### **8.4 Socio-economic Impacts**

The 1991 AQAP EIR discussed the beneficial socio-economic impacts of the plan, such as reduced health care costs, reducing damage to crops and forest, and reduced deterioration of some paints, dyes and textile fibers. Cost savings due to increased fuel efficiencies and growth of emission control industries were also cited.

The adverse socio-economic impacts of the control measures were listed as increased capital and/or operation and maintenance costs to individual businesses or residents. These were classified as adverse but not significant in the 1991 AQAP EIR.

## **APPENDIX A - Initial Study**



## **INITIAL STUDY**

**PROJECT NAME:** 2001 Clean Air Plan

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Santa Barbara County, State Tidelands and Outer Continental Shelf waters within 25 miles of the seaward boundaries of the State and located off the coast of the County for which the Air Pollution Control District is the corresponding onshore area.

**PROJECT SPONSOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS:**

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District  
26 Castilian Drive, B-23  
Goleta, California 93117

**LEAD AGENCY CONTACT PERSON INFORMATION:**

*Name:* Dr. Ron Tan  
*Title:* Air Quality Engineer  
*Phone:* 805.961.8812  
*Fax:* 805.961.8801  
*e-mail:* tanr@sbcapcd.org

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The 2001 Clean Air Plan for Santa Barbara County (2001 Plan), prepared by the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) is a comprehensive strategy to meet the requirements of both the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 and the California Clean Air Act of 1988.

As required by the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments, the 2001 Plan is a revision of the 1998 Clean Air Plan (1998 CAP). In addition, the 2001 Plan addresses all federal planning requirements for "Maintenance Plans" and provides for ongoing maintenance of the federal one-hour ozone standard through the year 2015. The 2001 Plan also formally requests that USEPA re-designate Santa Barbara County as an attainment area for the federal one-hour ozone standard. In addition, this 2001 Plan re-establishes on-road

mobile source reactive organic compound (ROC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) emission budgets to address the requirements of transportation conformity.

The 2001 Plan also addresses the California Clean Air Act requirements for the triennial update of the 1998 CAP, which updated the 1994 Clean Air Plan (1994 CAP) and the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (1991 AQAP). The 2001 Plan like the previous air quality attainment plans includes both stationary source control measures and transportation control measures. The implementation of the control measures in the 2001 Plan will reduce emissions of the ozone precursors (reactive organic compounds and oxides of nitrogen) and help the County to maintain the federal one-hour ozone standard and make progress in attaining the state ozone standard.

The majority of the control measures evaluated for the 2001 Plan are substantially the same as the control measures in the 1998 CAP, 1994 CAP and the 1991 AQAP. However, 8 control measures (3 revised measures and 5 new measures) are proposed in the 2001 Plan (Table 1). Four measures (those whose CAP Control Measure ID in Table 1 commence with a "R") will reduce the emissions of ROC and five measures (those whose CAP Control Measure ID in Table 1 commence with a "N") will reduce the emissions of NO<sub>x</sub>. These proposed measures are *to be adopted* as APCD Rules for the purpose of attaining the state one-hour ozone standard and are identified as *contingency* measures for the purpose of maintaining the federal one-hour ozone standard.

**TABLE A-1 PROPOSED APCD CONTROL MEASURES<sup>3</sup>**

Rule #	CAP Control Measure ID	Description	Previous Environmental Review
323	R-SC-1	Architectural Coatings (Revision)	1991 AQAP EIR APCD-EIR-2001 [SCH # 2001051120]
333	N-IC-1 N-IC-3	Stationary Internal Combustion Engines (Revisions to Rules 333 and 202 – change from 100 to < 50 brake horse power exemption)	1991 AQAP EIR 1991 Addendum
360	N-XC-2	Large Water Heaters and Small Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters (75,000 Btu/hr to < 2 million Btu/hr heat input) (New)	1991 AQAP EIR
321	R-SL-2	Solvent Degreasers (Revision)	1991 AQAP EIR
362	R-SL-2	Solvent Cleaning Operations (Use of Low-ROC or Aqueous Solvents) (New)	1991 AQAP EIR
363	N-IC-2	Gas Turbines (New)	1991 AQAP EIR
358	R-SL-4	Electronic Industry - Semiconductor Manufacturing (New)	1991 AQAP EIR
361	N-XC-4	Small Industrial and Commercial Boilers, Steam Generators, and Process Heaters (2 million Btu/hr to < 5 million Btu/hr heat input) (New)	1991 AQAP EIR

<sup>3</sup> Proposed emission control measures are control measures to be adopted for the purpose of attaining the state 1-hour ozone standard and to be identified as *contingency* control measures for the purpose of maintaining the federal 1-hour ozone standard.

## **OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED**

- ❑ California Air Resources Board
- ❑ US Environmental Protection Agency

## **PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS:**

### 1989 Air Quality Attainment Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 89012511)

The 1989 AQAP EIR was a program EIR, prepared by the APCD to assess the impacts of the 1989 Federal Air Quality Attainment Plan (1989 AQAP). The 1989 AQAP applied only to the southern portion of Santa Barbara County. It was required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to demonstrate attainment of the Federal one-hour ozone standard in Santa Barbara County. The 1989 AQAP EIR examined the potential environmental effects of the 1989 AQAP, including the impacts of a county-wide implementation option examined in the alternatives section of the EIR. The 1989 AQAP EIR did not identify any significant impacts that could not be mitigated to insignificant levels.

The environmental impacts of greatest concern stemmed from the use of anhydrous ammonia in several control technologies for the reduction of nitrogen oxides. The potential for an accident, most likely to occur during transportation, involving a massive release of anhydrous ammonia gas, was considered to present a significant risk to public health and safety. Therefore, the use of anhydrous ammonia in NO<sub>x</sub> control was prohibited in the 1989 AQAP and in subsequent documents for the implementation of the control technology through the adoption of rules. A projected increase in traffic from service and supply vehicles to multiple facilities in the same area was also classified as a potentially significant impact to existing traffic congestion. The mitigation measure in the EIR required APCD permit conditions to specify and require documentation of delivery schedules which avoid peak traffic hours for such facilities. No other potentially significant impacts were identified. The 1989 AQAP EIR is used as a reference document for this initial study.

### 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 9103105)

The 1991 AQAP EIR affected all of Santa Barbara County. It was required under the 1988 California Clean Air Act for areas that do not meet the state's air quality standards (i.e., nonattainment areas). The 1991 AQAP was intended to achieve a five percent annual reduction in emissions (both ROC and NO<sub>x</sub>) until the state ozone standard is met. The 1991 AQAP presented a detailed description of the air quality of the county and meteorological conditions primarily responsible for ozone formation, an inventory of the pollutant sources, short and long term air pollution control measure strategies, and the future air quality impacts expected under current and projected growth trends.

Reductions in emissions of ozone precursors, ROC and NO<sub>x</sub>, are realized through the implementation of control measures. Table 2-3 in the Final 1991 AQAP EIR listed the

emission control measures analyzed in the 1991 AQAP EIR along with the associated compliance methods.

The 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) identified rule requirements, compliance methods, and potential environmental impacts from the compliance methods required by the APCD rules. The following compliance methods (control systems and/or control techniques) identified in the 1991 AQAP EIR could be used to comply with the APCD Rules and Regulations:

VR	Vapor Recovery
RE	Reformulation
TE	Transfer Efficiency
EC	External Combustion Modification
IC	Internal Combustion Modification
PC	Post-Combustion Modification
EL	Electric Motor Replacement
CF	Alternative Combustion Fuels
OM	Operational Modifications

In addition, the following general methods were included for use in complying with Transportation Control Measures:

TR	Trip Reduction
TF	Traffic Flow Improvement
AF	Alternative Transportation Fuels

#### Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts of the 1991 AQAP

The 1991 AQAP EIR evaluated the impacts of the 1991 AQAP as a whole, based on the compliance methods which would be employed to implement the control measures. The EIR also evaluated the environmental impacts of the individual control measures which were adopted in the 1991 AQAP. A summary of the compliance methods that could be used by the affected sources to comply with individual control measures was provided in Section 2.1 of the 1991 AQAP EIR. The environmental impacts of the 1991 AQAP are summarized below.

No unavoidable potentially significant adverse impacts were identified (i.e., Class I impacts). The potentially significant adverse impacts of the 1991 AQAP that could be mitigated to a level of insignificance (i.e., Class II impacts) are associated with toxic and hazardous materials, or other public safety concerns on a regional basis. Public safety (related to transportation and risk of upset), water resources, biological, and hazardous waste generation were areas where mitigation was required to avoid potentially significant adverse impacts. Most of the adverse environmental effects of the 1991 AQAP were classified as not significant.



One area of concern that had been identified as significant in the 1991 AQAP EIR (and the EIR on the 1989 AQAP), is the use of anhydrous ammonia. The potential for a Class I impact was avoided in the 1991 AQAP by eliminating the use of anhydrous ammonia in emission control equipment and substituting the use of urea or aqueous ammonia as a reducing agent in the selective catalytic reduction and selective non-catalytic reduction processes. However, the substitution creates a tradeoff where the potential for impacts to water resources and biological resources increases and the risk of upset is reduced in significance. Impacts to water and biological resources were considered insignificant after mitigation.

The effects of emissions of Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) was another area of concern associated with the AQAP. The 1991 AQAP, when fully implemented, will affect a broad range of sources associated with TAC emissions. Most of ROC control measures reduce emissions by containing volatile compounds in the system. Since TACs are constituents of many of these compounds (especially ROCs from combustion), they are also reduced. However, solvents and coatings that have been reformulated to reduce ROC may be replaced with toxic compounds which are exempt from restrictions of APCD Rules and Regulations.

Nitrogen oxide control measures that increase energy efficiency also reduce TAC emissions associated with combustion fuels. But other controls reduce NO<sub>x</sub> at the expense of decreased fuel efficiency resulting in increased TAC emissions associated with fuel combustion. Thus, the actual implementation of 1991 AQAP had the potential to affect TAC emissions in an opposing manner. Overall, the reductions in TAC were greater than the increases. The EIR identified the positive and negative effects of the individual compliance methods.

Transportation control measures were associated with the potential to result in impacts such as: the use of hazardous alternative transportation fuels, increased transit system demand, public works demands, and public safety. The use of methanol as a substitute transportation fuel was cited as a potentially significant impact because of its physical and chemical properties and the need to transport greater quantities. The 1991 AQAP did not specify the means of achieving vehicle emission reductions. Instead, it required local jurisdictions to implement TCM plans that are appropriate for the locality by using any of a number of suggested Transportation Mitigation Measures. The use of methanol was not encouraged. Other potentially adverse effects were identified, but could not be clearly tied to significance criteria on a regional basis.

Overall the 1991 AQAP, when fully implemented, will improve the quality of the environment by improving air quality, and increase the efficiency of the use of natural resources and the transportation of goods and people. Long-term impacts and effects on productivity were considered beneficial or insignificant if adverse. No significant irreversible changes were identified. Growth-inducing impacts were related to improved air quality and in turn the increased desirability to live in the county. The 1991 AQAP EIR concluded that it would be highly speculative, however, to attempt to separate

normal growth under the county's General Plan from that specifically resulting from the 1991 AQAP.

The 1991 AQAP EIR included a Mitigation Monitoring Plan to implement the measures required to reduce potentially significant impacts to a level of insignificance (see Appendix D of the 1991 AQAP EIR).

The 1991 AQAP control measures have been adopted as APCD rules or are currently going through the rule adoption process. Before being adopted as rules, individual CEQA review was done. The 1991 AQAP EIR and those CEQA documents which were addenda to the 1991 AQAP EIR are also used as references for this Initial Study.

#### 1993 Federal Rate-of-Progress Plan EIR

The 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments (1990 FCAAA) required all ozone nonattainment areas classified as moderate and above to submit a Rate-of-Progress Plan (1993 ROP Plan) to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency by November 15, 1993. The 1993 ROP Plan affected all of Santa Barbara County. The purpose of the 1993 ROP Plan was to develop an inventory of ozone season emissions, an adjusted "base year inventory" for 1990 and a plan showing ROC emission reductions of at least 15% by November 15, 1996. The base year for the 15% emission reduction was 1990. Therefore, any emission reductions resulting from rules adopted from 1990 onward counted towards the 15% reduction needed under the 1990 FCAAA. For this reason existing and pending rules were included in the 1993 ROP Plan.

The implementation of the control measures in the 1993 ROP Plan was intended to reduce emissions of ROC, one of the ozone precursors. The majority of the ROC control measures in the 1993 Plan were substantially the same as the ROC control measures in the 1991 AQAP. Therefore, the finding was made that the 1991 AQAP EIR adequately described the general environmental setting of the project, significant environmental impacts of the project and alternatives and mitigation measures related to each significant effect. To be sufficient, both the circumstances and the environmental impacts of the two projects (the 1991 AQAP and the 1993 ROP Plan) are required to be essentially the same. The 1991 AQAP EIR was recirculated as the draft EIR for the 1993 ROP Plan. The final 1993 ROP Plan EIR, which was prepared as a subsequent document under CEQA Guidelines Section 15153, concluded that no significant impacts would result from the 1993 ROP Plan. The EIR was certified by the APCD Board of Directors.

#### 1994 Clean Air Plan Supplemental EIR (94-SD-3)

As required by the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments, the 1994 CAP was prepared as a revision of the 1989 Air Quality Attainment Plan and the 1993 Rate-of-Progress Plan. In addition, the 1994 CAP contained a request for redesignation from a nonattainment area to a maintenance area for the federal ozone standard along with a

plan to show maintenance with the federal standard through the year 2006. These components were later withdrawn by the APCD.

The 1994 CAP also addressed the California Clean Air Act requirements for the triennial update of the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (1991 AQAP). The 1994 CAP like the previous air quality attainment plans included both stationary source control measures and transportation control measures. The majority of the measures in the 1994 CAP were substantially the same as the control measures in the 1991 AQAP and the 1993 ROP Plan. The primary change in the project description in terms of the effects on the environment was the addition of Outer Continental Shelf sources to the APCD permit jurisdiction. The new Regulatory Flexibility Program was introduced in the 1994 CAP but the environmental impacts were not analyzed.

Since the proposed 1994 CAP retained the same control measures described in the 1991 AQAP, with a few updated measures and new strategies, a supplement to an EIR (SEIR) was prepared which contained information necessary to make the program Environmental Impact Report prepared for 1991 AQAP adequate for the 1994 CAP, as revised (CEQA Guidelines Section 15163). The SEIR focused on the changes in project description, consisting of the control measures (some of which are now adopted as APCD rules) that are relevant to Outer Continental Shelf sources. No additional significant issues other than those identified in the 1991 AQAP EIR were identified in the 1994 CAP SEIR.

#### 1998 Clean Air Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration (APCD-98-ND-01)

The 1998 Final Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the 1998 Clean Air Plan. No new impacts or mitigations were adopted.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

Geographically, the 2001 Plan applies to the entire County of Santa Barbara and the sources on the Outer Continental Shelf within 25 miles of the seaward boundary of the State and located off the coast of the County for which the APCD is the corresponding onshore area.

The following documents describe the existing Santa Barbara County environment setting and are incorporated herein by reference.

1. The 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan Environmental Impact Report, 91-EIR-4, SCH# 91031045.
2. The 1994 supplemental EIR (94-SD-3) prepared for the 1994 Clean Air Plan.
3. The 1998 Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (APCD-98-ND-01) for the 1998 Clean Air Plan.

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources        | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils                     |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources/Energy               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise/Nuisance          | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services             | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems              | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |

## DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by, or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find from existing documents (previous EIR's, etc.) that a environmental document must be prepared pursuant to CEQA Sections 15152 (Tiering) or 15153 (use of an EIR from an Earlier Project) or 15162/15163 (Supplement to an EIR, or 15164 (Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration).
- ☒ 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 nothing further is required although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment. Nothing further is required because all potentially 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.

**PROJECT EVALUATOR:**

Signature: /s/ Vijaya Jammalamadaka

Date: July 6, 2001

**CONCURRENCE OF APCD ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER:**

Signature: /s/ Ron Tan

Date: July 9, 2001

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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 paragraph 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).

All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

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.

“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 Section XVII, or “Earlier Analyses” may be cross-referenced).

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:

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

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 earlier analysis.

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.

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

Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address 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:  
the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and  
the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

# I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare , which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

## Significance Criteria or Threshold:

In addition to the above questions, the County of Santa Barbara Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual for determining visual impacts (*Section 17, item C, Initial Study Assessment Questions for the Analysis of Visual Resources*), include:

1a. Does the project site have significant visual resources by virtue of surface waters, vegetation, elevation, slope, or other natural or man-made features which are publicly visible?

1b. If so, does the proposed project have the potential to degrade or significantly interfere with the public's enjoyment of the site's existing visual resources?

2a. Does the project have the potential to impact visual resources of the Coastal Zone or other visually important area (i.e., mountainous area, public park, urban fringe, or scenic travel corridor)?

2b. If so, does the project have the potential to conflict with the policies set forth in the Local Coastal Plan, the Comprehensive Plan or any applicable community plan to protect the identified views?

3. Does the project have the potential to create a significantly adverse aesthetic impact through obstruction of public views, incompatibility with surrounding uses, structures, or intensity of development, removal of significant amounts of vegetation, loss of important open space, substantial alteration of natural character, lack of adequate landscaping, or extensive grading visible from public areas?

Impact Discussion: The 1991 AQAP EIR discusses "glare" impacts from flares used to destroy ROC emissions collected by vapor recovery systems (page 4-24) and classified the impacts as potentially significant but mitigable. However, the proposed control measures in the 2001 Plan will not rely on flares to control ROC emissions. No adverse aesthetic impacts are identified for the new and modified measures in the 2001 Plan.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

**II. AGRICULTURE 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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| a) <i>Reduce the viability of property for agricultural use (e.g., due to reduced parcel size, restricted agricultural practices, etc.) or otherwise involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Significance Criteria or Threshold:

The APCD uses the above questions for determining agricultural impacts.

### Impact Discussion:

The 1991 AQAP EIR does not indicate there will be any impact to agricultural resources resulting from the control measures. Since the same control measures in the 1991 AQAP may be used to comply with the new control measures, there is no impact to agricultural resources anticipated from the adoption and implementation of 2001 Plan.

### Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required. The new control measures in the 2001 Plan will have no impact on agricultural resources.



Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

**III. AIR QUALITY** – The significance criteria established by the *Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District* or more stringent thresholds adopted by the Lead Agency may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the applicable air quality plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute <u>substantially</u> ((including releasing emissions which exceed <i>project-specific</i> quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors) to an existing or projected air quality violation?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed <i>cumulative</i> quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create or contribute to a non-stationary source “hot spot” (primarily carbon monoxide)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Expose sensitive receptors to <u>substantial</u> <i>toxic</i> or hazardous air pollutant concentrations((including releasing emissions, which exceed <i>adopted exposure</i> thresholds)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Subject a substantial number of people to objectionable odors?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Significance criteria or thresholds:**

The criteria for determining the significance of air quality impacts are based on federal, state, and local air pollution standards and regulations. As adopted in the *APCD CEQA Guidelines*:

A proposed project will not have a significant air quality effect on the environment, if:

Operation of the project will:

- emit (from all project sources) less than the daily trigger for offsets or AQIA set in the APCD New Source Review Rule, for any pollutant; and
- emit less than 25 pounds per day of NOx or ROC from motor vehicle trips only; and
- not cause or contribute to a violation of any California or National Ambient Air Quality Standard (except ozone); and
- not exceed the APCD health risk public notification thresholds adopted by the APCD Board; and
- be consistent with adopted federal and state Air Quality Plans.

Thresholds of significance provide general guidance for determining significant impacts, but are not ironclad definitions of significant impacts. Each project must be judged individually for its potential for significant impacts, based on specific circumstances and evidence.

#### **Impact Discussion:**

According to the 1991 AQAP EIR, the only Class II (insignificant after mitigation) impact to air quality from the AQAP control methods is from post-combustion control equipment. The EIR indicates that there is a potential for vanadium pentoxide, a toxic heavy metal, used in most selective catalytic reduction (SCR) and selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR) processes, to be released into the environment.

#### **Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

The Final EIR for the 1991 Santa Barbara County AQAP indicates the following mitigation methods.

- Properly maintain and operate systems to minimize the adverse effects.
- Mitigation of toxic heavy metal releases requires that the SCR and SNCR catalysts be properly maintained (Section 4.1.2 of the 1991 AQAP EIR).

With mitigation, the effect of post-combustion control methods will be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have an adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, any endangered, rare, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (sections 17.11 or 17.12)?                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Significance Criteria or Thresholds:

The APCD uses the above questions for determining biological impacts.

## Impact Discussion:

In general, any compliance method that would benefit or adversely impact human health also has the potential to benefit or adversely impact biological resources. This initial study/negative declaration discusses the Class II (insignificant after mitigation) impacts, as identified in the 1991 AQAP EIR, in the following sections:

Section I, Aesthetics

Section III, Air Quality

Section VII, Hazards and Hazardous Waste

Section VIII, Hydrology and Water Quality

Section XI, Noise

Section XIII, Public Services

The adverse impacts identified in these issues areas have the potential to impact the County's biological resources. However, none of the impacts have been identified as unavoidable or potentially significant impacts if adequate mitigation measures are applied.

Section 4.4.2 of the 1991 AQAP EIR also indicates that impacts to endangered, rare, or other special plants and animals can be avoided on a project specific basis by requiring biological resource inventories and requiring adequate protective measures. Overall, the adoption of the 2001 Plan will have beneficial effects (related to healthier air) in the county.

## Mitigation and Residual Impact:

For mitigation measures, refer to the Sections referenced above. With mitigation, the effect of the new control measures in the 2001 Plan will be less than significant on biological resources.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

## V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of unique archaeological resources (i.e., an artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best available example of its type, or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

### Significance Criteria or Thresholds:

The APCD uses the above questions for determining cultural resource impacts.

### Impact Discussion:

The 1991 AQAP EIR does not indicate there will be any impact to cultural resources resulting from the control measures. Since the same control measures in the 1991 AQAP may be used to comply with the new control measures in the 2001 Plan, there is no impact to cultural resources anticipated.

### Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required. The 2001 Plan will have no impact on cultural resources.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

## VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

1

i) Rupture of <i>or proximity to</i> a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on strata or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Significance Criteria or Thresholds:

The APCD uses the above questions for determining geological impacts.

Impact Discussion:

The 1991 AQAP EIR does not indicate there will be any impact to geology and soils resulting from the control measures. Since applicants may use the same control techniques identified in the 1991 AQAP to comply with the 2001 Plan, staff anticipate that there will be no impact to geology and soils from the adoption of 2001 Plan.

Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required. The 2001 Plan will have no impact on geology and soils.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

## VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                                     |                                     |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 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?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |



**Significance Criteria or Thresholds:**

The APCD uses the above questions for determining hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

**Impact Discussion:**

The 1991 AQAP EIR indicates that some of the control measures may cause Class II (insignificant after mitigation) impacts from increased risk of fire/explosion and increased disposal of hazardous materials.

The following table shows the EIR control measures (methods that could be used to comply with the 2001 Plan) that may increase the risk of fire/explosion or cause an increase in the disposal of hazardous materials.

		FIRE/EXPLOSION	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS
VR	Vapor Recover	X	X
RE	Reformulation	X	X
TE	Transfer Efficiency	X	
PC	Post-Combustion Modification	X	X
CF	Alternative Combustion Fuels	X	

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

The 1991 AQAP EIR indicates the following mitigation measures:

For increased risk of fire/explosion:

Isolate potential fire and explosive hazards from flames and sparks.<sup>4</sup>

Maintain temperatures below the Lower Explosion Limit (LEL) of the compounds. Isolate potential fire and explosive hazards from flames and sparks.<sup>5</sup>

For increased disposal of hazardous materials:

Properly treat and dispose hazardous waste in Class I landfills, regenerate and recycle, or thermally incinerate.

All hazardous waste should be properly treated and disposed in a certified Class I landfill. Used activated carbon could be regenerated and reused, or thermally incinerated. Methods are being developed which may provide a means to reactivate or recycle used or spent catalyst.

With mitigation, the effect of 2001 Plan will be less than significant on hazards and hazardous materials.

---

<sup>4</sup> Table ES-1 of the 1991 Santa Barbara County Air Quality Attainment Plan EIR.

<sup>5</sup> Section 4.6.2 of the 1991 Santa Barbara County Air Quality Attainment Plan EIR.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

# VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Significance Criteria or Thresholds:

The APCD uses the above questions for determining hydrology and water quality impacts.

### Impact Discussion:

The 1991 AQAP EIR indicates that the following control measures may cause Class II (insignificant after mitigation) impacts to water quality:

VR	Vapor Recover
RE	Reformulation
PC	Post-Combustion Modification
AF	Alternative Transportation Fuel

### Mitigation and Residual Impact:

The 1991 AQAP EIR indicates the following mitigation measures:

Ensure proper treatment and disposal of substances, which could potentially contaminate potable water supplies. Public should be made aware of the proper disposal of the cleaning wastewater. Recover and recycle process constituents.

Ensure proper treatment and disposal of substances, which could potentially contaminate potable water supplies. Reduce risk of upset and establish appropriate clean up procedures. Water-based coatings should be properly labeled indicating potential impacts, also the public should be made aware of the proper disposal of the cleaning wastewater. Also, recover and recycle process constituents (Section 4.3.2).

With mitigation, the effect of 2001 Plan will be less than significant on hydrology and water quality.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** – Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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 the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Significance Criteria or Thresholds:**

The APCD uses the above questions for determining Land Use and Planning impacts.

**Impact Discussion:**

The 1991 AQAP EIR does not indicate there will be any impact to land use and planning resulting from the control measures. Since the same control measures in the 1991 AQAP may be used to comply with the 2001 Plan, there is no impact to land use and planning anticipated from the adoption of 2001 Plan.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

No mitigation is required. 2001 Plan will have no impact on land use and planning.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES** – Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Significance Criteria or Thresholds:**

The APCD uses the above questions for determining cultural resource impacts.

**Impact Discussion:**

The 1991 AQAP EIR does not indicate there will be any impact to mineral resources resulting from the control measures. Since the same control measures in the 1991 AQAP may be used to comply with the 2001 Plan T-BACT requirement, there is no impact to mineral resources anticipated from the adoption of 2001 Plan.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

No mitigation is required. 2001 Plan will have no impact on mineral resources.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

# **XI. NOISE** – Would the project result in:

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or the <i>County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual</i> (65 dB(A) CNEL).                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## **Significance Criteria or Thresholds:**

The APCD uses the above questions for determining noise impacts.

## **Impact Discussion:**

Of the control measures listed in the 1991 AQAP EIR that could be used to comply with the 2001 Plan, the EIR indicates that the following may cause Class II (insignificant after mitigation) impacts to noise and vibration:

VR	Vapor Recover
EC	External Combustion Modification
EL	Electric Motor Replacement

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

The 1991 AQAP EIR indicates the following mitigation measures:

1. Achieve County threshold limits by placement of equipment and the use of sound and vibration insulation.
2. Virtually any noise or vibration impact can be mitigated to acceptable exterior and interior levels. County RMD thresholds must be met for property line and exterior noise levels in order to avoid significant impacts. In the workplace, comply with OSHA noise regulations and provide equipment sound insulation and employee ear protection if necessary (Section 4.5.2)

With mitigation, the effect of 2001 Plan will be less than significant on noise.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING** – Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Significance Criteria or Thresholds:**

The APCD uses the above questions for determining population and housing impacts.

**Impact Discussion:**

The 1991 AQAP EIR does not indicate there will be any impact to population and housing resulting from the control measures. Since the same control measures in the 1991 AQAP may be used to comply with the 2001 Plan, there is no impact to population and housing anticipated from the adoption of 2001 Plan.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

No mitigation is required. 2001 Plan will have no impact on population and housing.



Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Significance Criteria or Thresholds:

The APCD uses the above questions for determining impact of the project on Public Services.

#### Impact Discussion:

The 1991 AQAP EIR does not indicate there will be any Class II (insignificant after mitigation) impacts to public services resulting from the control measures. Since the same control measures in the 1991 AQAP may be used to comply with the 2001 Plan, there are no Class II impacts to public services anticipated from the adoption of 2001 Plan.

#### Mitigation and Residual Impact:

No mitigation is required. 2001 Plan will have no Class II impacts on public services.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
<b><u>XIV. RECREATION</u></b> --				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Significance Criteria or Thresholds:**

The APCD uses the above questions for determining recreation impacts.

**Impact Discussion:**

The 1991 AQAP EIR does not indicate there will be any impact to recreation resulting from the control measures. Since the same control measures in the 1991 AQAP may be used to comply with the 2001 Plan, there is no impact to recreation anticipated from the adoption of 2001 Plan.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

No mitigation is required. 2001 Plan will have no impact on recreation.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** – Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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) as set forth in the <i>County Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual</i> ? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, as level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency (SBCAG) for designated roads or highways?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Result in a change in traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards <i>due</i> to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation modes (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Significance Criteria or Thresholds:**

The APCD uses the above questions for determining transportation and circulation impacts.

**Impact Discussion:**

The 1991 AQAP EIR does not indicate there will be any Class II (insignificant after mitigation) impacts to transportation/traffic resulting from the control measures. Since the same control measures in the 1991 AQAP may be used to comply with the 2001 Plan, there are no Class II impacts to transportation/traffic anticipated from the adoption of 2001 Plan.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:** No mitigation is required. 2001 Plan will have no Class II impacts on transportation/traffic.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** – Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Has the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Significance Criteria or Thresholds:**

The APCD uses the above questions for determining impacts on Utilities and Service Systems.

**Impact Discussion:**

The 1991 AQAP EIR does not indicate there will be any Class II (insignificant after mitigation) impacts to utilities and service systems resulting from the control measures. Since the same control measures in the 1991 AQAP may be used to comply with the 2001 Plan T-BACT

requirement, there are no Class II impacts to utilities and service systems anticipated from the adoption of 2001 Plan.

**Mitigation and Residual Impact:**

No mitigation is required. 2001 Plan will have no Class II impacts on utilities and service systems.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with mitigation	Less than significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

## **XVIII. REFERENCES:**

1. "County of Santa Barbara Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual," Santa Barbara County Planning and Development, Updated as of January 1995.
2. "Final EIR for the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (91-EIR-4; SCH No. 91031045)," Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, December 1991.
3. "Environmental Review Guidelines for the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District," November 2000.

## **APPENDIX B - Notice of Preparation**



## **NOTICE OF PREPARATION**

**DATE:** July 12, 2001

**SUBJECT:** Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the **2001 Clean Air Plan for Santa Barbara County**.

The Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (APCD), as Lead Agency under the California Environmental Quality Act, will prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan EIR (State Clearing House Number 91031045; County Document Number 91-EIR-4) and subsequent documents.

### **Project Location**

The 2001 Clean Air Plan will apply to Santa Barbara County, the state tidelands and the outer continental shelf (OCS). State tidelands facilities are located in coastal waters within three miles of the coastline. OCS facilities are in waters within 25 miles of the seaward boundaries of the state and located off the coast of Santa Barbara County, which is the corresponding onshore area.

### **Project Description**

The 2001 Clean Air Plan (2001 Plan) is a comprehensive strategy to meet the requirements of both the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 and the California Clean Air Act of 1988.

As required by the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act Amendments, the 2001 Plan is a revision of the 1998 Clean Air Plan (1998 CAP). The 2001 Plan also formally requests that USEPA re-designate Santa Barbara County as an attainment area for the federal 1-hour ozone standard. In addition, this 2001 Plan re-establishes on-road mobile source reactive organic gas and oxides of nitrogen emission budgets to address federal transportation conformity requirements.

The 2001 Plan also addresses the California Clean Air Act requirements for the triennial update of the 1998 CAP that updated the 1994 CAP and the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (1991 AQAP). The majority of the control measures evaluated for the 2001 Plan are substantially the same as the control measures in the 1998 CAP, 1994 CAP and the 1991 AQAP. However 3 revised and 6 new control measures are proposed in the 2001 Plan. These proposed measures are *to be adopted* as APCD Rules for the purpose of attaining the state 1-hour ozone standard and are identified as *contingency* measures for the purpose of maintaining the federal one-hour ozone standard.

### **Supplemental EIR Issue Areas**

Based on the 1991 AQAP EIR, and the Initial Study for this project, the 2001 Plan SEIR will focus on potentially significant impacts to air quality, biological resources, noise, glare, risk of upset and hazardous wastes.

### **Project Comments**

The views of concerned agencies and any interested persons regarding the scope and content of the environmental document for the proposed project are hereby requested. Copies of the 1991 AQAP EIR are available for review at the APCD offices and at libraries in Santa Barbara County. Please send your written responses to: Dr. Ron Tan, 26 Castilian Drive, B-23, Goleta, CA 93117 or by E-mail at [tanr@sbcapcd.org](mailto:tanr@sbcapcd.org). Due to time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but **not later than 30 days** after the receipt of this notice.

## **APPENDIX C - References**

State of California, Office of Planning and Research, 2000. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes and Guidelines.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, 2000. Environmental Review Guidelines for the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District: Guidelines for implementing the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended.

Santa Barbara County Planning and Development Department, January 1995. Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, December 1998. 1998 Clean Air Plan for Attainment of the State and Federal Ozone Standard in Santa Barbara County.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, 1998. Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 1998 Clean Air Plan (APCD-98-ND-01).

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, November 1994. 1994 Clean Air Plan.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, 1994. Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the 1994 Clean Air Plan (94-SD-3).

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District and Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, 1993. 1993 Rate-of-Progress Plan, Federal Ozone Standard Countywide.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, September 1993. Environmental Impact Report for the 1993 Rate-of-Progress Plan.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, December 1991. 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan: State Ozone Standard Countywide.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, December 1991. Final Environmental Impact Report for the 1991 Santa Barbara County Air Quality Attainment Plan. State Clearinghouse Number 91031045; County Document No. 91-EIR-4. Prepared by Jacobs Engineering Group.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, May 1990. 1989 Air Quality Attainment Plan for the Federal Ozone Standard, South County.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, May 1990. Final Environmental Impact Report for the 1989 Air Quality Attainment Plan. State Clearinghouse No. 89012511; Santa Barbara County # 89-EIR-9

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District. Rules and Regulations.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, 1993. 1992 Annual Air Quality Report.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, November 22, 1991. Final EIR for District Rule 333, Control of Emissions from Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines. State Clearinghouse No. 91031045; County Document No. 91-EIR-4.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, April 1994. Draft EIR for APCD Rule 359 - Flares and Thermal Oxidizers. SCH No. 94031005; 94-EIR-3.

## APPENDIX D - Mitigation Monitoring Plan

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Actions	Monitoring Responsibility	Monitoring Schedule
<b>Air Quality:</b> Post Combustion treatment processes which require use of catalysts (SCR and NSCR) can result in ammonia slip and release of heavy metals, such as vanadium pentoxide.	Systems shall be properly operated and maintained to minimize adverse impacts.	Any source proposing to use catalysts, the APCD permit shall require compliance with manufacturer's specifications.	Air Pollution Control District (APCD).	During APCD permit process.
<b>Water Quality:</b> Ground and surface water could be contaminated by materials or waste products used by some emission control systems.	Wastewater or other waste streams shall be treated to meet discharge standards or handled as hazardous waste.	Any source proposing to use emission control systems involving waste streams, the operator is subject to the regulations of relevant jurisdictions.	County Environmental Health Service (EHS), local sanitary district, Regional Water Quality Control Board, State Fish and Game; USEPA (on OCS or federal lands), Minerals Management Service (MMS).	APCD will notify relevant jurisdictions during APCD permit and compliance process.
<b>Biological Resources:</b> Compliance methods that adversely impact humans or water resources will also impact flora and fauna.	Adverse impacts to flora and fauna shall be minimized.	All mitigation measures identified under air quality, water quality, noise/nuisance, risk of upset and hazardous wastes shall be implemented.	State Dept. of Fish and Game, MMS.	APCD will notify relevant jurisdictions during APCD permit and compliance process.
<b>Noise/Nuisance:</b> The use of compressors, fans or pumps in emission control may increase ambient noise substantially. Night time glare from flares used to destroy ROC emissions may have an impact in visually sensitive areas.	Noise shall be mitigated in compliance with OSHA regulations. Planned flaring shall be restricted to day time hours or enclosed flares shall be used.	Any source proposing to use noise-generating equipment shall be subject to the regulations of relevant jurisdictions.	Occupational Safety Health Agency, MMS (for OCS).	APCD will notify relevant jurisdictions during APCD permit and compliance process.
<b>Risk of Upset:</b> The use of carbon adsorption canisters and electrostatic sprayers may create a hazard of fire and explosion.	Safe handling, operating, transportation, and disposal procedures shall be used.	Any source proposing to use emission controls which increase risk of fire and explosion shall implement procedures consistent with relevant federal, state and local regulations.	Local Fire Departments Office of Emergency Management (OEM), EHS, USEPA	APCD will notify relevant jurisdictions during APCD permit and compliance process.
<b>Hazardous Wastes:</b> Used carbon canisters or used catalysts could be disposed of improperly.	All hazardous wastes generated during emission control processes shall be disposed of properly.	Operator shall be subject to federal, state and local regulations governing the disposal of hazardous wastes.	EHS, County Fire Dept., Local Fire Dept., USEPA, US Dept. of Transportation, Calif. Highway Patrol.	APCD will notify relevant jurisdictions during APCD permit and compliance process.