ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

The environmental checklist provides a standard evaluation tool to identify a project's adverse environmental impacts. This checklist identifies and evaluates potential adverse environmental impacts that may be created by the proposed project.

Background

1. Project Title: Tosco Los Angeles Refinery Ethanol Import and Distribution Project

2. Lead Agency Name & Address: South Coast Air Quality Management District

21865 E. Copley Drive Diamond Bar, CA 91765

3. Contact Person & Phone Number: Mike Krause (909) 396-2706

4. Project Location: 1660 West Anaheim Street, Wilmington, California

5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address: **Tosco Refining Company**

1660 West Anaheim Street Wilmington, California

6. General Plan Designation: **Heavy Industrial** 7. Zoning: M3 – Heavy Industrial

8. Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary).

Tosco is proposing modifications to its existing Refinery and related terminals in order to blend and distribute ethanol instead of MTBE as an oxygenate in fuels to comply with State and Federal reformulated fuels requirements. Ethanol is currently the only oxygenate approved by CARB as a replacement for MTBE.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings).

The Tosco Los Angeles Refinery Wilmington Plant is located in Wilmington, California. The eastern part of the site borders a residential area, a Genstar roofing materials plant and a portion of the Harbor 110 Freeway. The northern portion of the site borders Harbor Lake Park, Harbor College, Harbor Golf Course, and a small residential area. The western part of the site borders Gaffey Street, including a firing range, vacant fields, recreational fields, and a U.S. Navy fuel storage facility. The southern portion of the site shares a border with a vacant property formerly a fuel blending facility belonging to Western Fuels.

The Tosco Marine Terminal is located in Los Angeles County at Berths 148 through 151, Port of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California. The facility is located in an industrialized area and involves shipping, transfer, and storage activities consistent with other Port activities. The Marine Terminal is located on a peninsula bounded by the Los Angeles Harbor West Basin and Slip No. 1 on the west and east, respectively. Warehouses, parking lots, and ship berths are located along the northern property line of the Marine Terminal.

The Tosco Torrance Tank Farm is located at 2650 West Lomita Boulevard, Torrance, California. The tank farm is located in the southern portion of Los Angeles County, towards the Palos Verdes

peninsula and near the Torrance airport. The tank farm is located in a mixed industrial, commercial, and residential area.

The Los Angeles Terminal is located at 13500 South Broadway in Los Angeles, California. The Terminal is located south of downtown Los Angeles, in the south central portion of Los Angeles County, near the Harbor 110 and 91 Freeway interchange. The area surrounding the terminal contains commercial and industrial land uses. A residential area is located about 600 feet from the facility.

The Colton Terminal East is located at 271 East Slover Avenue, Rialto, California. The Colton Terminal West is located at 2301 South Riverside Avenue, Bloomington, California. Although the addresses differ, the two facilities are located next to each other. The terminal is located in an industrial area.

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

The proposed project will require Permits to Construct/Operate from the SCAQMD and require building permits from local cities, including Torrance and Rialto, and the County of Los Angeles. No permits are expected to be required from the City of Los Angeles or the Port of Los Angeles.

CHAPTER 2: ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

			would be potentially affected by mpact" as indicated by the checkli		
[]	Land Use & Planning	[]	Transportation/Circulation	[]	Public Services
[]	Population & Housing	[]	Biological Resources	[]	Solid & Hazardous Wastes
[]	Geology & Soils	[]	Energy & Mineral Resources	[]	Aesthetics
[]	Water	[]	Hazards	[]	Cultural Resources
[]	Air Quality	[]	Noise	[]	Recreation
		[]	Mandatory Findings of Significant	nce	
DET	ERMINATION				
(To b	e completed by the Lead Age	ncy)			
On th	ne basis of this initial evaluation	n:			
			NOT have a significant effect on the prepared		
there on an	will not be a significant effect attached sheet have been add	t in thi ed to t	could have a significant effect on a scase because the mitigation mea he project. A NEGATIVE DECL	sures de ARATI	escribed ON
I find	that the proposed project MA ACT REPORT is required	Y hav	e a significant effect on the environment	onment,	and an ENVIRONMENTAL
at lea legal as de signi	st one effect 1) has been adeq standards, and 2) has been ad- scribed on attached sheets, if t ficant unless mitigated". An E	uately dresse he effe ENVIR	e a significant effect(s) on the envanalyzed in an earlier document produced by mitigation measures based or ect is a "potentially significant impondent and the beaddressed	oursuant the ear bact" or Γ is requ	to applicable lier analysis "potentially iired, but
there (a) ha been	WILL NOT be a significant e ave been analyzed adequately avoided or mitigated pursuant	ffect in an earto that	could have a significant effect on an this case because all potentially earlier EIR pursuant to applicable t earlier EIR, including revisions of the control	significa standard or mitiga	ant effects ls and (b) have ation measures
Signa	ature		Date		
Print	ed Name		For		

			Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	LA	ND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:				
	a)	Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	b)	Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	c)	Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	d)	Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	e)	Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
II.	PO	PULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal	l :			
	a)	Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	b)	Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	c)	Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
III.		EEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the proposal result rexpose people to potential impacts involving:	t in			
	a)	Fault rupture?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	b)	Seismic ground shaking?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	c)	Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	d)	Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	e)	Landslides or mudflows?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	f)	Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill?	[]	[]	[X]	[]

			Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	g)	Subsidence of the land?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	h)	Expansive soils?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	i)	Unique geologic or physical features?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
IV.	V	VATER. Would the proposal result in:				
	a)	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	b)	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	c)	Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	d)	Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	e)	Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	f)	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	g)	Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	h)	Impacts to groundwater quality?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	i)	Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
V.	AI	R QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
	a)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	b)	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	[]	[]	[X]	[]

			Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c)	Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	d)	Create objectionable odors?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
VI.	TR	ANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the p	proposal resu	ılt in:		
	a)	Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	b)	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	c)	Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	d)	Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	e)	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	f)	Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	g)	Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
VII.	BIG	OLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal r	esult in impa	acts to:		
	a)	Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	b)	Locally designated species (e.g. heritage trees)?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	c)	Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	d)	Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	e)	Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	[]	[]	[]	[X]

			Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
VIII	. Е	NERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the	e proposal	:			
	a)	Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	[]	[]	[X]	[]	
	b)	Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	[]	[]	[X]	[]	
	c)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	[]	[]	[X]	[]	
IX.	HA	AZARDS. Would the proposal involve:					
	a)	A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	[]	[]	[X]	[]	
	b)	Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	[]	[]	[]	[X]	
	c)	The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	[]	[]	[X]	[]	
	d)	Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	[]	[]	[X]	[]	
	e)	Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	[]	[]	[]	[X]	
Χ.	NOISE. Would the proposal result in:						
	a)	Increases in existing noise levels?	[]	[]	[X]	[]	
	b)	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	[]	[]	[X]	[]	
XI.	upe	BLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effeon, or result in a need for a new or altered vernment services in any of the following areas:	ct				
	a)	Fire protection?	[]	[]	[]	[X]	
	b)	Police protection?	[]	[]	[]	[X]	
	c)	Schools?	[]	[]	[]	[X]	

			Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	d)	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	e)	Other governmental services?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
XII.	p ne	LID AND HAZARDOUS WASTES. Would the roposal have an effect upon or result in a need for ew systems or supplies, or substantial alterations of the following utilities:				
	a)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	b)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid and hazardous waste?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
XIII	. A	ESTHETICS. Would the proposal:				
	a)	Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	b)	Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	c)	Create light or glare?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
XIV.	. C	ULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
	a)	Disturb paleontological resources?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	b)	Disturb archaeological resources?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	c)	Affect historical resources?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	d)	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	e)	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
XV.	R	ECREATION. Would the proposal:				
	a)	Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
	b)	Affect existing recreational opportunities?	[]	[]	[]	[X]

			Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI.	M	IANDATORY 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?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
	b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the 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.)	y []	[]	[X]	[]
	c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	[]	[]	[X]	[]

Potentially

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR of negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

- a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
- b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are "less than significant with mitigation 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.

MRBWORD:1942IS2