

**TABLE S.6  
IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF THE PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES<sup>a,b</sup>**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Alt. 2 Power Plant Bundling</b>		<b>Alt. 3 Geysers</b>
			<b>2a</b>	<b>2b</b>	
<b><u>Land Use and Planning</u></b>					
4.1-1: The proposed project is consistent with adopted general plan policies, land use designations and zoning, and thus would not conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.1-2: The four power plants being considered for divestiture are existing land uses that would remain in the same locations. Therefore, the project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of any established community. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.1-3: The project would not convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, or impair the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
<b><u>Population and Housing</u></b>					
4.2-1: The proposed project would not induce substantial growth or concentration of population. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.2-2: The proposed project would not displace a large number of people. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
<b><u>Geologic Problems</u></b>					
4.2-3: Minor construction activities resulting from the project (e.g., fences and site remediation) could cause soil disturbance. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.3-2: Potential operational changes due to the transfer in ownership of the Potrero, Pittsburg, and Contra Costa Power Plants would not create geologic problems. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.3-3: The change in ownership of the Geysers should not affect the potential for the facility to induce microseismicity in the project area and vicinity. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (G)

**TABLE S.6 (continued)**  
**IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF THE PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES<sup>a,b</sup>**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Alt. 2 Power Plant Bundling</b>		<b>Alt. 3 Geysers</b>
			<b>2a</b>	<b>2b</b>	
4.3-4: The transfer in ownership of the Geysers should not increase the frequency and magnitude of major earthquakes. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
<b><u>Water</u></b>					
4.4-1: The divestiture of the power plants would involve only minor construction at the plants. Therefore, no significant impacts to water resources from construction activities are anticipated. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.4-2: The project could increase the amount of water used at, and discharged from, the plants. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS(L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)
<b><u>Air Quality</u></b>					
4.5-1: The project may result in an increase in criteria air pollutant emissions in the affected air basins. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)
4.5-2: The project may result in an increase in local concentrations of criteria air pollutants in the vicinities of the power plants. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	B
4.5-3: The project may lead to an increase in health risks in the vicinities of the power plants. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (L)
4.5-4: The project may result in the elimination of PG&E's existing voluntary FTP cleanup programs. Loss of these programs could result in nuisance effects, caused by FTP stains. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.5-5: Depending upon whether, and how, the BAAQMD modifies Regulation 9, Rule 11, the project may be inconsistent with regional air quality plans. (Significant)	S/UN	NS (L)	S/UN (L)	S/UN (G)	NS (L)
<b><u>Transportation and Circulation</u></b>					
4.6-1: The project could increase traffic generation. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)
4.6-2: The potential minor increases in traffic would not increase traffic safety hazards. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)

**TABLE S.6 (continued)**  
**IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF THE PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES<sup>a,b</sup>**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Alt. 2 Power Plant Bundling</b>		<b>Alt. 3 Geysers</b>
			<b>2a</b>	<b>2b</b>	
4.6-3: The potential minor increases in traffic from the project would not have an effect on emergency access and access to nearby land uses. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)
4.6-4: The project could increase demand for on-site parking. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)
<b><u>Biological Resources</u></b>					
4.7-1: Divestiture could result in an overall loss of important species or habitat if future owners were unaware of the presence and sensitivity of such biological resources. (Significant)	S/M	NS (L)	S/M (E)	S/M (E)	NS (L)
4.7-2: If the Section 10 Permits are not issued to PG&E prior to the close of the sale or to the new owner at closing, divestiture may delay the issuance of such permits. The delay caused by divestiture may result in impacts to protected species. (Significant)	S/M	NS (L)	NS (L)	S/M (G)	NS (L)
4.7-3: Divestiture may result in impacts to locally designated species of concern and other aquatic organisms. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
<b><u>Energy and Mineral Resources</u></b>					
4.8-1: The project would not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (L)
4.8-2: The project would not promote wasteful or inefficient use of non-renewable resources. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	B
4.8-3: The project would not result in loss of availability of known mineral resources. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
<b><u>Hazards</u></b>					
4.9-1: Divestiture could advance the time at which existing hazards are remediated and therefore could advance a potential threat to worker safety or to public health should existing environmental contamination at the power plants be handled improperly. (Less than Significant)	NS (M)	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)

**TABLE S.6 (continued)**  
**IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF THE PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES<sup>a,b</sup>**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Alt. 2 Power Plant Bundling</b>		<b>Alt. 3 Geysers</b>
			<b>2a</b>	<b>2b</b>	
4.9-2: Remediation of contaminated soils, groundwater, or building materials at the plant sites would likely occur sooner as a result of transfers of title than would be the case if the power plants were not sold. Remediation would eliminate potential future threats to public health or to the environment. (Beneficial)	B	NS (G)	B (E)	B (E)	B (E)
4.9-3: Divestiture could promote increased use of hazardous materials at the power plants. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.9-4: Divestiture could result in an increased frequency of accidents at the power plant sites. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.9-5: Divestiture could result in increased generation of hazardous waste at the power plants. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)
4.9-6: Divestiture could affect electromagnetic field strength at the power plants (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)
<b>Noise</b>					
4.10-1: Minor construction activities that could be associated with transfer of ownership would temporarily increase noise levels above existing ambient levels in the project vicinities. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.10-2: Potential changes in operational activities by a new owner would generate noise levels above existing ambient levels in the project vicinities. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (G)
<b>Public Services</b>					
4.11-1: The project would not create the need for new or substantially altered fire, police, school or other government services. Therefore, the project would not have a significant environmental impact on public services. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.11-2: The combined sale of the Contra Costa and Pittsburg Power Plants in Contra Costa County would not create the need for new or substantially altered, fire, police, school, or other government services. Therefore, the project would not have a significant environmental impact on public	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)

**TABLE S.6 (continued)**  
**IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF THE PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES<sup>a,b</sup>**

Impact	Proposed Project	No Project	Alt. 2 Power Plant Bundling		Alt. 3 Geysers
			2a	2b	
services. (Less than Significant)					
4.11-3: The project may affect property tax revenues in the jurisdictions of the plants to be sold. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
<b><u>Utilities and Service Systems</u></b>					
4.12-1: The project would not result in the need for new or substantially altered electric power systems or supplies. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.12-2: Potential operational changes at the plants could increase the need for public water demand at the plants. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)
4.12-3: The project could result in an increase in wastewater disposal to the public sanitary sewer systems and increase the need for wastewater treatment. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)
4.12-4: The project could result in an increase in demand for solid waste services. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (E)
4.12-5: The project could increase the need for communications systems. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.12-6: The project would not result in the need for new or substantially altered natural gas systems or supplies. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (L)	NS (G)	NS (L)
<b><u>Aesthetics</u></b>					
4.13-1: Potential changes in operational activities by a new owner and minor construction activities would not produce new sources of light or glare in the project vicinity. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.13-2: The project would not result in the change or obstruction of scenic highway views or vistas open to the public or the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
<b><u>Cultural Resources</u></b>					
4.14-1: Minor construction activities associated with divestiture, such as fencing to separate the retained properties from the divested plant sites, could	NS (M)	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)

**TABLE S.6 (continued)**  
**IMPACTS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF THE PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES<sup>a,b</sup>**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Project</b>	<b>No Project</b>	<b>Alt. 2 Power Plant Bundling</b>		<b>Alt. 3 Geysers</b>
			<b>2a</b>	<b>2b</b>	
result in impacts to subsurface cultural resources. (Less than Significant)					
4.14-2: The continued operation of the divested plants would not affect known cultural resources. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
<b><u>Recreation</u></b>					
4.15-1: The project could minimally increase demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (L)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)
4.15-2: The project would not significantly affect existing or proposed recreational opportunities. (Less than Significant)	NS	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)	NS (E)