

ATTACHMENT B

*Analysis to Support the Lead Agency's
Decision to Not Recirculate*

Attachment B
Analysis to Support the Lead Agency’s Decision to Not Recirculate

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Yes	No, because construction impacts would be temporary and of short duration and because the portions proposed to be realigned would be installed underground. Impacts to Pigeon Point Light Station Historic State Park would not occur.	No	N/A
b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Yes	No, however, impacts from tree trimming would be reduced because the portions of the proposed project to be realigned are proposed to be undergrounded rather than installed overhead, avoiding the need for tree trimming.	No	N/A
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Yes	No, see Criterion A.	No	N/A
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Yes	No, the intensity of the impacts would be the same as disclosed; however, the duration would change (i.e., more days of underground installation and less days of aerial installation). Impacts would remain less than significant.	No	N/A
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 quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	No

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	No
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	No
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
b) 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?	Yes	No, impacts to Monterey Pine communities would be eliminated because undergrounding adjacent to this community could not cause disturbance.	No	N/A
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	Yes, but no new impact would occur.	N/A
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Yes	No, impacts would be reduced, as no known resources would be impacted.	Yes, but no new impact would occur.	N/A
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	Yes, but no new impact would occur.	N/A
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	Yes, but no new impact would occur.	N/A
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:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
iv) Landslides?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment. However, the proposed alignment would be undergrounded and located further from an existing mapped landside area within Año Nuevo State Park.	No	N/A
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Yes	No, there would be a minor increase in greenhouse gas emissions; however, impacts were disclosed in the IS/ND and would remain less than significant.	No	N/A
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
VIII. 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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
d) Be located on a site that 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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
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)?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
XII. 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 applicable standards of other agencies?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
XIII. 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)?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
XIV. 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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
Police protection?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
Schools?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
Parks?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
Other public facilities?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
XV. RECREATION				
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?				
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?				

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A

Attachment B (Continued)

	Analyzed in ND	Does the Realignment Involve New Avoidable Significant Effects?	Any Substantially Important New Information Requiring New Analysis or Verification?	Do the IS/ND Applicant Proposed Measures Address/Resolve Impacts?
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
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?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Yes	No, impacts as disclosed would not change due to the proposed realignment.	No	N/A

N/A = Not Applicable