

4.16 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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"/>
d) 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"/>

CHECKLIST ISSUES

a) Environmental Quality

As discussed in the above checklists, the project could degrade the quality of the environment. However, mitigation measures have been proposed in the Initial Study to reduce or eliminate all of the potentially significant impacts identified and discussed in checklists 4.1 through 4.15.

Conclusion

On the basis of information discussed under individual sections of this Initial Study, some degradation of the quality of the environment could potentially occur. However, the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in this Initial Study, coupled with the appropriate mitigation monitoring, would reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels.

b) Long-Term versus Short-Term Impacts

The power plant sites are presently committed to industrial uses, and such uses are expected to continue in the future, with or without divestiture. The project merely involves the transfer of the plants to new owners, with the resulting tendency of such new owners to increase generation at the plants within current permitted levels and extensive regulatory programs for environmental protection. Long term environmental goals would not be altered or adversely impacted by the project. Thus, the project would not achieve short term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long term goal.

Conclusion

Long-term environmental goals would not be altered or adversely impacted by the proposed divestiture. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) Cumulative Impacts

In addition to the project proposed by Edison and addressed in this document, there are three categories of projects that are reasonably foreseeable and may impact the environment cumulatively with the Edison project. They are 1) the divestiture of power plant assets by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), as proposed in PG&E's pending application (Application No. 96-11-020) to the CPUC, together with the anticipated second divestiture application from PG&E which will include four additional fossil fuel power plants and a geothermal plant; 2) other future power plants throughout California where applications have been filed (or are anticipated may be filed) with the California Energy Commission (CEC) to site power generating plants, or power plants that are either under construction currently or have received their certification from the CEC and are expected to start construction in the foreseeable future; and 3) local projects that could occur in the communities in which each of the power plants reside and that are located either adjacent to the facility or within reasonable proximity. These projects and their potential cumulative impacts are described below.

1. Divestiture of PG&E Power Plants

Pacific Gas & Electric Company's divestiture application (Application No. 96-11-020) seeks to sell three fossil-fueled power plants. The power plants are Morro Bay, in the city of Morro Bay, San Luis Obispo County; Moss Landing, in the city of Moss Landing, Monterey County; and, Oakland, in the city of Oakland, Alameda County. The plants represent approximately 42% of PG&E's natural gas and fuel oil fired generation assets. Combined, these facilities consist of 2,645 megawatts of generating capacity.

PG&E intends to submit an application to the CPUC by the end of 1997 to divest four additional fossil fuel plants and one geothermal power plant. The fossil fuel plants are: Contra Costa; Hunters Point; Potrero and Pittsburg. The Geysers geothermal power plant is located in Sonoma County. If these plants and all of the plants in the current application are sold, PG&E will have only one fossil fuel generating facility remaining, a plant at Humbolt Bay. Combined, the fossil fuel facilities consist of 3,482 net MWs of generating capacity, while the geothermal plant has a peak net of 680 MWs of generating capacity (which is declining over time).

Potential Cumulative Impacts

Although the issues and analysis for the PG&E power plants that are to be included in the second round application for divestiture may be similar to the issues and analysis for the current PG&E application, at this time the Proponent's Environmental Assessment (PEA) has not been completed nor submitted to the CPUC and, thus far, the project's potential impacts have not been analyzed. PG&E's initial application of three power plants are being examined in a separate Initial Study that is being prepared concurrent with this (Edison) Initial Study. That separate Initial Study indicates that PG&E's application will generate impacts similar to those of Edison's current application.

The power plants that are slated for divestiture by Edison and PG&E (in its current and future applications) will be sold at auction to new owners. It is anticipated that the new owners will have a tendency to increase generation at these plants. There are a number of reasons for this rationale that are outlined in Appendix C of the Initial Study. However, there is also considerable uncertainty and countervailing factors that make it infeasible to accurately predict the particular plants at which operations would increase as a result of divestiture or the amounts by which generation would increase at any particular plant (see Section 3, Approach to Environmental Analysis, in this Initial Study).

It is notable that increased generation at a power plant does not necessarily equate to increased emissions in light of the greater amount of emissions that are involved with start-ups or shutdowns from operating in a less constant mode. Furthermore, it is, anticipated that the demand for electricity will remain constant under divestiture. Because demand is constant, the cumulative availability of the Edison and PG&E power plants under new owners is likely to inhibit generation at any particular divested power plant. In addition, the PG&E plants to be divested are not in the

same location or area(s) as Edison's. The impacts associated with divestiture are primarily site specific and would not result in synergy's or impacts on a cumulative basis. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with PG&E's initial divestiture application and the power plants to be included in PG&E's future divestiture application would be less than significant.

2. Future Power Plant Development

Current and Certified Power Plant Developments

Information provided by the CEC lists 3 power plants that are either under construction at the present time or have the necessary certification to construct pending final siting and issuance of local building permits. They are Campbell Soup, Campbell Company, Sacramento County (158 MW); ARCO-Watson, ARCO Products Company, Carson, Los Angeles County (45 MW); and San Francisco Energy Company, San Francisco City and County (240 MW). These are further described below.

- Campbell Soup is under construction by Campbell Company. It is a natural gas fired Cogeneration power plant with a generating capacity of 158 MW located in Sacramento County. The power plant includes transmission line modifications and a substation to connect to the existing transmission system. The construction of the plant is about 95% complete. The start-up management has been selected and mobilized. The estimated date for construction to be completed is October, 1997.
- ARCO-Watson is being developed by ARCO Products Company. The Company has requested an amendment to the ARCO-Watson Cogeneration Project decision to expand the 385 MW capacity of its cogeneration plant by 45MW. The expansion is to be at the ARCO-Watson refinery in Carson. The expansion involves the construction and operation of a fifth natural gas fired turbine and heat recovery steam generator. ARCO-Watson has filed an amendment request to the ARCO-Watson Cogeneration Project Decision which will be heard by the CEC on September 24, 1997. ARCO proposes to start construction on October 1, 1997. After CEC approval, construction typically takes one and a half years for projects of this type.
- San Francisco Energy is proposed to be built by the San Francisco Energy Company. It is intended to be a combined-cycle cogeneration plant capable of generating up to 240 MW. The facility would generate electricity and steam using natural gas as the sole fuel source. The proposed project is a result of a solicitation by PG&E in which the Company was declared the winner in 1994. San Francisco Energy is evaluating two sites in the Bayview-Hunters Point area of San Francisco. Final site plans and agreements have not been completed. There is no announced date for construction to commence, and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors issued a Resolution in 1996 opposing the siting of this power plant.

Plants with Pending Applications

Information provided by the CEC lists five potential power plant siting cases. They are: Otay Mesa, San Diego County (660-700 MW); Sutter Power, Sutter County (480-500 MW); Pioneer, Livingston, Merced County (113 MW); High Desert, Victorville, San Bernardino County (680-830 MW); and Mobil Belridge, Kern County (166-177 MW).

- Otay Mesa is proposed by US Generating, Inc., an unregulated affiliate of PG&E. It would be a merchant power plant with a generating range of 660 to 700 MW to be located in southern San Diego County near the Mexico border. The facility is proposed to be a four unit gas-fired peaking project. The Project Proponent may convert the plant in the future to a combined cycle plant and is planning the electric transmission line size and circuitry to be able to handle either peaking loads or a combined cycle's more continuous operating profile. US Generating plans to file its Application for Certification (AFC) with the CEC by October 1, 1997.
- High Desert is proposed by Inland Energy and Constellation Energy. It would be a natural gas fired merchant power plant located at the California International Airport formerly known as George AFB near Victorville in San Bernardino County. The project may be a peaker, or a baseload combined-cycle plant, or a combination of both. An electric transmission line, natural gas pipeline and water and waste pipelines will be required. The AFC was filed on June 30, 1997. Staff recommendations to the CEC were heard on August 13, 1997 and the applicant was asked to submit additional information. Upon receipt of this information, the CEC will have 30 days to determine whether the AFC is complete.
- Sutter Power is proposed by the Calpine Corporation. It would be a natural gas fired merchant power plant in Sutter County at the same site as the company's existing Greenleaf Unit No. 1, located near Yuba City. The project will require construction of ancillary facilities including a new natural gas pipeline and a 230 KV transmission line. Calpine expects to file its AFC in September, 1997.
- Pioneer (aka Livingston) is proposed by Brock Energy, the Merced Irrigation District, the Turlock Irrigation District, Foster Farms and General Electric. It would be a combined cycle plant adjacent to the Foster Farms processing plant in the City of Livingston in Merced County. The project will serve as a commercial demonstration of the GE Kalina Cycle technology. The process uses a mixture of water and ammonia in the bottoming cycle to more efficiently convert gas turbine waste heat into electricity. The project will require up to nine miles of new or improved natural gas pipeline. The applicant plans to file its AFC in the Fall of 1997.
- Mobil Belridge is proposed by US Generating (an unregulated affiliate of PG&E) and Nations Energy. The project would be a thermally enhanced oil recovery facility located in the Belridge oil field. The site is located off Lost Hills Road near Highway 33 in Kern County.

The project will require the construction of ancillary facilities, including a natural gas pipeline connection with an existing line and a 230KV transmission line to interconnect with the PG&E Morro Bay-Midway line. In addition, steam, water and wastewater lines will need to be constructed to support the plant. The applicants expect to reach a decision on whether to file an AFC at the end of August (Haussler, 1997)

These power plants are in the early stages of application development and review. On average, permitting takes from 2-3 years before construction may start. It is unknown at this time which of these power plants, if any, will ultimately be fully permitted and built. However, it is reasonably foreseeable that one or more will ultimately be constructed.

Potential Cumulative Impacts

These potential future power plants, once constructed, are not expected to have cumulative impacts with the project. Demand for electricity in California is not expected to significantly increase. The cumulative effect of new plants (if built) would likely inhibit the tendency of the new owners of divested plants to increase operations at individual plants because new plants would tend to increase electrical generation capacity in California. The new proposed plants would employ the latest in generating and pollution control technology and may be cleaner to operate so that they would have lower emissions. This would provide a potential positive net benefit to the environment, particularly with respect to air quality. Therefore, the cumulative impacts associated with future potential power plants and the project would be less than significant.³

Local Cumulative Projects

There is the potential for the divestiture project, together with projects that are planned for the local communities in which a particular power plant resides, to result in cumulative impacts. This section analyzes the potential for cumulative impacts in the local communities utilizing the same checklist items from the Initial Study. The following projects have been identified by the Planning and Community Development departments for the communities surrounding the power plants. The list shows current and proposed development projects within a 1-mile radius of the plants.

TABLE 4.16-1: LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS WITHIN 1 MILE OF THE POWER PLANTS

Alamitos Generating Station	
6500 Pacific Coast Hwy	New supermarket and retail shops at the northwest corner of PCH and Studebaker. Review in process.
120 Studebaker Road	New hardware store (Orchards) and two restaurants at the southeast corner of PCH and Studebaker. Review in process.
Ellwood Generating Station	
Sandpiper	Condominiums, 160 units
UCSB Housing	Single Family Residential, 281 dwelling units Student Housing, 120 units
Naples	Single Family Residential, 354 dwelling units
Santa Barbara Shores	Single Family Residential, 33 dwelling units Townhomes, 128 units
Santa Barbara Shores Park Master Plan	Park/Recreation, 118 units
Phelps Road	Single Family Residential, 25 dwelling units Condominiums, 48 units
Camino Real Specific Plan (Phase II)	Residential (Condos or Apartments), 200 units
Winchester Common	Mixed Residential, 146 units
Hyatt Hotel	Hotel, 400 rooms
Storke Ranch	Mixed Residential, 275 units
Arco Dos Pueblos Links Golf Course	Golf Course, 27 holes
Dos Pueblos Golf Course	Golf Course, 18 holes
Deveraux School Residential	Condominiums, 20 units
Glen Annie Homes	Condominiums, 63 units
Storke Road Postal Facility	Postal, 207,000 square feet
Mountain View	Single Family Residential, 78 dwelling units Residential Duplex, 34 units
El Segundo Generating Station	
Sierra St.	Freight forwarding company
Sepulveda Blvd.	Chevron/McDonalds drive-thru restaurant
Vista Del Mar	Digester Gas Pipeline to Scattergood from Hyperion
3016-20 Highland 3017-21 Crest Dr., Manhattan Beach	4 unit Condominium Development; Use Permit/Tentative Parcel Map (UP/TPM) Extension
221 28th St., Manhattan Beach	Single Family Coastal Development Permit (CDP), not appealable to California Coastal Commission
117 21 St., Manhattan Beach	Commercial Planned Development (CPD), appealable to California Coastal Commission

TABLE 4.16-1: LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS WITHIN 1 MILE OF THE POWER PLANTS (Continued)

El Segundo Generating Station (cont.)	
2805 Highland Ave. Manhattan Beach	2-unit condo CPD/TPM
555-557 21st St. Manhattan Beach	Environmental Assessment (EA) [Gaslamp Overlay]
404 20th St., Manhattan Beach	Single Family Residential; CDP, not appealable to California Coastal Commission
216 24th Street, Manhattan Beach	Single Family Residential; CDP
3410 Laurel Avenue Manhattan Beach	Lot Split
124 19th Street, Manhattan Beach	Single Family Residential; CDP
2601 Crest Manhattan Beach	Room & Deck
558 31st Street Manhattan Beach	Single Family Residential
124 19th Street Manhattan Beach	Single Family Residential
212 43rd Street Manhattan Beach	Addition Duplex
657 33rd Street Manhattan Beach	2nd Story Addition
2607 Palm Ave. Manhattan Beach	Single Family Residential
1731 N. Sepulveda Manhattan Beach	Office Building
3301 Poinsettia Manhattan Beach	Single Family Residential
514 Marine Ave Manhattan Beach	2nd Story Garage Addition
570 30th Street Manhattan Beach	Single Family Residential
3100 Flournoy Manhattan Beach	Remodel
575 33rd St. Manhattan Beach	2nd Story Addition
448 24th Street Manhattan Beach	Remodel 2nd & 3rd Floor
1240 Rosecrans Manhattan Beach	Interior Improvements
448 24th Street Manhattan Beach	Remodel 2nd Floor

**TABLE 4.16-1: LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS WITHIN 1 MILE OF THE
POWER PLANTS (Continued)**

El Segundo Generating Station (cont.)	
1801 Sepulveda Blvd. Manhattan Beach	Remodel
221 28th Street Manhattan Beach	2-Unit Condo
Etiwanda Generating Station	
Price Costco, Inc. S/s Foothill Blvd. between I-15 & Etiwanda, Rancho Cucamonga	Retail building, 5,000 sq.ft. or restaurant, 2,800 sq.ft. on one acre
Price Costco, Inc. 12649 Foothill Blvd., Rancho Cucamonga	Price Club Addition, 24,000 sq.ft.
Wattson Co. S/s Foothill Blvd., E/o I-15 fwy. Rancho Cucamonga	Hollywood video; 6,550 sq.ft. on pad 1
Hughes Investments SWC Day Creek & Foothill Blvd., Rancho Cucamonga	Commercial Retail Center; 13 buildings; 322,975 sq.ft. total on 31.2 acres
Lewis Develop. Co. NWC Foothill & Rochester	Commercial Center, 495,736 sq.ft. on 47 acres
Wattson Co. S/s of Foothill Blvd., E/o I-15 fwy., Rancho Cucamonga	Oil Max; 1,900 sq.ft.
Arco NWC Foothill & Rochester, Rancho Cucamonga	Service station & mini-mart; 2,800 sq.ft. on 1.4 acres
J. Bermant Dev. Co. SEC Arrow Route & Rochester, Rancho Cucamonga	Twelve industrial buildings; 600,505 sq.ft. total on 29.4 acres
Schlosser Forge SWC Arrow & Rochester, Rancho Cucamonga	Addition of a Manufacturing building; 23,200 sq.ft.
Jack Masi SWC Foothill & Rochester, Rancho Cucamonga	One restaurant & three buildings; within the Masi Plaza
Ameron S/s Arrow, W/o Etiwanda, Rancho Cucamonga	Industrial building; 18,600 sq.ft. on 20+ acres
Himes-Peters Arch. NWC 6th and Rochester, Rancho Cucamonga	Industrial building expansion; 120,535 sq.ft. on 5.5 acres
Ralph Karubian S/s Jersey, W/o Millken, Rancho Cucamonga	Four warehouse buildings; 236,000 sq.ft. on 10 acres

**TABLE 4.16-1: LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS WITHIN 1 MILE OF THE
POWER PLANTS (Continued)**

Etiwanda Generating Station (cont.)	
Bradshaw International SEC Buffalo and San Marino, Rancho Cucamonga	Industrial building; 208,000 sq.ft. on 9.55 acres
Hertiage Bag N/s 4th, E/o Santa Anita, Rancho Cucamonga	Warehouse; 150,020 sq.ft. on 16.5 acres
Wallner Tooling N/o Foothill, E/o Center, Rancho Cucamonga	Manufacturing building; 82,252 sq.ft. on 7.55 acres
Jack Masi SWC Foothill & Rochester, Rancho Cucamonga	Industrial Master Plan; a mix of industrial, multi-tenant, office, & restaurant uses; 280,857 sq.ft. on 27 acres
Jack Masi SWC Foothill & Rochester, Rancho Cucamonga	Ice & Roller Rink, 29,800 sq.ft.; 1,250 seat theater within Masi Plaza
Ampac S/o Arrow Highway, E/o I-15 fwy., Rancho Cucamonga	Precast concrete pipe manufacturer, four buildings totaling 37,347 sq.ft.
Auto Nation NEC 4th & Buffalo Avenue, Rancho Cucamonga	Automotive Sales; 58,166 sq.ft. on 20 acres
Arco NEC 4th & Milliken, Rancho Cucamonga	Gas station & mini-market; 2,796 sq.ft. on 1.26 acres
Rancho Cucamonga Redevelopment Agency SWC ext. of Milliken & Jersey, Rancho Cucamonga	Addition of a Maintenance Facility Training Tower & Pump Test Enclosure, 27,592 sq.ft. on 7.08 acres
CBMWD SWC 6th St. & Etiwanda Ave., Rancho Cucamonga	Wastewater Treatment Plant, 6 buildings; 55,321 sq.ft. on 32.5 acres; development close to completion
So. Calif. Edison S/o Arrow 11711 Arrow Route, Rancho Cucamonga	Substation; W/s Rochester
Pacific Bell 7179 East Ave., Rancho Cucamonga	40 foot utility pole within a 360 sq.ft. leased site
JTC Architects 8306 Etiwanda, Rancho Cucamonga	GTE Facility; 672 sq.ft. Addition
CBMWD SWC 6th & Etiwanda; 9218 Etiwanda, Rancho Cucamonga	Two buildings within treatment plant

**TABLE 4.16-1: LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS WITHIN 1 MILE OF THE
POWER PLANTS (Continued)**

Etiwanda Generating Station (cont.)	
H.R. Engineering N/s Highland, E/o Day Creek, Rancho Cucamonga	Tentative Tract Map
Diversified Pacific Homes S/s Lemon, W/o Hermosa, Rancho Cucamonga	Tentative Tract Map
Mandalay Generating Station	
Mandalay	northeast corner of Harbor Blvd. and Fifth Street, 84.5 acre master planned residential community
Ormond Beach Generating Station	
Ormond Beach Specific Plan	The project could include the following uses: a golf course, recreation vehicle park, golf academy, visitor serving commercial recreation, aquaculture, business park, light industrial, open space park, residential, commercial, schools, park areas, visitor serving uses and a lake area.
Redondo Beach Generating Station	
609 North Lucia Avenue Redondo Beach	Construction of two residential condominium units
1717 Rockefeller Lane Redondo Beach	Construction of a chemical building for chloramine injection into the water delivery system
318 South Broadway, Redondo Beach	Construction of two residential condominium units
830 14th St., Hermosa Beach	Remodel
945 8th Pl., Hermosa Beach	Deck
570 3rd St., Hermosa Beach	Addition to condo
San Bernardino Generating Station	
Shell Oil Co. 1973 S. Tippicanoe St.	Interior & Exterior Remodel
Southeast corner of Rancho and Amigos Drives, Redlands	Structure totaling 15,252 square feet on a 39,797 square foot lot in the IC, Commercial Industrial District of the East Valley Corridor Specific Plan
1101 California Street, Redlands	Pharaoh's Lost Kingdom Theme Park
1740 E. Lugonia Avenue, Redlands	Review for a 4 foot monument sign with an area of 16 square feet for "Chief Auto Parts"
Huntington Beach Generating Station	
Third Block West btn Main Street and 5th Street, and Walnut Ave. and Olive Street	Approved mixed use project with 40,000 square feet of retail/commercial, and housing; construction anticipated to begin Fall 1997.
Waterfront Project PCH, btn Huntington Street and Beach Blvd.	Existing Waterfront Hilton Hotel proposed to be used for a 500- room resort hotel and conference center, residential uses, and a third hotel in the future. Project under review.

**TABLE 4.16-1: LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS WITHIN 1 MILE OF THE
POWER PLANTS (Continued)**

Huntington Beach Generating Station (cont.)	
Main Street/Walnut	Demolish existing Standard Market building and replace with a new 9,000 sq. ft. two-story retail building. Construction anticipated to begin September 1997.
Morgan Stanley Property PCH, btn First Street and Huntington Street	Proposed retail/commercial, and timeshare resort development. Initial conceptual plan submitted.
Highgrove Generating Station	
Bernardo Way, Grand Terrace	Single Family Residential, 3,000 sq. ft. addition
Pacific Diversified Homes, Inc. Grand Terrace	28 new Single Family Residential units on existing approved lots
Noal Long House Grand Terrace	Single Family Residential; 3,000 sq. ft addition
Lot split Grand Terrace	Tentative Parcel Map (TPM)
Lot split Grand Terrace.	TPM
Lot split Grand Terrace.	TPM
Superior Pool Products, Grand Terrace	12,000 sq. ft. warehouse/distribution center, Certificate of Occupancy
TNT Construction, Grand Terrace	3,600 sq. ft. industrial building with office space
COX Communication Grand Terrace.	Location for cellular telecommunication tower

Land Use and Planning

The various projects are under consideration for approval from the community planning agencies and will be accepted or rejected based on their individual compliance with local planning and zoning regulations and policies. Each of the plants to be divested is consistent with the planning and zoning regulations that pertain within the local jurisdiction. The project would not result in cumulative impacts on land use and planning with the proposed projects.

Population and Housing

The list of projects includes many projects that will have incremental effects on community growth and housing. However, the divestiture project will not likely generate additional population or give rise to housing demand, and will thus have no effect cumulatively with these projects.

Geologic Problems

The project will not alter the geologic conditions or hazards existing on or near the power plant sites. The local projects and divestiture of the power plants do not have any synergistic or cumulative impact on geologic conditions.

Water

Although many of the projects will have some effect on water demand, the existing basin adjudication agreements result in no cumulative effect with the divestiture project on groundwater supply. The divestiture project will have essentially no impact on erosion or runoff, so no cumulative impact with local projects would be expected. There are no water quality discharges from the local projects that would commingle or otherwise affect the discharges from the divestiture project. Therefore, no cumulative impacts on water resources are anticipated.

Air Quality

The incremental air quality effects of this project stems from an unquantifiable tendency for new owners to operate the plants at higher levels. As discussed in Section 3, it is not feasible to predict how this tendency might manifest itself at particular plants. Given this uncertainty, and the fact that new owners will be constrained to operate within the existing air quality permits and regulations, this project does not have impacts that would be considered cumulatively considerable.

Transportation and Circulation

Transportation and circulation impacts from the divestiture project, if any, are negligible. The incremental impacts of the project would pose no cumulatively considerable impacts when considered with community projects.

Biological Resources

As mitigated, the impact of divestiture on local sensitive habitats would be insignificant, and the local projects are not expected to affect these habitats in a way that would produce significant impacts in combination with the project.

Energy and Mineral Resources

All of the community projects will consume some energy and mineral resources for construction and for operation. However, neither the divestiture nor the local community projects would conflict with any adopted energy conservation plans, are anticipated to be wasteful or inefficient, or would affect known mineral resources. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative impacts.

Hazards

The project was found to pose less than significant impacts to the environment with respect to risks of accidental explosion or exposure of people to potential health hazards. The hazards associated with the project would not interact cumulatively with the local community projects. Therefore, there would not be any significant cumulative projects.

Noise

Noise from the project was found to be less than significant. Although there are local community projects planned for the vicinity of some of the plants, the noise from construction and operation of the community projects would be sufficiently distant from any particular plant so as not to measurably raise decibel levels. Since the incremental effects of the project are not considerable when viewed in connection with the proposed community projects, the project, together with cumulative projects, would pose less than significant cumulative impacts.

Public Services

It was determined that there are less than significant impacts to local public services as a result of divestiture. Although the local community projects would require additional public services, the minor potential impacts from the divestiture project would not be expected to additionally burden public services substantially more than the needs for the community projects. Since the incremental effects of the project are not considerable when viewed in connection with the proposed community projects, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Utilities and Service Systems

The divestiture was found to have negligible impacts on utilities and service systems, if any. Although the local community projects would place additional demands on utilities and service systems, the minor potential impacts from the divestiture project would not be expected to additionally burden these systems substantially more than the needs for the community projects. In particular, the projects incremental effects would not be considerable when viewed in conjunction with the community project's. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Aesthetics

Because the physical modifications of the project are minor, such as new fences within industrial areas, the project will have a less than significant impact on local aesthetics and vistas and scenic highways. Although the local community projects may have some effects on aesthetics, the divestiture project's affects are so minor that they would not cumulate with those of the other projects.

Cultural Resources

The minor construction projects (e.g., fences and soil remediation) that could result from the divestiture project may potentially impact currently unknown subsurface archaeological and paleontological resources. Mitigation methods are proposed to fully mitigate impacts should they occur. It is possible that the local community projects may also impact cultural resources. However, since the divestiture project impacts would be fully mitigated and the impacts of the local community projects could be (and likely would be) similarly mitigated, no cumulative impacts would be expected.

Recreation

The divestiture project may result in a slight increase in employment, and correspondingly demand for recreational facilities, at plants where new owners increase operation of the plants. There would be no cumulative significant impacts on recreation supply and demand.

Conclusion

Divestiture has no impact or a less than significant impact on the following environmental issues: land use and planning, population and housing, geology, water, transportation, energy and mineral resources, hazards, public services, utilities and service systems, noise, aesthetics, and recreation. With the mitigation measures proposed, there are less than significant impacts to air quality, biologic resources, and cultural resources as a result of divestiture. The local community projects are not anticipated to affect these resources in a manner that would create significant impacts in combination with the project. Therefore, and in light of the foregoing analysis, the cumulative impacts are less than significant.

d) Effects on Human Beings

As discussed in the above checklists, the project could result in substantial adverse effects on human beings. However, with the proposed mitigations and mitigation monitoring all potentially significant impacts are reduced to less than significant. Conclusion

On the basis of the information and the analysis discussed under the individual checklists and summarized above, the potential effects on human beings would be less than significant as a result of divestiture.