

**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 goals.

### ***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 PG&E and addressed in this document, there are three categories of projects that are reasonably foreseeable and may impact the environment cumulatively with the PG&E project. They are 1) the divestiture of power plant assets by Southern California Edison, as proposed in Southern California Edison's pending application (Application No. 96 11 046) 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 Other CPUC Regulated Power Plants***

##### **Divestiture of Southern California Edison Power Plants**

Southern California Edison Company's divestiture application (Application No. 96-11-046) seeks to sell 12 fossil fuel power plants, all located in Southern California. The power plants are:

Alamitos, in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County; Cool Water, in the community of Dagget, San Bernardino County; Ellwood, in the community of Goleta, Santa Barbara County; El Segundo, in the City of El Segundo, Los Angeles County; Etiwanda, in the City of Rancho Cucamonga, San Bernardino County; Highgrove, in the City of Grand Terrace, San Bernardino County; Huntington Beach, in the City of Huntington Beach, Los Angeles County; Long Beach, in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County; Mandalay, in the City of Oxnard, Ventura county; Ormond Beach, in the City of Oxnard, Ventura County; Redondo, in the City of Redondo Beach, Los Angeles County; and San Bernardino, in San Bernardino County. The plants represent almost 100% of Edison's natural gas and fuel oil fired generation assets. Combined, these facilities consist of 9,562 megawatts of generating capacity.

### **Future Divestiture of PG&E Power Plants**

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. Edison's power plants are being examined in a separate Initial Study that is being prepared concurrent with this (PG&E) Initial Study. That separate Initial Study indicates that Edison's application will generate impacts similar to those of the 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 Edison plants to be divested are not in the same location or area(s) as PG&E's. The impacts associated with divestiture are primarily site specific and would not result in synergies or impacts on a cumulative basis. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with Edison's 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 project, together with projects that are planned within the local communities in which a particular power plant resides, to result in cumulative impacts. The communities of concern are : Moss Landing (within Monterey County), the City of Morro Bay and the City of Oakland. The following projects have been identified by the Planning and Community Development Departments for the communities surrounding the power plants and, in the case of the Oakland power plant, information was supplied by the Port of Oakland. This section analyzes the potential for cumulative impacts in the local communities utilizing the same checklist items from the Initial Study. The cumulative projects are listed in the Table 4.16.1.

<b>TABLE 4.16.1: LOCAL COMMUNITY PROJECTS</b>	
<b>Moss Landing (Monterey County)</b>	
Moss Landing Harbor	This project involves a potential reconfiguration in the harbor facilities adjacent to the plant, which would allow for increased harbor use by commercial fishing and recreational vessels.
Marine Laboratory	This project would relocate a California State University Marine Laboratory to a site approximately 1/4 mile south of the Moss Landing Power Plant.
<b>City of Morro Bay</b>	
220 Atascadero Road	Remodel and add 24,090 sq. ft. to an existing roller rink, to include a 16 lane bowling alley and restaurant
290 Atascadero Road	Construct 800 sq. ft. fast food restaurant
1305 Berwick	New Single Family Residence (SFR)
1318 Berwick	New SFR
1323 Berwick	New SFR
1332 Berwick	New SFR
1348 Berwick	New SFR
1368 Berwick	New SFR
1307 Berwick	New SFR
1310 Bolton	New SFR
1340 Bolton	New SFR
Coleman Drive	RV Park & Campground and Marine Services
Coleman Drive	Marine Haul-out Facility Launch Ramp & Re-locate Coleman Park
945 Embarcadero	Reconstruct Deck and Accessway
998 Embarcadero	New 2 story 4,000 sq. ft. Retail
1200 Block Embarcadero	Coastguard Building Expansion
1200 Block Embarcadero	Seafood Processing Plant
1200 Block Embarcadero	City Maintenance Yard Expansion
215 Harbor	Restore 21 unit Hotel
235 Harbor	Addition to Motel
911 Main	Convert Commercial Space to apartment
845 Morro Avenue	Addition to Motel
1215 Morro Avenue	New SFR
1260 Morro Avenue	New SFR
260 Morro Bay Blvd.	New 33 unit Motel
1305 Prescott	New SFR

**TABLE 4.16.1: (Continued) Cumulative Projects**

<b>Port of Oakland</b>	
Jack London Square Marinas	Reconstruct dock and berthing facilities in three basins; improvement of land side support facilities (harbormaster office, restrooms, etc.) and public access.
Potomac & Relief Berthing	Construction of permanent berthing facilities for the yacht Potomac and light ship Relief.
Barnes & Noble Improvements	Construction of enhancements to north and east sides of structure to improve service operations (deliveries, trash, pick-up) and aesthetic value.
Embarcadero Corridor Improvement Program	Rehabilitation and enhancement of Embarcadero from Clay to Oak Street, including removal of unused rails, installation of improved pedestrian surfaces and landscaping.
Ferry Terminal Improvements	Construction of land side enhancements at all foot of Clay Street to make the terminal more visible and provide sheltered waiting area.
Harrison Marine Renovations	Renovation of three existing buildings (interior & exterior), landscape improvements.
Marriot Hotel	Demolition of existing miscellaneous structures & construction of a 122-room all-suite hotel with public access improvements on a 2-acre site.
Cinema/Retail Development, Broadway & Embarcadero	Construction of an eight-screen cinema above ground-floor retail on parcel at Broadway & Embarcadero.
Historic Ships Cove, West Basin	Construction of berthing and visitor facilities for historic vessels.
Superfund Site	Construction of boat maintenance business on capped site.
Waterfront Plaza Hotel Expansion	Construction of a high end hotel with restaurant and conference facilities, on the development parcel at Water and Washington Streets.
Charter Vessel Marina (Hornblower), West Basin	Installation of floating docks to accommodate East Bay base for charter operation.
FDR Pier Replacement	Major repairs or total demolition and replacement of deteriorated public pier at Clay Street.
Jack London Aquatic Center	City project to construct public boathouse facilities and parking on approximately 1.5 acres. Port to contribute to project funding.
Lincoln Property Company	Sale of an approximately 9-acre parcel to Lincoln Properties for development of a 288-unit rental apartment complex.
Crowley	Demolition of derelict buildings and wharves.
Cal Crew Boathouse	Proposal to develop boathouse, dock, parking and landscaping on approximately 2-acre portion of 6-acre development parcel.



## **Moss Landing**

### **Cumulative Impacts**

**Land Use and Planning.** The two projects are consistent with the Moss Landing Master Plan, as is the Moss Landing power plant under divestiture.

**Population and Housing.** The harbor and marine lab projects, together with the project, will not displace any established community or be growth inducing.

**Geologic Problems.** The local projects and divestiture of the power plant do not alter or significantly impact geologic conditions in either the harbor or the vicinity of the plant.

**Water.** Under divestiture it was determined that there were less than significant impacts due to thermal discharges at the Moss Landing power plant as the plant would operate within its NPDES limits. There is no cumulative impact based upon the inclusion of the local projects with respect to water discharge or marine water quality.

**Air Quality.** The incremental air quality effects of this project stem from 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.** The project would pose no cumulative impacts with inclusion of the harbor or marine lab projects. Only negligible traffic increases could occur with these projects.

**Biological Resources.** Divestiture gives rise to a potentially significant impact on the Moss Landing slough, which is a local sensitive habitats. However, with proposed mitigation, the impact is less than significant. The harbor project will need to deal with its own permit and dredging issues in order to go forward but cumulatively considerable impacts would be less than significant since the projects will have to comply with NPDES permits.

**Energy and Mineral Resources.** There are no cumulative impacts on energy and mineral resources expected to occur based upon divestiture and the harbor and marine lab projects.

**Hazards.** No cumulative impacts are expected from the project and the harbor reconfiguration and marine lab relocation with respect to accidents and risk of upset or exposure to hazardous waste because project proponents will be required to comply with all pertinent laws and regulations.

**Noise.** The project was found to have less than significant impacts stemming from potential increases in noise levels based upon the tendency for new owners to increase operations at plants. Neither the harbor nor the marine lab project area expected to generate substantial new noise. The combined projects would pose no significant cumulative impacts to local noise conditions.

**Public Services.** The project, combined with the harbor reconfiguration and the marine lab relocation would not place any additional significant burdens on local services and would not create impacts cumulatively.

**Utilities and Service Systems.** Utilities and local service systems, including electrical transmission reliability, would essentially remain unchanged by the project combined with the two local projects and would not produce any cumulative impacts.

**Aesthetics.** Cumulatively, the project and the Moss Landing harbor reconfiguration and marine lab relocation would not significantly alter or adversely affect local visual contrasts with the surrounding landscape.

**Cultural Resources.** The project was found to have a less than significant impact on archaeological resources after mitigation measures are imposed. No cumulatively significant impacts are expected with the inclusion of the local harbor and lab projects, which could involve similar mitigation measures to ensure that cultural resources would not be adversely affected.

**Recreation.** Under divestiture new owners would continue to pay a "boat wash" subsidy to keep local boats clean and all other local recreational areas would be unaffected. The harbor reconfiguration project would potentially increase local recreation resources. Therefore, the project, combined with the local developments, will produce no cumulative impacts.

### ***Conclusion***

Divestiture has less than significant impacts, with the mitigation measures proposed in the Initial Study. The local projects are not anticipated to affect local resources in a manner that would create significant impacts in combination with the project. Therefore, there are no significant cumulative impacts expected.

### **Morro Bay**

According to the Morro Bay Planning Department, there are 12 single family residence, 2 motel/hotels, 1 commercial building, 1 apartment building, a recreational vehicle park and several waterfront related projects either under construction or with permits pending. There are also several other projects in the conceptual stage. The list shows current and proposed projects within an approximately 1-mile radius of the plant. All of these are considered in the analysis below.

**Land Use and Planning.** The various projects are under consideration for approval from the City Planning Department and will be accepted or rejected based upon their individual compliance with local planning and zoning regulations and policies. The projects would not result in cumulative impacts on land use and planning with the proposed project.

**Population and Housing.** The list of local projects includes many that will have incremental effects on community growth and housing. However, the divestiture project will have no impact cumulatively with these projects since the project is not expected to affect population numbers, or housing needs or supplies.

**Geologic Problems.** The project itself does not impact geologic conditions or hazards. The local projects and divestiture of the power plant would not have any synergistic or cumulative impact on geologic conditions.

**Water.** Although many of the projects will have some effect on water demand, this would be minor and would result in no cumulative considerable effect with the divestiture project on water supply. 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.** The project itself would not impact traffic and circulation. The effects of the project and the projects being proposed would have only incremental and minor increases in traffic. The combined projects would not result in cumulative impacts on local transportation and circulation.

**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.** There are no cumulative impacts expected to occur from divestiture and the local projects as they would not affect known mineral resources, nor increase the wasteful use of energy.

**Hazards.** The project was found to pose less than significant impacts to the environment with respect to risks of accidents or exposure of people to potential health hazards. Cumulatively the local projects and the divested plant would pose no additional impacts since all construction and operation would be subject to laws & regulations designed to protect human health and safety.

**Noise.** The project and local projects combined would account for only minor incremental increases in noise. Noise would likely remain within accepted level and ordinance standards.

**Public Services.** The project would only minimally affect public services. Public services would experience only minor incremental increases due to the project and the local proposed projects. Cumulatively, considerable impact would not occur.

**Utilities and Service Systems.** Divestiture, together with the local projects, would present no cumulative impacts on transmission reliability, power, or local water supplies.

**Aesthetics.** The project, in combination with local proposed developments would have no significant effect on local vistas, scenic highways or in creating additional light and glare. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impacts.

**Cultural Resources.** The project's impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated. The project and proposed local developments would have only a minor effect on local paleontological, archaeological and historical resources. Each individual project could mitigate its potential effects on cultural resources. There would thus be no cumulative impacts due to the combined projects.

**Recreation.** With divestiture and the proposed local projects, there would be incremental effects, some of which would enhance local recreational resources. There would be no significant cumulative impacts on recreation supply or demand.

### ***Conclusion***

With mitigation measures, divestiture would not significantly impact the environment. Divestiture and the combination of local development projects would have incremental effects on the environment that would be minor or insignificant. The local projects are not anticipated to affect local resources in a manner that would create significant impacts in combination with the project. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts from the sale of the Morro Bay plant.

### **Oakland**

According to the Port Commission Real Estate Division of the Port of Oakland, there are a number of projects planned for development in the Port area. Projects include: a cinema and retail complex at Jack London Square, 2 hotels, marine terminal and berthing improvements, a 288 unit apartment complex, building renovations and improvements to the Embarcadero along the waterfront. The list shows current and proposed developments within approximately a 1-mile radius of the plant. All of these are considered in the analysis below.

**Land Use and Planning.** The various projects are under consideration for government approval, and will be accepted or rejected based upon their individual compliance with local planning and

zoning regulations and policies. The Oakland plant is an existing land use that will not change with the project. The projects would not result in cumulative impacts on land use and planning in combination with the proposed projects.

**Population and Housing.** The list of local projects includes many that will have incremental effects on community growth and housing. However, the divestiture project will have no impact cumulatively with these projects since the project is not expected to affect population, or housings needs or supplies.

**Geologic Problems.** The project itself will not affect geologic conditions or hazards. The local projects and divestiture of the power plant would not have any synergistic or cumulative impact on geologic conditions.

**Water.** Although many of the projects will have some effect on water demand, this would be minor and would result in no cumulative effect with the divestiture project on water supply. There are no water quality discharges from the local projects that would affect the divestiture project. Therefore, no cumulative impacts on water resources are anticipated.

**Air Quality.** The incremental air quality effect 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.** The project itself would not impact traffic circulation. The effects of the project and the projects being proposed would have only incremental and minor increases in traffic. The combined projects would not result in cumulative impacts on local transportation and circulation.

**Biological Resources.** The effect of the project and the local projects on local sensitive habitats would be insignificant or incrementally small since the area is urban and relatively developed. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impacts.

**Energy and Mineral Resources.** There are no cumulative impacts expected to occur from divestiture and the local projects as they would not affect known mineral resources, nor increases the wasteful use of energy.

**Hazards.** The project was found to pose less than significant impacts to the environment with respect to risks of accidents or exposure of people to potential health hazards. Cumulatively the local projects and the divested plant would pose no additional impacts since all construction and operation would be subject to laws and regulations designed to protect human health and safety.

**Noise.** The project and local projects combined would account for some incremental increases in noise. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impacts on current ordinances and would be within accepted levels.

**Public Services.** The project would minimally, if at all, affect public services. Public services would experience only minor incremental increases due to the project and the local proposed projects. Cumulatively, there would be no impacts.

**Utilities and Service Systems.** Divestiture, together with the local projects, would present no cumulative impacts on transmission reliability, power, or local water supplies.

**Aesthetics.** The project, in combination with local proposed developments, would have no significant effect on local vistas, scenic highways or in creating additional light and glare. All of these projects are in a relatively developed, urban setting. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impacts.

**Cultural Resources.** The project will produce no impacts to cultural resources at the Oakland plant. The project and proposed local developments would have only a minor effect on local paleontological, archaeological and historical resources. There would be no cumulative impacts due to the combined projects.

**Recreation.** With divestiture and the proposed local projects, there would be incremental effects, some of which would enhance local recreational resources. There would be no cumulative significant impacts on recreation supply and demand.

### ***Conclusion***

The divestiture of the Oakland Power Plant, combined with local projects within and adjacent to the Port of Oakland will not contribute to cumulative impacts in the Oakland area.

### **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 mitigation's 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.