

SECTION 2.0

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST & EXPANDED EXPLANATION

1. Project Title: Pacific Gas and Electric Company Divestiture of Richmond-to-Pittsburg Fuel Oil Pipeline and Hercules Pump Station/San Pablo Bay Pipeline Company to Own and Operate the Richmond-to-Pittsburg Fuel Oil Pipeline and Hercules Pump Station
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: California Public Utilities Commission
Energy Division
505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Billie C. Blanchard (415) 703-2068
4. Project Location: 4200 San Pablo Avenue, Pumping Station
Hercules, CA 94547
Contra Costa County
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street, P.O. Box 77000
San Francisco, CA 94177-0001

San Pablo Bay Pipeline Company
1660 West Anaheim
Wilmington, CA 90744
6. General Plan Designation: Various (see Section IX for complete listings)
7. Zoning: Various (see Section IX for complete listings)
8. Description of Project:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company is seeking authority, through submittal of a Section 851 Application to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), to sell its heated Richmond to Pittsburg Fuel Oil Pipeline and Hercules Pump Station to San Pablo Bay Pipeline Company (SPBPC), a subsidiary of Tosco Corporation. SPBPC is seeking authority under Sections 216 and 228 of the Public Utilities Code to own and operate the Richmond-to-Pittsburg Fuel Oil

Pipeline and Hercules Pump Station as a common carrier pipeline corporation. See the attached pages.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The approximately 35-mile pipeline is located underground in Contra Costa County, California, and primarily follows the San Francisco Bay shoreline between the cities of Richmond and Pittsburg. The land uses traversed by the pipeline are primarily characterized as urban; however, portions of the pipeline cross several open space/parklands. The Hercules Pump Station is located in the City of Hercules at 4200 San Pablo Avenue.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

The anticipated replacement of a portion of the pipeline would require the new owner (San Pablo Bay Pipeline Company) to obtain various permits and discretionary approvals. These may include, but are not limited to, compliance with the following (note that these approvals are discussed in greater detail in their respective checklist section but are included for reference here in list form):

- Historic Resources, State Historic Preservation Office, Historic Preservation Act Section 106
- Federal Endangered Species Act 16 United States Code (USC) Sections 1531 – 1544
- Clean Water Act, Section 401/404, Water Quality Certification/Waiver, Title 33 USC Section 1125 et seq.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Title 33 USC Section 401 et seq., Title 33 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 320 et seq., Nationwide permit program
- Clean Water Act, Storm Water Regulations, Construction Activities, Title 40 CFR Part 122
- National Environmental Policy Act, Title 40 CFR Part 1501.3 (b)
- California Endangered Species Act, Fish and Game Code 2050 et seq.
- San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) Permit
- California Native Plant Protection Act under the direction of the Department of Fish and Game
- Streambed Alteration, Fish and Game Code Section 1600
- Welding permit, Bay Area Air Quality Management District
- Local encroachment permits

- Compliance with local general plans and corresponding approval from the Cities of Richmond, Pinole, Hercules, Martinez, and Pittsburg, as well as, Contra Costa County
- Work permit from Union Pacific Railroad to work along easements

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.