

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



January 11, 2019

Mr. David Thomas
245 Market Street, Room 1054D
San Francisco, CA 94105

RE: Minor Project Modification #10 for the Fulton-Fitch Mountain Reconductoring Project

Dear Mr. Thomas,

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) prepared an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E's) Fulton-Fitch Mountain Reconductoring Project (A. 15-12-005). On December 18, 2017, the CPUC issued a decision to adopt the Final IS/MND and grant PG&E a Permit to Construct the project (Decision D.17-12-012). The CPUC adopted the mitigation measures (MMs) and applicant proposed measures (APMs) identified in the IS/MND as conditions of project approval, as well as a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) to ensure compliance with the MMs and APMs pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21081.6 and § 15097 of the CEQA Guidelines (Section 4 of the Final IS/MND).

A detailed Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Plan (MMCRP) was developed for the project with direct participation with PG&E staff. The MMCRP defines specific procedures that are part of the adopted program including the Minor Project Refinement (MPR) process, which requires PG&E to obtain CPUC authorization for any deviations from the approved project.

On January 7, 2019, PG&E submitted MPR #10 requesting CPUC authorization to leave geotextile fabric and gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12. A copy of the MPR request materials are enclosed as Attachment 1. The CPUC conducted a CEQA consistency review for MPR #10 following the procedures set forth in the MMCRP. A completed review form and summary of findings is provided in Attachment 2. This letter serves to inform you that the CPUC has reviewed and approved PG&E's request for MPR #10 on the basis that no new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

Please direct any questions related to this matter to me at 415-703-1966 or lisa.orsaba@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Lisa Orsaba".

Lisa Orsaba

Mr. David Thomas
January 11, 2019

Page 2

Project Manager
Energy Division, CEQA Unit

cc: Aaron Lui, Project Manager, Panorama Environmental, Inc.
Tom Davis, Environmental Compliance Supervisor, Stantec

Attachment 1: PG&E Request for MPR #10
Attachment 2: CPUC Review of MPR #10

Attachment 1: PG&E Request for MPR #10

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REQUEST FORM



Part A: Request Description

MPR Request

Request Number: 10
Date Requested: [January 7, 2018]
**Proposed Duration/
Timing of Use:** June 1, 2018 to January 31, 2019
Monday-Sunday; 24 hours/day
Location: LZ-6 and PS-12, Bailhache Avenue
0.84 square acre in size
Attached Map? Yes No

Proposed Action(s)

PG&E proposes to leave geotextile fabric and gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12, at the request of the property owner; LZ-6 is approximately 0.7 acre and PS-12 is approximately 0.14 acre in size. As a result, these impacts would be changed from temporary to permanent.

Purpose(s)

The property owner has requested that gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12 be left on site.

Part B: Existing Conditions

Existing Land Uses: Private open space
Surrounding Land Uses: Residential, vineyard, pasture
**Sensitive Receptors
within 500 feet:** N/A
**Environmental Recourses
within 500 feet:** N/A
**Has landowner approval
been granted?** Yes No N/A

Landowner: Minaglia Partners; 1115 Bailhache Avenue, Healdsburg, CA 95448

Surveys

List any new survey reports under Part D, attach a copy, and describe relevant survey details under the applicable resource category listed in the Part E.

Biological Resources. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for biological resources with the potential to occur in the area? If so, were survey results positive or negative? Were surveys completed during the appropriate timing and season to detect resources? If not, describe under the applicable resource category in Part E.

LZ-6 and PS-12 were surveyed during vegetation surveys in March 2018, and during preconstruction surveys. Prior to installing geotextile fabric and gravel in the work spaces, they were composed entirely of non-native grassland habitat. There is no suitable aquatic habitat for California red-legged frog or foothill yellow-legged frog within 500 feet of LZ-6 or PS-12.

Cultural Resources. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for cultural resources (records search and pedestrian survey)? If so, were survey results positive or negative?

Pedestrian surveys were conducted between 2011 and 2017. Results of surveys were negative.

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REQUEST FORM

Jurisdictional Waters. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for hydrologic resources? If so, were survey results positive or negative?

The LZ-6 and PS-12 were surveyed for hydrological resources; none occur within LZ-6 or PZ-12

Part C: Permits, Agency Approvals, and Environmental Protection Measures

List any new permits or agency approvals under Part D, attach a copy, and describe relevant details under the applicable resource category listed in Part E.

Have all required permits, permit amendments/authorizations, or agency approvals been issued by resource agencies with applicable jurisdiction? Describe if necessary.

Yes

Would the proposed action(s) conflict with permit conditions or agency approvals? Describe if necessary.

No.

Would the proposed action(s) conflict with project applicant proposed measures or mitigation measures listed in Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND)? Describe if necessary.

No. The ISMND Project Description Section 2.6.3 "Gravel and Geotextile Fabric" (page 2-32) allows for gravel and fabric to be left in place for use by landowner request if on private land.

Part D: Attached Materials

List any attached materials (e.g. surveys, maps, photos, memos, agency authorizations, etc.) below. Materials should be attached to the end of this form.

Figure 1: Map of LZ-6 and PS-12.

Part E: Final IS/MND Consistency Summary

Complete the Final IS/MND Consistency Summary below and answer the consistency questions for each resource category. Include a description and justification below each resource category as necessary. The consistency questions were developed using the CEQA Checklist provided in the Final IS/MND. Refer to the Final IS/MND for the details on the project impact evaluation.

Would the proposed action(s) result in a new impact, or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on:	No Change	Potentially Significant Change	N/A
---	-----------	--------------------------------	-----

Aesthetics (e.g., damage scenic resources or vistas, degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings, or create sources of light or glare)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

Leaving the gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12 would result in a conversion of grassland habitat; however, it would not be visible to the public from adjacent Bailhache Avenue. LZ-6 and PS-12 would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on aesthetics.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources (e.g., convert Farmland to nonagricultural use, or create a conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REQUEST FORM

Leaving the gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12 would result in a conversion of non-native grassland, historically used as grazing land by the property owner. As such, the proposed action would result in the conversion of approximately 0.84 acre of farmland to non-agricultural land.

Air Quality (e.g. produce additional emissions, or expose sensitive receptors to additional pollutants)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant

Use of LZ-6 and PS-12 after construction is complete could result in the creation of fugitive dust. However, use of the site would be limited to personal use by the property owner for personal vehicles and farming equipment, and would be consistent with current ongoing activities at the active ranch. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on air quality.

Biological Resources (e.g., cause an adverse effect to sensitive or special-status species, or impact riparian, wetland, or any other sensitive habitat, or conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

There is no suitable aquatic habitat for California red-legged frog or foothill yellow-legged frog within 500 feet of LZ-6 or PS-12. No small mammal burrows or badger dens were observed during preconstruction surveys. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on biological resources.

Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources (e.g., cause adverse change to a historical, archeological, or tribal cultural resource)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

No new excavations or digging would be performed in the proposed at LZ-6 or PS-12. The LZ-6 and PS-12 would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on cultural or tribal resources.

Geology and Soils (e.g., cause or expose people or structures to geologic or soil hazards, including erosion or loss of topsoil)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

Leaving gravel in place at LZ-6 and PS-12 would not require any earthmoving activities and would not result in the loss of topsoil or increase erosion; Leaving these areas in place would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on geology and soils.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (e.g., generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant

Leaving LZ-6 and PS-12 in place after construction is completed would not result in an increase in the level of equipment use and run time of equipment. The use would be consistent with current ongoing operations at the active ranch. The LZ-6 and PS-12 would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (e.g., create or increase the exposure of people or structures to hazardous materials or wildland fires, involve the use of additional hazardous materials or equipment, or interfere with an adopted emergency plan)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

LZ-6 and PS-12 does not contain any known hazardous material sites, and none were created as a result of construction activities. Leaving the gravel would result in a reduction in fire risk in that area. LZ-6 and

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REQUEST FORM

PS-12 would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality (e.g., degrade water quality, discharge waste or sediment, deplete groundwater, alter the existing drainage pattern, create additional runoff water or polluted runoff, place structures in a 100-year flood hazard area, or expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

There are no aquatic resources within 500 feet of LZ-6 and PS-12. While leaving the gravel in place at these sites may result in an increase in runoff, the threat to water quality would be low and additional BMPs would be left in place after construction, as necessary. LZ-6 and PS-12 would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on hydrology and water quality.

Land Use (e.g., conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, or conflict with a habitat conservation plan)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

The LZ-6 and PS-12 are located on private property and would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on land use and planning.

Noise (e.g., expose sensitive receptors to additional noise or vibration)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

There are no sensitive receptors within 500 feet of LZ-6 or PS-12, and would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on noise.

Paleontological Resources (e.g., cause adverse change to a paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

Leaving gravel in place LZ-6 and PS-12 would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on paleontological resources.

Population and Housing (e.g., induce substantial population growth in an area, or displace substantial numbers of people or housing)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant

Leaving gravel in place at LZ-6 and PS-12 would not result in any impacts to population and housing, and would be consistent with the analysis of the ISMND. LZ-6 and PS-12 would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on population and housing.

Recreation (e.g., increases the use of, or cause adverse effects to, parks or other recreational facilities)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

The LZ-6 and PS-12 is located on private land, and would therefore have no impact on recreation facilities or parks. The LZ-6 and PS-12 would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on recreation.

Transportation and Traffic (e.g., increase traffic congestion or degrade performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, or increase hazards due to a design feature)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REQUEST FORM

Leaving gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12 would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on transportation and traffic.

Utilities and Public Services (e.g., result in construction of new, or expansion of existing, water facilities, stormwater drainage facilities, require additional water entitlements, or creation of new solid waste disposal needs)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

Leaving gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12 would not include the construction of new, or expand existing, water facilities, stormwater drainage facilities, require additional water entitlements, or creation of new solid waste disposal needs.



- Legend**
- Access Road
 - Fitch Mt Tap 60 kV
 - Fulton-Hopland 60 kV
 - Geysers - Fulton 230 kV
 - Pole

TAP Staging Area

LZ 6

PS 12

Bunin Rd
Bailhache Ave

Mineralia Rd

104

105

109

92

91

90

89

88



Attachment 2: CPUC Review of MPR #10

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM



Part A: Request Description

MPR Request

Request Number: 10
Date Requested: January 7, 2019
**Proposed Duration/
Timing of Use:** Permanent
Location: LZ-6 and PS-12, Bailhache Avenue
0.84 acres in size
Attached Map? Yes No

Proposed Action(s)

PG&E proposes to leave geotextile fabric and gravel that was installed at LZ-6 and PS-12. LZ-6 is approximately 0.7 acre and PS-12 is approximately 0.14 acre in size (collectively 0.84 acres). As a result, vegetation and land impacts at these locations would be changed from temporary to permanent.

Purpose(s)

The property owner has requested that gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12 be left on site. By granting the landowners request, PG&E would reduce construction costs and decrease some environmental effects at the locations by reducing associated truck trips, waste disposal, dust generation, and emissions.

Part B: Existing Conditions

Existing Land Uses: Private land; open space
Surrounding Land Uses: Residential, agriculture, pasture
**Sensitive Receptors
within 500 feet:** None
**Environmental Recourses
within 500 feet:** None
**Has landowner approval
been granted?** Yes No N/A

Landowner: Minaglia Partners; 1115 Bailhache Avenue, Healdsburg, CA 95448

Surveys

List any new survey reports under Part D, attach a copy, and describe relevant survey details under the applicable resource category listed in the Part E.

Biological Resources. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for biological resources with the potential to occur in the area? If so, were survey results positive or negative? Were surveys completed during the appropriate timing and season to detect resources? If not, describe under the applicable resource category in Part E.

LZ-6 and PS-12 were surveyed during vegetation surveys in March 2018, and during preconstruction surveys. Prior to installing geotextile fabric and gravel in the work spaces, both sites were documented as non-native grassland and potentially suitable habitat for special-status wildlife. No special-status species were identified at the sites. There is no suitable aquatic habitat for California red-legged frog or foothill yellow-legged frog within 500 feet of LZ-6 or PS-12.

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM

Cultural Resources. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for cultural resources (records search and pedestrian survey)? If so, were survey results positive or negative?

Pedestrian surveys were conducted between 2011 and 2017. Results of surveys were negative.

Jurisdictional Waters. Were all sites associated with the proposed action(s) surveyed for hydrologic resources? If so, were survey results positive or negative?

LZ-6 and PS-12 were surveyed for hydrological resources; none occur within LZ-6 or PZ-12.

Part C: Permits, Agency Approvals, and Environmental Protection Measures

List any new permits or agency approvals under Part D, attach a copy, and describe relevant details under the applicable resource category listed in Part E.

Have all required permits, permit amendments/authorizations, or agency approvals been issued by resource agencies with applicable jurisdiction? Describe if necessary.

Yes

Would the proposed action(s) conflict with permit conditions or agency approvals? Describe if necessary.

No

Would the proposed action(s) conflict with project applicant proposed measures or mitigation measures listed in Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND)? Describe if necessary.

No. The IS/MND Project Description Section 2.6.3 "Gravel and Geotextile Fabric" (page 2-32) allows for gravel and fabric to be left in place for use by landowner request if on private land. CPUC requested that PG&E submit an MPR request for the proposed actions because leaving gravel at sites as large as LZ-6 and PS-12 could be considered a deviation from impacts described in the IS/MND, which state impacts from construction would be temporary.

Part D: Attached Materials

List any attached materials (e.g. surveys, maps, photos, memos, agency authorizations, etc.) below. Materials should be attached to the end of this form.

Figure 1: Map of LZ-6 and PS-12

Part E: Final IS/MND Consistency Summary

Complete the Final IS/MND Consistency Summary below and answer the consistency questions for each resource category. Include a description and justification below each resource category as necessary. The consistency questions were developed using the CEQA Checklist provided in the Final IS/MND. Refer to the Final IS/MND for the details on the project impact evaluation.

Would the proposed action(s) result in a new impact, or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on:

**No
Change**

**Potentially
Significant
Change**

N/A

Aesthetics (e.g., damage scenic resources or vistas, degrade the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings, or create sources of light or glare)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

Leaving the gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12 would permanently convert a vegetated area (0.84 acre of non-native grassland) to an unvegetated graveled area. Permanently removing vegetation could affect visual quality; however, the work area locations are not visible from public vantages and leaving the

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM

gravel in place has been requested by the landowner. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on aesthetics.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources (e.g., convert Farmland to nonagricultural use, or create a conflict with existing agricultural zoning or a Williamson Act)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

LZ-6 and PS-12 are located on land subject to a Williamson Act Contract. Temporary and permanent impacts on Williamson Act Contract lands were analyzed in the IS/MND and found to be less than significant. The analysis in the IS/MND described 23.1 to 24.9 acres of temporary impacts and 0.001 acre of permanent impacts on Williamson Act Contract land. Leaving gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12 would permanently convert 0.84 acre of additional Williamson Act Contract land. Removing this amount of Williamson Act Contract land from the area would not result in a significant impact on agriculture resources, and the increase in permanent impacts would not be substantial due to the large size of the property and wide availability of agricultural land in the area.

LZ-6 and PS-12 are located entirely in areas that were non-native grassland. No forestry resources are present; therefore, there would be no impact to forestry resources.

Air Quality (e.g. produce additional emissions, or expose sensitive receptors to additional pollutants)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant

Impacts on air quality from installation and removal of the gravel at landing zones and pull sites were analyzed in the IS/MND, including those associated with equipment emissions and dust generation. The proposed refinement would involve leaving gravel at LZ-6 and PS-12. By doing so, PG&E would incrementally reduce equipment emissions and dust generation that would occur when removing the gravel. The work areas would be permanently converted to unvegetated areas, and landowner activities at the sites would generate greater levels of fugitive dust than if the sites were vegetated. Any dust generation that occurs from use of the sites would be similar to existing ranching activities on the landowner's property. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on air quality.

Biological Resources (e.g., cause an adverse effect to sensitive or special-status species, or impact riparian, wetland, or any other sensitive habitat, or conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

Prior to construction, LZ-6 and PS-12 contained non-native grassland that was determined to be potentially suitable habitat for special-status species. No special-status species were identified at the sites during vegetation surveys in March 2018 or during pre-construction surveys immediately before construction began. No suitable aquatic habitat for California red-legged frog or foothill yellow-legged frog is located within 500 feet of the sites and no small mammal burrows or badger dens were observed during preconstruction surveys.

The analysis in the IS/MND described 29.9 to 32.9 acres of temporary impacts and less than 0.001 acre of permanent impacts to non-native grassland defined as potentially suitable habitat for special-status species. Permanently converting an additional 0.84 acre of non-native grassland would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact. The impact would be less than significant impact.

Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources (e.g., cause adverse change to a historical, archeological, or tribal cultural resource)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

No new excavations or digging would be performed at LZ-6 or PS-12. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on cultural or tribal resources.

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM

Geology and Soils (e.g., cause or expose people or structures to geologic or soil hazards, including erosion or loss of topsoil)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

The proposed refinement would not require any additional earthmoving activities and would not result in the loss of topsoil or increase erosion. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on geology and soils.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (e.g., generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant

Impacts from greenhouse gas emissions were analyzed in the IS/MND, including those associated with equipment emissions. The proposed refinement would involve leaving gravel in place at LZ-6 and PS-12. By doing so, PG&E would incrementally reduce equipment emissions that would occur when removing the gravel.

The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (e.g., create or increase the exposure of people or structures to hazardous materials or wildland fires, involve the use of additional hazardous materials or equipment, or interfere with an adopted emergency plan)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

LZ-6 and PS-12 do not contain any known hazardous material sites, and none were created as a result of construction activities. Leaving the gravel in place would not increase the risk of potential hazards. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on hazards and hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality (e.g., degrade water quality, discharge waste or sediment, deplete groundwater, alter the existing drainage pattern, create additional runoff water or polluted runoff, place structures in a 100-year flood hazard area, or expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

There are no water features within 500 feet of LZ-6 and PS-12.

Leaving compacted gravel in place at LZ-6 and PS-12 would result in a small increase in impervious surfaces (0.84 acre) that could increase the rate or amount of surface runoff. This small increase in impervious surface would not have a substantial effect on the rate of infiltration and runoff for the watershed in the area.

The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on hydrology and water quality.

Land Use (e.g., conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, or conflict with a habitat conservation plan)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

LZ-6 and PS-12 are located on private property. Leaving gravel at the landowner's request would not conflict with land use or zoning designations. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on land use.

Noise (e.g., expose sensitive receptors to additional noise or vibration)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM

The proposed refinement would reduce noise-generating activities since the gravel and geotextile fabric would not be removed from LZ-6 and PS-12. Landowner use of the sites could involve equipment use and noise generating activities, but there are no sensitive receptors within 500 feet of LZ-6 or PS-12. Noise that occurs from use of the sites would be similar to existing ranching activities on the landowner's property. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on noise.

Paleontological Resources (e.g., cause adverse change to a paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on paleontological resources.

Population and Housing (e.g., induce substantial population growth in an area, or displace substantial numbers of people or housing)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant

The proposed refinement would have no impact on population and housing.

Recreation (e.g., increases the use of, or cause adverse effects to, parks or other recreational facilities)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

The proposed refinement would have no impact on recreation.

Transportation and Traffic (e.g., increase traffic congestion or degrade performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, or increase hazards due to a design feature)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

The proposed refinement would reduce impacts on transportation and traffic. Trucks would no longer be required to haul the gravel from LZ-6 and PS-12 to the disposal location, resulting in less vehicular travel. The proposed refinement would not result in a new impact or increase the severity of a previously analyzed impact on transportation and traffic.

Utilities and Public Services (e.g., result in construction of new, or expansion of existing, water facilities, stormwater drainage facilities, require additional water entitlements, or creation of new solid waste disposal needs)?

Final IS/MND evaluation: Less than Significant with Mitigation

The proposed refinement would reduce solid waste generated by the project. The proposed refinement would have no impact on utilities and public services.

MINOR PROJECT REFINEMENT REVIEW FORM

Figure 1: Map of LZ-6 and PS-12

