

1    **3.19 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

2    The lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the  
 3    environment and thereby require an EIR to be prepared for the project where there is  
 4    substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that any of the following conditions  
 5    may occur. Where prior to commencement of the environmental analysis a project  
 6    proponent agrees to mitigation measures or project modifications that would avoid any  
 7    significant effect on the environment or would mitigate the significant environmental  
 8    effect, a lead agency need not prepare an EIR solely because without mitigation the  
 9    environmental effects would have been significant (State CEQA Guidelines § 15065).

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE-	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	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, substantially 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10    **3.19.1 Impact Analysis**

11    ***a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment,***  
 12    ***substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or***  
 13    ***wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a***  
 14    ***plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or***  
 15    ***endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods***  
 16    ***of California history or prehistory?***

17    **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** As indicated in Section 3.4, Biological  
 18    Resources (Terrestrial), the Project would not result in a loss or disturbance to any

1 unique, rare or threatened plant community. Neither would a reduction in the numbers  
2 or restriction in the range of any unique, rare or threatened plant species or a reduction  
3 in extent, diversity or quality of native vegetation occur. Although there are known  
4 terrestrial biological resources in the vicinity of the onshore construction area, the onshore  
5 area is limited to previously developed areas and **MM TBIO-1: Terrestrial Wildlife**  
6 **Awareness Training** and **MM TBIO-2: Breeding/Nesting Bird Protection** have been  
7 identified to protect those resources during the temporary construction period. No  
8 significant impacts to terrestrial biological resources would result.

9 As outlined in Section 3.5, Biological Resources (Marine), although the Project has the  
10 potential to create short-term, temporary, and localized impacts to the seafloor and  
11 water column, turbidity effects are expected to be less than significant. The use of a  
12 dynamically positioned CIV will minimize seafloor impacts. Further, an ROV (**MM MBIO-**  
13 **3a: Cable Installation and Retrieval**) will be used to avoid areas of hard substrate to  
14 the extent feasible. Post-Project Surveys and Reporting (**MM MBIO-3b: Post-Project**  
15 **Survey** and **MM MBIO-3c: Post-Project Technical Report**) will document and identify  
16 mitigation for any impacts that occur. The presence of offshore Project vessels for 1 to 2  
17 months would increase the potential for impacts to marine mammals due to noise or  
18 entanglement; however, the temporary effects are not expected to significantly impact  
19 marine mammals in the Project area. Implementation of actions specified in **MM MBIO-**  
20 **6: Marine Wildlife Monitoring and Contingency Plan (MWMCP)** would further reduce  
21 potential impacts to less than significant.

22 As indicated in Section 3.6, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, based on multiple  
23 record searches and survey events; no known offshore cultural or paleontological  
24 resources have been identified within the offshore Project area. Onshore excavation  
25 would be limited to areas that have been previously disturbed. If potential cultural  
26 resource material is encountered during excavation, work shall be halted until a qualified  
27 archaeologist and Native American representative are consulted. Protection of the  
28 resource shall be in accordance with State and local guidelines. Implementation of **MM**  
29 **CUL-1: Avoidance of Offshore Cultural Resources** will reduce the potential impact to  
30 less than significant.

31 ***b) Does the project have impacts that would be individually limited, but***  
32 ***cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the***  
33 ***incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with***  
34 ***the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects***  
35 ***of probable future projects.)***

36 **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** The Project would have no impact in the areas  
37 of agriculture and forest resources, mineral resources, and utilities and service systems,  
38 and less than significant impacts to noise, population and housing, public services, and  
39 recreation. The Project would have potential impacts requiring mitigation to aesthetics,

1 air quality, terrestrial and marine biology, cultural and paleontological resources,  
2 geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land  
3 use and planning, recreation, utilities and service systems, and transportation. In  
4 addition, Section 4.1 proposes mitigation for potential impacts to commercial fishing. For  
5 any impacts to act cumulatively on any past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future  
6 projects (hereafter called “cumulative projects”), the cumulative projects would have to  
7 have individual impacts in the same resource areas at the same time and in the same  
8 localized area as the Project. Since the Project is a replacement-in-kind, is located  
9 primarily offshore, and would be short-term in nature; potential impacts would be  
10 localized and of short-duration. Therefore, it is unlikely that any other projects similar in  
11 nature and within the Project vicinity would occur to be cumulatively considerable.  
12 However, Project-related impacts from air quality (which have a greater area of extent to  
13 be cumulatively considered) are further discussed below.

14 **Air Quality and GHGs.** Use of Project vessels and equipment used for excavation by  
15 the conduit tunnel at the lower end of Las Flores Canyon will generate emissions.  
16 Estimated total cumulative emissions are: NO<sub>x</sub> (24.86 tons/year); ROG (7.18 tons/year);  
17 PM (3.67 tons/year); CO (37.63 tons/year); and SO<sub>2</sub> (1.12 tons/year). Although Project  
18 emissions are estimated to be below existing thresholds and in compliance with existing  
19 plans and programs, ExxonMobil will be required to submit a permit application to the  
20 SBCAPCD to demonstrate that the anticipated actual annual Project emissions will be  
21 below the 25 tons/year threshold. The Emission Reporting Plan would be used to limit  
22 equipment use and Project duration in compliance with Rule 201.F.7. Project  
23 construction would generate GHG emissions that would be below the SBC interim  
24 guidance threshold of 10,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year; therefore, impacts associated with GHG  
25 emissions would be less than significant, and are not cumulatively considerable.

26 ***c) Does the project have environmental effects that would cause substantial***  
27 ***adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

28 **Less than Significant with Mitigation.** As discussed in Section 3.3, Air Quality, the  
29 removal and installation of cables from the LFCPF to Platforms Heritage and Harmony  
30 could result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly.  
31 Some potential impacts would occur through air emissions released by construction  
32 equipment and activities; however, implementation of **MM AQ-1: Emissions Reporting**  
33 **Plan, AQ-2: Low-Sulfur Fuels, MM AQ-4: Construction Emissions Reduction,** and  
34 **MM AQ-4: Dust Control Measures** would reduce such impacts to less than significant.  
35 Additionally, as discussed in Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, potential  
36 impacts due to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and/or accidental  
37 spills or discharge from Project vessels or equipment could endanger workers and/or  
38 residents adjacent to the Project area. These potential impacts would be reduced to  
39 less than significant through implementation by ExxonMobil of **MMs HAZ-1** through **MM**  
40 **HAZ-11** (see Section 3.9).