

1 **3.3.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance**

<p>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE – The lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the environment and thereby require an EIR to be prepared for the project where there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record, that any of the following conditions may occur. Where prior to commencement of the environmental analysis a project proponent agrees to mitigation measures or project modifications that would avoid any significant effect on the environment or would mitigate the significant environmental effect, a lead agency need not prepare an EIR solely because without mitigation the environmental effects would have been significant (per Section 15065 of the State CEQA Guidelines):</p>	<p>Potentially Significant Impact</p>	<p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>No Impact</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>c) 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)?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

2 **3.3.18.1 Impact Analysis**

- 3 **a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the**
 4 **environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species,**
 5 **cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels,**
 6 **threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the**
 7 **number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or**
 8 **eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or**
 9 **prehistory?**

1 As described in Section 3.3.4, Biological Resources, the Project would not result in
2 significant impacts to sensitive marine resources and would not have a significant effect
3 on listed species or habitat used by those species. Sensitive habitats located within the
4 Project area such as sea grass and kelp beds would be avoided, and rocky features
5 where the proposed power/data transfer cable would be laid would not be significantly
6 affected. Organisms that could be potentially affected by the deployment of the
7 proposed OBS units and associated cable include polychaete worms, sea pens,
8 anemones, seastars, mollusks, and possibly small, leafy red algae attached to the
9 upper portions of some of the rock features. Impacts to these common species that may
10 result from burial under the OBS units or burial or abrasion by the cable would not result
11 in a significant impact. Therefore, the Project would not result in significant impacts
12 related to habitat reduction, fish or wildlife populations, or the range of sensitive species.

13 As described in Section 3.3.5, Cultural Resources, the Project would not result in
14 significant impacts to any known cultural resources and the potential for the Project to
15 encounter previously undetected resources is remote.

16 ***b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental***
17 ***goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?***

18 As described in Section 3.3.9, Land Use and Planning, the Project would be consistent
19 with applicable policies of the Coastal Act and San Luis Obispo County. The Project
20 would not result in impacts such as an increase in the population of the Project area,
21 which would have the potential to result in long-term impacts.

22 ***c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but***
23 ***cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the***
24 ***incremental effects of a project are significant when viewed in connection***
25 ***with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and***
26 ***the effects of past, present and probable future projects)?***

27 Project-related impacts would result from the installation and recovery of proposed OBS
28 units. Due to the short-term duration and effects of such impacts, the Project would not
29 result in impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

30 ***d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial***
31 ***adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

32 The Project would not result in significant air quality, noise, hazards or other
33 environmental impacts that would result in substantial adverse impacts to residents of
34 the Project area.