Summary

S.1 Overview

The purpose of this summary is to provide the reader with a brief overview of the proposed Strauss Wind Energy Project (SWEP or Project) and its anticipated environmental impacts, which are described in detail in Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR). This summary also lists the mitigation measures proposed to reduce the severity of the Project's environmental impacts and presents the alternatives to the Project analyzed in the SEIR. The County of Santa Barbara (County), as lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), has prepared this Draft SEIR in accordance with CEQA, Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 CCR Sections 15000 et seq., and the County Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA. It addresses the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Strauss Wind Energy Project (SWEP or Project).

This Draft SEIR is an informational document that will be used by the general public, utility providers, and governmental agencies to review and evaluate the Project. The reader should not rely exclusively on this summary as the sole basis for judgment of the Project and alternatives. The complete Draft SEIR should be consulted for specific information about the Project's environmental impacts and the associated mitigation measures intended to reduce the severity of those impacts.

Proposed Project Overview and Background

Strauss Wind, LLC, proposes to construct and operate a wind energy facility on 5,887 acres of rural land in an unincorporated area of the County of Santa Barbara, California, south of the City of Lompoc. The SWEP proposes the installation of 30 wind turbine generators (WTGs) with an electrical generating capacity of 102 megawatts (MW). The SWEP would also involve construction of various facilities required for the operation of the Project, including a substation, operation and maintenance facility, a switchyard and electrical transmission line. The components of the proposed SWEP include:

- Up to 30 WTGs,
- New access roads and improvements to existing roads,
- A communication system,
- One meteorological towers and two SODAR devices,
- On-site electrical collection lines,
- On-site substation, including a control building,
- On-site operations and maintenance (O&M) facility,
- A new 115-kilovolt electrical transmission line up to 7.3 miles in length to interconnect with Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) Company's electric grid via a new switching station,
- A new switchyard, and
- Upgrades to existing PG&E facilities.

The Project site is the location of the previously proposed Lompoc Wind Energy Project (LWEP), which was approved by the County in 2009, but never constructed. The Applicant has purchased the LWEP

and proposes changes to the previously approved project. The SWEP would involve the construction of fewer but larger WTGs than the LWEP and would have a slightly increased generating capacity. The locations of the WTGs, O&M facility, and substation have been changed compared to the LWEP, and on-site road alignments have been modified. The SWEP also includes modifications to San Miguelito Road to provide necessary clearances for trucks hauling turbine components and equipment, which were not specified for the LWEP. The proposed alignment for the 115-kV transmission line to interconnect with the PG&E system has also been altered compared to the LWEP and a new location for the switchyard is proposed.

A Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared for the LWEP and certified by the County in February 2009 (County EIR No. 06EIR-00000-00004).[1] The project approvals were renewed several times since the initial approvals and have since expired.[2] The SWEP environmental review is a supplement to the LWEP EIR.

S.1.1 Environmental Impact Report Scope

This Draft SEIR examines potential short-term and long-term impacts of the Project. These impacts were determined through a rigorous process mandated by CEQA in which existing conditions are compared and contrasted with conditions that would exist once the Project was implemented. The significance of each identified impact was determined using either County Thresholds of Significance (revised March 2018) or CEQA thresholds where there is no County threshold. The following categories are used for classifying Project related impacts:

- *Class I* – Class I impacts are significant adverse effects that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance through the application of feasible mitigation measures. Class I impacts are significant and unavoidable.
- *Class II* – A Class II impact is a significant adverse effect that can be reduced to a less-than-significant level through the application of feasible mitigation measures presented in this SEIR.
- *Class III* – A Class III impact is a minor change or effect on the environment that does not meet or exceed the criteria established to gauge significance.
- *Class IV* – Class IV impacts represent beneficial effects that would result from project implementation.

For each significant impact identified, mitigation measures that are designed to reduce impacts to less than significant levels are presented. Avoidance and Protection measures were identified to minimize impacts from upgrades to connect to the Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) electrical system (see Section 2.5.5). These measures were considered in the assessment of Project impacts to determine whether they would be mitigated and in the development of additional mitigation measures. In those instances in which mitigation measures cannot reduce such impacts to less-than-significant levels, the impacts are identified as Class I. In many cases, these mitigation measures would also further reduce adverse, but less-than-significant impacts (Class III).

[1] Project Case Nos. 06CUP-00000-00009 and 06ORD-00000-00002.

[2] A lawsuit was filed in Superior Court charging that the certified EIR was inadequate and that the project was improperly approved by the Board of Supervisors. The Court denied the petition, and the Appeals Court affirmed the lower court ruling.

The Draft SEIR also presents alternatives to the Project, including the "No Project" alternative, and a qualitative assessment of the impacts that would be associated with the implementation of each. Finally, the cumulative impacts of the Project when added to other local proposed or approved projects were also evaluated.

S.1.2 Notice of Preparation

In July 2018, the County filed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) with the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research to announce the intention to prepare a Draft SEIR. The filing of the NOP initiated a 30-day period during which public and agency input was solicited on the scope of issues that should be addressed in the SEIR. As part of the scoping process, a public meeting was conducted in the City of Lompoc on July 19, 2018, to present information on the proposed Project and receive public input. Relevant comments received from agencies and members of the public in response to the NOP were considered in preparation of the Draft SEIR, as appropriate. More information on the scoping process is provided in Section 1.5.1 of the SEIR.

S.1.3 Summary of Project Impacts

The significance of each impact resulting from implementation of the proposed Project has been determined according to the County Thresholds and Guidelines Manual and/or State CEQA Guidelines thresholds. Table S-1 presents a summary of the impacts, mitigation measures, and residual significance of impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project. In summary, the proposed Project would result in the following key impacts:

- Beneficial Impacts (Class IV)
  - The Project could be consistent with federal goals and state legislation related to the use of renewable energy.
  - The Project would result in GHG emissions reductions in the power generation sector, resulting in a beneficial effect related to greenhouse gas emissions.
- Significant and Unavoidable Impacts (Class I)
  - Operation of the WTGs and related structures have the potential to be visible in the vicinity of the Project.
  - The westernmost WTGs could be visible to users of Jalama Beach County Park.
  - The Project's transmission line could be visible from two segments of San Miguelito Road, south Lompoc roads, and residential areas.
  - Vehicular transport of Project components would require road widening and tree removal that could alter the landscape characteristics along portions of San Miguelito Road.
  - FAA-required hazard lighting on the WTGs could result in adverse nighttime light impacts.
  - Oak woodland and tanoak forest could be impacted during construction, including the loss of an estimated 607 individual oak trees.
  - Unknown numbers of special status and non-sensitive birds and bats are could be at risk of dying through collisions with the WTGs over the duration of the Project.
  - The proposed Project would be inconsistent with County Plans, Policies, and Development Standards concerning tree removal.

- Cumulative Impacts
  - Since the FAA would require red, synchronized-flashing hazard lights on all of the WTGs, the synchronized flashing across the dark ridgeline landscape above the night-lighted urban landscape of the greater Lompoc Valley would attract a casual viewer's attention and would be a considerable contribution to the night lighting cumulative impact.
  - Some cumulative projects in the southern portion of the City (including cumulative projects 16 and 20 southeast of the City) would combine with the visible impact from the Project's transmission line descending the north slopes of the Lompoc Hills. Cumulative projects would be visible in the same field of view as the visible portion of the transmission line segment and switchyard. The Project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be considerable.
  - The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to vegetation and wildlife habitat would be considerable.
  - The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to the loss of woodland and forest within the Lompoc Valley would be considerable.
  - The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to jurisdictional resources would be considerable.
  - The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to Gaviota tarplant would be considerable.
  - The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to special-status plants would be considerable.
  - The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to special-status wildlife and nesting birds would be considerable.

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
Aesthetics		
VIS-1: WTG Visibility. Construction and operation of the WTGs and related structures have the potential to be visible in the vicinity of the Project.	VIS-1: Materials Storage During Construction. VIS-2: Location of Construction Activities. VIS-4: Landscape and Lighting Plan.	Class I (Operation)
VIS-2: Views from Jalama Beach County Park, Miguelito County Park, and La Purisima Mission. Westernmost WTGs could be visible to users of Jalama Beach County Park; Northeastern-most WTGs could be visible to users of La Purisima Mission.	VIS-3: Contribution to County Parks Fund. VIS-4: Landscape and Lighting Plan.	Class I (Jalama Beach County Park) Class III (La Purisima Mission) No impact (Miguelito Park)
VIS-3: Views from State Route 1. WTGs could be visible from the SR-1 corridor and the Lompoc Valley.	VIS-4: Landscape and Lighting Plan (recommended).	Class III
VIS-4: Transmission Line Skyline Silhouette. Placement of the transmission line in the area of SR-1 introduces three new structures that could partially silhouette against the skyline.	None.	Class III
VIS-5: Transmission Line Visibility. Construction and operation of the transmission line could be visible from public roadways and residential areas.	VIS-1: Materials Storage During Construction. VIS-2: Location of Construction Activities. VIS-4: Landscape and Lighting Plan.	Class III (Majority of San Miguelito Road & SR-1) Class I (South Lompoc roads and residential areas and two segments of San Miguelito Road)
VIS-6: Transmission Line and Switchyard Visibility from State Route 1. Placement of the transmission line switchyard in the area of SR-1 introduces a new industrial facility that could be visible from SR-1.	VIS-4: Landscape and Lighting Plan.	Class II

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
VIS-7: San Miguelito Road Landscape. Vehicular transport of Project components would require road widening and tree removal that could alter the landscape characteristics along portions of San Miguelito Road.	VIS-4: Landscape and Lighting Plan.	Class I
VIS-8: Nighttime Lighting. The Project could result in nighttime light impacts.	VIS-4: Landscape and Lighting Plan (for facility lighting - recommended). VIS-5: Reduced FAA Hazard Lighting Plan.	Class III (Facility lighting) Class I (FAA hazard lighting)
Agricultural Resources		
AG-1: Important Farmland/ Williamson Act Contract Lands. Development of the SWEP and power line installation could result in the temporary and permanent disturbance of farmland.	None.	Class III
Air Quality		
AQ-1: Short-Construction Emissions. Construction emissions could result in a considerable net increase of pollutants that would violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	AQ-1: Construction Equipment Emission Reduction Plan. AQ-2: Dust Control Plan.	Class II
AQ-2: Long-term Operation Emissions. Operation emissions could result in a considerable net increase of pollutants that would violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	None.	Class III
Biological Resources		
BIO-1a: Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat Impacts during Construction. Vegetation and wildlife habitat could be temporarily and permanently lost during construction.	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-3: Site Restoration and Revegetation Plan. BIO-8: Native Grassland Restoration. BIO-11b: Fencing. BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring. BIO-11d: Monitoring Report.	Class II
BIO-1b: Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat Impacts during O&M. Vegetation and wildlife habitat could be impacted during O&M.	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-3: Site Restoration and Revegetation Plan. BIO-8: Native Grassland Restoration. BIO-11b: Fencing.	Class II

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
	BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring. BIO-11d: Monitoring Report.	
BIO-2a: Construction Impacts to Woodland and Forest. Oak woodland and tanoak forest could be impacted during construction.	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-4a: Tree Protection Plan. BIO-4b: Tree Replacement Plan – Planned Removal and Unexpected Damage. BIO-4c: Invasive Plant Pathogen Abatement (SOD Prevention). BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring. BIO-11d: Monitoring Report.	Class I
BIO-2b: O&M Impacts to Woodland and Forest. Oak woodland and tanoak forest could be impacted during Project operations.	None.	Class III
BIO-3: Wetlands, Seeps, and Springs, and Features Subject to Regulation by the USACE, Santa Barbara County, or CDFW. Direct loss of wetlands and seeps could occur at creek crossings, the laydown yard, water well, road improvement and access road locations, pole locations along the transmission line, and WTG pads. Additionally, soil erosion or spills could reduce water quality during construction.	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-3: Site Restoration and Revegetation Plan. BIO-9: Wetland Avoidance and Riparian Habitat Restoration Plan. BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring. BIO-11d: Monitoring Report.	Class II
BIO-5a: Construction Impacts to Gaviota Tarplant. Impacts to Gaviota tarplant and designated critical habitat could occur during construction.	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-3: Site Restoration and Revegetation Plan. BIO-5: Pre-construction Rare Plant Surveys and Restoration. BIO-6: Gaviota Tarplant Disturbance. BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring. BIO-11d: Monitoring Report.	Class II
BIO-5b: O&M Impacts to Gaviota Tarplant. Occasional disturbance to small areas of Gaviota tarplant habitat could occur as a result of operations or maintenance activities involving clearing or vehicle operation in occupied habitat	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-3: Site Restoration and Revegetation Plan. BIO-5: Pre-construction Rare Plant Surveys and Restoration. BIO-6: Gaviota Tarplant Disturbance. BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring. BIO-11d: Monitoring Report.	Class II

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
BIO-6: Other Special-Status Plants. A number of other special-status plant species may be present on site or in the transmission line corridor and could be lost during construction.	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-3: Site Restoration and Revegetation Plan. BIO-5: Pre-construction Rare Plant Surveys and Restoration. BIO-7: Kellogg's and Mesa Horkelia Habitats. BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring. BIO-11d: Monitoring Report.	Class II
BIO-7: Common Wildlife. Individual animals could be injured or killed by vehicles, equipment, or large holes during construction.	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-11a: Pre-construction Wildlife Surveys. BIO-11b: Fencing. BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring. BIO-11d: Monitoring Report.	Class II
BIO-8: Nesting Birds. Nesting birds could potentially lose nests through destruction or abandonment.	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-11a: Pre-construction Wildlife Surveys. BIO-11b: Fencing. BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring. BIO-11d: Monitoring Report. BIO-12: Avoidance Measures for Nesting Birds. BIO-14e: Sensitive Avian and Bat Species.	Class II
BIO-9: Special-Status Wildlife. Direct and indirect impacts could occur to special-status wildlife species.	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-3: Site Restoration and Revegetation Plan. BIO-9: Wetland Avoidance and Riparian Habitat Restoration Plan. BIO-11a: Pre-construction Wildlife Surveys. BIO-11b: Fencing. BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring. BIO-11d: Monitoring Report. BIO-13: Pre-construction Surveys and Conservation of El Segundo Blue Butterfly. BIO-14a: California Horned Lizard. BIO-14b: Northern California Legless Lizard.	Class II

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
	BIO-14c: San Diego Desert Woodrat. BIO-14d: American Badger. BIO-14e: Sensitive Avian and Bat Species. BIO-14f: Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp. BIO-14g: California Red-Legged Frog. BIO-14h: Western Spadefoot Toad. BIO-14i: California Condor. BIO-14j: Maternity Colony or Hibernaculum Surveys and Avoidance Measures for Sensitive Bats.	
BIO-10: Avian and Bat Collisions with WTGs. Unknown numbers of special status and non-sensitive birds and bats could be at risk of dying through collisions with the WTGs over the duration of the Project.	BIO-15a: Siting. BIO-15b: Appropriate WTG and Project-Element Design. BIO-16: Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan / Bird and Bat Conservation Strategy. BIO-16a: Before-After/Control-impact Study. BIO-16b: Bird/Bat Mortality Study. BIO-16c: Remove Carrion Near Turbines. BIO-16d: Adaptive Management Plan.	Class I
BIO-11: Avian and Bat Collisions with Power Lines and Meteorological Towers. Birds and bats could collide with transmission and power collection poles, transmission and power collection lines, and meteorological towers.	BIO-15b: Appropriate WTG and Project-Element Design.	Class II
BIO-12: Avian Displacement from WTGs. Birds with habitat within 200 feet of WTG towers may be displaced.	None.	Class III
BIO-13a: Indirect Construction Effects (Wildlife). Indirect impacts to wildlife could occur during construction from a variety of sources, resulting in temporary wildlife displacement.	None.	Class III
BIO-13b: Indirect O&M Effects (Wildlife). Indirect operational impacts could occur to terrestrial wildlife compared to pre-Project levels.	None.	Class III
BIO-14: Indirect Impacts (Vegetation). Invasive species carried from other work sites could establish on site and displace native plant species or interfere with revegetation; topsoil removal and equipment operation could reduce the ability of soils to support vegetation.	BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program. BIO-2: Ground Disturbance. BIO-3: Site Restoration and Revegetation Plan. BIO-5: Pre-construction Rare Plant Surveys and Restoration. BIO-6: Gaviota Tarplant Disturbance. BIO-9: Wetland Avoidance and Riparian Habitat Restoration Plan. BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring.	Class II

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
	BIO-11d: Monitoring Report. BIO-17: Weed Control Plan.	
Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources		
CULT-1: Known Prehistoric Archaeological Sites. Construction activities could result in significant impacts to 29 prehistoric archaeological sites.	CULT-6: Avoidance. CULT-7: Final Plan Notification. CULT-8: Temporary Fencing. CULT-9: Site Capping. CULT-10: Archaeological Evaluation, Data Recovery Excavation, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan.	Class II
CULT-2: Unidentified Archaeological Resources. Impacts to unidentified subsurface archaeological resources may occur as a result of earth-disturbing activities.	CULT-6: Avoidance. CULT-7: Final Plan Notification. CULT-8: Temporary Fencing. CULT-9: Site Capping. CULT-10: Archaeological Evaluation, Data Recovery Excavation, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan.	Class II
CULT-3: Unauthorized Artifact Collection. Impacts to known and unidentified archaeological resources may occur as a result of increased public access to archaeological sites via new or improved roads.	CULT-10: Archaeological Evaluation, Data Recovery Excavation, Monitoring, and Reporting Plan.	Class II
CULT-4: Impacts on Traditional Cultural Properties. Construction of WTGs could adversely affect Native cultural practices at known Traditional Cultural Properties (Sacred Sites).	None.	Class III
Energy		
EEU-1: Federal and State Renewable Energy Goals. The Project could be consistent with federal goals and state legislation related to the use of renewable energy.	None.	Class IV
EEU-2: Nonrenewable Energy Resources. Construction and operation of the Project could result in consumption of diesel fuel and gasoline.	None.	Class III
EEU-3: New/Altered PG&E Facilities. Impacts from temporary and long-term modifications to the PG&E system to implement the Project could occur.	None.	Class III

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
Fire Hazards and Emergency Services		
FPES-1: Increased Fire Risk (Construction). The Project could result in an increased risk of wildland fires that could spread to more developed areas. Fire risks include vehicle exhaust, sparks, welding, parking on dry grass, and fuel tanks.	FPES-1: Fire Protection Plan. FPES-2: Smoking and Open Fires. FPES-6: Red Flag Warning.	Class II
FPES-2: Increase Fire Risk (Operations). Operation of the Project could increase baseline fire risks.	FPES-1: Fire Protection Plan. FPES-2: Smoking and Open Fires. FPES-3: Install Gravel around Substation. FPES-4: Access Roads.	Class II
FPES-3: Fire Department Response Times. The Project could have the potential to increase demand for fire protection services.	FPES-1: Fire Protection Plan. FPES-2: Smoking and Open Fires. FPES-4: Access Roads.	Class II
FPES-4: Emergency Services Response Times. The Project could temporarily increase the need for emergency medical services during construction.	Although not required, FPES-1: Fire Protection Plan, would reduce the adverse impact.	Class III
FPES-5: Interference with Fire Prevention Techniques. The Project could interfere with controlled burns in the Project area.	FPES-1: Fire Protection Plan.	Class II
FPES-6: Emergency Evacuation/Response. The closure of Sudden Road and Upper Miguelito Canyon Road could hinder emergency response.	None.	Class III
Geology and Soils		
GEO-1: Fault Rupture. There could be a risk of damage to structures by fault rupture.	None.	Class III
GEO-2: Ground Shaking and Liquefaction. A major earthquake could result in ground shaking, liquefaction, or seismically induced landslides resulting in damage to structures or exposure of people to injury or death.	GEO-1: Seismic Design. GEO-2: Grading and Drainage Plan.	Class II
GEO-3: Landslides. Construction activities could increase the potential for landslides and/or reactivate existing landslides.	GEO-2: Grading and Drainage Plan.	Class II
GEO-4: Soil Erosion. Construction could accelerate or increase the potential for erosion from water and wind.	GEO-2: Grading and Drainage Plan.	Class II
GEO-5: Expansive Soils. Project Structures could be damaged by expansive soils.	GEO-3: Expansive Soils.	Class II
GEO-6: Sewage Effluent Disposal. Soils could be found incapable for use of septic or alternative wastewater disposal.	None.	Class III
GEO-7: Compressible and Collapsible Soil, Subsidence. Subsidence or compressible or collapsible soils could cause settlement damage to structures and roadways.	GEO-4: Foundation Support.	Class II

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
Greenhouse Gases		
GHG-1: Reduction in GHG Emissions. The Project would result in GHG emissions reductions in the power generation sector, resulting in a beneficial effect related to greenhouse gas emissions.	None.	Class IV
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
RISK-1: Tower Failure and Blade Throw. There could be a risk to the public from possible WTG tower collapse or blade throw.	None.	Class III
RISK-2: Blade Icing and Ice Throw. Risk to the public could occur from blade icing and ice throw.	None.	Class III
RISK-3: Electromagnetic Field Effect. Electromagnetic fields could cause a possible hazard when associated with the siting of high-voltage overhead power lines or cables in proximity to residences.	None.	Class III
RISK-4: Utility/Turbine Interface and Worker Safety. Construction workers could be exposed to safety risks, including electrical shock and falls. Risk could occur to members of public who incidentally or intentionally enter the Project site.	None.	Class III
RISK-5: Release of Hazardous Materials. Accidental spills or leakage of hazardous materials could occur, including fuels (gasoline and diesel), lubricants, motor oil, and paints.	RISK-1: Hazardous Materials Management Plan (recommended). RISK-2: Refueling Spill Notification (recommended). RISK-3: Equipment Maintenance (recommended). RISK-4: Avoidance of Sensitive Areas for Refueling (recommended).	Class III
RISK-6: Radiofrequency Radiation. The Project could expose people to radiofrequency radiation (RFR) in excess of the IEEE-ANSI C95.1-1992 standard.	None.	No Impact
Hydrology and Water Quality		
WAT-1: Erosion and Sedimentation. Project-related ground disturbance could induce erosion and sedimentation into local watercourses.	None; however, standard regulatory requirements apply.	Class III
WAT-2: Pollutant Discharge. Water quality could be affected by small fuel or oil spills, concrete, and trash and litter during construction and operation.	None; however, standard regulatory requirements apply.	Class III
WAT-3: Stormwater Runoff/Flooding. Temporary and permanent land disturbance could affect stormwater runoff/flooding and stormwater quality.	None.	Class III
WAT-4: Groundwater. The Project could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.	WAT-1: Construction Water Source. Also, standard regulatory requirements apply.	Class II
WAT-5: Riparian Vegetation Removal. The Project could result in the removal or reduction of vegetation from the buffer zone of streams, creeks, or wetlands, which could affect water quality.	WAT-2: Minimize Watercourse Encroachment. MM BIO-3: Site Restoration and Revegetation Plan. MM BIO-10: Riparian Habitat Restoration.	Class II

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
Land Use and Planning		
LU-1a: LUDC Visual Impact Development Standards. The Project poses potential inconsistency with County Plans, Policies, and Development Standards concerning visual impacts.	None.	Class III
LU-1b: Tree Protection. The proposed Project is inconsistent with County Plans, Policies, and Development Standards concerning tree removal.	MM BIO-1: Worker Education and Awareness Program MM BIO-2: Ground Disturbance MM BIO-4a: Tree Protection Plan MM BIO-4b: Tree Replacement Plan MM BIO-4c: Invasive Plant Pathogen Abatement (SOD Prevention) MM BIO-11c: Biological Monitoring MM BIO-11d: Monitoring Report	Class I
LU-2: FAA Air Navigation Requirements. . Potential conflict with FAA air navigation requirements from installation of WTGs and meteorological towers, and possible use of helicopters during construction.	None.	Class III
LU-3: Compatibility with VAFB Operations. Potential incompatibility with VAFB operations, such as radar, telemetry antennas, and microwave links.	None.	Class III
LU-4: Quality of Life – Traffic. Construction activities would result in increased traffic in relatively quiet neighborhoods.	TC-1: Traffic Management Plan. (construction)	Class II
LU-5a: Quality of Life – Noise. Noise from Project construction could cause temporary impacts to quality of life of residences within and surrounding the Project area.	NOI-2: Construction Hours NOI-3: Telephone Number for Noise Complaints NOI-4: Noise Complaint Resolution Plan. NOI-5: Maintenance of Construction Equipment NOI-6: Resident Notification	Class II
LU-5b: Quality of Life – Noise. Noise from WTG operation could potentially impact quality of life of nearby residences.	NOI-1: WTG Maintenance NOI-3: Telephone Number for Noise Complaints NOI-4: Noise Complaint Resolution Plan NOI-7: Acoustical Analysis NOI-8: Noise Monitoring and Control Plan NOI-9: Maintenance Hours.	Class II
LU-6: Coastal Resources. Possible unpermitted encroachment into the Coastal Zone, impacting coastal resources.	LU-1: Staking of Coastal Zone.	Class II
LU-7: Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan. Long-term impacts to land use following end of Project.	LU-2: Decommissioning & Reclamation Plan. LU-3: Financial Assurance for Decommissioning and Reclamation	Class II

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
Noise		
NOI-1: Short-term Construction Noise. Some types of construction equipment could generate short-term noise impacts to residences less than 2,000 feet from a construction area.	NOI-2: Construction Hours. NOI-3: Telephone Number for Noise Complaints. NOI-4: Noise Complaint Resolution Plan. NOI-5: Maintenance of Construction Equipment. NOI-6: Resident Notification.	Class II
NOI-2: Long-term Wind Turbine Generator Noise. Adjacent residences could be exposed to substantial noise levels during Project operations.	NOI-1: WTG Maintenance. NOI-3: Telephone Number for Noise Complaints. NOI-4: Noise Complaint Resolution Plan. NOI-7: Acoustical Analysis. NOI-8: Noise Monitoring and Control Plan. NOI-9: Maintenance Hours.	Class II
Paleontological Resources		
PALEO-1: Exposure and Potential Destruction of Significant Paleontological Resources. Ground-disturbing activities such as mechanical excavation, drilling, or trenching could affect paleontological resources.	PALEO-1: Pre-construction Workshop. PALEO-2: Implement Monitoring. PALEO-3: Discovery of Fossils.	Class II
PALEO-2: Unauthorized Fossil Collection. Unauthorized collection of fossils by construction workers or operational personnel may occur.	PALEO-1: Pre-construction Workshop. PALEO-4: Pre-construction Pedestrian Survey.	Class II
Recreation		
REC-1: Loss of Recreation. Project construction-related activities could interfere with recreational activities in the Project area.	REC-01: Community Signage and Coordination with LVDC, LVBC, and SBAS.	Class II
Transportation and Traffic		
TC-1: LOS and V/C Ratio. Project-related construction traffic could temporarily affect traffic levels and LOS on Project area roadways.	TC-1: Traffic Management Plan.	Class II
TC-2: Roadway Safety. Long, heavy trucks used to deliver equipment during construction could present safety concerns and physical modifications to the roadway or nearby trees will be required.	TC-1: Traffic Management Plan.	Class II
TC-4: Road Blockages/Traffic Delays. During peak construction, several oversized trucks per day could slow traffic and necessitate temporary blockages of intersections.	TC-1: Traffic Management Plan.	Class II
TC-5: Damage to Roadways. Trucks carrying heavy equipment could damage existing streets.	TC-3: Roadway Repairs.	Class II

Table S-1. Summary of Impacts, Development Standard/Mitigation, and Residual Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Significance
TC-6: Soil on Roadways. Project vehicles could track dust and soil onto public roads.	None.	Class III
Utilities and Service Systems		
USS-1: Solid Waste Generation. The Project could potentially impact landfills with disposal of solid waste generated during construction.	USS-1: Source Reduction and Solid Waste Management Plan.	Class II
USS-2: Water Supply. The proposed Project could impact water supplies during both construction and operation.	None.	Class III
USS-3: Wastewater. The Project's proposed wastewater system could impact groundwater or watercourses on site.	None.	Class III
USS-4: Public Infrastructure. The Project could impact public infrastructure in the City of Lompoc.	None.	Class III

S.1.4 Summary of Project Alternatives

Seven potential were considered for analysis in the SEIR and four of these alternatives were selected for evaluation in the SEIR, including the No Project Alternative. These alternatives were selected because they are capable of achieving most Project objectives, are feasible, and have the potential to reduce significant impacts associated with the proposed Project. The selected alternatives are described below and analyzed in Section 5.5 of the SEIR. A comparison of the impacts of the proposed Project and the alternatives (excluding the No Project Alternative) is presented in Table S-2 at the end of this SEIR summary.

No Project Alternative

CEQA requires that the impacts associated with a "No Project" alternative be evaluated as part of the SEIR. For a project that would involve construction or other property development activities, the No Project Alternative is the circumstance under which a project does not proceed. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as a proposal for another project, this No Project consequence should be discussed. The State CEQA Guidelines further direct the Lead Agency to analyze the impacts of the No Project Alternative by projecting what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if a proposed Project was not approved.

Under the No Project Alternative, the SWEP and associated transmission line would not be constructed, and the underlying land uses at the Project site would remain unchanged. PG&E would not interconnect an additional 102 MW of renewable generating capacity from a wind energy project in the Lompoc area. However, PG&E and other electric utilities would continue to seek alternative locations for development of renewable energy sources to meet the State's mandated goal of 60 percent of electricity sales from renewable sources by 2030.

Modified Project Layout, Including Elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8

This alternative was identified to reduce the severity of the significant and unavoidable impacts to oak woodlands and to eliminate direct impacts to Coastal Zone resources. This alternative would be implemented at the same site as the Project, and Project construction practices and regulatory requirements would be unchanged. Project components would also be unchanged with the exception of:

- The elimination WTGs E-7 and E-8 and associated new roads and widening of existing roads from the eastern string;
- Construction of a new 1.79-MW WTG along the access road on the north string between proposed WTGs N-8 and N-9 (the newly proposed WTG would be designated as WTG N-10);
- Substitution of the proposed Project's 1.79-MW WTGs at locations W-7 and N-3 with larger 3.8-MW WTGs; and
- Construction of a new access road from the laydown area to WTG E-1 and a new access road from WTG E-1 to WTG E-2 to eliminate direct impacts on Coastal Zone resources.

As currently proposed, WTGs E7 and E8 would be located in particularly rugged and steep terrain and would require existing roads to be graded and widened as well as construction of new roads to accommodate equipment. The elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8 under this alternative would reduce

the earthwork and grading activities required along the eastern string. Furthermore, this alternative would avoid the removal of approximately 382 oak trees, which are proposed for removal under the proposed Project (and potentially more if the Fire Department requires defensive-space clearing around each WTG). There would be additional grading impacts associated with construction of a new access road to WTG E-1, but all grading in the Coastal Zone would be eliminated with this alternative. With implementation of this alternative, there would be 29 WTGs installed (one less than the proposed Project) and the maximum electrical generating capacity would be approximately 98.14 MW (compared to 102 MW for the proposed Project). In total, this alternative would include the construction of twenty-three 3.8-MW WTGs and six 1.79-MW WTGs. It would also include construction of the other components of the Project, including the electrical collection lines, substation, O&M building, transmission line, and switchyard.

Alternative Switchyard Location

This alternative was identified to reduce the severity of the significant but mitigable impact associated with views of the proposed switchyard from SR-1 and to reduce the significant and unavoidable visual impact associated with the section of the transmission line along the ridge entering the proposed switchyard location. This alternative would place the Project's switchyard at a location along the proposed transmission line route that is approximately 1.1 miles south and west of the Project's proposed switchyard location. This alternate location for the switchyard is in the hills on the Imerys mine property. This location for the switchyard would reduce the total length of the Project's 115-kV transmission line to 6.2 miles, compared to 7.3 miles in length for the proposed Project. Like the proposed Project, the existing PG&E 115-kV transmission line would need to be re-conductored between the Cabrillo Substation in Lompoc and the Project switchyard, but due to the more southerly location of the alternate switchyard site, approximately 1.7 miles of re-conductoring would need to occur compared to 0.6 mile under the proposed Project.

Alternate Surface Transport Route

This alternative would alter the transportation route to move the majority of the transport outside of the City of Lompoc and reduce the number of turns that are required within the City of Lompoc. The alternate surface transport route would deviate from the proposed transport route at the intersection of CA-1 and Santa Lucia Canyon Road. The blades would then travel south along Santa Lucia Canyon Road, which becomes Floradale Avenue. The blades would proceed south along Floradale Avenue, making an easterly turn at W. Ocean Avenue. The blades would then proceed east along W. Ocean Avenue, entering the City of Lompoc and connecting with the portion of the proposed transport route at South I Street. This alternative transportation route would require the same number of turns from CA-1 through to South I street but would reduce the length of transport within the City of Lompoc from approximately 2.67 miles to approximately 1.9 miles, although the overall length of the transport route would increase slightly. Additionally, this route would move one of the required turns outside of the City of Lompoc, as the CA-1 and W. Ocean Avenue turn would now be made outside of the City.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

As discussed in Section 5.6 of the SEIR, the analysis concluded that, other than the No Project Alternative, the environmental superior alternative is the Modified Project Layout, Including Elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8, primarily due to its reduced disturbance of native vegetation in comparison to the proposed Project, particularly the reduction in loss of native oak trees. Also, because this

alternative would have one less WTG than the proposed Project, there would be slightly reduced impacts on visual resources and air quality. This alternative also eliminates direct impacts in the Coastal Zone. Overall, this alternative reduces 18 impacts compared to the proposed Project, including impacts associated with aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, land use, and vegetative waste disposal.

The three alternatives (other than the No Project Alternative) are not mutually exclusive and could be implemented together. Therefore, while the Modified Project Layout alternative is the single alternative most capable of reducing adverse impacts associated with the proposed Project, the combination of all three alternatives would be the most effective in reducing adverse impacts.

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
Meets most Project objectives?		Yes	Yes	Yes
Reduces impacts compared to the proposed Project?		19 reduced impacts 2 reduction in significance determinations No impacts in the Coastal Zone	15 reduced impacts 1 reduction in significance determinations Same Coastal Zone impacts as the proposed Project	4 reduced impacts No changes to significance determinations Same Coastal Zone impacts as the proposed Project
Aesthetics\Visual Resources				
VIS-1: WTG Visibility.	Construction and operation of the WTGs and related structures have the potential to be visible in the vicinity of the Project. (Class I)	***Slightly Reduced***. WTG visibility and associated visual contrast would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project. (Class I)	***Similar***. Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class I)	***Similar***. Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class I)
VIS-2: Views from Jalama Beach County Park, Miguelito County Park, and La Purisima Mission.	Westernmost WTGs could be visible to users of Jalama Beach County Park; Northeastern-most WTGs could be visible to users of La Purisima Mission. (Class I – Jalama Beach Co. Park) (Class III – La Purisima Mission)	***Similar***. Impacts to views from Jalama Beach County Park (Class I) and La Purisima Mission (Class III) would not substantially differ from the proposed Project.	***Similar***. Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class I and Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class I and Class III)
VIS-3: Views from State Route 1.	WTGs could be visible throughout from the SR-1 corridor and the Lompoc Valley. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts on views from State Route 1 would not substantially differ from the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class III)
VIS-4: Transmission Line Skyline Silhouette.	Placement of the transmission power line in the area of SR-1 introduces three new structures that could partially silhouette against the skyline. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts on views from State Route 1 would not substantially differ from the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would not substantially differ from the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class III)
VIS-5: Transmission Line Visibility.	Construction and operation of the transmission line could be visible from public roadways and residential areas. (Class III – Majority of San Miguelito Road & SR-1) (Class I – South Lompoc roads and residential areas and two segments of San Miguelito Road)	***Similar***. Impacts on views from San Miguelito Road and some roads and residential areas in south Lompoc would not substantially differ from the proposed Project. (Class I and Class III)	***Reduced***. Impacts on views from San Miguelito Road would be the same as the proposed Project (Class I) for two road segments south of Miguelito County Park. Impacts on views from public roadways and residential areas in south Lompoc would be reduced (Class III). All other viewing locations would experience impacts similar to the proposed Project.	***Similar***. Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class I and Class III)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
VIS-6: Transmission Line and Switchyard Visibility from State Route 1.	Placement of the transmission line switchyard in the area of SR-1 introduces a new industrial facility that could be visible from SR-1. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts on views from State Route 1 would not substantially differ from the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Reduced.*** Impacts on views from SR-1 would be substantially reduced (Class III).	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class II)
VIS-7: San Miguelito Road Landscape.	Vehicular transport of Project components would require road widening and tree removal that could alter the landscape characteristics along portions of San Miguelito Road. (Class I)	***Similar.*** Impacts on views from San Miguelito Road would not substantially differ from the proposed Project. (Class I)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class I)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class I)
VIS-8: Nighttime Lighting.	The Project could result in nighttime lighting impacts. (Class III – Facility lighting) (Class I – FAA hazard lighting)	***Similar.*** Impacts on aesthetics / visual resources would not substantially differ from the proposed Project. (Class I and Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class I and Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class I and Class III)
Agricultural Resources				
AG-1: Important Farmland/ Williamson Act Contract Lands.	Development of the SWEP and power line installation could result in the temporary and permanent disturbance of farmland. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts to agricultural resources would be slightly greater than the proposed Project due to the added disturbance to an actively farmed area, but there would be no change in the severity of impact. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts to agriculture resources would not substantially differ from the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts to agriculture resources under this alternative would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class III)
Air Quality				
AQ-1: Short-Construction Emissions.	Construction emissions could result in a considerable net increase of pollutants that would violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Short-term construction air pollutant emissions would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Short-term localized construction emissions associated with transmission line construction site would be slightly reduced. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ substantially from the proposed Project. Emission increases associated with the slightly longer blade transport route would be minor in the context of total construction emissions. (Class II)
AQ-2: Long-term Operation Emissions.	Operation emissions could result in a considerable net increase of pollutants that would violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. (Class III)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Long-term operation air pollutant emissions would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Long-term operation air pollutant emissions would not differ substantially from the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Long-term operation air pollutant emissions would not differ substantially from the proposed Project. (Class III)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
Biological Resources				
BIO-1a: Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat Impacts during Construction.	Vegetation and wildlife habitat could be temporarily and permanently lost during construction. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Overall vegetation and habitat impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the net reduction of one WTG but impacts to sensitive native grassland would be slightly increased. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** The reduction in transmission line length would result in a minor reduction in ground disturbance under this alternative. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Vegetation and wildlife habitat impacts would be the same. (Class II)
BIO-1b: Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat Impacts during O&M.	Vegetation and wildlife habitat could be impacted during O&M. (Class II)	***Similar.*** O&M impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the net reduction of one WTG may marginally decrease impacts. (Class II)	***Similar.*** O&M impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the reduced transmission line length may marginally decrease impacts. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. O&M impacts would be the same. (Class II)
BIO-2a: Construction Impacts to Woodland and Forest.	Oak woodland and tanoak forest could be impacted during construction. (Class I)	***Reduced.*** Impacts to oaks would be reduced by 67%. However, because oak woodlands are sensitive and take decades to recover even when restoration is successful, impacts to 225 oaks under this alternative would remain significant and unavoidable. (Class I)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the reduced transmission line length may slightly decrease impacts. (Class I)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Oak woodland and tanoak forest impacts would be the same. (Class I)
BIO-2b: O&M Impacts to Woodland and Forest.	Oak woodland and tanoak forest could be impacted during Project operations. (Class III)	***Similar.*** O&M impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the net reduction of one WTG may marginally decrease impacts. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the reduced transmission line length may marginally decrease impacts. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. O&M impacts would be the same. (Class III)
BIO-3: Wetlands, Seeps, and Springs, and Features Subject to Regulation by the USACE, Santa Barbara County, or CDFW.	Direct loss of wetlands and seeps would occur at creek crossings, the laydown yard, water well, road improvement and access road locations, pole locations along the transmission line, and WTG pads. Additionally, soil erosion or spills could reduce water quality during construction. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the net reduction of one WTG may marginally decrease impacts. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the reduced transmission line length may marginally decrease impacts. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Impacts to jurisdictional resources would be the same. (Class II)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
BIO-5a: Construction Impacts to Gaviota Tarplant.	Impacts to Gaviota tarplant and designated critical habitat could occur during construction. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** The realigned access road to WTG E-1 would slightly increase impacts to Gaviota tarplant because it is within a mapped population. However, the realigned access road to WTG E-2 would reduce impacts to Gaviota tarplant by slightly decreasing the length of road within a mapped population. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Impacts to Gaviota tarplant would be the same. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Impacts to Gaviota tarplant would be the same. (Class II)
BIO-5b: O&M Impacts to Gaviota Tarplant.	Occasional disturbance to small areas of Gaviota tarplant habitat could occur as a result of operations or maintenance activities involving clearing or vehicle operation in occupied habitat. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** O&M impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the slight reduction in widening an existing access road length in a mapped population may marginally decrease impacts. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. O&M impacts would be the same. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. O&M impacts would be the same. (Class II)
BIO-6: Other Special-Status Plants.	A number of other special-status plant species may be present on site or in the transmission line corridor and could be lost during construction. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the net reduction of one WTG. (Class II)	***Similar.*** There are four scattered, small occurrences of black-flowered figwort (CRPR 1B.2) consisting of 1 to 4 plants each in the general area of the alternative switchyard location; however, these occurrences may be able to be avoided during micrositing. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Impacts to special-status plants would be the same. (Class II)
BIO-7: Common Wildlife.	Individual animals could be injured or killed by vehicles, equipment, or large holes during construction. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the net reduction of one WTG. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the reduced transmission line length. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Impacts to common wildlife would be the same. (Class II)
BIO-8: Nesting Birds.	Nesting birds could potentially lose nests through destruction or abandonment. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the net reduction of one WTG. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the reduced transmission line length. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Impacts to nesting birds would be the same. (Class II)
BIO-9: Special-Status Wildlife.	Direct and indirect impacts could occur to special-status wildlife species. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the net reduction of one WTG. (Class II)	***Slightly Increased.*** The alternative switchyard location supports a small amount of mapped seacliff buckwheat (0.003 acre), the host plant for the federally listed El Segundo blue butterfly. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Impacts to special-status wildlife would be the same. (Class II)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
BIO-10: Avian and Bat Collisions with WTGs.	Unknown numbers of special status and non-sensitive birds and bats are could be at risk of dying through collisions with the WTGs over the duration of the Project. (Class I)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the net reduction of one WTG. (Class I)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. O&M impacts to birds and bats from WTGs would be the same. (Class I)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. O&M impacts to birds and bats from WTGs would be the same. (Class I)
BIO-11: Avian and Bat Collisions with Power Lines and Meteorological Towers.	Birds and bats could collide with transmission and power collection poles, transmission and power collection lines, and meteorological towers. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Overhead transmission facilities and meteorological towers would be the same. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** The reduced transmission line length would slightly decrease impacts. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. O&M impacts would be the same. (Class II)
BIO-12: Avian Displacement from WTGs.	Birds with habitat within 200 feet of WTG towers may be displaced. (Class III)	***Similar.*** While impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the net reduction of one WTG, the two larger WTGs would marginally increase the area of displacement at WTGs W-7 and N-3. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Avian displacement would be the same. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Avian displacement would be the same. (Class III)
BIO-13a: Indirect Construction Effects (Wildlife).	Indirect impacts to wildlife could occur during construction from a variety of sources, resulting in temporary wildlife displacement. (Class III)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the net reduction of one WTG. (Class III)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project due to the reduced transmission line length and associated decrease in ground disturbance. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Indirect impacts to wildlife would be the same. (Class III)
BIO-13b: Indirect O&M Effects (Wildlife).	Indirect operational impacts could occur to terrestrial wildlife compared to pre-Project levels. (Class III)	***Similar.*** O&M impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the net reduction of one WTG may marginally decrease impacts. (Class III)	***Similar.*** O&M impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the reduced transmission line length may marginally decrease impacts. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. (Class III)
BIO-14: Indirect Impacts (Vegetation).	Invasive species carried from other work sites could establish on site and displace native plant species or interfere with revegetation; topsoil removal and equipment operation could reduce the ability of soils to support vegetation. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the net reduction of one WTG may slightly decrease indirect impacts. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** Impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the reduced transmission line length and associated reduction in ground disturbance may slightly decrease indirect impacts. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ from the proposed Project. Indirect impacts to vegetation would be the same. (Class II)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources				
CULT-1: Known Prehistoric Archaeological Sites.	Construction activities could result in significant impacts to 29 prehistoric archaeological sites. (Class II)	***Similar.*** No impacts on cultural or tribal resources would be avoided by the elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8. There is the potential for slightly increased disturbance of several cultural resource sites near WTGs N-10, W-7, and N-3, and the access road to WTG E-2. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** The reduced length of the transmission line under this alternative would avoid potential impacts to one cultural resource site. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
CULT-2: Unidentified Archaeological Resources.	Impacts to unidentified subsurface archaeological resources may occur as a result of earth-disturbing activities. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
CULT-3: Unauthorized Artifact Collection.	Impacts to known and unidentified archaeological resources may occur as a result of increased public access to archaeological sites via new or improved roads. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
CULT-4: Impacts on Traditional Cultural Properties.	Construction of WTGs could adversely affect Native cultural practices at known Traditional Cultural Properties (Sacred Sites). (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. WTG N-10 would be visible from the Traditional Cultural Properties (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
Energy				
EEU-1: Federal and State Renewable Energy Goals.	The Project could be consistent with federal goals and state legislation related to the use of renewable energy. (Class IV)	***Similar.*** The beneficial effects of the proposed Project would be slightly reduced. (Class IV)	***Similar.*** There would be no change to energy-related impacts under this alternative. (Class IV)	***Similar.*** There would be no change to energy-related impacts under this alternative. (Class IV)
EEU-2: Nonrenewable Energy Resources.	Construction and operation of the Project could result in consumption of diesel fuel and gasoline. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Fuel consumption would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Fuel consumption would be similar to the proposed Project, although slightly increased due to construction of a longer transmission line. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Fuel consumption would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)
EEU-3: New/Altered PG&E Facilities.	Impacts from temporary and long-term modifications to the PG&E system to implement the Project could occur. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the similar to the proposed Project although the amount of work on PG&E's system would be slightly increase. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
Fire Hazards and Emergency Services				
FPES-1: Increased Fire Risk (Construction).	The Project could result in an increased risk of wildland fires that could spread to more developed areas. Fire risks include vehicle exhaust, sparks, welding, parking on dry grass, and fuel tanks. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
FPES-2: Increase Fire Risk (Operations).	Operation of the Project could increase baseline fire risks. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
FPES-3: Fire Department Response Times.	The Project could have the potential to increase demand for fire protection services. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
FPES-4: Emergency Services Response Times.	The Project could temporarily increase the need for emergency medical services during construction. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
FPES-5: Interference with Fire Prevention Techniques.	The Project could interfere with controlled burns in the Project area. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
FPES-6: Emergency Evacuation/Response.	The closure of Sudden Road and Upper Miguelito Canyon Road could hinder emergency response. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
Geology and Soils				
GEO-1: Fault Rupture.	There could be a risk of damage to structures by fault rupture. (Class III)	***Similar***. The modified layout would not change hazards associated with fault rupture. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
GEO-2: Ground Shaking and Liquefaction.	A major earthquake could result in ground shaking, liquefaction, or seismically induced landslides resulting in damage to structures or exposure of people to injury or death. (Class II)	***Similar***. The modified layout would not change hazards associated with ground shaking and liquefaction. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
GEO-3: Landslides.	Construction activities could increase the potential for landslides and/or reactivate existing landslides. (Class II)	***Similar***. The modified layout would not substantially change the potential for landslides. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
GEO-4: Soil Erosion.	Construction could accelerate or increase the potential for erosion from water and wind. (Class II)	***Similar***. The modified layout would not substantially change the potential for soil erosion. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
GEO-5: Expansive Soils.	Project Structures could be damaged by expansive soils. (Class II)	***Similar***. The modified layout would not substantially change the potential for damage from expansive soils. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
GEO-6: Sewage Effluent Disposal.	Soils could be found incapable for use of septic or alternative wastewater disposal. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
GEO-7: Compressible and Collapsible Soil, Subsidence.	Subsidence or compressible or collapsible soils could cause settlement damage to structures and roadways. (Class II)	***Similar***. The modified layout would not substantially change the potential for damage from subsidence or compressible or collapsible soils. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions				
GHG-1: Reduction in GHG Emissions.	The Project would result in GHG emissions reductions in the power generation sector, resulting in a beneficial effect related to green-house gas emissions. (Class IV)	***Similar***. The potential to offset GHG emissions in the power generation sector would be reduced slightly compared to the proposed Project, but impacts would remain similar. (Class IV)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class IV)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class IV)
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
RISK-1: Tower Failure and Blade Throw.	There could be a risk to the public from possible WTG tower collapse or blade throw. (Class III)	***Similar***. The modified layout of this alternative, including installation of one less WTG, does not substantially change potential hazards. (Class III)	***Similar***. The different switchyard location and shorter transmission line associated with this alternative does not change potential hazards. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
RISK-2: Blade Icing and Ice Throw.	Risk to the public could occur from blade icing and ice throw. (Class III)	***Similar***. The modified layout of this alternative, including installation of one less WTG, does not substantially change potential hazards associated with blade icing and ice throw. (Class III)	***Similar***. The different switchyard location and shorter transmission line associated with this alternative does not change potential hazards associated with blade icing and ice throw. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
RISK-3: Electromagnetic Field Effect.	Electromagnetic fields could cause a possible hazard when associated with the siting of high-voltage overhead power lines or cables in proximity to residences. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
RISK-4: Utility/Turbine Interface and Worker Safety.	Construction workers could be exposed to safety risks, including electrical shock and falls. Risk could occur to members of public who incidentally or intentionally enter the Project site. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
RISK-5: Release of Hazardous Materials.	Accidental spills or leakage of hazardous materials could occur, including fuels (gasoline and diesel), lubricants, motor oil, and paints. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)
RISK-6: Radiofrequency Radiation.	The Project could expose people to radiofrequency radiation (RFR) in excess of the IEEE-ANSI C95.1-1992 standard. (No Impact)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (No Impact)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (No Impact)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (No Impact)
Hydrology and Water Quality				
WAT-1: Erosion and Sedimentation.	Project-related ground disturbance could induce erosion and sedimentation into local watercourses. (Class III)	***Similar.*** The modified layout of this alternative, including installation of one less WTG, does not substantially change the potential for erosion and sedimentation. (Class III)	***Slightly Reduced.*** The shorter transmission line would result in slightly reduced growth disturbance during construction. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
WAT-2: Pollutant Discharge.	Water quality could be affected by small fuel or oil spills, concrete, and trash and litter during construction and operation. (Class III)	***Similar.*** The modified layout of this alternative, including installation of one less WTG, does not substantially change the potential for pollutant discharge. (Class III)	***Slightly Reduced.*** The shorter transmission line would result in slightly reduced potential for pollutant discharge during construction. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
WAT-3: Stormwater Runoff/Flooding.	Temporary and permanent land disturbance could affect stormwater runoff/flooding and stormwater quality. (Class III)	***Similar.*** The modified layout of this alternative, including installation of one less WTG, does not substantially change potential impacts related to stormwater runoff. (Class III)	***Similar.*** The alternative switchyard location and shorter transmission line does not substantially change potential impacts related to stormwater runoff. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
WAT-4: Groundwater.	The Project could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. (Class III)	***Similar.*** The modified layout of this alternative, including installation of one less WTG, does not substantially change potential impacts related to groundwater. (Class III)	***Similar.*** The alternative switchyard location and shorter transmission line does not substantially change potential impacts related to groundwater. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
WAT-5: Riparian Vegetation Removal.	The Project could result in the removal or reduction of vegetation from the buffer zone of streams, creeks, or wetlands, which could affect water quality. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the net reduction of one WTG may marginally decrease impacts. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would not differ appreciably from the proposed Project, but the reduced transmission line length may marginally decrease impacts. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
Land Use and Planning				
LU-1a: LUDC Visual Impact Development Standards.	Potential inconsistency with County Plans, Policies, and Development Standards concerning visual impacts. (Class III)	***Reduced.*** This alternative would not be subject to the requirements of the County's Coastal Land Use Plan and Coastal Zoning Ordinance, but would be subject to the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use and Development Code. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
LU-1b: Tree Protection.	The proposed Project is inconsistent with County Plans, Policies, and Development Standards concerning tree removal. (Class I)	***Reduced.*** The elimination of WTGs E-7 and E-8 would substantially reduce tree loss, including a 67% reduction of loss of oak trees. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class I)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class I)
LU-2: FAA Air Navigation Requirements.	Potential conflict with FAA air navigation requirements from installation of WTGs and meteorological towers, and possible use of helicopters during construction. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts to air navigation would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
LU-3: Compatibility with VAFB Operations.	Potential incompatibility with VAFB operations, such as radar, telemetry antennas, and microwave links. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Compatibility with VAFB operations would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
LU-4: Quality of Life – Traffic.	Construction activities would result in increased traffic in relatively quiet neighborhoods. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Construction traffic impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	Slightly Reduced. Temporary traffic impacts in Lompoc associated with blade transport would be reduced (Class II)
LU-5a: Quality of Life – Noise.	Noise from Project construction could cause temporary impacts to quality of life of residences within and surrounding the Project area. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Construction noise impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
LU-5b: Quality of Life – Noise.	Noise from WTG operation could potentially impact quality of life of nearby residences. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Operational noise impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
LU-6: Coastal Resources.	Possible unpermitted encroachment into the Coastal Zone, impacting coastal resources. (Class II)	***Reduced.*** The elimination of widening a portion of an existing road in the Coastal Zone would result in reduced impacts. (Class III)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
LU-7: Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan.	Long-term impacts to land use following end of Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
Noise				
NOI-1: Short-term Construction Noise.	Some types of construction equipment could generate short-term noise impacts to residences less than 2,000 feet from a construction area. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)
NOI-2: Long-term Wind Turbine Generator Noise.	Adjacent residences could be exposed to substantial noise levels during Project operations. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)
Paleontological Resources				
PALEO-1: Exposure and Potential Destruction of Significant Paleontological Resources.	Ground-disturbing activities such as mechanical excavation, drilling, or trenching could affect paleontological resources. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Ground disturbance would be substantially similar to the proposed Project and, therefore, impacts would be similar. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Ground disturbance would be substantially similar to the proposed Project and, therefore, impacts would be similar. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Ground disturbance would be would the same as the proposed Project and, therefore, impacts would be similar. (Class II)
PALEO-2: Unauthorized Fossil Collection.	Unauthorized collection of fossils by construction workers or operational personal may occur. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
Recreation				
REC-1: Loss of Recreation.	Project construction-related activities could interfere with recreational activities in the Project area. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
Transportation and Traffic				
TC-1: LOS and V/C Ratio.	Project-related construction traffic could temporarily affect traffic levels and LOS on Project area roadways. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)
TC-2: Roadway Safety.	Long, heavy trucks used to deliver equipment during construction could present safety concerns and physical modifications to the roadway or nearby trees will be required. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** The change in transport route would slightly reduce impact severity because a portion of the turning activities would be transferred to a less constrained area. (Class II)
TC-4: Road Blockages/Traffic Delays.	During peak construction, several oversized trucks per day could slow traffic and necessitate temporary blockages of intersections. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar.*** Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced.*** The change in transport route would slightly reduce impact severity because a portion of the turning activities would be transferred to a less constrained area. (Class II)

Table 5-1. Comparison of Alternatives (Excluding No Project)

	Proposed Project	Modified Project Layout	Alternative Switchyard Location	Alternate Surface Transport Route
TC-5: Damage to Roadways.	Trucks carrying heavy equipment could damage existing streets. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class II)
TC-6: Soil on Roadways.	Project vehicles could track dust and soil onto public roads. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
Utilities and Service Systems				
USS-1: Solid Waste Generation.	The Project would potentially exceed Santa Barbara County thresholds for solid waste generation during construction. (Class II)	***Reduced***. Vegetative waste due to removal of oaks trees and other vegetation would be reduced compared to the proposed Project. (Class II)	***Slightly Reduced***. Due a shorter length of transmission line, vegetative waste from construction would be slightly reduced compared to the proposed Project (Class II)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class II)
USS-2: Water Supply.	The proposed Project would consume water during both construction and operation, but adequate supplies exist to meet these needs. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be similar to the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
USS-3: Wastewater.	The Project would generate nominal amounts of wastewater but would not affect the capacity of the local waste-water treatment system. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)
USS-4: Public Infrastructure.	The Project would require temporary relocations of minor facilities within the City of Lompoc. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Similar***. Impacts would be the same as the proposed Project. (Class III)	***Slightly Reduced***. Impacts associated with temporary removal of street infrastructure (signs, signals, lights) would be reduced within central Lompoc. (Class III)