

4.7 Energy

This section describes existing environmental conditions and anticipated energy resources impacts to the environment associated with the Proposed Project. This section describes the consumption of energy resources by the Proposed Project (e.g., from Proposed Project decommissioning activities, equipment use, and scheduling of activities) and whether the Proposed Project would conflict with adopted plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Scoping Comments Received. During the scoping comment period for the EIR, written and verbal comments were received from agencies, organizations, and the public. These comments identified various substantive issues and concerns relevant to the EIR analysis. Appendix B includes all comments received during the scoping comment period. The following list provides a summary of scoping comments applicable to this issue area and considered in preparing this section:

- Address the loss of electric power supply brought about by the retirement and decommissioning the Diablo Canyon Power Plant.
- Consider the impacts of electrical power import needs created by decommissioning the Diablo Canyon Power Plant including from Wyoming coal-fired generation.
- Consider geothermal energy production as a replacement for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant.
- Consider what alternative energy system will be needed to generate power for customers that currently rely on Diablo Canyon Power Plant.

4.7.1 Environmental Setting

The DCPD Project Site is in an “operating” status. The basis for this EIR is that PG&E will retire DCPD and transition DCPD into a “decommissioning” status. The No Project Alternative for the DCPD site is discussed in Section 5.4.1, *Alternative 1: SAFSTOR Alternative*, and in this alternative, DCPD would be put in a safe, stable storage condition, and decommissioning would need to be completed within 60 years as required by NRC regulations. The Proposed Project involves the decommissioning (withdraw from service and make inoperative) and dismantlement (demolition, decontamination, and removal) of the existing plant.

Under existing conditions, the DCPD generates power for California’s end users of electricity. PG&E delivers energy to nearly 16 million people throughout a 70,000-square-mile service area in Northern and Central California. PG&E’s service area stretches from Eureka in the north to Bakersfield in the south, and from the Pacific Ocean in the west to the Sierra Nevada in the east. PG&E provides electric service to more than 5 million electric customer accounts (PG&E, 2020).

Nuclear power is a substantial portion of the energy provided to PG&E’s customer base. The energy sources that make up the mix of power supplied to PG&E customers, relative to the 2020 California power mix, are summarized in Table 4.7-1.

Table 4.7-1. 2020 Energy Sources of Electricity Supplied to PG&E Customers (Power Content)

| Energy Resources | 2020 Power Content Label for PG&E's Base Plan | 2020 California-wide Power Mix |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Eligible Renewable | 30.6% | 33.1% |
| Biomass & biowaste | 2.6% | 2.5% |
| Geothermal | 2.6% | 4.9% |
| Eligible hydroelectric | 1.2% | 1.4% |
| Solar | 15.9% | 13.2% |
| Wind | 8.3% | 11.1% |
| Coal | 0.0% | 2.7% |
| Large Hydroelectric | 10.1% | 12.2% |
| Natural Gas | 16.4% | 37.1% |
| Nuclear | 42.8% | 9.3% |
| Other | 0.0% | 0.2% |
| Unspecified sources of power ¹ | 0.0% | 5.4% |
| Total | 100% | 100% |

Source: California Energy Commission (CEC), 2021a.

¹ "Unspecified sources of power" means electricity from transactions not traceable to specific generation sources.

In recent years, the annual electricity consumption procured or generated by PG&E to serve its customers has generally declined and in 2020 was down to a level of 78,519 gigawatt-hours (GWh) (CEC, 2021b). This trend is driven by growth in customer-installed distributed generation and the expansion of Community Choice Aggregators procuring energy for enrolled customers (PG&E, 2020). Table 4.7-2 shows the baseline electricity consumption by PG&E's customers over the prior five years, separated by customer classes.

Table 4.7-2. Electricity Consumption for Load Served by PG&E (GWh per year)

| Customer Sector | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Ag & Water Pump | 6,692 | 5,100 | 5,832 | 4,567 | 6,638 |
| Commercial Building | 30,661 | 30,753 | 30,148 | 30,069 | 26,247 |
| Commercial Other | 4,546 | 4,353 | 4,266 | 4,424 | 3,949 |
| Industry | 10,619 | 10,515 | 10,519 | 9,877 | 9,814 |
| Mining & Construction | 1,909 | 1,765 | 1,594 | 1,670 | 1,748 |
| Residential | 28,625 | 29,138 | 27,700 | 27,485 | 29,834 |
| Streetlight | 355 | 321 | 311 | 298 | 290 |
| PG&E Total Usage | 83,408 | 81,945 | 80,369 | 78,390 | 78,519 |

Source: CEC, 2021b.

¹ Usage expressed in gigawatt-hours (GWh); one GWh equals one million kilowatt-hours.

4.7.2 Regulatory Setting

Retirement of Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant

The Diablo Canyon Power Plant Decommissioning Project would be a consequence of PG&E's decision to not pursue renewal of the existing licenses to operate the DCPD reactors (see Section 1.2.1, *DCPD License Expiration and Retirement*). In 2016, PG&E decided to forego license renewal efforts and announced plans to close DCPD. This decision was confirmed by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) in 2018. The CPUC's order indicated that replacement procurement of energy resources and efforts to avoid an increase in GHG emissions relating to the retirement would need to be addressed in the CPUC's Integrated Resource Planning proceedings or an equivalent proceeding.

Energy Action Plan and Loading Order

California has mandated and implemented aggressive energy-use reduction programs for electricity and other resources. In 2003, California's first Energy Action Plan (EAP) established a high-level, coherent approach to meeting California's electricity and natural gas needs and set forth the "loading order" to address California's future energy needs. The "loading order" established that the State, in meeting its energy needs, would invest first in energy efficiency and demand-side resources, followed by renewable resources, and only then in clean conventional electricity supply (CPUC, 2008). Since that time, the CPUC and California Energy Commission (CEC) have overseen the plans, policies, and programs for prioritizing the preferred resources, including energy efficiency and renewable energy.

California's Renewables Portfolio Standard

Electric utilities in California must procure a minimum quantity of the electricity sales from eligible renewable energy resources as specified by Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) requirements. The most-recent update to the RPS targets was set forth in 2018 with the "100 Percent Clean Energy Act of 2018" (Senate Bill 100 [SB 100]), which establishes the policy that eligible renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources supply 100 percent of retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers by December 31, 2045. SB 100 requires the CPUC and CEC to ensure that implementation of this policy does not cause or contribute to GHG emissions increases elsewhere in the western grid.

Integrated Resource Planning

An Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) is an electricity system planning document that lays out the energy resource needs, policy goals, physical and operational constraints, and the general priorities or proposed resource choices of an electric utility, including customer-side preferred resources. Through Senate Bill 350 (De León, Chapter 547, Statutes of 2015) (SB 350), California's investor-owned utilities such as PG&E must file with the CPUC an IRP that is subject to a review for consistency with statewide targets for energy efficiency, renewable resources, and GHG emissions reductions.

PG&E filed its 2020 IRP to the CPUC in September 2020 in the proceeding for the 2020 IRP cycle (CPUC Rulemaking (R.) 16-02-007). Each IRP for any of the load-serving entities that filed to the

CPUC in the 2020 cycle was required to “[p]rovide narrative description explaining which specific resources are planned to be procured to serve their load in the absence of DCPP” and that “new resources are suitable substitutes and are able to maintain system reliability without increasing GHG emissions” (PG&E, 2020). All load-serving entities (i.e., a company or utility that supplies electricity to a customer) under the CPUC’s jurisdiction must submit an updated IRP for the 2022 cycle by November 1, 2022 (CPUC, 2022).

During 2020 and 2021, the CPUC clarified and expedited the procurement requirements to address mid-term (2023-2026) reliability needs, including the replacement of capacity from DCPP and several other thermal power plants anticipated to retire as a result of once-through-cooling regulations (in Decision (D.) 21-06-035, June 24, 2021, in CPUC R. 20-05-003).¹⁶ The order for mid-term reliability specifically establishes the emissions profile for the replacement capacity for DCPP’s retirement to require procurement of 2,500 megawatts (MW), including 1,000 MW of long-duration storage and 1,000 MW from firm, zero-emitting resources by 2024. The order assigned the procurement responsibility to all load-serving entities based on their share of peak demand (CPUC, 2021).¹⁷

County of San Luis Obispo EnergyWise Plan

The Board of Supervisors adopted the EnergyWise Plan in 2011 (San Luis Obispo, 2011), updated in 2016 (San Luis Obispo, 2016), with one overarching goal, to reduce GHG emissions from community-wide and County operations sources by a minimum of 15 percent from 2006 baseline emissions by 2020. The 2016 update summarized progress towards implementing measures, and overall emissions trends since the baseline inventory in 2006. The 2016 update reviews the implementation of 12 specific reduction goals, six for government operations and six for community-wide activity. The EnergyWise Plan goals revolve around reducing energy use, reducing water use, promoting renewable energy use, and improving energy efficiency.

4.7.3 Significance Criteria

The Proposed Project would be found to cause a significant environmental impact if it would:

- Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during decommissioning.
- Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

For the analysis of decommissioning activities that would involve use of energy-consuming equipment and processes, this analysis presents a qualitative discussion of energy use necessary

¹⁶ CPUC D. 21-06-035, June 24, 2021 (p.44): “Nonetheless, to ensure no ambiguity, we will require that at least 2,500 MW of the resources procured by the LSEs [load-serving entities] collectively, between 2023 and 2025, be from zero-emission resources that generate electricity, or generation resources paired with storage, to replace Diablo Canyon.”

¹⁷ The CPUC defined “firm” resources as “resources must be able to deliver firm power (with a capacity factor of at least 80 percent). This means that the resource must not be subject to use limitations or be weather dependent. The resource must be a generating resource, not storage, able to generate when needed, for as long as needed. In addition, the resource may not have any on-site emissions, except if the resource otherwise qualifies under the RPS program eligibility requirements.” D.21-06-035 at p. 36.

to undertake the different phases and components of the Proposed Project. Consistent with the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix F: Energy Conservation, the goal of conserving energy implies the wise and efficient use of energy including:

- Decreasing overall per capita energy consumption;
- Decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas, and oil; and
- Increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

Lead agency actions that are consistent with these goals would not likely cause an energy-related impact. The energy impact analysis emphasizes avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and evaluates whether a potentially significant environmental impact would occur due to inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy.

4.7.4 Environmental Impact Analysis and Mitigation

Impact EN-1: Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources (Class III: Less than Significant).

Phase 1

DCPP Project Site

The baseline and environmental setting include the DCPP Project Site in an “operating” status. Upon expiration of the Unit 1 and Unit NRC licenses, PG&E would retire DCPP and transition DCPP into a “decommissioning” status (see Section 1.1.1, *DCPP License Expiration and Retirement*).

Currently, DCPP provides 2,240 MW of generating capacity to California’s electric transmission system. With or without the Proposed Project, the baseline production of electricity would cease when operations cease. PG&E would no longer need to procure or receive nuclear fuel for power production.

Because the decommissioning of DCPP would be a consequence of PG&E’s prior decision to not pursue renewal of the existing licenses to operate the DCPP reactors, this analysis focuses on the energy use that could occur during decommissioning activities themselves. See Impact EN-2 for a discussion of the effects of procuring replacement power.

Phase 1 activities for the Proposed Project would commence after DCPP Unit 1 shuts down in November 2024 and continue over approximately eight years until most above-grade structures and some below-grade structures are removed from the site. Electricity used during decommissioning would be approximately 10 to 15 MW more than current needs at the DCPP site, which would be obtained through PG&E’s regional power grid (PG&E, 2021). This increase in electricity usage represents a small change (about 0.03%) in the context of California’s historic peak day loads of 47,121 MW to 52,061 MW, in 2020 or 2022, respectively (CAISO, 2023).

During the transition into decommissioning, the planned closure would bring about an overall reduction in activity at the site. Water demand for the Proposed Project would be much lower than the typical annual freshwater used for power production and domestic water use at the site.

Compared with current DCPD operations, decommissioning staffing is expected to be less than current staffing levels. Presently, DCPD employs approximately 1,157 but generally up to approximately 1,400 workers (see Section 2.2.3.1), and during decommissioning there would be around 870 workers daily in Phase 1, and around 160 workers daily in Phase 2. Because lower numbers of staff would travel to and from the site as compared to current DCPD operations, energy used by DCPD site staff for commuting would be less than current levels.

During decommissioning, motorized equipment and vehicles would consume energy resources in the form of fossil fuels (i.e., diesel fuel and gasoline). Additionally, Phase 1 activities would involve long-distance truck travel, tugboat and barge operations, and rail transport by locomotives. The delivery and export of materials and equipment to the site, provision of water supplies, and use of electric grid power would also require energy consumption of various forms of energy.

Phase 1 activities would consume primarily diesel fuel with comparably negligible consumption of gasoline, natural gas, or electricity. Diesel fuel would be consumed by trucks, locomotives, and marine vessels transporting decommissioned debris; and off-road and marine equipment used in the onshore and offshore demolition activities. As shown in Table 4.9-2 (see Section 4.9, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*), Phase 1 of the Proposed Project would emit approximately 91,744 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) over the 8 years of Phase 1 activity. The volume of diesel consumed during Phase 1 of decommissioning can be estimated by using a general emission factor for diesel of 10.2 kilograms of CO₂ per gallon.¹⁸ Based on the mass of CO₂e emissions, approximately 9.0 million gallons overall or 26,769 barrels per year of diesel fuel would need to be used over the 8-year duration of Phase 1.

California's refineries produce approximately 1 million to 1.4 million barrels of diesel fuel each week (CEC, 2022) or roughly 50 to 70 million barrels per year. The equivalent annual-average diesel fuel use during Phase 1 of 26,769 barrels per year would equate to approximately 0.05 percent of the diesel volume produced by California's refineries in one year. Therefore, the impact of energy use during Phase 1 would be less than significant (Class III). Additionally, energy used during decommissioning activities would be reduced incidentally by minimizing unnecessary use of construction equipment and vehicles (e.g., by limiting idling, committing construction equipment to be properly maintained, and using electric equipment where feasible) so that activity levels are not wasteful (see Table 2-12). Air quality mitigation (MM AQ-1, *Implement a Decommissioning Activity Management Plan [DAMP]*) to manage decommissioning activities could also result in expanded carpooling or other transportation management efficiencies, which would reduce vehicle trips and the energy used during worker travel, thus further reducing Phase 1 energy impacts.

Railyards

Energy consumption by Phase 1 activities at the railyards is included in the overall estimate for Phase 1, described above. The impact of wasteful energy consumption would be less than significant (Class III).

¹⁸ The volume of diesel fuel used can be approximated from 10.2 kg CO₂ per gallon, based on the fuel heating value (0.138 million British thermal units per gallon) multiplied by the default CO₂ emission factor (73.96 kg CO₂ per million British thermal unit), in Table 2-3 of Title 17, California Code of Regulations, Section 95115.

Phase 2

Activities in Phase 2 include contaminant remediation, demolition of remaining utilities and structures, soil grading and landscaping, long-term stormwater management, closure of the Intake Structure, and continuation of Discharge Structure removal and restoration activities. Similar to Phase 1 activities, Phase 2 would consume primarily diesel fuel through the use of trucks and other equipment but at a much smaller scale compared to Phase 1.

As shown in Table 4.9-3 (see Section 4.9, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*), Phase 2 of the Proposed Project would emit approximately 7,698 metric tons of CO₂e. As noted above, the volume of diesel consumed during Phase 2 of decommissioning can be estimated by using a general emission factor for diesel of 10.2 kilograms of CO₂ per gallon. Based on the mass of CO₂e emissions, approximately 0.75 million gallons overall or 2,245 barrels per year of diesel fuel would need to be used over the entire 8-year duration of Phase 2. This would equate to approximately 0.004 percent of the diesel volume produced by California's refineries in one year. Therefore, the impact of energy use during Phase 2 would be less than significant (Class III).

Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix F, evaluating a project for significant impacts with regard to energy conservation should consider whether the project would use large amounts of fuel or energy in an unnecessary, wasteful, or inefficient manner. Taken together, Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Proposed Project would not involve inefficient or wasteful use of energy. Unnecessary, wasteful, or inefficient fuel use would be avoided through Applicant Commitments (ACs) (see Table 2-12) designed to avoid unnecessary air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

Although the Proposed Project would require the use of energy resources throughout decommissioning, the activities would not result in significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts of the Proposed Project decommissioning activities would be less than significant (Class III).

Post-Decommissioning Operations

New Facility Operations. Following Phase 2, operational activities at the DCPD site would include long-term management of the GTCC Waste Storage facility and operation of the Security Building, indoor Firing Range, and Storage Buildings. These operations would be expected to use less energy than current operations and would consist of less than 50 peak staff employees. These activities would not involve inefficient or wasteful use of energy. This impact would be less than significant (Class III).

Future Actions. Marina improvement and operations would be completed by a third party who would be required to obtain necessary land use and building permits as well as a new or amended lease from CSLC. The Breakwaters would remain in place and the Marina would be used for small vessels to be launched into the Intake Cove. These improvements may include parking lots, bathrooms, and a boat hoist, and would not contribute to inefficient or wasteful energy use, so this impact would be less than significant (Class III).

Mitigation Measures for Impact EN-1. No mitigation measures are required.

Impact EN-2: Conflict with state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency (Class III: Less than Significant Impact).

Phase 1

DCPP Project Site

The retirement plans for DCPP that were approved by the CPUC in January 2018 include procuring replacement power supplies from cost-effective, GHG-free portfolio of energy efficient renewables and energy storage projects, as described in EIR Section 1.2.1, *DCPP License Expiration and Retirement*. The CPUC decision in 2018 directed all CPUC-jurisdictional load serving entities to plan for the procurement of their share of replacement power for the retirement of the DCPP. The planning efforts that are consistent with CPUC direction for procurement of replacement power by load-serving entities, therefore reflect retirement of DCPP and would continue unchanged by the Proposed Project.

California's policies establish the goal of eligible renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources to supply 100 percent of retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers by December 31, 2045, as established by SB 100. In the provisions of SB 100, the CPUC and CEC must ensure that implementation of this policy does not cause or contribute to GHG emissions increases elsewhere in the western grid.

CPUC's 2021 order for statewide electric system reliability specifically establishes the emissions profile for the replacement capacity for DCPP's retirement to require procurement of 2,500 MW from firm, zero-emitting resources by 2024. The order assigned the procurement responsibility to all load-serving entities based on their share of peak demand (CPUC, 2021). These requirements ensure that the replacement power for DCPP retirement would be procured in a manner that is consistent with statewide plans for promoting renewable energy. Additionally, as mentioned in Section 2.3.13, *Removal of 230 kV Lines and Poles and 500 kV Lines and Towers from Switchyards to Diablo Canyon Power Plant*, the DCPP 230 and 500 kV switchyards would be retained, as well as the existing transmission lines that connect to these switchyards (to support the transmission grid), with the exception of those identified in Figure 2-18.

There are no plans or policies that relate specifically to use of renewable energy or energy efficiency during decommissioning activities. The Phase 1 activities would have no potential to conflict with federal, state, and local plans for renewable energy development or energy efficiency. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant (Class III).

Railyards

No specific renewable energy or energy efficiency plans would relate to Phase 1 activities at the railyards.

Phase 2

Before Phase 2, Units 1 and 2 would be decommissioned, and Phase 2 activities would include contaminant remediation, demolition of remaining utilities and structures, soil grading and landscaping, long-term stormwater management, closure of the Intake Structure, and continuation

of Discharge Structure removal and restoration activities. Similar to Phase 1 activities, Phase 2 would consume primarily diesel fuel through the use of trucks and other equipment but at a much smaller scale compared to Phase 1.

There are no plans or policies that relate specifically to use of energy during decommissioning activities. Phase 2 activities would have no potential to conflict with federal, state, and local plans for renewable energy development or energy efficiency. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant (Class III).

Post-Decommissioning Operations

New Facility Operations. Following Phase 2, operational activities at the DCPD site would include long-term management of the GTCC Waste Storage facility and operation of the Security Building, indoor Firing Range, and Storage Buildings. No specific energy efficiency or renewable energy plans would relate to new facility operations. This impact would be less than significant (Class III).

Future Actions. Marina improvement and operations would be completed by a third party who would be required to obtain necessary land use and building permits as well as a new or amended lease from CSLC. The Breakwaters would remain in place and the Marina would be used for small vessels to be launched into the DCPD Intake Cove. No specific energy efficiency or renewable energy plans would relate to new facility operations. This impact would be less than significant (Class III).

Mitigation Measures for Impact EN-2. No mitigation measures are required.

4.7.5 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Geographic Extent Context

The geographic scope of the cumulative analysis for energy consumption would span the State of California including all the cumulative projects listed in EIR Section 3.3.2, *Relevant Cumulative Projects*. This geographic area is selected because decommissioning activities and all other cumulative projects have the potential to utilize energy resources temporarily or permanently, and by using fossil-fueled resources, cumulative projects could have the potential to conflict with plans and policies related to increasing renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Cumulative projects that are considered for potential cumulative impacts related to energy include:

Diablo Canyon Power Plant

- Orano System ISFISI Modifications (#1)
- Communications Facility (#2)
- Avila Beach Drive at Highway 101 Interchange (#3)
- Flying Flags Campground (#4)
- Bob Jones Trail Construction (#5)
- Avila Beach Resort Phased Expansion Development Plan/Coastal Development Permit (#6)

Pismo Beach Railyard

- Signal at Bello and Price Canyon Road (#7)
- U.S. 101 Pismo Congestion Relief Project (#8)
- Public Safety Center (#9)
- Bello Road Paving (#10)
- Price Street Sidewalk Pavers (#11)
- Realign Frady Lane (#12)
- Storm Drain on Wadsworth from Bello to Judkins Middle School (#13)

In Vicinity of Truck Route (City of Santa Maria)

- Westgate Marketplace (#14)
- SerraMonte Townhomes (#15)
- Workforce Dormitories (#16)

SMVR-SB – Betteravia Industrial Park (County of Santa Barbara)

- Highway 101 – Betteravia Road Interchange (#17)

Offshore/Energy Projects

- Vandenberg Offshore Wind Energy Projects (#18)
- South Ellwood Project (#19)
- Rincon Onshore and Offshore Facilities (#20)
- Chumash Heritage Marine Sanctuary Project (#21)
- Morro Bay Wind Energy Area (#22)
- Humboldt Wind Energy Area (#23)
- PacWave South Project (#24)
- Port San Luis Breakwater Repair (#25)

Cumulative Impact Analysis

The analysis above shows that the incremental effect of the Proposed Project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources (Impact EN-1) and would not conflict with any plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency (Impact EN-2). Energy use would be reduced by minimizing unnecessary use of equipment and vehicles and limiting the idling of equipment (see Table 2-12).

The range of cumulative projects identified in Section 3.3.2, *Relevant Cumulative Projects*, includes transportation, commercial, and residential developments, and energy infrastructure including offshore wind projects. Although development activities associated with cumulative projects would require the use of fossil fuels, similar to fossil fuel demands of the decommissioning activities of the Proposed Project, each project could be expected to initiate feasible energy-saving efficiencies and to comply with applicable building standards, energy policies and regulations as part of project approval to reduce wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy resources.

Furthermore, many of the cumulative projects would also contribute additional renewable energy supplies to California, facilitating the State’s transition away from reliance on fossil fuels. Many of the listed cumulative projects would provide a beneficial cumulative contribution related to directly supporting federal, state, and local plans for renewable energy development, and the incremental effect of the Proposed Project would not be cumulatively considerable.

4.7.6 Summary of Significance Findings

Table 4.7-3 presents a summary of the environmental impacts, significance determinations, and mitigation measures for the Proposed Project.

Table 4.7-3. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures – Energy

| Impact Statement | Impact Significance Class | | | | Mitigation Measures |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Phase 1 | | Phase 2 | Post-Decom | |
| | <i>DCPP</i> | <i>PBR/ SB</i> | <i>DCPP</i> | <i>Ops/ Marina</i> | |
| EN-1: Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources | III | III/ III | III | III | None required |
| EN-2: Conflict with state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency | III | NI/NI | III | III | None required |
| Cumulative Impact | Not cumulatively considerable | | Not cumulatively considerable | | None required |

Acronyms: PBR = Pismo Beach Railyard, SB = Betteravia Industrial Park (Santa Barbara County), Post-Decom = Post-Decommissioning, Ops = Long-Term Operations, Class I = Significant and Unavoidable, Class II = Less than Significant with Mitigation, Class III = Less than Significant, Class IV = Beneficial, NI = No Impact.