

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

California Public Resources Code Section 21003 (f) states: "...it is the policy of the state that...[a]ll persons and public agencies involved in the environmental review process be responsible for carrying out the process in the most efficient, expeditious manner in order to conserve the available financial, governmental, physical, and social resources with the objective that those resources may be better applied toward the mitigation of actual significant effects on the environment." This policy is reflected in the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Guidelines) Section 15126.2(a), which states that "[a]n EIR [Environmental Impact Report] shall identify and focus on the significant effects of the Proposed Project on the environment" and Section 15143, which states that "[t]he EIR shall focus on the significant effects on the environment." The Guidelines allow use of an Initial Study to document project effects that are less than significant (Guidelines Section 15063[a]). Guidelines Section 15128 requires that an EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant, and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR.

The Initial Study prepared for the Proposed Project in December 2018 determined that impacts listed below would be less than significant. Consequently, they have not been further analyzed in this Draft EIR. Please refer to Appendix A for explanation of the basis of these conclusions. Impact categories and questions below are summarized directly from the CEQA Environmental Checklist, as contained in the Initial Study.

**Table 8-1 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant**

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
<b>I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</b>	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact.
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</b>	
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	No Impact.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

**Table 8-1 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant**

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	No Impact.
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact.
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact.
<b>III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</b>	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Less Than Significant Impact.
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact.
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	No Impact.
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Less Than Significant Impact.
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Less Than Significant Impact.
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>	
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	No Impact.
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	Less Than Significant Impact.
<b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</b>	
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	No Impact.
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	Less Than Significant Impact.
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less Than Significant Impact.
iv) Landslides?	Less Than Significant Impact.
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Less Than Significant Impact.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

**Table 8-1 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant**

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	Less Than Significant Impact.
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	No Impact.
<b>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</b>	
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less Than Significant Impact.
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less Than Significant Impact.
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	No Impact.
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact.
<b>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</b>	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Less Than Significant Impact.
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:	
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	Less Than Significant Impact.
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	Less Than Significant Impact.
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	Less Than Significant Impact.
<b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</b>	
a) Physically divide an established community?	No Impact.
<b>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>	
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	No Impact.
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	No Impact.
<b>XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:</b>	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

**Table 8-1 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant**

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
<b>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</b>	
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Less Than Significant Impact.
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact.
<b>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</b>	
d) Parks?	Less Than Significant Impact.
e) Other public facilities?	Less Than Significant Impact.
<b>XVI. RECREATION.</b>	
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Less Than Significant Impact.
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Less Than Significant Impact.
<b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</b>	
c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Less Than Significant Impact.
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less Than Significant Impact.