

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 environmental impacts of the proposed project" 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 § 15063[a]). Guidelines Section 15128 requires that an EIR 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 Draft EIR.

8.1 INITIAL STUDY ASSESSMENT

The Initial Study prepared in April 2015 determined that impacts listed below would be less than significant, and are not further analyzed in this Draft EIR. Refer to Appendix A for explanation of the basis of these conclusions. Impact categories and questions are summarized from the CEQA Environmental Checklist.

Table 8-1 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

| Environmental Issues | Initial Study Determination |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 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: | |
| 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 |
| 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 |

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Table 8-1 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

| Environmental Issues | Initial Study Determination |
|---|------------------------------|
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | Less than Significant Impact |
| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project: | |
| a) Expose people or structures to 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 |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | Less than Significant Impact |
| iv) Landslides? | 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 |
| VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project: | |
| 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 |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | 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 Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | Less than Significant Impact |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | No Impact |
| IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project: | |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | No Impact |
| X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project: | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | No Impact |
| XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project: | |
| 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 |
| XII. NOISE. Would the project result in: | |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | Less than Significant Impact |
| XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project: | |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | No Impact |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | No Impact |