

## 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 July 2019 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>	
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact.
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	Less Than Significant Impact.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less Than Significant 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>	

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
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.
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>	
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Less Than Significant Impact.
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.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No 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?	No 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?	Less Than Significant Impact.
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	Less Than Significant Impact.
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	Less Than Significant Impact.
<b>VI. ENERGY. Would the project:</b>	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	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
<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?	No Impact.
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	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.
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.
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 § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less Than Significant 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.
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less Than Significant Impact.
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	No Impact.
<b>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</b>	
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Less Than Significant Impact.
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:	
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	Less Than Significant Impact.
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	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) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	Less Than Significant Impact.
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Less Than Significant Impact.
<b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</b>	
a) Physically divide an established community?	No Impact.
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less Than Significant 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?	Less Than Significant Impact.
<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>	
a) Fire protection?	Less Than Significant Impact.
b) Police protection?	Less Than Significant Impact.
c) Schools?	Less Than Significant Impact.
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>XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:</b>	
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	Less Than Significant Impact.
<b>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</b>	
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	Less Than Significant Impact.
<b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</b>	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	Less Than Significant Impact.
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	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.
<b>XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</b>	
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact.
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	No Impact.
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	No Impact.
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	No Impact.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*This page intentionally left blank.*