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 Section 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 ASSESSMENT IN THE INITIAL STUDY

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project in April 2013 determined that impacts listed below would be less than significant. Consequently, they have not been further analyzed in this Draft EIR (DEIR). Please refer to Appendix A for explanation of the basis of these conclusions. Impact categories and questions below are taken directly from the CEQA Environmental Checklist in the Initial Study.

Table 8-1 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:	
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
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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
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
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:	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Less Than Significant Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (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?	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?	No Impact
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
iv) Landslides?	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	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:	
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

8. Impacts Found No to be Significant

Table 8-1 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
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
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Less Than Significant Impact
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	No Impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	No Impact
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No Impact
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	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:	
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact
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?	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less Than Significant Impact

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

This page intentionally left blank.