

8. *Impacts Found Not to Be Significant*

California Public Resources Code Section 21003(f) states: "...it is the policy of the state that...all 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 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.2(a), which states that "a[n] EIR [Environmental Impact Report] shall focus on the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project" and Section 15143, which states that "the EIR shall focus on the significant effects of the environment." The Guidelines allow use of an Initial Study to document project effects that are less than significant (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063[a]). CEQA 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, therefore, were not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR (DEIR).

8.1 ASSESSMENT IN THE INITIAL STUDY

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project in February 2006 determined that the impacts listed below would be less than significant. Consequently, they have not been further analyzed in this DEIR. Please refer to Appendix A in Volume IIA for an explanation of the basis for 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	
<i>Environmental Issues</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:	
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 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. 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
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	No 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?	Less Than Significant Impact

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Table 8-1
Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

<i>Environmental Issues</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>
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?	Less Than Significant Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	No 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iv) Landslides? 	Less Than Significant 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
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	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
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

8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

<i>Environmental Issues</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	
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
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
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	
a) Physically divide an established community?	No Impact
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less Than Significant Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	Less Than Significant Impact
X. 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
XI. 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
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	
a) Induce substantial 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 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
XV. 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
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	Less Than Significant Impact



8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

Table 8-1
Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

<i>Environmental Issues</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>
e) 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
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Less Than Significant Impact