

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 this Draft EIR (DEIR).

As described in the Notice of Preparation prepared for the proposed Industry General Plan Update (see Appendix A), all impact categories (with the exception of Agricultural Resources, Mineral Resources, and Recreation) were found to have at least one potentially significant impact; therefore, these categories have been evaluated in this DEIR.

8.1 **ASSESSMENT IN THE INITIAL STUDY**

The Initial Study prepared in March 2011 for the proposed Industry General Plan Update determined that impacts listed below would be less than significant. Consequently, they have not been further analyzed in this DEIR. Please refer to the Initial Study in Appendix A for an 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**

<i>Environmental Issues</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>
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) 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

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>
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?	Less Than Significant Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	
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
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.	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:	
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
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?	Less Than Significant Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	
a) Physically divide an established community?	Less Than Significant Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	No 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

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>
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
XIII. 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:	
d) Parks?	Less Than Significant Impact
e) Other public facilities?	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION.	
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
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?	Less Than Significant Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	No Impact



8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

This page intentionally left blank.