8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

California Public Resources Code Section 21003 (f) states: "...it is the policy of the state that...[a]II 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.

As described in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) prepared for the proposed project, all impact categories, except agricultural resources, were found to have at least one potentially significant impact.

8.1 ASSESSMENT IN THE INITIAL STUDY

The initial study prepared for the proposed project in November 2008 determined that impacts listed in Table 8-1 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 summarized directly from the CEQA Environmental Checklist, contained in the initial study.



Table 8-1 Impacts Found Not to Be Significant		
	Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
l. <i>l</i>	AESTHETICS. Would the project:	<u> </u>
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact
env (19	AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agrironmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Lai 197) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to mland. Would the project:	nd Evaluation and Site Assessment Model
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:	
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
VI.	. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	
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
IX.	. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	No Impact
XI	I. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Less Than Significant Impact
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Less Than Significant Impact