

CHAPTER 6

Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

California 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 mitigation of actual significant effect on the environment." This policy is reflected in the *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.2(a), which states that "[a]n EIR shall identify and focus on the significant effects on the environment." The Guidelines allow the use of an Initial Study to document project effects that are less than significant (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15063(a)). In addition, *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15128 requires that an EIR contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible effects of a project were determined not to be significant, and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR.

As described in the Notice of Preparations/Initial Studies (included as Appendices A1 and A2) prepared for the proposed project, Mineral Resources was found not to have any potentially significant impact. Therefore, all categories except for Mineral Resources have been evaluated in the EIR.

6.1 Assessment in the Initial Studies

The Initial Studies prepared for the proposed project in September 2013 and October 2014 determined that the impacts listed below would be less than significant. Consequently, they have not been further analyzed in the EIR. Please refer to Appendices A1 and A2 of this EIR for a detailed explanation of the basis of these conclusions. Impact categories and questions in **Table 6-1** are summarized directly from the CEQA Environmental Checklist, as contained in the Initial Studies.

TABLE 6.1
IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Would the project:	
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, 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
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
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 forest land to non-forest use?	No impact
Air Quality. Would the project:	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Less than significant impact
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. iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? 	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 risks to life or property?	No impact
Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Would the project:	
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?	No impact
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	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
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 authoritative flood hazard delineation map?	No impact
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	No impact

TABLE 6.1
IMPACTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
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?	Less than significant impact
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No impact
Land Use and Planning. Would the project:	
a) Physically divide an established community?	No impact
Mineral Resources. Would the project:	
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of 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
Noise. Would the project:	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, in an area within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?	No impact
f) For a project located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No impact
Population and Housing. Would the project:	
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
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
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	No impact
Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater 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?	No impact

6.2 Energy Resources

The *CEQA Guidelines* Appendix F provides guidance for assessing the significance of potential energy impacts, and provides that a project could have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- Result in a substantial increase in overall or per capita energy consumption;
- Result in wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy;

- Require or result in the construction of new sources of energy supplies or additional energy infrastructure capacity the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or
- Conflict with applicable energy efficiency policies or standards.

6.2-1: Result in a substantial increase in overall or per capita energy consumption.

Development of the proposed project would result in 72 residential units that would be developed pursuant to the California Green Building Standards Code (24 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Part 11), also known as the CALGreen Code, which is to provide for sustainable construction practices, including energy efficiency. The CALGreen Code applies to planning, design, operation, construction, use, and occupancy of residential buildings. In addition, energy consumption would be reduced with implementation of 2016 Title 24 Standards for energy conservation, and installation of EnergyStar-labeled programmable thermostats, lighting and roofing material. The average energy consumption the 72 units is considered incremental as compared to the overall energy use of the southern California region, and it is not anticipated that the 72 units would result in an increase in per capita energy consumption. This impact would be less than significant.

6.2-2: Result in wasteful or unnecessary consumption of energy.

Construction of proposed project would require the use of energy, such as the use of fuels for vehicles and propane to run equipment. Construction activities would result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy if construction equipment if equipment is left to idle when not in use, if travel routes are not planned to minimize vehicle miles traveled, or if excess lighting is used during construction activities.

Construction of the project would occur in two sequential phases, on Phase 1 (south parcel) first that would occur for 18 months and then on Phase 2 (north parcel) that would occur for 14 months. As a result, the demand for construction-related electricity and fuels to construct the proposed project would be spread out over that time frame. All excavated soils would be balanced onsite; no import or export of soils would be necessary; thus, reducing any unnecessary haul trips. In addition, the project would comply with the California Airborne Toxic Control Measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]) by minimizing equipment idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes. Furthermore, the project would limit construction hours to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. No construction activity shall be undertaken on Sundays or federal holidays (Section 4-6-7 of the County's Municipal Code and Project Design Feature PDF-21). The limitation in construction hours would reduce the intensity of the use of construction energy and reduce the amount of construction lighting that would be needed.

Energy is also required to make the materials and components used in construction of the project. This includes energy used for extraction of raw materials, manufacturing, and transportation associated with manufacturing. As described in Section 3.16, *Utilities and Service Systems*, all

recyclable wastes generated during construction and operation and maintenance would be recycled at appropriate facilities pursuant to state regulations.

Implementation of the project would require energy consumption; however, none of the proposed energy-consuming activities associated with construction would be a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy. As a result, impacts would be less than significant.

6.2-3: Require or result in the construction of new sources of energy supplies or additional energy infrastructure capacity the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Development of the proposed project would include connecting into the existing electrical infrastructure that is located to the north of the project site, which is available to serve new development. Electricity is currently available to the surrounding residential properties, and the infrastructure for delivering electric power to the proposed project. Existing electrical service capacity would be sufficient to accommodate the proposed project.

In regards to gas services, each parcel within the project would be served by separate propane tanks, which would not require the construction of any infrastructure capacity to provide service. As a result, impacts related to construction of energy infrastructure to serve the proposed project would be less than significant.

6.2-4: Conflict with applicable energy efficiency policies or standards.

As described above, the proposed project would result in 72 residential units that would be developed pursuant to the California Green Building Standards Code (24 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Part 11), also known as the CALGreen Code, which is to provide for sustainable construction practices, including energy efficiency. The CALGreen Code applies to planning, design, operation, construction, use, and occupancy of residential buildings. In addition, energy consumption would be reduced with implementation of current Title 24 Standards for energy conservation, and installation of EnergyStar-labeled programmable thermostats, lighting and roofing material. The project would not conflict with any applicable energy efficiency policies or standards, and impacts would not occur.