

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 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 November 2009 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 bases 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?	Less Than Significant
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	Less Than Significant
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?	Less Than Significant
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

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>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	
f) 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
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 located 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
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:	
a) Physically divide an established community?	No Impact
d) Be developed within the Airport Influence Area as adopted by the San Bernardino International Airport Authority?	Less Than Significant 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:	
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
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	Less Than Significant Impact