

## 8. Impacts Found Not To Be Significant

The Initial Study identified 14 environmental factors in which at least one impact category would not be significantly impacted by the Proposed Project and therefore, did not warrant further review in this Draft EIR. Each of these environmental issues was evaluated in the Initial Study and was determined not to represent a potentially significant impact of the project. Please refer to the Initial Study in Appendix A for more information. The impact categories found not to be significant are listed on Table 8-1 below. All other impact categories are analyzed in this Draft SEIR.

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

<i>Environmental Issues</i>	<i>Initial Study Determination</i>
<b>I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:</b>	
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway or local scenic expressway, scenic highway, or eligible scenic highway?	No Impact
<b>II. AGRICULTURAL 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 Mode (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:</b>	
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
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</b>	
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?	No Impact
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



## 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) 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?	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as 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
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</b>	
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and/or identified on the Qualified Historic Structures list of the Anaheim Colony Historic District Preservation Plan (July 20, 1999)?	No Impact
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	Less than Significant Impact
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	Less than Significant Impact
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less than Significant Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:</b>	
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.	No Impact
iv) Landslides?	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	No Impact
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:</b>	
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

## 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>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school?	Less than Significant Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan (Los Alamitos Armed Forces Reserve Center or Fullerton Municipal Airport), 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
<b>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:</b>	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Less than Significant Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?	Less than Significant Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site?	Less than Significant Impact
j) Inundation by seiche or mudflow?	No Impact
<b>IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:</b>	
a) Physically divide an established community?	No Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	No Impact
<b>X. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:</b>	
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?	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>
<b>XI. NOISE: Would the project result in:</b>	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan (Los Alamitos Armed Forces Reserve Center or Fullerton Municipal Airport), would the project expose people residing or working in the Project Area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:</b>	
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
<b>XIV. RECREATION: Would the project:</b>	
a) 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) 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
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:</b>	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	No Impact
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	Less than Significant Impact
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus stops/routes, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, etc.)?	No Impact
<b>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>	
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	No Impact