

Effects Found Not to be Significant



Chapter 8 | Effects Found Not to be Significant

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provides that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) shall focus on the significant effects on the environment, discussing the effects with emphasis in proportion to their severity and probability of occurrence. The environmental topics concluded to be clearly insignificant and unlikely to occur need not be discussed further in the EIR, unless information inconsistent with this finding is subsequently received.

California Public Resources Code (PRC) § 21100 (c) states that an EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that a project's various possible significant effects were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR (PRC § 21000 et. seq.). To this end, this Environmental Assessment (EA) further evaluates the Project's possible significant effects, in substantial conformance with the State CEQA Guidelines.

This Section addresses the revised Project's effects that were determined to not be significant and therefore, per State CEQA Guidelines § 15128, do not need to be discussed in detail within this EA. State CEQA Guidelines § 15128 also requires a brief indication of the reasons why these effects were not found to be significant. The following environmental topics were found not to be significant: agriculture and forestry resources; hazards and hazardous materials (concerning airports and airstrips), mineral resources; and noise (concerning airports and airstrips). Consistent with the 2016 PEIR and in substantial conformance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, each environmental topic below answers the CEQA Environmental Checklist questions used to determine the Project's impacts.

8.1 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Would the Project:

- *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*
- *Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production; or*
- *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.

None of the candidate sites are zoned for agricultural use, except Candidate Site #9, which is located within the Encinitas Ranch Specific Plan and is zoned ER-AG (Encinitas Ranch – Agriculture Zone). Candidate Site #9 is mapped as unique farmland and is currently used as a flower nursery, not food production. The Encinitas Ranch Specific Plan is the only area within the City that has an existing agriculture zone. The City does have an urban agriculture zone, yet no properties hold this zone outside of the Encinitas Ranch Specific Plan. None of the candidate sites are within a Williamson Act contract (San Diego County Williamson Act 2013/2014 Sheet 1 of 2 map). As noted, all candidate sites are within the "urban and built-up land" designation, except Candidate Site #9. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significance impact concerning conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

The City does not contain any forest land as defined by Public Resources Code § 12220(g), timberland as defined by Public Resources Code § 4526, nor timberland production zone/timberland preserve zone as defined by Government Code § 51104(g). Therefore, no impact would occur.

All 17 candidate sites are located within the existing built environment and would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, no impact would occur in this regard.

Project implementation would not result in other changes to the existing environment, as it pertains to the conversion of farmland or forest land to a non-agriculture use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

8.2 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the Project:

- *Be 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, resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area; or*
- *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.

None of the candidate sites are near a private airstrip or within two miles of McClellan-Palomar Airport (the nearest airport). Further, none of the candidate sites are within the McClellan-Palomar Airport's Airport Influence Area (McClellan-Palomar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Exhibit III-5, *Compatibility Policy Map: Airport Influence Area*). Therefore, the Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area concerning an airport or private airstrip.

8.3 MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the Project:

- *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? or*
- *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.

The City of Encinitas is within the MRZ-3 Classification.¹ The MRZ-3 Classification is defined by “areas containing known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance.” All candidate sites are within the MRZ-3 Classification resulting in no loss of known mineral resources of value to the region or residents of the State or local importance.

The Housing sites are not within an area designated by the State for locally important mineral resources and none are utilized for mineral resource production. As such, the Project would not impact the availability of any known mineral resource or locally important mineral resource.

¹ Updated Mineral Land Classification Map for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, California, California Geological Survey, 2017.

8.4 NOISE

Would the Project:

- *Be 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, and would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise problems; or*
- *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.

None of the candidate sites are near a private airstrip or within two miles of McClellan-Palomar Airport (the nearest airport). Further, none of the candidate sites are within the Airport Influence Area for McClellan-Palomar Airport (McClellan-Palomar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Exhibit III-5, *Compatibility Policy Map: Airport Influence Area*). Therefore, the Project would not result in excessive noise levels for people residing or working in the Project area concerning an airport or private airstrip.