

## 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 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.

### 8.1 ASSESSMENT IN THE INITIAL STUDY

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project in July 2017 determined that impacts listed below would be less than significant. Consequently, they have not been further analyzed in this DEIR. Please refer to the Initial Study (Appendix A) for explanation of the basis of these conclusions. Impact categories and questions below are summarized directly from the CEQA Environmental Checklist, as contained in the Initial Study.

Note that the impact thresholds listed above are those in CEQA Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form, when the Notice of Preparation for the EIR was circulated in Summer 2017. Various changes to impact thresholds were made as part of the CEQA Guidelines Update approved in December 2018. The topical sections in Chapter 5 of this DEIR have been revised with the new impact thresholds.

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
<b>I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</b>	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</b> 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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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?	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	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
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	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 of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>	
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
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
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated 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.	Less than Significant Impact
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	Less than Significant Impact
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less than Significant Impact
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
<b>VIII. 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**

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
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?	Less than Significant 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?	Less than Significant Impact
<b>IX. 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
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
<b>X. 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>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b>	
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	Less than Significant 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?	Less than Significant Impact
<b>XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:</b>	
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
<b>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</b>	
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Less than Significant Impact
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>XV. RECREATION.</b>	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	No Impact
<b>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:</b>	
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?	Less than Significant 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?	Less than Significant Impact

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

### 8.1.1 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

The project site—as well as the entire part of the Los Angeles Basin within Los Angeles County—is not mapped as important farmland on the California Important Farmland Finder maintained by the Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP 2017). There are no Williamson Act contracts in effect on the project site and the project site is zoned by the City of Torrance for light agricultural use (A-1), which permits the growing of orchards, berries, and bush crops and development of detached single-family homes. While the project site is zoned for agricultural use, no such use exists on or near the site. The project site consists mainly of nonnative grassland, disturbed land, sagebrush, and toyon chaparral vegetation, and is not zoned for forestland protection or timber production. The project site is not located adjacent to or within the vicinity of any farmland. Therefore, the project would result in no impact to agricultural or forest resources.

### 8.1.2 Mineral Resources

A diatomaceous earth mine operated onsite from the early 1900s to the late 1950s. Diatomaceous earth mining was discontinued primarily due to reserve depletion; in addition, the ore in this area was low grade, generating large amounts of tailings (LACSD 1995). The project site is designated Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2) by the California Geological Survey, meaning that significant Portland cement concrete (PCC)-grade aggregate resources are known to be present (CGS 2010). The Chandler sand and gravel quarry, an active mine, is approximately 1.2 miles southeast of the project site. In 2014 the City of Rolling Hills Estates approved redevelopment of a 228-acre site, including the Chandler Quarry, with single-family residences and a golf course (Rolling Hills Estates 2019). Future aggregate mining onsite would be incompatible with surrounding land uses, including a senior living facility next to the southeast site boundary and residences to the east, southwest, and northwest. Any remaining diatomaceous earth onsite is not considered valuable to the region and the state because of resource depletion by past mining and the low grade of the ore. Project development would not cause a loss of availability of a known mineral resource, and impacts to mineral resources would be less than significant.

### 8.1.3 Population and Housing

Population increase and estimated employment due to project development would be well within the regional population and employment forecast for the City. Population and employment growth impact would be less than significant. Project development would extend infrastructure into the 5.71-acre development area. The project would not extend infrastructure that could induce offsite growth, and such extension would be impracticable considering the steep cliff next to the south side of the development area. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. In addition, there are no residents or housing onsite that would be displaced by project development; therefore, no impact to displacement of housing or residents would occur.

## 8.2 REFERENCES

California Geological Survey (CGS). 2010. Update of Mineral Land Classification for Portland Cement Concrete-Grade Aggregate in the San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region, Los Angeles

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

County, California. Plate 1. San Gabriel Valley P-C Region Showing MRZ-2 Areas and Active Mine Operations. [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR\\_209/Plate%201.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_209/Plate%201.pdf).

Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP). 2016. Los Angeles County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016. [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA\\_15\\_16\\_WA.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA_15_16_WA.pdf).

Los Angeles County, Sanitation Districts of (LACSD). 1995, June. Remedial Investigation Report, Palos Verdes Landfill, Volume I. <https://www.lacsd.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=2800>.

Rolling Hills Estates, City of. 2019. Chandler Ranch Subdivision/ Rolling Hills Country Club - Chadmar Homes. <http://ci.rolling-hills-estates.ca.us/government/planning/project-updates/chandler-ranch-subdivision-rolling-hills-country-club-chadmar-homes>.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*This page intentionally left blank.*