

## 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 December 2015 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 basis of these conclusions. Impact categories and questions below are summarized directly from the CEQA Environmental Checklist, as contained in the Initial Study.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

**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?	<b>No Impact.</b> The nearest officially designated state scenic highway is State Route 74 (SR-74), over 27 miles to the east. An eligible but not officially designated state scenic highway, Interstate 15 (I-15) is 0.65 mile to the west. Scenic views from I-15 are mountain views to the west. The Project Site is not visible from I-15. No impact to a state scenic highway would result from project implementation. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
<b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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. 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:</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?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The Project Site was used for agricultural land prior to 1938, but agricultural uses ceased in 2002. The Project Site is designated Farmland of Local Importance by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (DOC 2014). However, the City of Wildomar General Plan land use plan designates the Project Site OS-R (Open Space Recreational), and the zoning map designates the Project Site R-R (Rural Residential). The Department of Conservation does not require Land Evaluation Site Assessment for farmland of local importance, and the impact significance for farmland of local importance is determined by the jurisdictional city or county (DOC 2009). The City of Wildomar's general plan policies on agricultural resources are to work with state and federal agencies to periodically update the agricultural resources map to reflect current conditions (Policy OS 7.1), and to accept the loss of agricultural productivity on lands within the city limits that are designated for urban uses as a consequence of city development. Development of the Project Site is consistent with the city's policies and would not conflict with the state's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<b>No Impact.</b> The Project Site is zoned R-R (Rural Residential) and is not zoned for agricultural use. The Project Site is not under a Williamson Act contract. No impact is anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
<p>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))?</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> “Forest land” is land that can support 10 percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.</p> <p>“Timberland” means land—other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the board as experimental forest land—that is available for and capable of growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees.</p> <p>The Project Site contains natural plant communities but does not contain timberland or forest land (Brylski 2014). The Project Site is zoned R-R (Rural Residential) and is not zoned forest land or timberland. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with the existing zoning or rezoning of forestland or timberland. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> As discussed in above Section 3.2.c, the Project Site is not forest land or timberland. No loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to nonforest use would result from the project implementation. No impact is anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The Project Site and surrounding areas are planned for urban development by the city’s general plan. The Project Site is not being used for agricultural or tree resources production, and no changes are proposed to convert farmland to nonagricultural use or forest land to nonforest use. No significant impact is anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p><b>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:</b></p>	
<p>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> SCAQMD Rule 402, Nuisance, regulates the generation of offensive odors. Operation of the Proposed Project would not generate significant odors. Project construction would involve the operation of heavy equipment and haul trucks, resulting in exhaust emissions and attendant nuisance odors. Any such odors would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the equipment itself. By the time odors generated by diesel exhaust reached the sensitive residential receptors, they would be diluted to well below any level of air quality concern. An occasional “whiff” of diesel exhaust from passing equipment and trucks accessing the site from public roadways may result. Such brief exhaust odors are not significant air quality impacts. Additionally, some odor would be produced from the application of asphalt, paints, and coatings. Any exposure of the general public to these common odors would be of short duration and less than significant. Therefore, this issue will not be examined further in the EIR.</p>

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
<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?	<p><b>No Impact.</b> The Project Site is vacant, undeveloped land with no existing structures. No sites within the City of Wildomar are listed under the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (NPS 2014) or California Historical Resources (CHR) (OHP 2014). A cultural resource records search was conducted through the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California, Riverside, in 2004, supplemented by historical US Geological Survey topographic maps, the NRHP, and the CHR. An intensive foot survey of the Project Site did not identify any potentially significant historical resources. Therefore, development and operation of the Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, and impacts would be less than significant. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> There are no known human remains in the project area. California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that in the event that human remains are discovered within a Project Site, disturbance of the site shall halt until the county coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes or has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. The Proposed Project would be required to adhere to existing laws regarding the discovery of human remains; therefore, no impact would occur. This section will not be discussed further in the EIR.</p>
<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.	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The Project Site does not lie within or immediately adjacent to a fault-rupture hazard zone as defined by the Alquist-Priolo (AP) Special Studies Zone. The nearest AP zone is in the Murrieta Quadrangle for the Elsinore Fault Zone, about a mile southwest of the Project Site (DOC 2014). No rupture of a known earthquake fault is anticipated on the Project Site. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The Project Site is not underlain by any known active faults. However, regional faults could cause ground shaking on the Project Site, including the Elsinore Fault, approximately 1.2 miles to the southwest, and Glen Ivy segment (also within the Elsinore Fault zone), approximately 7.5 miles to the northwest. A major seismic event along this fault zone could impact the Project Site, although not substantially more than at any other sites in the region. The community college would be designed in accordance with the seismic requirements of the California Building Code (CBC), Title 24, California Code of Regulations. Therefore, this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The California Geological Survey has identified areas where liquefaction has occurred or where local geological, geotechnical, and groundwater conditions indicate a potential for permanent ground displacement. The Project Site is not located in any liquefaction zone identified by this Seismic Hazard Zones map for Murrieta Quadrangle (DOC 2007). Seismic-related liquefaction impacts are not anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
iv) Landslides?	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The Seismic Hazard Zones map of the Murrieta Quadrangle identifies earthquake-induced landslide areas, where previous landslide movement or local topographic, geologic, geotechnical, and subsurface water conditions indicate a potential for permanent ground displacement. Although the Project Site has a hill that is approximately 1,580 feet in elevation, it is not identified as having a significant landslide potential (DOC 2007). This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p> <p>Landslide and lateral spreading: A landslide is a movement of surface material down a slope, and lateral spread or flow are terms referring to landslides that commonly form on gentle slopes and that have rapid, fluidlike movement. The Seismic Hazard Zones map of the Murrieta Quadrangle identifies earthquake-induced landslide areas, where previous landslide movement or local topographic, geologic, geotechnical, and subsurface water conditions indicate a potential for permanent ground displacement. The Project Site, although contains a hill with 1,580 feet elevation, is not identified as having significant landslide potential (DOC 2007). These issues will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>Subsidence: The Project Site is not in an area of known subsidence associated with groundwater or petroleum withdrawal, peat oxidation, or hydrocompaction. In addition, the Project Site is underlain by massive igneous rock masses or the southern California batholith. Therefore, the potential constraint associated with subsidence is considered negligible (Mission 2004a). This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
	<p>Liquefaction: The California Geological Survey has identified areas where historical occurrence of liquefaction or local geological, geotechnical, and groundwater conditions indicate a potential for permanent ground displacement. The Project Site not in the liquefaction zone identified by this Seismic Hazard Zones map for the Murrieta Quadrangle (DOC 2007). Seismic-related liquefaction impacts are not anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p>Soil Collapse: Expansive and collapsible soils are subject to changes in volume and settlement in response to wetting and drying, often resulting in severe damage to structures. The onsite soils are anticipated to have a low to moderate expansion potential. Compliance with standard construction practices in accordance with the California Building Code and implementation recommendations in the site-specific geotechnical investigation would ensure that no significant expansive soils impact would result from the Proposed Project. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> Expansive soils are clay-type soils that shrink or swell as its moisture content changes. Volume changes associated with changes in the moisture content of near-surface expansive soils can cause dramatic effects on structures. The onsite soils are anticipated to have a low to moderate expansion potential. Compliance with standard construction practices in accordance with the CBC and implementation recommendations in the site-specific geotechnical investigation would ensure that no significant expansive soils impact would result from the Proposed Project. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> The Project Site would be connected to the municipal wastewater system, served by EVMWD. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be necessary. No impact is anticipated, and this issue will not be examined further in the EIR.</p>
<p><b>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</b></p>	
<p>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The Proposed Project would involve the development and operation of a new community college, and no significant amount of hazardous materials would be routinely transported, used, or disposed of in connection with operation of the Proposed Project. Chemicals and hazardous substances used in the laboratory classes would be used in small quantities under proper supervision. Maintenance of the facility would likely require the use of cleaners, solvents, paints, and other janitorial products that are potentially hazardous. However, these materials would be used in relatively small quantities and stored in compliance with established state and federal requirements. These materials would be used in accordance with normal operational safety practices, as employed at other school facilities within the District. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
<p>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</p>	<p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The Phase I environmental site assessment prepared in 2004 stated that the Project Site was historically used for agricultural purposes (possibly dry farming) from approximately 1938 until sometime between 1994 and 2002. Therefore, a subsequent Preliminary Soils Sampling investigation was conducted in 2004 to identify any residual agriculture-related chemicals. The soil sampling investigation found no indication of previous application of common, commercially available agricultural chemicals from previous agricultural land use. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not release hazardous materials into the environment to create a significant hazard to the public or the environmental. This issue will not be further examined in the EIR.</p>
<p>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The nearest school, Ronald Reagan Elementary School, is approximately 0.5 mile to the northwest. There are no toxic air emission sources within 0.25 mile of the Project Site, based on a search on SCAQMD's FIND system. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse impact on any existing or proposed school within one-quarter mile of the Project Site. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The Phase I found that no properties were listed on the following regulatory databases that were within their respective search radii of the Project Site: NPL, CERCLIS-NFRAP, RCRA-CORRACTS, RCRA-TSD, RCRA-LQG, RCRA-SQG, CAL-SITES, AWP, AST, UST, LUST, Toxic Pits, SWLF, WMUDS/SWAT, and SLIC. A follow-up records search through the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker and Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor databases also did not identify the Project Site as a hazardous materials site. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to public health or the environment because the project would not be located on a hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> The nearest airport is Skylark Field Airport in Lake Elsinore, nearly four miles to the northwest. Skylark Field Airport is a private airport, and no safety impact is anticipated from this airport to the Proposed Project. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> There are no private airstrips near the Project Site. The nearest airport is Skylark Field Airport in Lake Elsinore, 3.95 miles to the northwest. Inland Valley Regional Medical Center Heliport is about 0.4 mile to the southwest. The Proposed Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impact is anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
<b>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</b>	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> No uniquely challenging water quality situation has been identified during that would not be covered by the previous Sections 3.9.a through 3.9.e. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
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 flood hazard delineation map?	<b>No Impact.</b> The Project Site is in Zone X of the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel No. 06065C2705G, published by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (FEMA 2008). Zone X represents areas determined to be outside the 100-year flood hazard area. In addition, the Proposed Project would not involve any housing development. This issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The Project Site is in Zone X of the FIRM Panel No. 06065C2705G, published by FEMA (FEMA 2008). Zone X represents areas determined to be outside the 100-year flood hazard area. The Proposed Project would not place any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. No 100-year flood hazard is anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
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?	<b>No Impact.</b> The Project Site is not within a dam inundation area according to Figure S-10, "Dam Failure Inundation Zones" of the County of Riverside General Plan. There are no large water bodies near the Project Site, and no flooding impact due to failure of a levee or dam is anticipated. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b></p> <p><i>Seiche:</i> A seiche is a surface wave created when a body of water is shaken, usually by earthquake activity. Seiches are of concern relative to water storage facilities because inundation from a seiche can occur if the wave overflows a containment wall, such as the wall of a reservoir, water storage tank, dam or other artificial body of water. There is no large open water source that could cause severe inundation impact on the Project Site. Therefore, no seiche impact is anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p><i>Tsunami:</i> The Project Site is more than 50 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean, and no tsunami impact is anticipated. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p> <p><i>Mudflow:</i> Mudflows are rivers of rocks, earth, and other debris saturated with water. The Project Site contains a hill with a 1,580-foot elevation, but it is not identified as having potentially significant landslide potential (DOC 2011). Moreover, the potential hazard related to static slope stability is considered low to moderate on natural slopes and manufactured cut-and-fill slopes (Mission 2004a). The required compliance with the CBC standards would ensure that impacts due to mudflow onsite are less than significant. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:</b>	
a) Physically divide an established community?	<b>No Impact.</b> The project sit is currently vacant, and no physical division of an established community would occur due to project implementation. No impact is anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
<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?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The Project Site is classified as Mineral Resources Zone (MRZ) 3 in the Riverside County General Plan Mineral Resources map. MRZ-3 represents areas where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist, but the significance of the deposit is undetermined. The Project Site and surrounding areas have not been used for mineral resources extraction. Development of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resources. No significant impact is anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
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?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> See Section 3.11.a.
<b>XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:</b>	
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?	<b>No Impact.</b> There are no public airports within two miles of the Project Site. The nearest airport is Skylark Field Airport in Lake Elsinore, a private airport approximately 3.95 miles to the northwest. The Project Site is not within an airport land use plan, and implementation of the Proposed Project would not expose people in the project area to excessive airport noise. No impact is anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
<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)?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The proposed community college is anticipated to serve a maximum 10,000 full-time equivalent students and employ approximately 400 faculty and staff at ultimate buildout. The jobs-housing ratio is a general measure of the balance between the number of jobs and number of housing units in a geographic area, without regard to economic constraints or individual preferences. The jobs-housing ratio is one indicator of a project's effect on growth and quality of life in the project area. No ideal jobs-housing ratio has been adopted in state, regional, or city policies; jobs/housing ratios are considered advisory only and fluctuate based on the types of jobs and population in an area. The Southern California Association of Governments applies the jobs-housing ratio at the regional and subregional level as a tool for analyzing the fit between jobs, housing, and infrastructure.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
	<p>The American Planning Association (APA) is an authoritative resource for community planning best practices, including recommendations for assessing jobs-housing ratios. Although the APA recognizes that the ideal jobs-housing ratio will vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, its recommended target is 1.5 with a recommended range of 1.3 to 1.7 (Weltz 2003). According to the Employment Development Department Labor Market Information Division's March 2013 benchmark data, the City of Wildomar's employment number is 7,800, and the Census Bureau indicates that there are 10,819 housing units in the city (US Census Bureau). Therefore, the jobs-housing ratio is anticipated to be 0.72, and the city is considered "housing rich." Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase the ratio to 0.76—a positive impact on the city's jobs market and a beneficial jobs-housing balance impact. The Project Site and its surrounding area are planned for development by the city's general plan and zoning map, and the Proposed Project would not have a substantial impact on the growth pattern of the area. Roadways and infrastructure are already available, and the Proposed Project would not adversely impact the project area's balanced growth potential. Impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> The Project Site is currently vacant, and no displacement of existing housing is involved with the project implementation. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> The Project Site is currently vacant, and no displacement of people would result from the project implementation. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
<p><b>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</b></p>	
<p>c) Schools?</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> The Project Site is within the Lake Elsinore Unified School District jurisdiction for kindergarten through 12th grade. The demand for schools is created by residential population growth, and the proposed community college development would not generate K-12 student population in the area. The Proposed Project would serve existing and future college students and the adult population, and it is not a growth-inducing project that would have adverse impacts on existing or future school facilities. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
d) Parks?	<b>No Impact.</b> The demand for park services is created by growth-inducing projects, and the Proposed Project would not substantially affect any existing or planned parks in the area. The Proposed Project would include open space, trail access, and recreational facilities for student use. Such facilities are considered a benefit to the local community, and no significant impact is anticipated. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
e) Other public facilities?	<b>No Impact.</b> The Proposed Project is not a growth-inducing project and would not create need for other public facilities such as libraries. The Proposed Project would provide a library onsite that would be available for students. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
<b>XV. RECREATION.</b>	
a) Would the project 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?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> An increased need in recreational facilities typically occurs when there is an increase in population. The Proposed Project is not a growth-inducing project that generates increased usage of neighborhood and regional parks. The proposed community college would serve the existing population in the community who already use recreational facilities in the area. Although the Project Site is designated OS-R (Open Space Recreation) by the general plan land use map, the Project Site is zoned R-R (Rural Residential), which permits various urban development on site and is not intended for open space or recreational uses. Moreover, the Proposed Project would provide open space, a trail system, and various onsite recreational facilities for school population use. Therefore, no substantial physical deterioration of other local or regional recreational facilities is anticipated. Project impacts would not be significant, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.
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?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> See Section 3.15.a, above.
<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?	<b>No Impact.</b> The Proposed Project involves development and operation of a community college and would not result in change in air traffic patterns through an increase in traffic levels. The nearest airport is Skylark Field Airport in Lake Elsinore, 3.95 miles to the northwest. No impact is anticipated, and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Initial Study Determination
<b>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</b>	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> Trash hauling and recycling services for residential and commercial properties within the City of Wildomar are provided by private firms operating under contract. The area east of I-15, including the Project Site, is served by Waste Management of the Inland Empire (WM). Solid wastes are taken to El Sobrante Landfill in Corona, a state-of-the-art disposal facility with a capacity to process up to 10,000 tons of waste per day (WM 2014). It processes approximately 43 percent of Riverside County's annual waste (WM 2014). The estimated closure date for this landfill is January 2045, and it has a maximum permitted throughput of about 16,000 tons per day. At full buildout, a maximum of 15,000 part-time or 10,000 FTE students would be served, as well as 400 faculty and staff. As shown in Table 3-1, the Proposed Project would generate approximately 7,763 lb/day or 1,417 tons per year, adding 0.04 percent of waste flow to El Sobrante's daily waste processing amount. Therefore, there is sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Proposed Project's solid waste disposal needs, and impacts would not be significant. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.</p>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<p><b>Less Than Significant Impact.</b> The following federal and state laws and regulations govern solid waste disposal. The US Environmental Protection Agency administers the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 and the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965, which govern solid waste disposal. In the State of California, AB 939 (Integrated Solid Waste Management Act of 1989; Public Resources Code §§ 40050 et seq.) required every California city and county to divert 50 percent of its waste from landfills by the year 2000 by such means as recycling, source reduction, and composting. In addition, AB 939 requires each county to prepare a countywide siting element specifying areas for transformation or disposal sites to provide capacity for solid waste generated in the county that cannot be reduced or recycled for a 15-year period. AB 1327, the California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, requires local agencies to adopt ordinances mandating the use of recyclable materials in development projects. The project would comply with all laws and regulations governing solid waste, including those listed above.</p> <p>Participation in various recycling and waste diversion programs would reduce solid waste generated from the Proposed Project and assist in compliance with AB 939. The Proposed Project is required to deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and, therefore will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant, and this issue will not be examined further in the EIR.</p>