

## 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.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed project was distributed by the City of Claremont on February 4, 2022, to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and interested parties (see Appendix A of this DEIR). Three environmental topical areas—Agriculture and Forest Resources, Mineral Resources, and Recreation—were determined not to require further analysis for the site-specific reasons discussed in this section. These issue areas do not require further analysis for the reasons discussed in this section. All other applicable environmental issue categories have been evaluated in this DEIR.

The impact categories and threshold questions below are taken directly from the CEQA Appendix G Environmental Checklist to provide the brief statements of the reasons for determining no impact and that no further detail is required in the DEIR as permitted by CEQA Guidelines Section 15128.

### 8.1 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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:

**AG-1      Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland**

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

### **Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** The Project Area is mapped as Urban and Built-Up Land, and not as important mapped farmland, on the California Important Farmland Finder maintained by the Department of Conservation (DOC 2022a). There are also no areas designated as farmland abutting or within proximity of the Project Area. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would not convert important mapped farmland to nonagricultural use, and no impact would occur.

### **AG-2 Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

**No Impact.** The Project Area is not zoned for agricultural use. As shown in Figures 3-5, *Existing General Plan Land Use Designation*, and 3-7, *Existing Zoning Designation*, the current general plan land use and zoning designation of the Project Area is Public. As shown in Figures 3-6, *Proposed General Plan Land Use Designation*, and 3-8, *Proposed Zoning Designations*, the proposed general plan land use and zoning designations of the Project Area are Residential 6 (residential homes between 2.1 and 6 units per acre) and Specific Plan, respectively. The current and proposed land use and zoning designations do not and would not permit agricultural uses. As shown in Figure 3-1, *Aerial Photograph of Project Area*, the Project Area is in an urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by residential uses and a sports park. The Project Area does not contain active farmland or other agricultural uses and is not adjacent to or in proximity of such uses. Furthermore, the Project Area is not subject to a Williamson Act contract (DOC 2023). Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would not conflict with zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract. Accordingly, no impact would occur.

### **AG-3 Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code § 51104(g))?**

**No Impact.** Forest land is defined as “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” (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 12220[g]). Timberland is defined as “land...which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of any commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees” (PRC Section 4526).

As shown in Figure 3-1, *Aerial Photograph of Project Area*, the Project Area is in an urbanized area of the City and is surrounded by residential uses and a sports park. The Project Area is not designated or zoned for forest or timber land or used for forestry. As noted above, the current zoning designation of the Project Area is Public, and the proposed zoning designation is Specific Plan. Furthermore, all trees within the Project Area are ornamental trees and are not cultivated for forest resources. Therefore, the Project Area does not meet the definition of lands designated as forestland or timberland in PRC Sections 12220(g), 4526, and 51104(g). Implementation of the Specific Plan would have no impact on forest land or resources.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

**AG-4** Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**No Impact.** See response to Section AG-3, above. As substantiated in This section, no impact would occur.

**AG-5** Would the project 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.** See responses to Sections AG-1, AG-2, and AG-3, above. As substantiated in these sections, no impact would occur.

### 8.2 MINERAL RESOURCES

**MIN-1** Would the project 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?

**No Impact.** The project site is mapped as Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2) by the California Geological Survey, which are areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood exists for the presence (DOC 2022b).

However, the Project Area is not in a resource sector, that is, an MRZ-2 area identified as having regional or statewide significance. The Project Area consists of vacant land (see Figure 3-1, *Aerial Photograph of Project Area*) and is not used and has never been used for mining; no locally important mineral resource recovery sites are on or near the Project Area. Additionally, mining in the Project Area would be incompatible with the surrounding uses, which consists of residential uses and a sports park. Mining is also not a permitted use under the Project Area's current or proposed general plan land use or zoning designations. The Claremont General Plan shows the Project Area as committed to urban development and not appropriate for mining. Furthermore, the Project Area does not support and has never supported mineral extraction operations.

Finally, no oil or energy extraction and/or generation activities exist on the Project Area. A review of California Geologic Energy Management Division well finder indicates that there are no oil or energy wells located on or within proximity of the Project Area (CalGEM 2023).

Based on the preceding, no impact to mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites would occur.

**MIN-2** Would the project 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.** See response to Section MIN-1, above. Also, several aggregate mining sites occur in the Claremont-Upland Production region, two of which include large mining operations just east of Claremont. Local area mining occurs just north of the City, upstream from the San Antonio Creek Flood Control Dam (Claremont 2006). However, these areas of locally significant mineral resources are not within the vicinity of the Project Area. Therefore, implementation of the Specific Plan would not cause a loss of availability of a

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

mining site identified in the City's General Plan or locally important mineral resource. No impact would occur.

### 8.3 RECREATION

Would the project:

**REC-1** 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?

**Less than Significant Impact.** Development of the single-family residential units under the Specific Plan is expected to cause an increase in the use of parks and recreational facilities in the City of Claremont. Chapter 17.159 (Park Requirements) of the Claremont Municipal Code requires four acres of land in the City per 1,000 residents be devoted to park and recreation purposes. This is the ratio the City uses for park dedication/fees requirements. As outlined in Section 5.12, *Population and Housing*, the total number of residents that would be generated at buildout of the Specific Plan would be 183 (168 for the 58 single-family home plus 15 for the 10 accessory dwelling units). Using the parkland dedication requirements of Chapter 17.159, implementation of the Specific Plan would require approximately 0.73 acres of parkland.

Existing parks in the City of Claremont within one mile of the Project Area include: La Puerta Sports Park, Jaeger Park, Higginbotham Park, June Vail Park, and Claremont Wilderness Park. The La Puerta Sports Park is immediately adjacent to the Project Area to the west (see Figure 3-1, *Aerial Photograph of Project Area*). Additionally, the nearest regional park is the Marshall Canyon Regional Park, located approximately 2.1 miles northwest of the project site.

The new residents generated by development accommodated by the Specific Plan would be expected to increase the use of the existing aforementioned local and regional parks and recreational facilities. However, this demand would be partially offset by the provision of private outdoor living space in the form of enclosed private yards for each single-family residence. Additionally, there are adequate parks and recreation facilities in the vicinity of the Project Area to serve the needs of the project's residents.

Furthermore, to offset the costs of acquiring and maintaining park, recreation, and other community facilities associated with the demands of residential development accommodated by the Specific Plan, the City requires the payment of park development fees in accordance with Section 16.206.020 (Park Fees) of the Claremont Municipal Code. As outlined in Section 16.206.020, developers of any subdivision or new development project are required to pay all park fees as required by Chapter 17.159 (Park Requirements) of the Claremont Municipal Code. The parkland fee is required to be paid prior to the recordation of a tract map. If not paid at recordation, then it is required at time of issuance of building permits. Payment of fees to the City of Claremont would enable the City to acquire additional parkland, improve new or existing parkland, or both. As stated in Section 17.159.020 (Park and Recreation Facilities Fund), all fees collected pursuant to Chapter 17.159 are required to be deposited in the City's "Park Dedication Fund." The fund are administered by the City and used for the acquisition of land, the provision of improvements, or the

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

purchase of capital equipment for the recreational use of the public. The project applicant would be subject to parkland fees.

The combination of onsite private yards, the amount of parks and recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Project Area, and the payment of parkland fees would ensure that development accommodated by the Specific Plan would not cause or accelerate substantial deterioration of existing local or regional parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**REC-2 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.** See response to Section REC-1, above. Additionally, implementation of the Specific Plan does not include the development of recreational facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur.

### 8.4 REFERENCES

California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2023. Reports and Statistics.  
[https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/wa/Pages/stats\\_reports.aspx](https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/wa/Pages/stats_reports.aspx).

———. 2022a. California Important Farmland Finder. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/>.

———. 2022b. Mineral Land Classification Interactive Map.  
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc>.

California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM). 2023. Well Finder. CalGEM GIS.  
<https://www.conservation.ca.gov/calgem/Pages/WellFinder.aspx>.

Claremont, City of. 2009, October 13 (revised). City of Claremont General Plan. Adopted November 14, 2006. <https://www.ci.claremont.ca.us/living/general-plan-1708>.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

*This page intentionally left blank.*