

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

---

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (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 are therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. 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 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.”

### 8.1 ASSESSMENT IN THE SCOPING PROCESS

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Proposed Project was distributed by the County on June 17, 2015, to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and interested parties (see Appendix A of this EIR).

As described in the NOP for the Proposed Project, four categories of environmental issues—Agriculture and Forest Resources, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, and Recreation—were determined not to require further analysis for the site specific reasons discussed in this section. All other applicable environmental issue categories have been evaluated in the EIR. City zoning status is include for information only as the County is not subject to City zoning for this Project as discussed in Section 5.9, *Land Use and Planning*.

This section provides the basis for the County determination that four environmental issue categories from the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G checklist would be less than significant or no impact, as shown in Table 8-1. Impact categories and questions in Table 8-1 are summarized directly from the applicable CEQA Environmental Checklist to provide the brief statements of the reasons for determining that these four categories needed no further detail in the EIR as permitted by CEQA Guidelines Section 15128.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Discussion
<p><b>II. 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:</b></p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>The Project Site is already developed as a County jail facility and would continue to operate as a County jail facility. The SSPS Site is currently developed as a surface parking lot. The Vignes Lot was previously developed with heavy manufacturing uses and is almost entirely covered by concrete. The Project Site, SSPS Site, and Vignes Lot are not designated as special status farmland by the California Important Farmland Finder (DOC 2014). No agricultural land would be converted, and no significant impact related to agricultural resources would occur.</p>
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<p>The Project Site is zoned PF (Public Facilities) by the City of Los Angeles zoning map. The SSPS Site is zoned C2-2 (Commercial). The Vignes Lot is designated as Heavy Manufacturing by the General Plan and is in the Central City North Community Plan. The zoning designation is M3-1-RIO (Heavy Industrial). No agricultural use or zoning would be impacted by the Proposed Project. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not conflict with any Williamson Act contract, and no significant impact related to agricultural resources would occur.</p>
<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>The Project Site is already developed as a County jail facility and zoned PF (Public Facilities). The SSPS Site is already developed as a parking lot and zoned C2-2 (Commercial). The Vignes Lot was previously developed with heavy manufacturing uses and is almost entirely covered by concrete. No forest land or timberland would be impacted by the Proposed Project, and no zoning change would be necessary. No significant impact related to forest land resources would occur.</p>
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<p>The Project Site and SSPS Site are already developed. The Vignes Lot was previously developed with heavy manufacturing uses and is almost entirely covered by concrete. No loss of forest land would occur due to project implementation. No significant impact related to forest land resources would occur.</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>The Project Site and SSPS Site are already developed. The Vignes Lot was previously developed with heavy manufacturing uses and is almost entirely covered by concrete. No farmland or forest land would be converted to non-agricultural or non-forest use. No significant impacts related to agricultural resources or forest land resources would occur.</p>
<p><b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</b></p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>The Project Site and SSPS Site are already developed and not mining extraction sites. The Vignes Lot was previously developed with heavy manufacturing uses and was never used for mineral extraction. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No significant impact related to mineral resources is anticipated.</p>

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

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

Environmental Issues	Discussion
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?	The City of Los Angeles General Plan or Central City North Community Plan does not delineate the Project Site, SSPS Site, or the Vignes Lot as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not result in a loss of locally important mineral resources. No significant impact related to mineral resources is anticipated.
<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)?	The Project Site is already developed as a County jail facility and would continue operate as a county jail facility, serving approximately 20% fewer inmate-patients. The SSPS Site is currently developed as a surface parking lot and would continue to operate as a parking facility. The Vignes Lot would be used for a 3,000 space parking structure. The Proposed Project would increase the number of employees at the Project Site and the adjacent Twin Towers Correctional Facility by 50 employees. With an unemployment rate of 5.5 percent in the City and 5.2 percent in the County as of June 2016 (EDD 2016), new hires could be filled by the available unemployed local labor force of 110,600 persons in the City of Los Angeles and the unemployed labor force from other areas in the County and region, based on individual eligibility for the vacant positions and the County Sheriff's Department hiring protocol and requirements. The number of jobs available in the City of Los Angeles would increase by 50 positions from 1,753,558 jobs in 2013 (SCAG 2015). The increase would be within SCAG projections of 2,169,100 jobs by 2040 (SCAG 2016). The Project would not result in substantial employment growth in the City beyond what SCAG has projected for 2040. There would be no exceedance of SCAG's population projections for the City for 2040, and no substantial employment growth would occur with the Project. Therefore, the Proposed Project is not a growth-inducing project, and no significant impact would occur.
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	The Proposed Project would not require demolition of any residential units. No construction of replacement housing would be necessary, and no significant impact would occur.
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	The Proposed Project would not require demolition of any residential units and would not result in displacement of any people. New employees may seek housing opportunities in the City or County. As of January 1, 2016, there are 85,486 vacant housing units in the City, representing a vacancy rate of 5.9 percent (DOF 2016). The vacancy rate for the County as a whole is 5.6 percent. There is available housing in the City and County to accommodate new employee housing. The Proposed Project would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing, and no significant impact would occur.
<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?	The Proposed Project involves redevelopment of the existing MCJ and would not create new or increased demands for recreational facilities. Demands for recreation facilities are typically generated when there is residential growth in the area. The proposed CCTF would not increase the use of any parks or any other recreational facilities in the area. No significant impact would occur.
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?	The Proposed Project would provide a new public plaza area within the CCTF. All recreational needs of the inmates would be accommodated by the CCTF, and no offsite expansion of existing recreational facilities would be necessary. No significant impact would occur.

## 8. Impacts Found Not to Be Significant

### 8.2 REFERENCES

- California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG). 1994. Generalized Mineral Land Classification Map of Los Angeles County: South Half. Open File Report 94-14, Plate 1B.  
[ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR\\_94-14/](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/OFR_94-14/).
- Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP). 2013. Los Angeles County Williamson Act FY 2012/2013.  
[ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA\\_12\\_13\\_WA.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA_12_13_WA.pdf).
- . 2014, December 11. California Important Farmland Finder.  
<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>.
- Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR). 2014, December 11. DOGGR Online Mapping System (DOMS). <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/doms/doms-app.html>.
- Department of Finance (DOF). 2016. May 2016. Table 2: E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 1/1/2016. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/>.
- Employment Development Department (EDD). 2016, June 27. Report 400C: Monthly Labor Force Data for Cities and Census Designated Places (CDP). May 2016 Preliminary.  
<http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/labor-force-and-unemployment-for-cities-and-census-areas.html>.
- Los Angeles, City of. 2001, September 26. General Plan Conservation Element.  
<http://cityplanning.lacity.org/cwd/gnlpln/consvelt.pdf>.
- Office of Mine Reclamation (OMR). 2014, December 11. Mines Online.  
<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mol/mol-app.html>.
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2015. Profile of the City of Los Angeles. Local Profiles Report 2015. <https://www.scag.ca.gov/Documents/LosAngeles.pdf>.
- . 2016, April. The 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Demographics & Growth Forecast Appendix.  
<http://scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS.pdf>.