PROJECT REPORT
TO: ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE AGENDA DATE: February 23, 202
FROM: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES AGENDA TIME 1:30 PM / No.
PROJECT TYPE: <u>CaLEVOO, LLC - CUP #22-0023</u> SUPERVISOR DIST <u>#4</u>
LOCATION:5880 Hwy 86APN:019-170-033-000
Westmorland, CA 92281 PARCEL SIZE: 400.4 acres
GENERAL PLAN (existing) <u>Agriculture</u> GENERAL PLAN (proposed) <u>N/A</u>
ZONE (existing) <u>A-2\3 (General\Heavy Agriculture) and C-2-PE (Median Commercial Pre Existing</u> ZONE (proposed) <u>N/A</u>
GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS
PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION: HEARING DATE:
APPROVED DENIED OTHER
PLANNING DIRECTORS DECISION: HEARING DATE:
APPROVED DENIED OTHER
ENVIROMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE DECISION: HEARING DATE: 02/23/2023
INITIAL STUDY: <u>#22-0041</u>
NEGATIVE DECLARATION MITIGATED NEG. DECLARATION EI
DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS / APPROVALS:
PUBLIC WORKS       NONE       ATTACHED         AG       NONE       ATTACHED         APCD       NONE       ATTACHED         E.H.S.       NONE       ATTACHED         FIRE / OES       NONE       ATTACHED         SHERIFF       NONE       ATTACHED         OTHER       Quechan, Caltrans       ATTACHED
REQUESTED ACTION:

(See Attached)

# □ NEGATIVE DECLARATION □ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Initial Study & Environmental Analysis For:

#### CUP #22-0023 IS #22-0041

CaLEVOO, LLC



Prepared By:

COUNTY OF IMPERIAL Planning & Development Services Department 801 Main Street El Centro, CA 92243 (442) 265-1736 www.icpds.com

(February 2023)

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

#### SECTION 1

Ι.	INTRODUCTION

#### SECTION 2

tl.	ENVIR	ONMENTAL CHECKLIST	8
	PROJE	CT SUMMARY	10
	ENVIR	ONMENTAL ANALYSIS	13
	L	AESTHETICS	14
	П.	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	
	III.	AIR QUALITY	
	IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	
	V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES	
	VI.	ENERGY	
	VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	
	VIII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION	
	IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	
	X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	
	XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING	
	XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES	
	XIII.	NOISE	
	XIV.	POPULATION AND HOUSING	
	XV.	PUBLIC SERVICES	
	XVI.	RECREATION	
	XVII.	TRANSPORTATION	
	XVIII	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	21
	XIX.	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	
	XX.	WILDFIRE	

#### SECTION 3

III.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	23
IV.	PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED	24
V.	REFERENCES	25
VI.	NEGATIVE DECLARATION - COUNTY OF IMPERIAL	26
27	FINDINGS	27
SE	ECTION 4	

VIII.	RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)	28
IX.	MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) (IF ANY)	29

3

# SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

#### A. PURPOSE

This document is a  $\Box$  policy-level,  $\boxtimes$  project level Initial Study for evaluation of potential environmental impacts resulting with the proposed Conditional Use Permit 22-0023 / Initial Study #22-0041 where the intent of the project is to operate an olive oil mill. (Refer to Exhibit "A" & "B").

# B. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPERIAL COUNTY'S GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING CEQA

As defined by Section 15063 of the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and Section 7 of the County's "CEQA Regulations Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, as amended", an **Initial Study** is prepared primarily to provide the Lead Agency with information to use as the basis for determining whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Negative Declaration, or Mitigated Negative Declaration would be appropriate for providing the necessary environmental documentation and clearance for any proposed project.

According to Section 15065, an **EIR** is deemed appropriate for a particular proposal if the following conditions occur:

- The proposal has the potential to substantially degrade quality of the environment.
- The proposal has the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- The proposal has possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.
- The proposal could cause direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings.

According to Section 15070(a), a Negative Declaration is deemed appropriate if the proposal would not result in any significant effect on the environment.

According to Section 15070(b), a Mitigated Negative Declaration is deemed appropriate if it is determined that though a proposal could result in a significant effect, mitigation measures are available to reduce these significant effects to insignificant levels.

This Initial Study has determined that the proposed applications will not result in any potentially significant environmental impacts and therefore, a Negative Declaration is deemed as the appropriate document to provide necessary environmental evaluations and clearance as identified hereinafter.

This Initial Study and Negative Declaration are prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et. seq.); Section 15070 of the State & County of Imperial's Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000, et. seq.); applicable requirements of the County of Imperial; and the regulations, requirements, and procedures of any other responsible public agency or an agency with jurisdiction by law.

Pursuant to the County of Imperial <u>Guidelines for Implementing CEQA</u>, depending on the project scope, the County of Imperial Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and/or Planning Director is designated the Lead Agency,

in accordance with Section 15050 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Lead Agency is the public agency which has the principal responsibility for approving the necessary environmental clearances and analyses for any project in the County.

#### C. INTENDED USES OF INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This Initial Study and Negative Declaration are informational documents which are intended to inform County of Imperial decision makers, other responsible or interested agencies, and the general public of potential environmental effects of the proposed applications. The environmental review process has been established to enable public agencies to evaluate environmental consequences and to examine and implement methods of eliminating or reducing any potentially adverse impacts. While CEQA requires that consideration be given to avoiding environmental damage, the Lead Agency and other responsible public agencies must balance adverse environmental effects against other public objectives, including economic and social goals.

The Initial Study and Negative Declaration, prepared for the project will be circulated for a period of 20 days (*30-days if submitted to the State Clearinghouse for a project of area-wide significance*) for public and agency review and comments. At the conclusion, if comments are received, the County Planning & Development Services Department will prepare a document entitled "Responses to Comments" which will be forwarded to any commenting entity and be made part of the record within 10-days of any project consideration.

#### D. CONTENTS OF INITIAL STUDY & NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This Initial Study is organized to facilitate a basic understanding of the existing setting and environmental implications of the proposed applications.

#### SECTION 1

**I. INTRODUCTION** presents an introduction to the entire report. This section discusses the environmental process, scope of environmental review, and incorporation by reference documents.

#### SECTION 2

**II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM** contains the County's Environmental Checklist Form. The checklist form presents results of the environmental evaluation for the proposed applications and those issue areas that would have either a significant impact, potentially significant impact, or no impact.

**PROJECT SUMMARY, LOCATION AND EVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS** describes the proposed project entitlements and required applications. A description of discretionary approvals and permits required for project implementation is also included. It also identifies the location of the project and a general description of the surrounding environmental settings.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS** evaluates each response provided in the environmental checklist form. Each response checked in the checklist form is discussed and supported with sufficient data and analysis as necessary. As appropriate, each response discussion describes and identifies specific impacts anticipated with project implementation.

#### SECTION 3

**III. MANDATORY FINDINGS** presents Mandatory Findings of Significance in accordance with Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.

IV. PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED identifies those persons consulted and involved in

preparation of this Initial Study and Negative Declaration.

V. REFERENCES lists bibliographical materials used in preparation of this document,

#### VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION – COUNTY OF IMPERIAL

VII. FINDINGS

#### SECTION 4

#### VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)

#### IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) (IF ANY)

#### E. SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

For evaluation of environmental impacts, each question from the Environmental Checklist Form is summarized and responses are provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. Impacts and effects will be evaluated and quantified, when appropriate. To each question, there are four possible responses, including:

- 1. **No Impact:** A "No Impact" response is adequately supported if the impact simply does not apply to the proposed applications.
- 2. **Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed applications will have the potential to impact the environment. These impacts, however, will be less than significant; no additional analysis is required.
- 3. Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: This applies where incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact".
- 4. **Potentially Significant Impact:** The proposed applications could have impacts that are considered significant. Additional analyses and possibly an EIR could be required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

#### F. POLICY-LEVEL or PROJECT LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This Initial Study and Negative Declaration will be conducted under a policy-level, project level analysis. Regarding mitigation measures, it is not the intent of this document to "overlap" or restate conditions of approval that are commonly established for future known projects or the proposed applications. Additionally, those other standard requirements and regulations that any development must comply with, that are outside the County's jurisdiction, are also not considered mitigation measures and therefore, will not be identified in this document.

#### G. TIERED DOCUMENTS AND INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

Information, findings, and conclusions contained in this document are based on incorporation by reference of tiered documentation, which are discussed in the following section.

#### 1. <u>Tiered Documents</u>

As permitted in Section 15152(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, information and discussions from other documents can be included into this document. Tiering is defined as follows:

"Tiering refers to using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR (such as the one prepared

for a general plan or policy statement) with later EIRs and negative declarations on narrower projects; incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR; and concentrating the later EIR or negative declaration solely on the issues specific to the later project."

Tiering also allows this document to comply with Section 15152(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, which discourages redundant analyses, as follows:

"Agencies are encouraged to tier the environmental analyses which they prepare for separate but related projects including the general plans, zoning changes, and development projects. This approach can eliminate repetitive discussion of the same issues and focus the later EIR or negative declaration on the actual issues ripe for decision at each level of environmental review. Tiering is appropriate when the sequence of analysis is from an EIR prepared for a general plan, policy or program to an EIR or negative declaration for another plan, policy, or program of lesser scope, or to a site-specific EIR or negative declaration."

Further, Section 15152(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

"Where an EIR has been prepared and certified for a program, plan, policy, or ordinance consistent with the requirements of this section, any lead agency for a later project pursuant to or consistent with the program, plan, policy, or ordinance should limit the EIR or negative declaration on the later project to effects which:

(1) Were not examined as significant effects on the environment in the prior EIR; or

(2) Are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or other means."

#### 2. Incorporation By Reference

Incorporation by reference is a procedure for reducing the size of EIRs/MND and is most appropriate for including long, descriptive, or technical materials that provide general background information, but do not contribute directly to the specific analysis of the project itself. This procedure is particularly useful when an EIR or Negative Declaration relies on a broadly-drafted EIR for its evaluation of cumulative impacts of related projects (*Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation v. County of Los Angeles* [1986, 177 Ca.3d 300]). If an EIR or Negative Declaration relies on information from a supporting study that is available to the public, the EIR or Negative Declaration cannot be deemed unsupported by evidence or analysis (*San Francisco Ecology Center v. City and County of San Francisco* [1975, 48 Ca.3d 584, 595]). This document incorporates by reference appropriate information from the "Final Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Assessment for the "County of Imperial General Plan EIR" prepared by Brian F. Mooney Associates in 1993 and updates.

When an EIR or Negative Declaration incorporates a document by reference, the incorporation must comply with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines as follows:

- The incorporated document must be available to the public or be a matter of public record (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[a]). The General Plan EIR and updates are available, along with this document, at the County of Imperial Planning & Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243 Ph. (442) 265-1736.
- This document must be available for inspection by the public at an office of the lead agency (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[b]). These documents are available at the County of Imperial Planning & Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243 Ph. (442) 265-1736.
- These documents must summarize the portion of the document being incorporated by reference or briefly

describe information that cannot be summarized. Furthermore, these documents must describe the relationship between the incorporated information and the analysis in the tiered documents (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[c]). As discussed above, the tiered EIRs address the entire project site and provide background and inventory information and data which apply to the project site. Incorporated information and/or data will be cited in the appropriate sections.

- These documents must include the State identification number of the incorporated documents (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[d]). The State Clearinghouse Number for the County of Imperial General Plan EIR is SCH #93011023.
- The material to be incorporated in this document will include general background information (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[f]). This has been previously discussed in this document.

# II. Environmental Checklist

- 1. Project Title: Conditional Use Permit #22-0023 / Initial Study #22-0041 for the CaLEVOO, LLC
- 2. Lead Agency: Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department
- 3. Contact person and phone number: Derek Newland, Planner II, (442)265-1736, ext. 1756
- 4. Address: 801 Main Street, El Centro CA, 92243
- 5. E-mail: dereknewland@co.imperial.ca.us
- 6. Project location: 5880 Hwy 86, Westmorland, CA 92281
- 7. Project sponsor's name and address: CaLEVOO, LLC; John F. "Rick" Benson

5880 Hwy 86, Westmorland, CA 92281

- 8. General Plan designation: Agriculture
- 9. Zoning: A-2 (General Agriculture), A-3 (Heavy Agriculture), and C-2-PE (Medium Commercial Pre Existing)

10. **Description of project**: The applicant proposes to install an olive oil mill inside an existing and permitted metal structure for the purpose of producing olive oil from locally sourced olives from olive groves located on the project parcel and potentially from other growers within the County. The mill is proposed to operate during olive harvesting season which is August to January. The organic waste streams are proposed to be utilized on site, composted, or recycled in an effort to reach near zero offsite waste disposal. With olives being processed onsite, all current trucks used in the harvesting process will remain onsite with the exception of any offsite fruit being brought in for processing. The olive oil product will be taken off-site to retailers via passenger vehicles.

11. **Surrounding land uses and setting**: The olive oil mill will be located within an existing and permitted 3,000 square foot metal structure located on a 400.4 acre parcel containing 200 acres of olive groves and a roughly +/- 9 acre reservoir adjacent to the metal building. The surrounding properties to the north, east and west are agricultural lands with SR-86, open desert space to the south. There is also a single family home on an adjacent parcel south of the project as well.

12. **Other public agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): Planning Commission

13. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentially, etc.?

The AB 52 Notice of Opportunity to consult was mailed via certified mail to the Quechan Indian Tribal Governments and the Campo Band of Mission Indians on October 21, 2022 for their review and comment. The Quechan Indian Tribe responded on October 24, 2022 and does not wish to comment on this project. No response was received from the Campo Band of Mission Indians.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code, Section 21080.3.2). Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code, Section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code, Section 21082.3 (c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Energy
Geology /Soils	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Hazards & Hazardous Materials
Hydrology / Water Quality	Land Use / Planning	Mineral Resources
Noise	Population / Housing	Public Services
Recreation	Transportation	Tribal Cultural Resources
Utilities/Service Systems	Wildfire	Mandatory Findings of Significance

# **ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE (EEC) DETERMINATION**

After Review of the Initial Study, the Environmental Evaluation Committee has:

Found that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a <u>NEGATIVE</u> <u>DECLARATION</u> will be prepared.

Found that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. <u>A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION</u> will be prepared.

Found that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an <u>ENVIRONMENTAL</u> <u>IMPACT REPORT</u> is required.

Found that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

Found that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE DE MINIMIS IMPACT FINDING: 🗌 Yes
---

No No

EEC VOTES PUBLIC WORKS ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SVCS OFFICE EMERGENCY SERVICES APCD AG SHERIFF DEPARTMENT ICPDS			ABSENT
--	--	--	--------

Jim Minnick, Director of Planning/EEC Chairman

Date:

#### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

- A. Project Location: The project site is located at 5880 Hwy 86, Westmorland, CA 92281. The parcel is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 019-170-033-000 and is legally described as Parcel B of Lot Line Adjustment 264, also being a Portion of the East Half & a Portion of the Southwest Quarter of Section 32, T12S, R12E, Northeasterly of Hwy 86 400.4 AC, S.B.B.M, in an unincorporated area of the County of Imperial.
- B. Project Summary: The applicant proposes to install an olive oil mill inside an existing and permitted metal structure for the purpose of producing olive oil from locally sourced olives from olive groves located on the project parcel and potentially from other growers within the County. The mill is proposed to operate during olive harvesting season which is August to January. The organic waste streams are proposed to be utilized on site, composted, or recycled in an effort to reach near zero offsite waste disposal. With olives being processed onsite, all current trucks used in the harvesting process will remain onsite with the exception of any offsite fruit being brought in for processing. The olive oil product will be taken off-site to retailers via passenger vehicles.
- C. Environmental Setting: The proposed project will be within an existing and permitted 3,000 square foot metal structure (building) on a 400.4 acre parcel with 200 acres of actively farmed and maintained olive groves. The parcel is zoned A-2, A-3 and C-2-PE with the project being located on the portion of the parcel zoned A-2. The land north, east and west of the property are agricultural lands. South of the project is SR-86, open space desert land, and a residential building on an adjacent parcel to the south.
- D. Analysis: The proposed project is located within the County's General Plan designation of "Agriculture". The project is located on a portion of the property zoned A-2 under the County Land Use Ordinance, Section 90508.00. The proposed olive oil mill could be found consistent with the County Land Use Ordinance, as the processing of an agricultural product into a consumable form would be an allowed use with an approved Conditional Use Permit.
- E. General Plan Consistency: The proposed project is located on land designated within the County's General Plan as "Agriculture". The processing of agricultural products is allowed within the Agricultural designation and its subsequent Agricultural Land Use Zones.





Exhibit "B" Site Plan/Tract Map/etc.

#### EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

		Potentially Significant Impact <b>(PSI)</b>	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated <b>(PSUMI)</b>	Less Than Significant Impact <b>(LTSI)</b>	No Impact (NI)
I. <b>AE</b>	STHETICS				
Excep	t as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the p	roject:			
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway? a) The proposed olive oil mill will be inside an existing perm	itted metal war	ehouse structure is lo	cated roughly	
	north of SR-86, which is not designated as a scenic vista or h Highway Element of the General Plan <sup>1</sup> . The majority of harv site from the surrounding olive grove also on the property. A	ighway, pursua vesting and tran	int to section IIB-5, und sporting of fruit for pr	der the Circula ocessing will	tion/Scenic
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? b) The proposed olive oil mill is not located near any scenic				⊠ d.
c)	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surrounding? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? c) The proposed olive oil mill is not located in an urbanize regulations with an approved Conditional Use Permit, therefore				I and other
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? d) Any nighttime lighting installed at the olive oil mill, which structure as an allowed use by right would be installed in accor impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
Agricu use in enviro the sta	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES ermining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significan ltural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whe mental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by ate's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Asses measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by	by the California other impacts to f y the California D sment Project an	Department of Conserv orest resources, includi Department of Forestry and the Forest Legacy As	ation as an opti ng timberland, a and Fire Protec sessment proje	onal model to are significant tion regarding act; and forest
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? a) The proposed olive oil mill will be located on a 400.4 acre p Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitori Farmland, +/- 61.5 acres of Farmland of State Importance, +/- Urban and Built-up Land and +/- 40.3 acres of other land. T permitted and constructed metal structure that is located on that also consists of a reservoir. Therefore, the proposed pro- impacts are expected to be less than significant.	ing Program Ma - 110 acres of F The location of t the +/- 15.8 acr	p the parcel consists armland of Local Imp the proposed project re area designated as	of +/- 170 acre ortance, +/- 15 will be inside Urban and Bu	es of Prime 5.8 acres of a currently ilt-up Land
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? b) There are no current Williamson Act Contracts within Imp Agriculture) zone, which allows for agriculture produce proc are considered to be less than significant.				

			Potentially		
		Potentially	Significant	Less Than	
		Significant	Unless Mitigation	Significant	
		Impact		Impact	No Impact
		(PSI)	(PSUMI)	(LTSI)	(NI)
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				$\boxtimes$
	4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				
	c) The proposed olive oil mill will be inside a permitted and "Agriculture" per the Imperial County General Plan and will n Therefore, no impact is expected.				
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				$\boxtimes$
	d) As stated above, the proposed olive oil mill will be inside a	permitted and bu	uilt metal structure is lo	ocated on land	designated
	as "Agriculture" and will not result in loss of or conversion of				
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			$\boxtimes$	
	to non-forest use? e) The proposed olive oil mill will not involve changes that v	would result in c	onversion of farmland	l or forest land	: therefore.
	any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				,
	RQUALITY				
Where relied	e available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air upon to the following determinations. Would the Project:	quality managem	nent district or air pollution	on control distric	t may be
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			$\bowtie$	
	a) The proposed olive oil mill will not conflict with or obstruct be located in a permitted warehouse building. Additionally Control District for compliance and any required permits. An	y the applicant s	shall contact the Impo	erial County Ai	
b)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any				
- /	criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality			$\bowtie$	
	standard?	t in a not increas	a of any oritoria pollu	itant for which	the project
	<li>b) The operation of the proposed olive oil mill will not result region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state</li>	ambient air qual	lity standard. Any imp	acts would be	considered
	less than significant.				
C)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations?			$\boxtimes$	
	c) Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors a or other facilities that may house individuals with health co quality. The proposed olive oil mill housed inside a current.	onditions that w y permitted and	ould adversely be im built structure is roug	pacted by char ghly +/- 6.8 mile	nges in air es from the
	nearest potential sensitive receptors in the City of Westmork pressing of fruit within a structure. Onsite farming operation which are watered for dust suppression year round. In additi VIII to control fugitive dust emissions. Any impacts would be	ons already prod	luce some dust from v it will need to comply v	vehicles on the with ICAPCD's	dirt roads
	vin to control lugitive dust emissions. Any impacts would be	r exherien in ne	, isse than eighnisdift.		
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			$\boxtimes$	
	d) The proposed olive oil mill contained in a permitted and o	constructed met	al structure is located	on a 400.4 acr	e agriculture

parcel that is bounded by other agricultural parcels, SR-86, and desert land and is roughly +/- 6.8 from the nearest built up area that is the City of Westmorland and therefore should not result in other emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

			Potentially Significant Impact <b>(PSI)</b>	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact <b>(NI)</b>
IV.	BIC	DLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? a) According to Figure 2 and 3 of the Conservation/Open Sp could potentially be a flat-tailed horned lizard habitat based located in the FTHL Management Area. The proposed olive of that is located on a 400.4 acre parcel on disturbed land that h farmed and maintained olive groves. Therefore, the proposed either directly or through habitat modification, on the species Any impacts are considered to be less than significant.	on the FTHL D I mill will be ins as been activel d project does	istribution Model, how ide a permitted and co y farmed for decades not appear to have a s	wever, the prop onstructed meta and currently h substantial adv	perty is not al structure las actively erse effect,
	b)	<ul> <li>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</li> <li>b) The proposed olive oil mill will be located in a permitted an that contains actively farmed and maintained olive groves an natural communities. Therefore, any impacts are expected to</li> </ul>	d is not located	d near an identified rip		
	c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? c) The proposed olive oil mill will be located in a permitted defined as protected wetlands, State or Federal. Any impacts				r any areas
	d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? d) The proposed olive oil mill located inside a permitted and of farmed and maintained olive groves does not appear to interfe fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or m nursery sites. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less	re substantially nigratory wildlif	with the movement of fe corridors, or impede	any resident o	r migratory
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resource, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? e) No local, state, or regional preservation or conservation proposed special event facility. Therefore, no impacts are exp		Cies have been identi	fied as applica	able to the
	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? f) As stated in section IV (a) the project is located in an area w it is not located in their management area. Additionally, the constructed metal structure that is on disturbed and actively expected to be less than significant.	vithin the Flat-T ne proposed ol	ive oil mill will be lo	cated in a per	mitted and

			Potentially Significant Impact <b>(PSI)</b>	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated <b>(PSUMI)</b>	Less Than Significant Impact <b>(LTSI)</b>	No Impact <b>(NI)</b>
V.	CU	LTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? a) The proposed olive oil mill will be located inside a perm agricultural field that has been farmed for decades and curr property. Therefore, no impacts are expected.				
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? b) The proposed olive oil mill will be located inside a permitte agricultural field that has been farmed for decades and currer property. Therefore, no impacts are expected.				
	c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? c) The proposed olive oil mill will be located inside a perm agricultural field that has been farmed for decades and curr property. Therefore, no impacts are expected.	itted and const ently has active	ucted metal structure by farmed and mainta	located on a a a located on a	⊠ 400.4 acre ves on the
VI.	ENI	ERGY Would the project:				
	a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? a) Electrical service is currently provided by Imperial Irrigation in potentially significant environment impact due to wasteful, Any impact is expected to be less than significant.				
	b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? b) The proposed olive oil mill is not expected to conflict with o efficiency. No impacts are expected.	or obstruct a sta	tte or local plan for rer	newable energy	⊠ ∕ or energy
VII.	GE	OLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:				
	a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving. The proposed olive oil mill located within a permitted and con potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, in Tree fault but would be no more affected by seismic activity th to be less than significant.	jury, or death. 1	The site is located +/- 1	1.2 miles east o	of the Lone
		<ol> <li>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?</li> <li>The proposed olive oil mill located within a permitte nearest fault, the Lone Tree fault within the San Jacinto rupture is expected, therefore, any impacts are expected</li> </ol>	fault zone. No	potential substantial a		
		<ol> <li>Strong Seismic ground shaking?</li> <li>The proposed olive oil mill located within a permitte nearest fault, the Lone Tree fault. In case of an earthqu surrounding areas. Therefore, any impacts are expected</li> </ol>	ake, ground sh	aking would be expec	∑ +/- 1.2 miles e ted to be in th	east of the e same as

					Potentially		
				Potentially	Significant	Less Than	
				Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
_				(PSI)	(PSUMI)	(LTSI)	(NI)
		3)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and seiche/tsunami?			$\boxtimes$	
			3) The proposed olive oil mill located within a permittee next to a human made reservoir and could potentially be to be less than significant.				
		4)	Landslides? 4) The proposed olive oil mill located in a permitted an Activity area according to the Imperial County Seismic topography within the site is relatively flat with excep impacts are expected.	and Public Safe	ety Element, Figure 2	(Landslide Act	ivity). The
	b)	b) 1 Safe	ult in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? The project site is not located within an area of substantia ety Element, Figure 3 (Erosion Activity). The project will n mpacts are expected.				
	c)	wou pote subs c) T proj	ocated on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that Id become unstable as a result of the project, and intially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, sidence, liquefaction or collapse? The proposed olive oil mill will be located in a permitted posed. It is not expected that the proposed project would expected to be less than significant.				
	d)	Build or pi d) 1 As r proj	ocated on expansive soil, as defined in the latest Uniform ding Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risk to life roperty? The proposed olive oil mill will be located in an existing p no new structures are proposed the proposed project is n perty. Any new structures will be required to meet the lat expected to be less than significant.	ot expected to c	reate substantial direc	t or indirect ris	sk of life or
	e)	sept whe wate e) T an c	e soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of ic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems re sewers are not available for the disposal of waste er? The proposed olive oil mill will be located in an existing pe posite septic system. There is no indication the soils will expected.	rmitted metal st	ructure that contains a support the onsite se	bathroom whi ptic system. I	Ch will use No impacts
	f)	or si f) T	ctly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource te or unique geologic feature? he proposed project will be located within an existing per ned land. No impacts are expected.	mitted metal str	ucture that is located	☐ on disturbed a	⊠ nd actively
VIII.	GR	EENH	OUSE GAS EMISSION Would the project:				
	a)	indir envi a) I proj betv proj proc wou	erate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or ectly, that may have a significant impact on the ronment? Based on the applicant's description of farm truck use in ect description dated January 19, 2023 <sup>2</sup> , greenhouse g veen August and January. The current truck traffic travels bosed olive oil mill would cause the current traffic to be cessed onsite removing the out of County travel. Any offs Id also reduce total mile traveled as those vehicles woul rall vehicle miles traveled to be reduced and the applicant	as emissions a s off of the prope reduced to ons ite harvest truck d also not be tr	are currently highest erty and out of the cou site travel as the fruit is hauling purchased f aveling out of county.	during the oli nty during this would be harv ruit for process Due to the po	ve harvest time. The vested and sing onsite otential for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Project Description Addendum Letter from Applicant John F. "Rick" Benson Dated January 19, 2023

				Potentially		
			Potentially Significant	Significant Unless Mitigation	Less Than Significant	
			Impact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact
			(PSI)	(PSUMI)	(LTSI)	(Nİ)
		is expected that any impacts would be less than significant.				
	b)	Conflict with an applicable plan or policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			$\boxtimes$	
		b) The proposed olive oil mill is not expected to conflict w purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases; as me requirements and permits. Impacts are expected to be less the	entioned above			
IX.	HAZ	ZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project				
	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
		a) The proposed olive oil mill does not intend to use or dispo	se of nazardou	s materiais. No impac	ts are expected	0.
	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?				$\boxtimes$
		b) The proposed olive oil mill with be processing olives into o will be used. Any waste would be organic and therefore no in			d no hazardou	s materials
	C)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				
		<ul> <li>c) The proposed olive oil mill will be processing organic mate Westmorland. No impacts are expected.</li> </ul>	erial and the nea	arest school is +/- / m	iles away in th	e City of
	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?				
		<ul> <li>d) The proposed olive oil mill will be located inside an existing on a list of hazardous material sites. Therefore, any impacts</li> </ul>				te included
	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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				$\boxtimes$
		e) The proposed olive oil mill will be located inside an existin a 400.4 acre parcel with actively farmed and maintained olive Brawley Airport which are both +/- 13 miles northeast and sou	groves. The ne	arest airports are the	Calipatria Airp	ort and
	f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				$\boxtimes$
		f) The proposed olive oil mill will not impair the implementation response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impacts are		ally interfere with an a	dopted emerge	ency
	g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				
		g) The proposed olive oil mill is not located within a wildland permitted metal structure with a man-made reservoir adjacent impacts are expected to be less than significant.				

			Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact <b>(LTSI)</b>	No Impact (NI)
Х.	HY	DROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? a) The proposed olive oil mill will be filtering waste water fro suppression. The applicant will reach out and comply with Regional Board. Any impacts are considered to be less than	any permits o			
	b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? b) The proposed project will be utilizing IID canal water and Therefore, any impacts are considered less than significant.	L does not prop	Dosed to extract groun	⊠ nd water for an	U purpose.
	C)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: c) The proposed olive oil mill will be located in an existing drainage pattern of the site or area as no other structures or o than significant.				
		<ul> <li>(I) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;</li> <li>i) The proposed olive oil mill will be located in an existing a oil making process will be utilized on site for the farming a expected to be less than significant.</li> </ul>				
		<ul> <li>(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;</li> <li>ii) The proposed olive oil mill will be located in an existing an the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would be less than significant.</li> </ul>				
		<ul> <li>(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or;</li> <li>iii) The proposed olive oil mill will be utilizing storage tanks of the onsite olive groves and will not create or contribute runo storm water drainage systems or proved substantial addition less than significant.</li> </ul>	off water which v	would exceed the capa	city of existing	or planned
		<ul> <li>(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?</li> <li>iv) The proposed olive oil mill located in an existing and per Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.</li> </ul>	mitted metal st	ructure will not imped	le or redirect fl	lood flows.
	d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? d) The proposed olive oil mill located in an existing and per However, the proximity to the adjacent human made reservoir that any impacts from a seiche event would be less than signi	could lead to a p			
	e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality			$\boxtimes$	

			Potentially Significant Impact <b>(PSI)</b>	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated <b>(PSUMI)</b>	Less Than Significant Impact <b>(LTSI)</b>	No Impact (NI)
		control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? e) The proposed olive oil mill would be required to comply wi Basin Regional Board in regard to septic and waste water disc the implementation of a water quality control. Therefore, any	charge. This c	ompliance would lesse	en any conflicts	
XI.	LA	ND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:				
	a)	Physically divide an established community? a) The proposed olive oil mill will be located in an existing ar (General Agriculture) on a property that currently has farm agriculture, SR-86, and open space. The project does not in divide an established community. No impacts are expected.	ed and maintai	ined olive groves. Th	ne surrounding	lands are
	b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? b) The proposed olive oil mill is not expected to conflict v Conditional Use Permit (CUP) was submitted for the proposed mill is located on is zoned A-2 (General Agriculture) and the impacts are considered to be less than significant.	d project. The	portion of the parcel t	hat the propos	ed olive oil
XII.	MIN	VERAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
	a)	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? a) The proposed olive oil mill will be located in an existing classified to be a regionally important mineral resource pe Classification <sup>3</sup> . No impacts are expected.				
	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) The proposed olive oil mill will be located in an existing an be classified as a regionally important mineral resource. Ther in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource or other land use plan and so no impacts are expected.	efore, it is not e	expected that the prop	osed project w	ould result
XIII.	NO	ISE Would the project result in:				
	a)	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? a) The proposed olive oil mill will be within an existing and per- farmed and maintained olive groves with the main source of n harvesting season which is between August and January. The lies along SR-86 which has daily and nightly traffic consisting it is expected that the project will not generate a substantial ter vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the	oise from the r surrounding la of passenger a emporary or pe	nill being the press us nd is active agriculture nd commercial vehicle rmanent increase in ar	ed to crush oli e and the projects of all types mbient noise le	ves during ct property Therefore, vels in the

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> California Department of Conservation - https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc

 Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department

 Page 21 of 33

		Detection	Potentially	Less Than	
		Potentially Significant	Significant Unless Mitigation	Significant	
		Impact (PSI)	Incorporated (PSUMI)	Impact (LTSI)	No Impac (NI)
	of other agencies. Additionally the project will be subject to co and with Imperial County Land Use Ordinance Division 7: Nois to be less than significant.			eneral Plan Noi	
b)	Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground- borne noise levels?			$\boxtimes$	
	b) The proposed olive oil mill will be located inside an existing excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise lo significant.				
c)	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?			$\boxtimes$	
	<ul> <li>c) The nearest airports are northeast in the City of Calipatria</li> <li>+/- 13 miles from the project. The project is not located with</li> <li>Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; therefore, it is not expect</li> <li>levels. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.</li> </ul>	hin either Comp	atibility Map accordi	ng to the Impe	rial County
PO	PULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:				
a)	Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				$\boxtimes$
	a) The proposed olive oil mill will be located within an existing or housing is proposed. Therefore, no impacts are expected.		netal structure and no	further land de	evelopment
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				$\boxtimes$
	b) The proposed olive oil mill is not expected to displace sul the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, as th agricultural land as well as open desert and SR-86. Therefore	e project is lo	cated on and surrou		
Pl	UBLIC SERVICES				
a)	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: a) The proposed olive oil mill located within an existing and p adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of ner physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other impacts are expected to be less than significant.	w or physically a which could ca	altered governmental use significant enviro	facilities, need nmental impac	for new or ts, in order
	1) Fire Protection?			$\boxtimes$	
	<ol> <li>The proposed olive oil mill located inside an existing and approval. Additionally, the applicant shall comply with Imp October 26, 2022. It is expected that compliance with the ICF less than significant.</li> </ol>	perial County F	ire Department requi	irements per le	etter dated

			Potentially		
		Potentially	Significant	Less Than	
		Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
		(PSI)	(PSUMI)	(LTSI)	(NI)
M					<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>
	2) Police Protection?			$\boxtimes$	
	2) The proposed olive oil mill located inside an existing and	permitted metal	structure is not expec		substantial
	adverse impact to police protection. Any impacts are expe				
			<u> </u>		
	3) Schools?				
	<ol> <li>The proposed olive oil mill located inside an existing and adverse impact to schools or require the construction of an</li> </ol>				
		,			••
	4) Parks?				$\boxtimes$
	4) The proposed olive oil mill located inside an existing and		structure would not re	sult in substant	tial adverse
	physical impacts to existing parks. No impacts are expected	d.			
	5) Other Bublic Eccilition?		<b>—</b>		
	5) Other Public Facilities? 5) The proposed olive oil mill located inside an existing an	ليا d permitted metal	L etructure is not ever		
	adverse physical impact any other public facility. Any impa				substantial
			to be leas than aight	ourr.	
XVI. <b>R</b> i	ECREATION				
a)	Would the project increase the use of the existing				
,	neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational		<b></b> 1		
	facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the				$\boxtimes$
	facility would occur or be accelerated?				
	a) The proposed olive oil mill located insides an existing and				
	in population that would increase use of neighborhood and r physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be acce				substantial
	physical deterioration of the facility would occur of be acce	ierateo. Therefor	e, no impacts are exp	ectea.	
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the				
	construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might			$\boxtimes$	
	have an adverse effect on the environment?				
	<li>b) The proposed olive oil mill located inside an existing and or require the construction or expansion of recreational factors.</li>				
	Any impacts would be expected to be less than significant.	cinica winch ning	Int nave all adveise e	fiect of the en	VII OIIIIIGIIL.
	···· / ···· ··························				
'II. <b>TR</b> /	ANSPORTATION Would the project:				
a)	Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing	_	_		_
	the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and			$\boxtimes$	
	pedestrian facilities?		weeksternet and the second		<b>n</b> :
	<ul> <li>a) The proposed olive oil mill will be located within an existi a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circula</li> </ul>				
	facilities. The current trucks being used to hall fruit off of				
	would no longer need to leave the site as processing wou				
	significant.			•	
L)					
b)	Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			$\bowtie$	
	b) The proposed olive oil mill to be located in an existing	and nermitted m	etal structure would	notentially redu	ico ovorali
	vehicle miles traveled by keeping the current truck traffic ha				
	the fruit would be on site. Therefore, it is expected that the				
	CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b). Any imp				
C)	Substantially increases hazards due to a geometric design				
9	feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or			$\boxtimes$	
	incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<b>L</b> ]		_	<u> </u>
		and a survey life of survey	tal atruatura ia in an	area of antiquit	ternal Calala
	c) The proposed olive oil mill will be located in an existing	and permitted me	etal structure is in an	area or agricul	tural fields



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Office of Historic Preservation http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/ListedResources/?view=county&criteria=13

			Potentially Significant Impact ( <b>PSI)</b>	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated <b>(PSUMI)</b>	Less Than Significant Impact <b>(LTSI)</b>	No Impact (NI)
= XIX.	UT	ILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:		(	(2.0.)	<u></u>
	a)	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? a) The proposed olive oil mill to be located within an exist relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastew gas, or telecommunications facilities. Any impacts would be	ater treatment	or storm-water draina		
	b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			$\boxtimes$	
		b) The parcel containing the project has an onsite reservoir a the existing and reasonably foreseeable future. In addition, th well as capture olive water from the olive pressing process fo reservoir. Any impacts are expected to be less than significa	ne project propo r irrigation and	oses to recycle water u	used to wash th	e olives as
	c)	<ul> <li>Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</li> <li>c) The proposed olive oil mill will be located in an existing a EHS has made no comments as to the need to increase or comments dated December 6, 2022, the septic system may colive mill shall be plumbed into the system. It is expected th less than significant.</li> </ul>	modify the car only be used fo	pacity of the septic sy r domestic waste and	ystem. Per EH I no waste wate	S' emailed er from the
	d)	<ul> <li>Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</li> <li>d) The proposed project will not generate solid waste in exc local infrastructure. The main waste from the proposed oliv utilize, recycle or compost as much of this waste as possi significant.</li> </ul>	ve oil mill is org	ganic in nature and th	ne project is pro	oposing to
	e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? e) The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and lo to solid waste. Impacts would be considered to be less than		t and reduction statut	es and regulation	ons related
XX.	WI	DFIRE				
lf	locat	ed in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high	gh fire hazard se	verity zones, would the	Project:	
	a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			$\boxtimes$	
		a) The proposed project site is not located in or near a mode Local Response Area according to the Fire Hazard Severity Z Forestry and Fire Protection. The applicant will need to comp letter dated October 26, 2022. Any impacts would be conside	ones in State R ly with the Impe	esponse Areas by the rial County Fire Depar	e California Dep	artment of
	b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				
		b) The proposed project will be located in an area that is ge areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zon				

		Potentially Significant Impact <b>(PSI)</b>	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact <b>(LTSI)</b>	No Impact (NI)
c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? c) The proposed project will be located adjacent to a priv required by the Imperial County Fire Department. Any impact				n would be
d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? d) The proposed project is located in an area that is gen impacted are agricultural fields and no people or structur	-			

instability, or drainage changes. Any impacts would be considered less than significant.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino,(1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors; (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; Protect the Historic Armador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

Revised 2009- CEQA Revised 2011- ICPDS Revised 2016 – ICPDS Revised 2017 – ICPDS Revised 2019 – ICPDS

	Potentially		
Potentially	Significant	Less Than	
Significant	Unless Mitigation	Significant	
Impact	Incorporated	Impact	No Impact
(PSI)	(PSUMI)	(LTSI)	(NI)

### SECTION 3 III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The following are Mandatory Findings of Significance in accordance with Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.

- a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below selfsustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, eliminate tribal cultural resources or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)
- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

#### IV. PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED

This section identifies those persons who prepared or contributed to preparation of this document. This section is prepared in accordance with Section 15129 of the CEQA Guidelines.

#### A. COUNTY OF IMPERIAL

- Jim Minnick, Director of Planning & Development Services
- Michael Abraham, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning & Development Services
- Diana Robinson, Planning Division Manager
- Derek Newland, Project Planner
- Imperial County Air Pollution Control District
- Department of Public Works
- Fire Department
- Ag Commissioner
- Environmental Health Services
- Sheriff's Office

#### **B. OTHER AGENCIES/ORGANIZATIONS**

- Imperial Irrigation District (IID)
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

(Written or oral comments received on the checklist prior to circulation)

#### V. REFERENCES

- 1. "County of Imperial General Plan EIR", prepared by Brian F. Mooney & Associates in 1993; and as Amended by County in 1996, 1998, 2001, 2003, 2006 & 2008, 2015, 2016.
- 2. Imperial County Important Farmland 2018 Map
- 3. Imperial County Williamson Act FY 2016/2017 Map

4. California Department of Conservation Earthquake Zone Map <a href="https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/">https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/</a>

5. Department of Conservation Tsunami Inundation Maps http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=tsunami

6. EnviroStor Database http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/

7. 1996 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan https://www.icpds.com/assets/hearings/airport-land-use-commission/aluc-compatibility-plan-1996-part-1.pdf

8. FEMA Flood Map Service Center https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=4895%20hovley%20rd.%2C%20brawley#searchresultsanchor

9. California Department of Conservation https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc

10. Office of Historic Preservation

http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/ListedResources/?view=county&criteria=13

#### VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION – County of Imperial

The following Negative Declaration is being circulated for public review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act Section 21091 and 21092 of the Public Resources Code.

Project Name: CaLEVOO, LLC.

Project Applicant: John F. "Rick" Benson

Project Location: 5880 Hwy 86, Westmorland, 92281

**Description of Project:** The applicant proposes to install an olive oil mill inside an existing and permitted metal structure for the purpose of producing olive oil from locally sourced olives from olive groves located on the project parcel and potentially from other growers within the County. The mill is proposed to operate during olive harvesting season which is August to January. The organic waste streams are proposed to be utilized on site, composted, or recycled in an effort to reach near zero offsite waste disposal. With olives being processed onsite, all current trucks used in the harvesting process will remain onsite with the exception of any offsite fruit being brought in for processing. The olive oil product will be taken off-site to retailers via passenger vehicles.

#### VII. FINDINGS

This is to advise that the County of Imperial, acting as the lead agency, has conducted an Initial Study to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environmental and is proposing this Negative Declaration based upon the following findings:



The Initial Study shows that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- The Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects but:
- (1) Proposals made or agreed to by the applicant before this proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration was released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur.
- (2) There is no substantial evidence before the agency that the project may have a significant effect on the environment.
- (3) Mitigation measures are required to ensure all potentially significant impacts are reduced to levels of insignificance.

A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

If adopted, the Negative Declaration means that an Environmental Impact Report will not be required. Reasons to support this finding are included in the attached Initial Study. The project file and all related documents are available for review at the County of Imperial, Planning & Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243 (442) 265-1736.

#### NOTICE

The public is invited to comment on the proposed Negative Declaration during the review period.

Date of Determination

Jim Minnick, Director of Planning & Development Services

The Applicant hereby acknowledges and accepts the results of the Environmental Evaluation Committee (EEC) and hereby agrees to implement all Mitigation Measures, if applicable, as outlined in the MMRP.

Applicant Signature

Date

# **SECTION 4**

Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department Page 31 of 33

#### VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)

# IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)

S:\AllUsers\APN\019\170\033\CUP22-0023\EEC\CUP22-0023\_IS22-0041 Initial Study.docx

# COMMENTS

ADMINISTRATION / TRAINING 1078 Dogwood Road Heber, CA 92249

> Administration Phone: (442) 265-6000 Fax: (760) 482-2427

**Training** Phone: (442) 265-6011

October 26, 2022

RE: Condition Use Permit 22-0023 Calevoo, LLC 5800 Hwy 86, Brawley CA 92227

Imperial County Fire Department would like to thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on CUP 22-0023 for Calevoo LLC, located at 5800 Hwy 86, Brawley CA 92227. Calevoo will be an olive mill to process olives into olive oil.

Imperial County Fire Department has the following comments and/or requirements.

- An approved water supply connected to a Draft Hydrant(s) connection as required by Imperial County Fire Department. Water supply and draft hydrant connections shall be accessible and supply of water shall be maintained at all times.
- Fire department access roads shall be a width of a least 20 feet and all weather surface capable of supporting fire apparatus. Fire department access roads will be provided with approved turn around approved by Imperial County Fire Department. Gates will be in accordance with the current adapted fire code and the facility will maintain a Knox Box/lock for access on site.
- Secondary access shall be required and shall be kept clear of vehicle congestion and other factors that could limit access.
- All storage and handling of flammable and combustible liquids shall be in accordance with the California Fire Code and all federal, state, and local regulations, codes, and ordinances.
- Compliance with all required sections of the fire code.

The project shall be in compliance at all times with requirements in the California Fire Code and local ordinances and requirements. Imperial County Fire Department shall conduct annual fire and life safety inspections

Imperial County Fire Department reserves the right to comment and request additional requirements pertaining to this project regarding fire and life safety measures, California Building and Fire Code, and National Fire Protection Association standards at a later time as we see necessary.

If you have any questions, please contact the Imperial County Fire Prevention Bureau at 442-265-3020 or 442-265-3021.

#### AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER



OPERATIONS/PREVENTION 2514 La Brucherie Road Imperial, CA 92251

> **Operations** Phone: (442) 265-3000 Fax: (760) 355-1482

**Prevention** Phone: (442) 265-3020
#### ADMINISTRATION / TRAINING 1078 Dogwood Road Heber, CA 92249

**Administration** Phone: (442) 265-6000 Fax: (760) 482-2427

**Training** Phone: (442) 265-6011



**OPERATIONS/PREVENTION** 

2514 La Brucherie Road Imperial, CA 92251

**Operations** Phone: (442) 265-3000 Fax: (760) 355-1482

**Prevention** Phone: (442) 265-3020

Sincerely Andrew Loper Lieutenant/Fire Prevention Specialist Imperial County Fire Department Fire Prevention Bureau

Robert Malek Deputy Chief Imperial County Fire Department Fire Prevention Bureau

## COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Miguel Figueroa County Executive Officer miguelfigueroa@co.imperial.ca.us www.co.imperial.ca.us



County Administration Center 940 Main Street, Suite 208 El Centro, CA 92243 Tel: 442-265-1001 Fax: 442-265-1010

October 26, 2022

TO:	Derek Newland, Planning and Development Services Department
FROM:	Rosa Lopez, Executive Office
SUBJECT:	Request for Comments – Calevoo, LLC (CUP22-0023/IS22-0041 - APN 019-170-033-000)

The County of Imperial Executive Office is responding to a request for comments Calevoo, LLC (APN 019-170-033-000) project. The Executive Office would like to inform the developer of conditions and responsibilities should the applicant seek a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The conditions commence prior to the approval of an initial grading permit and subsequently continue throughout the permitting process. This includes, but not limited to:

- Sales Tax Condition. The permittee is required to have a Construction Site Permit reflecting the project site address, allowing all eligible sales tax payments are allocated to the County of Imperial, Jurisdictional Code 13998. The permittee will provide the County of Imperial a copy of the CDTFA account number and sub-permit for its contractor and subcontractors (if any) related to the jobsite. Permittee shall provide in written verification to the County Executive Office that the necessary sales and use tax permits have been obtained, prior to the issuance of any grading permits.
- Construction/Material Budget: Prior to a grading permit, the permittee will provide the County Executive Office a construction materials budget: an official construction materials budget or detailed budget outlining the construction and materials cost for the processing facility on permittee letterhead.

Should there be any concerns and/or questions, do not hesitate to contact me.

"Establishing Direction. Creating Opportunity" AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER

www.iid.com



Since 1911

November 2, 2022

Mr. Derek Newland Planner II Planning & Development Services Department County of Imperial 801 Main Street El Centro, CA 92243

SUBJECT: Calevoo, LLC Olive Mill Project, CUP22-0023/IS22-0041

Dear Mr. Newland:

On October 21, 2022, the Imperial Irrigation District received a request for agency comments on Conditional Use Permit application No. 22-0023, Initial Study No. 22-0041, for an olive mill project. The applicant, Calevoo, LLC, proposes the construction and operation of an olive oil producing facility at 5800 Hwy. 86 in Brawley, CA (APN 019-170-033-000).

The IID has reviewed the application and has the following comments:

- 1. The site currently has electrical service feeding water pumps for irrigation. If the project requires an upgrade to the site's current electrical service, the applicant should be advised to contact Gabriel Ramirez, IID service planner, at (760) 339-9257 or e-mail Mr. Ramirez at <u>gramirez@iid.com</u> to initiate the customer service application process. In addition to submitting a formal application (available for download at the website <u>http://www.iid.com/home/showdocument?id=12923</u>), the applicant will be required to submit AutoCAD file of site plan, electrical plans, electrical panel size and panel location, operating voltage, electrical loads, project schedule, and the applicable fees, permits, easements and environmental compliance documentation pertaining to the provision of electrical service to the project. The applicant shall be responsible for all costs and mitigation measures related to providing new electrical service to the project.
- 2. Electrical capacity is limited in the project area. A circuit study may be required. Any system improvements or mitigation identified in the circuit study to enable the provision of electrical service to the project shall be the financial responsibility of the applicant.
- 3. IID water facilities that may be impacted include the Trifolium Extension and Trifolium Drain No. 17.

Derek Newland November 2, 2022 Page 2

- 4. To insure there are no impacts to IID water facilities, the project's engineering plans, including Imperial County-approved grading/drainage and fencing plans, are to be submitted to IID Water Department Engineering Services Section for review prior to final project design. IID WDES Section can be contacted at (760) 339-9265 for additional information.
- 5. Under the General Planning Narrative's Water Use Section, it states "the mill will use less than 2,000 gallons of filtered IID ditch water daily during 60-100 days of processing. That wash water will be made potable through a locally-acquired, standard multi-step process". The applicant should be advised to install a point-of-use potable water system that is permitted by Imperial County for their processing.
- 6. Given that employees will be working for 60 to 100 days per year at the proposed mill, to receive water from IID's raw water system the applicant must have water delivered by a state approved water provider as required by the State of California Safe Drinking Water Act. The project must be in compliance with state requirements in order to receive IID canal water.
- 7. The applicant may not use IID's canal or drain banks to access the project site.
- 8. For the project's proposed road access from Highway 86, crossing over IID's Trifolium Extension, IID Encroachment permits will be required.
- 9. Any construction or operation on IID property or within its existing and proposed right of way or easements including but not limited to: surface improvements such as proposed new streets, driveways, parking lots, landscape; and all water, sewer, storm water, or any other above ground or underground utilities; will require an encroachment permit, or encroachment agreement (depending on the circumstances). A copy of the IID encroachment permit application and instructions for its completion are available at <a href="https://www.iid.com/about-iid/department-directory/real-estate">https://www.iid.com/about-iid/department-directory/real-estate</a>. The IID Real Estate Section should be contacted at (760) 339-9239 for additional information regarding encroachment permits or agreements. No foundations or buildings will be allowed within IID's right of way.
- 10. In addition to IID's recorded easements, IID claims, at a minimum, a prescriptive right of way to the toe of slope of all existing canals and drains. Where space is limited and depending upon the specifics of adjacent modifications, the IID may claim additional secondary easements/prescriptive rights of ways to ensure operation and maintenance of IID's facilities can be maintained and are not impacted and if impacted mitigated. Thus, IID should be consulted prior to the installation of any facilities to mitigate or avoid impacts to IID's facilities.

Derek Newland November 2, 2022 Page 3

11. Any new, relocated, modified or reconstructed IID facilities required for and by the project (which can include but is not limited to electrical utility substations, electrical transmission and distribution lines, water deliveries, canals, drains, etc.) need to be included as part of the project's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and/or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation, environmental impact analysis and mitigation. Failure to do so will result in postponement of any construction and/or modification of IID facilities until such time as the environmental documentation is amended and environmental impacts are fully analyzed. Any and all mitigation necessary as a result of the construction, relocation and/or upgrade of IID facilities is the responsibility of the project proponent.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 760-482-3609 or at <u>dvargas@iid.com</u>. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this matter.

Respectfully,

**Donald Vargas** 

Compliance Administrator II

Enrique B. Martinez – General Manager Mike Pacheco – Manager, Water Dept. Jamie Asbury – Manager, Energy Dept. Constance Bergmark – Deputy Mgr. Energy Dept. Geoffrey Holbrook –General Counsel Michael P. Kemp – Superintendent, Regulatory & Environmental Compliance Laura Cervantes. – Supervisor, Real Estate Jessica Humes – Environmental Project Mgr. Sr., Water Dept.

## **Derek Newland**

From: Sent: To: Subject: Derek Newland Tuesday, December 6, 2022 3:05 PM ICPDSCommentLetters; Jorge Perez FW: CUP22-0023/IS22-0041 Request for Comments

Thank you Jorge.

Derek Newland Planner II County of Imperial Planning and Development Services <u>dereknewland@co.imperial.ca.us</u> (442) 265-1736

From: Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us> Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 3:02 PM To: Derek Newland <DerekNewland@co.imperial.ca.us> Subject: RE: CUP22-0023/IS22-0041 Request for Comments

Hi Derek,

Based on the project description, DEH has the following comments:

- 1. Only domestic waste from on-site restrooms shall be plumbed into the on-site septic system.
- 2. Applicant shall verify the discharge of the olive wash water and olive water with the Colorado River Basin Regional Board. This water shall not be plumbed into the septic system.
- 3. Based on the project description, it appears the olive oil will be distributed to retailers. However, if a retail space is opened up on-site, the applicant shall contact our agency to obtain a retail food facility permit. Additional permitting requirements may be required.

If you or the applicant have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards, Jorge A. Perez Imperial County Division of Environmental Health P: 442-265-1888 – C: 760-427-1190

From: Aimee Trujillo <<u>aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us</u>> Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 2:05 PM

To: Carlos Ortiz <<u>CarlosOrtiz@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Sandra Mendivil <<u>SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Jolene Dessert <<u>JoleneDessert@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Margo Sanchez <<u>MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Ana L Gomez <<u>analgomez@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Belen Leon <<u>BelenLeon@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Monica Soucier <<u>MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Jesus Ramirez <<u>JesusRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Eric Havens <<u>EricHavens@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Ryan Kelley <<u>RyanKelley@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Rosa Lopez <<u>RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Vanessa Ramirez <<u>VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Jeff Lamoure <<u>JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Alphonso Andrade <<u>AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Jorge Perez

<JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Mario Salinas <<u>MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Robert Menvielle

<RobertMenvielle@co.imperial.ca.us>; Alfredo Estrada Jr <AlfredoEstradaJr@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Malek
<RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us>; Andrew Loper <AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us>; Guillermo Mendoza
<GuillermoMendoza@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Gay <JohnGay@co.imperial.ca.us>; Guillermo Mendoza
<GuillermoMendoza@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Gay <JohnGay@co.imperial.ca.us>; RKelley@icso.org;
rbenavidez@icso.org; Scott Sheppeard <scottsheppeard@icso.org>; Ray Loera - Sheriff <rloera@icso.org>; Manuel
Deleon <mdeleon@icso.org>; dvargas@iid.com; maurice.Eaton@dot.ca.gov; kimberly.dodson@dot.ca.gov;
roger.sanchez-rangel@dot.ca.gov; Marcus Cuero <marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov>; jmesa@campo-nsn.gov;
historicpreservation@quechantribe.com; Jordan D. Joaquin <tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com>;
thomas.tortez@torresmartinez-nsn.gov; joseph.mirelez@torresmartinez-nsn.gov
Cc: Jim Minnick <JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us>; Derek Newland <DerekNewland@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo
<aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Allison Galindo <alisongalindo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Maria Scoville</a>
<aimeetrujill@co.imperial.ca.us>; Melina Rizo <melinarizo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Soto
<RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us>
Subject: CUP22-0023/IS22-0041 Request for Comments

Good Afternoon,

Please see attached Request for Comments packet for CUP22-0023/IS22-0041, APN 019-170-033 {5800 Hwy 86, Brawley, CA 92227}

Comments are due by November 7th at 5:00PM.

In an effort to increase the efficiency at which information is distributed and reduce paper usage, the Request for Comments packet is being sent to you via this email.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Derek Newland at (442) 265-1736, or submit your comment letters to ICPDScommentletters@co.imperial.ca.us.

Thank you,

## Aímee Trujíllo

Office Assistant III Imperial County Planning & Development Services 801 Main Street El Centro, CA 92243 (442) 265-1736 (442) 265-1735 (Fax) aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us



## **Derek Newland**

From:	Lecourtois, Charlie@DOT <charlie.lecourtois@dot.ca.gov></charlie.lecourtois@dot.ca.gov>
Sent:	Tuesday, December 6, 2022 10:57 AM
То:	Derek Newland
Cc:	Eaton, Maurice A@DOT
Subject:	RE: IMP- SR-86 SR-78FW: CUP22-0023/IS22-0041 Request for Comments

CAUTION: This email originated outside our organization; please use caution. Good Morning Derek,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Request for Comments packet for CUP22-0023/IS22-0041 (Desert Milling Inc Addition), located near SR-86. At this time Caltrans does not have any comments.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. Thank you!

Respectfully,

## Charlie Lecourtois

Associate Transportation Planner Caltrans District 11 LDR Branch 4050 Taylor Street., MS 240 San Diego, CA 92110 Charlie.Lecourtois@DOT.ca.gov



From: Derek Newland <DerekNewland@co.imperial.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 2:13 PM
To: Lecourtois, Charlie@DOT <Charlie.Lecourtois@dot.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: IMP- SR-86 SR-78--FW: CUP22-0023/IS22-0041 Request for Comments

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Good afternoon Charlie, Just checking in on if you have comments for this project.

Thank you,

Derek Newland Planner II County of Imperial Planning and Development Services <u>dereknewland@co.imperial.ca.us</u> (442) 265-1736 From: Derek Newland
Sent: Wednesday, November 2, 2022 4:20 PM
To: Lecourtois, Charlie@DOT <<u>Charlie.Lecourtois@dot.ca.gov</u>>; Aimee Trujillo <<u>aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>
Cc: Eaton, Maurice A@DOT <<u>maurice.eaton@dot.ca.gov</u>>; Diana Robinson <<u>DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>
Subject: RE: IMP- SR-86 SR-78--FW: CUP22-0023/IS22-0041 Request for Comments

## Good afternoon Charlie,

This file seems to be much clearer. If it is still not adequate please let me know.

Thank you,

Derek Newland Planner II County of Imperial Planning and Development Services <u>dereknewland@co.imperial.ca.us</u> (442) 265-1736

From: Lecourtois, Charlie@DOT <<u>Charlie.Lecourtois@dot.ca.gov</u>>
Sent: Tuesday, November 1, 2022 4:31 PM
To: Derek Newland <<u>DerekNewland@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Aimee Trujillo <<u>aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>
Cc: Eaton, Maurice A@DOT <<u>maurice.eaton@dot.ca.gov</u>>; Diana Robinson <<u>DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>
Subject: FW: IMP- SR-86 SR-78--FW: CUP22-0023/IS22-0041 Request for Comments

**CAUTION:** This email originated outside our organization; please use caution.

Good Afternoon Derek and Aimee,

I hope this email finds all of you well. Caltrans District 11 – Local Development Review Branch appreciates the opportunity to review the Desert Milling Inc Addition Project located near SR-86. After further review and analysis of the submittal package would you please provide the original pdf version of the Site Plan (Sheet 1 – BP 61139) that came in the October 21, 2022, Request for Comment Package? The scanned copy in the Request for Comment Package is difficult to analyze and read because the project information is blurry.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this email.

Respectfully,

## Charlie Lecourtois

Associate Transportation Planner Caltrans District 11 LDR Branch 4050 Taylor Street., MS 240 San Diego, CA 92110 <u>Charlie.Lecourtois@DOT.ca.gov</u> Cell: (619) 985-4766



2

From: Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>

Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 2:05 PM

To: Carlos Ortiz < CarlosOrtiz@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sandra Mendivil < SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jolene Dessert <JoleneDessert@co.imperial.ca.us>; Margo Sanchez <MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ana L Gomez <a>analgomez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Belen Leon <<u>BelenLeon@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Monica Soucier</a> <MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jesus Ramirez <JesusRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Eric Havens <EricHavens@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ryan Kelley <RyanKelley@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Lopez <RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Vanessa Ramirez <VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jeff Lamoure <JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us>; Alphonso Andrade <AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Mario Salinas <MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Menvielle <<u>RobertMenvielle@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Alfredo Estrada Jr <<u>AlfredoEstradaJr@co.imperial.ca.us</u>>; Robert Malek <RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us>; Andrew Loper <AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us>; Guillermo Mendoza <GuillermoMendoza@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Gay <JohnGay@co.imperial.ca.us>; RKelley@icso.org; rbenavidez@icso.org; Scott Sheppeard <scottsheppeard@icso.org>; Ray Loera - Sheriff <rloera@icso.org>; Manuel Deleon <mdeleon@icso.org>; dvargas@iid.com; Eaton, Maurice A@DOT <maurice.eaton@dot.ca.gov>; Dodson, Kimberly@DOT <kimberly.dodson@dot.ca.gov>; Sanchez Rangel, Rogelio@DOT <roger.sanchez-rangel@dot.ca.gov>; Marcus Cuero <marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov>; jmesa@campo-nsn.gov; historicpreservation@quechantribe.com; Jordan D. Joaquin <tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com>; thomas.tortez@torresmartinez-nsn.gov; joseph.mirelez@torresmartinez-nsn.gov Cc: Jim Minnick < Jim Minnick@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham < Michael Abraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Diana Robinson <DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Derek Newland <DerekNewland@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Allison Galindo <allisongalindo@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Robb <JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us>; Laryssa Alvarado <laryssaalvarado@co.imperial.ca.us>; Maria Scoville <mariascoville@co.imperial.ca.us>; Melina Rizo <melinarizo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Soto <RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us> Subject: CUP22-0023/IS22-0041 Request for Comments

EXTERNAL EMAIL. Links/attachments may not be safe.

Good Afternoon,

Please see attached Request for Comments packet for CUP22-0023/IS22-0041, APN 019-170-033 {5800 Hwy 86, Brawley, CA 92227}

Comments are due by **November 7th at 5:00PM**.

In an effort to increase the efficiency at which information is distributed and reduce paper usage, the Request for Comments packet is being sent to you via this email.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Derek Newland at (442) 265-1736, or submit your comment letters to ICPDScommentletters@co.imperial.ca.us.

Thank you,

Aímee Trujíllo

Office Assistant III Imperial County Planning & Development Services 801 Main Street El Centro, CA 92243 (442) 265-1736 (442) 265-1735 (Fax) aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us



## **Derek Newland**

From:	Quechan Historic Preservation <historicpreservation@quechantribe.com></historicpreservation@quechantribe.com>
Sent:	Monday, October 24, 2022 8:32 AM
То:	Aimee Trujillo
Cc:	Derek Newland
Subject:	RE: AB52 Letter for CUP22-0023

**CAUTION:** This email originated outside our organization; please use caution.

This email is to inform you that we do not wish to comment on this project.

From: Aimee Trujillo [mailto:aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us]
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2022 3:10 PM
To: Jordan D. Joaquin; H. Jill McCormick
Cc: Michael Abraham; Jim Minnick; Diana Robinson; Derek Newland; Aimee Trujillo; Allison Galindo; John Robb; Laryssa Alvarado; Maria Scoville; Melina Rizo; Rosa Soto
Subject: AB52 Letter for CUP22-0023

Good afternoon,

Attached hereto please find the AB52 letter for CUP22-0023/ APN 019-170-033

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Derek Newland at (442) 265-1736, or by email at dereknewland@co.imperial.ca.us

Thank you,

## Aímee Trujíllo

Office Assistant III Imperial County Planning & Development Services 801 Main Street El Centro, CA 92243 (442) 265-1736 (442) 265-1735 (Fax) aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us





Virus-free.www.avast.com

## **APPLICATION**

.

# CONDITIONAL USE PERHIT I.C. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPT. 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243 (760) 482-4236

- APPLICANT MUST COMPLETE ALL NUMBERED (black) SPACES - Please type or print -

EMAIL ADDRESS rick@calevoo.com	EMAIL ADDRESS rick@calevoo.com, cg4557600@gmail.com								
ZIP CODE 92014	PHONE NUMBER 415-385-5742								
EMAIL ADDRESS rick@calevoo.com	EMAIL ADDRESS rick@calevoo.com								
ZIP CODE 92014	PHONE NUMBER 415-385-5742								
EMAIL ADDRESS kesiskhon@yahoo	EMAIL ADDRESS kesiskhon@yahoo.com								
ZIP CODE 92011	PHONE NUMBER 858-3951-1134								
SIZE OF PROPERTY (in ad 400.40 AC									
7. PROPERTY (site) ADDRESS 5880 HWY 86, WESTMORLAND, CA 92281									
8. GENERAL LOCATION (i.e. city, town, cross street) WESTMORLAND									
LEGAL DESCRIPTION PAR B LLA 264 ALSO BEING POR E2 & POR E2 AND POR SW4 OF AOXC AG ECON									
UNIT / ORCHARD / CONCRETE DITCH, 400.40 AC									
	rick@calevoo.com ZIP CODE 92014 EMAIL ADDRESS rick@calevoo.com ZIP CODE 92014 EMAIL ADDRESS kesiskhon@yahoo ZIP CODE 92011 SIZE OF PROPERTY (in a 400.40 AC	rick@calevoo.com, cg4557600@gm         ZIP CODE       PHONE NUMBER         92014       415-385-5742         EMAIL ADDRESS       rick@calevoo.com         ZIP CODE       PHONE NUMBER         92014       415-385-5742         EMAIL ADDRESS       kesiskhon@yahoo.com         ZIP CODE       PHONE NUMBER         92011       858-3951-1134         SIZE OF PROPERTY (in acres or square foot)       400.40 AC							

## PLEASE PROVIDE CLEAR & CONCISE INFORMATION (ATTACH SEPARATE SHEET IF NEEDED)

10. DESCRIBE PROPOSED USE OF PROPERTY (list and describe in detail) MILLING, STORAGE AND BOTTLING OF OLIVE OIL									
CURING AND FOOD GRADE PACKAGING FOR WHOLE OLIVES . See Attached									
-									
11. DESCRIBE CURRENT USE OF PROPERTY OLIVE GROVE & HARVESTING									
12. DESCRIBE PROPOSED SEWER SYSTEM	PORTABLE	PORTABLE TOILET, ADA, MENS & WOMENS							
13. DESCRIBE PROPOSED WATER SYSTEM		R, CISTERN	1(S)	WITH FI	LTERING STATION				
14. DESCRIBE PROPOSED FIRE PROTECTION									
15. IS PROPOSED USE A BUSINESS? IF YES, HOW MANY EMPLOYEES WILL BE AT THIS SITE?									
I / WE THE LEGAL OWNER (S) OF THE ABOVE CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION SHOWN OR STAT	I / WE THE LEGAL OWNER (S) OF THE ABOVE PROPERTY CERTIENT THAT THE INFORMATION SHOWN OR STATED HEREIN								
IS TRUE AND CORRECT.	LD THEREIN		A.	SITE PLA	AN .				
JOHN BENSON 9-21-22			B.	FEE					
Print Name Date									
Signature	£ 0.0		C.	OTHER					
Rrint Name Date	5.22		D.	OTHER					
Cecilia Vonel			_						
Signature				_					
APPLICATION RECEIVED BY:	-	DATE	_		REVIEW / APPROVAL BY OTHER DEPT'S required.				
APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE BY:		DATE	_			CUP #			
APPLICATION REJECTED BY:		DATE			<b>A</b> P. C. D.				
TENTATIVE HEARING BY:		DATE			0. E. S.	22-00			
	DENIED	DATE	-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	RIVI-			
			-						

Desert Milling, Inc. John F. "Rick" Benson, CEO Mill: 5880 Hwy 86, Westmorland, CA 92281 Mill: 760-925-8500 Mail: PO Box 235, Brawley, CA 92227 Email: rick@desertmilling.com

#### **General Planning Narrative for New Olive Mill:**

Production of olives for olive oil is a reviving industry for the Imperial Valley that takes advantage of its weather and varied soils while using much less water than traditional valley crops. According to early county crop reports from the mid-1910s, there were almost 2,000 acres of olives over 100 years ago in the Imperial Valley but labor constraints during World War I led to their removal. Fast forward to modern machine harvested olives and a growing number of farmers are considering the crop as a high-income, low water use crop alternative. Today's 600 acres are expected to grow to many thousands of acres in the next few years. It is possible that olives could displace crops like Bermuda grass on weak soils, saving 60% of the current water use while also generating five to ten times the revenue per acre farmed and more than doubling real estate property taxes. This could potentially transform the valley economy, as this new crop is permanent and can grow on weaker soils, generating jobs and taxes, while also increasing the revenues and profits of local farmers. Just 100,000 acres of olives would use save over 300,000 acre-feet of water compared to current forage crops while producing 5-10 times the local economic impact. However, local farmers won't plant more acreage without a local buyer, and Desert Milling, Inc.'s new olive mill is planning on being that local buyer that helps relaunch an industry in Imperial Valley.

Desert Milling, Inc. is a Brawley-based farming company that was the owner of Imperial Valley's first modern olive mill in 2013. Its Alfa Laval micro mill ran inside a former barn off Hovley Road, and produced excellent award-winning olive oil. However, DMI sold that mill in 2015 as the mini mill was too small to be run economically, only processing a 1/4 ton per hour or 2 tons a day. DMI subsequently has focused on being an olive farm manager that consults on roughly 550 acres of the Imperial Valley's now mature olive orchards. After years of frustration using almost every other commercial olive mill within 500 miles (including mills in Stockton, Dinuba, Sanger, Temecula and Phoenix), DMI and its local farmers have decided to build an olive mill in Imperial County to process local fruit locally, saving on trucking costs while simultaneously creating better quality.

DMI harvests olives annually from August to January, as the different varieties mature. Its focus will be on the quality of its product, which means less than twelve hours pass from local harvest to milling completion in order to produce better tasting, fresher and authentic Extra Virgin Olive Oil (EVOO). In addition, Desert Milling will eventually cure table olives on site into food products once it receives its CDFA Food Processing Plant registration, which is in process. It is also a possibility that with the acquisition of a few additional pieces of equipment, the olive mill could be also used to process avocados into Extra Virgin Avocado Oil for local San Diego farmers from January through October, creating additional jobs from new revenue when olives are out of season.

DMI's planned 3,000 square foot building will house a Pieralisi olive mill with a nominal capacity to process up to 4 tons an hour (16 times faster than its original micro mill), although best quality is achieved at 60% nominal capacity. Therefore, DMI expects to process at most 20 tons a day during peak harvest (or one full truckload per day). The majority of seasonal milling tonnage will be from

the 210-acre orchard on site, so most fruit will never leave the ranch. Total annual volume will max out in heavy crop years between 1,000 and 1,500 tons, generating up to 30,000 gallons of EVOO. The oil will be stored inside the climate-controlled mill building in food grade storage containers until bottled and shipped to customers. DMI expects the entire mill and bottling system to need no more than one employee to operate, although two or three employees will make the processing more efficient. There will be a unisex bathroom and break area inside the building, as well as a shaded outside air-conditioned office for employee comfort.

#### Water Use:

The mill will use less than 2,000 gallons of filtered IID ditch water daily during 60-100 days of processing, mostly for washing raw fruit before milling (using less than one acre-foot of water annually). That wash water will be made potable through a locally-acquired, standard multi-step process, including sand media filtration, UV light filtering, chlorination in a 3,000 gallon fresh water tank and carbon filtering into a pressure tank.

### Waste Streams:

At peak milling, 20 tons of fresh olives a day will be converted into 2-4 tons of extra virgin olive oil (10-20% by weight) and between 16-18 tons of waste byproducts (80-90% by weight). However, the goal of the mill is to have zero waste leave the ranch because all of the waste streams have some value and can be used on site. Therefore, waste streams will either be retained on site for future sale, recycled on site or composted and returned to the soil for its fertilizer value. The waste streams of the mill include:

- 1. Dirty olive wash water
  - a. between 1,500 and 2,000 gallons a day
  - b. used to irrigate 210-acre on site orchard
- 2. Olive water
  - a. ~50-60% of weight of raw fruit, generating ~10-12 tons or ~2,500-3,000 gallons
  - b. 100% captured for on-farm use for dust control in 3,000-gallon tank
- 3. Olive pumice (includes both fruit paste and pits)
  - a.  $\sim$ 25-40% of fruit by weight, equaling 5-8 tons daily.
  - b. Post milling, olive pumice will be pitted, separating pumice into paste and pits.
  - 3a. Olive paste
    - a.  $\sim 20-35\%$  of fruit by weight, equaling 4-7 tons daily.
    - b. Paste without pits is edible with high nutritional value but is exceedingly bitter. Those bitterness compounds are anti-oxidants, giving paste feed value.
    - c. Paste will be either processed into food products, sold to cattle feeders or composted for its nutritional value and spread back on the olive orchards
  - 3b. Olive pits
    - a.  $\sim 10-15\%$  of raw fruit, equaling 2-3 tons a day of very hard woody pits
    - b. usable like gravel on-farm for road material or burned on site for hot water boiler
    - c. DMI is also considering packaging pits for sale as barbecue smoker chips

## DESERT MILLING, INC.

January 19, 2023

Attn: Derek Newland Imperial County Planning

#### RE: CUP 22-0023/IS 22-0041 Expected Truck Usage & Current Dust Control

To Whom It May Concern:

Desert Milling's mill building is surrounded by CalEVOO's 200+ acres of actively farmed olives. Regarding county traffic, the new mill will dramatically reduce outside county road traffic and have a net positive impact on reducing local and regional truck traffic. First, all local farm truck traffic that once left the ranch with 800+ tons of fruit each season will now stay on site, as freshly harvested fruit will be delivered to the onsite mill instead of a cooler in Brawley or all the way to Modesto. This should reduce total county road truck trips by 100+ trips a year. Second, all fruit from other local farmers will continue to travel the county's roads but only one 20 ton or less truckload is expected per harvest day and those trips will be shortened from 500+ miles to 20 miles or less. The mill expects to receive fruit from other county growers less than 60 days a year. Those trucks are already using county roads, so that represents zero change in volume for local county roads, but a massive reduction in total regional miles traveled for the fruit. In total, this new mill will reduce total annual county road truck trips by at least 100 trips.

Regarding dust control, all olives are wind pollinated, with limited pollination from normal fruit tree pollinators like bees. To prevent road dust from overwhelming the olive pollen during bloom, the farm began using daily road watering during bloom from January to May to suppress dust on the farm's roads two years ago. That has since been expanded to year-round dust suppression, benefiting tree and fruit health. Desert Milling expects 100% of its processing fruit water to be reused on the local farm's dirt roads to continue to suppress dust, as it is a dust control quality upgrade versus ditch water. The mill expects the regular use of olive fruit water for dust control to have a large cumulative dust reduction benefit over many years.

Sincerely,

John F. "Rick" Benson, CEO Desert Milling, Inc.

MILL: 5880 Hwy 86 MAIL: P.O. Box 235

WESTMORLAND, CA 92281 BRAWLEY, CA 92227 TEL 415-385-5742

