

PROJECT REPORT

TO: Environmental Evaluation Committee

AGENDA DATE October 13, 2022

FROM: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

AGENDA TIME 1:30pm / No. 3

PM #02502 / IS #22-0029

PROJECT TYPE: Legacy Capital Solutions, LLC SUPERVISORY DISTRICT #2

LOCATION: 590 Kubler Road APN: 052-180-042-000

Calexico, CA 92231 PARCEL SIZE: +/- 191.08 acre

GENERAL PLAN (existing) Agriculture GENERAL PLAN (proposed) NA

ZONE (existing) A-2-R (General Agriculture/Rural) ZONE (proposed) N/A

GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS

☒ CONSISTENT

☐ INCONSISTENT

☐ MAY BE/FINDINGS

PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION:

HEARING DATE: _____

☐ APPROVED

☐ DENIED

☐ OTHER

PLANNING DIRECTORS DECISION:

HEARING DATE: N/A

☐ APPROVED

☐ DENIED

☐ OTHER

ENVIROMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE DECISION:

HEARING DATE: 10/13/2022

INITIAL STUDY: #22-0029

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION

☐ MITIGATED NEG. DECLARATION

☐ EIR

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

IID, Quechan Indian Tribes

REQUESTED ACTION:

(See Attached)

Planning & Development Services
801 MAIN ST., EL CENTRO, CA 92243 442-265-1736
(Jim Minnick, Director)

MA

MAVAGIS\AllUsers\APN\052\180\042\PM02502\IEEC\IS22-0029 PROJECT REP.docx

- ☐ **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**
☐ **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

*Initial Study & Environmental Analysis
For:*

**Parcel Map #02502
Initial Study #22-0029
Legacy Capital Solutions, LLC**



Prepared By:

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

October 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>SECTION 1</u>	
I. INTRODUCTION	3
<u>SECTION 2</u>	
II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	8
PROJECT SUMMARY	10
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	13
I. AESTHETICS	14
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	14
III. AIR QUALITY	15
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	15
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	16
VI. ENERGY	16
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	17
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION	18
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	18
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	19
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING	20
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES	20
XIII. NOISE	20
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING	21
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES	21
XVI. RECREATION	22
XVII. TRANSPORTATION	22
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	22
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	22
XX. WILDFIRE	22
<u>SECTION 3</u>	
III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	25
IV. PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED	26
V. REFERENCES	27
VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION - COUNTY OF IMPERIAL	28
VII. FINDINGS	29
<u>SECTION 4</u>	
VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)	30
IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) (IF ANY)	31

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

This document is a ☐ policy-level, ☒ project level Initial Study for evaluation of potential environmental impacts resulting with the proposed Parcel Map #02502, where the intent of the project is to separate the existing house from farmland. For purposes of this document, the abovementioned project will be called the "proposed application".

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 Guidelines for Implementing CEQA, 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 ENVIRONMENTAL 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. Tiered Documents

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:** Parcel Map #02502 for Legacy Capital Solutions, LLC / Initial Study #22-0029
2. **Lead Agency:** Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Victoria Escalante Planner I, (442) 265-1736, ext. 1750
4. **Address:** 801 Main Street, El Centro CA, 92243
5. **E-mail:** victoriaescalante@co.imperial.ca.us
6. **Project location:** The project site ("site") is located at 590 Kubler Road, Calexico, CA. The parcel is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 052-180-042-000 and is legally described as Por E2 Sec1 17-13 179.24 AC N & W of Rds & W & S of Riv Bluff West ½, SE ¼, Section 1, T17S, R13E, SBBM.
7. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Legacy Capital Solutions, LLC
8632 Tamarack Village Suite 119
Woodbury, MN 55125
8. **General Plan designation:** Agriculture
9. **Zoning:** A-2-R (General Agriculture/Rural)
10. **Description of project:** The applicant intends to subdivide parcel to separate the existing house from farmland. The current size of the property is approximately 191.08 acres and the project consists of splitting the parcel into two lots, one being 184.41 acres and the other being 6.67 acres approximately.
11. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project site is surrounded by agricultural fields, parcels with houses and farmland, and undeveloped fallow land.
12. **Other public agencies whose approval is required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): A) 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 confidentiality, etc.?**

Quechan Indian Tribe provided comment, on August 3, 2022 stating they had no comments or concerns regarding project impact on tribal cultural resources. No other comments were received.

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.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 NEGATIVE DECLARATION 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. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ Found that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 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

EEC VOTES	YES	NO	ABSENT
PUBLIC WORKS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SVCS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OFFICE EMERGENCY SERVICES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
APCD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
AG	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SHERIFF DEPARTMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ICPDS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Jim Minnick, Director of Planning/EEC Chairman

Date:

PROJECT SUMMARY

- A. **Project Location:** The project site ("site") is located at 590 Kubler Rd Road, Calexico. The parcel is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 052-180-042-000 and is legally described as Por E2 Sec1 17-13 179.24 AC N & W of Rds & W & S of Riv Bluff West ½, SE ¼, Section 1, T17S, R13E, SBBM.
- B. **Project Summary:** The applicant intends to subdivide the parcel to separate the existing house from farmland. The current size of the property is approximately 191.08 acres and the project consists of splitting the parcel into two lots, one being 184.41 acres and the other being 6.67 acres approximately.
- C. **Environmental Setting:** The project site is surrounded by agricultural fields, parcels with houses and farmland, and undeveloped fallow land.
- D. **Analysis:** The project site is designated as "Agriculture" and is zoned "A-2-R" (General Agriculture/Rural) per Zoning Map #28 under Title 9 Land Use Ordinance. The proposed subdivision would create two lots and one of them is being proposed below the minimum lot size within the A-2 Zone, which is 40 acres per Title 9 Division 5 Chapter 8 Section 90508.04. However, since the parcel meets the conditions under Lot Reduction Exception #1, the proposed subdivision is consistent with the General Plan. The existing house on the property were built prior to April 1, 1976, the subdivider agrees to convey and surrender development rights to the County and the project shows compliance with all other requirements in Title 9. The agricultural use shall continue to be the principal use.
- E. **General Plan Consistency:** As previously mentioned, since the project meets the conditions under Lot Reduction Exception #1 under the A-2 Zone (per Section 90508.04), it is consistent with Imperial County's Title 9 Land Use Ordinance Divisions 5, Zoning Areas Established and Division 8 Subdivision Ordinance. The project is also consistent with the existing land use designation of Agriculture, since the existing uses, agricultural and residential, are allowed.

Exhibit A Vicinity Map





Exhibit B Site Plan



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

I. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) | Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | a) The project site is not located near a scenic highway per the Imperial County Circulation and Scenic Highway Element¹. The roads surrounding the parcel do not meet the scenic highway criteria found on the California Scenic Highway Program²; therefore, no impacts are expected. | | | | |
| b) | Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | b) There are no scenic resources surrounding the project site; therefore, no impacts are expected. | | | | |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | c) The proposed project would not modify the existing visual character of the site nor its surroundings since it consists of a minor subdivision and no physical changes are being proposed; therefore, no impacts are expected. | | | | |
| d) | Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | d) The application does not include any proposals of new sources of light or glare; therefore, no impacts are expected. | | | | |

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. --Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) | Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | a) According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (2016), the project site is designated as "Farmland of Statewide Importance"³, there is no conversion of agricultural use to non-agricultural use being proposed; therefore, no impacts are expected. | | | | |
| b) | Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | b) The existing farming and residential uses are consistent with the A-2-R (General Agriculture/Rural) zone. In addition, the Williamson Act Contract expired and County of Imperial issued Non-Renewals; therefore, no impacts are expected. | | | | |
| c) | Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

¹ Imperial County General Plan Circulation and Scenic Highways Element, page 30

² Imperial County General Plan Circulation and Scenic Highways Element, pages 80-108

³ California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
c) The project is not within any forest land; therefore, no impacts related to the conversion of timberlands or forest land are expected.				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? d) As previously stated, the project site is not within or close to any forest land; therefore, no impacts would occur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? e) No changes are being proposed other than the minor subdivision to separate the existing house from farmland. No impacts are expected to occur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to the following determinations. Would the Project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
a) The project is not expected to cause any impacts to air quality since no changes are being proposed to the existing structures nor farmland. Future development, if any is subject to County agencies' review (i.e. Air Pollution Control District). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 standard?
b) Since no physical changes are being proposed, no impacts are expected to occur regarding increase of pollutant levels. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations?
c) The proposed project would not cause for the release of pollutants since no changes to the existing uses nor structures are being proposed; therefore, no impacts are being proposed. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?
d) No emissions are expected to impact a substantial number of people since the project consists of a minor subdivision and the parcels surrounding the project site are mostly agricultural fields; therefore, no impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

IV. BIOLOGICAL 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) After research, it was found that the project site is not within a designated sensitive habitat area, but is within the "Burrowing Owl Species Distribution Model" according to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element, Figure 2. The proposed project is not expected to have adverse impacts on any species or their habitats since the subdivision will not physically affect the environment and no development is being proposed. The applicant shall contact ICPDS prior to any future development; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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?
b) The project site is not near any type of wetland and is therefore not a riparian habitat. The parcel has been previously disturbed as it has been used for agricultural and residential purposes since at least 1960's. No impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
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 project site is surrounded by agricultural fields and no bodies of water; therefore, no impacts on wetlands are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 project site is not located in or near a body of water, so no fish or wildlife species could be affected by the subdivision; therefore, no impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resource, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? e) The proposed subdivision does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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) According to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element, the project is not within a designated sensitive habitat nor an agency-designated habitat area; therefore, no impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

V. **CULTURAL RESOURCES** *Would the project:*

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?
a) The project site is not within or near any "Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity" as per Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
b) It was found that the site location is not in or near any "Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity", nor within any Tribal Lands area according to the Tribal Lands in U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 Map⁴; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?
c) There are no known cemeteries on or surrounding the project site. Should the property be developed in the future, the applicant shall show compliance with California Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA §15064.5, and California Public Resources Code §5097.98. Less than significant impacts are expected to occur. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

VI. **ENERGY** *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) No consumption of energy is anticipated for this proposed subdivision. No impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?
b) No local or state plans regarding energy are anticipated; therefore, no impacts are expected to occur. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

⁴ Tribal Lands in U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 Map

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

VII. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS** *Would the project:*

- a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving: ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- a) According to the Department of Conservation's Regulatory Maps⁵, the project site is not in a fault zone. Being that Imperial County is classified as a Seismic Category D by the latest California Building Code, any future development would require incorporation to the most stringent earthquake resistant measures. Compliance with said codes and County agencies' approvals would bring potential impacts to less than significant levels at the time of future development.**
- 1) 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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- 1) As previously mentioned, the project is not located in a fault zone and the scope of work does not include any structures nor earthmoving activities. Compliance with applicable County agencies' requirements would bring any potential impacts to less than significant levels.**
- 2) Strong Seismic ground shaking? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- 2) The proposed subdivision will not expose people to seismic ground shaking since the site is not near a known fault. As previously mentioned, if any development were to be proposed in the future, it shall have to incorporate the appropriate design measures. Less than significant impacts are expected to occur.**
- 3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and seiche/tsunami? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- 3) Less than significant impacts are expected regarding ground failure, liquefaction and/or seiche/tsunami since the project site is not near a body of water of the characteristics that could cause those impacts.**
- 4) Landslides? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- 4) The site is not located within a landslide hazard zone; therefore, no impacts are expected to occur.**
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- b) The proposed project does not include any earthmoving activities that could cause soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Should any future development occur, it shall be done in accordance with local and state standards; doing so will bring potential impacts to less than significant levels.**
- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- c) The project site is not known to be located on unstable geological units or soil, and the conditions for lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction and collapse are not present; therefore, no impacts are expected.**
- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the latest Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risk to life or property? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- d) The proposed subdivision will not cause physical changes in the environment. The applicant shall confirm with ICPDS Building Division Manager whether a Soils Report will be required prior to future development plans, if any. Compliance with County agencies' requirements will bring project impacts to less than significant levels.**
- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- e) No septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems are being proposed as part of the scope of work for this subdivision application and no structures are being proposed that would increase the capacity of the existing septic system; therefore, no impacts are expected.**

⁵ Department of Conservation Regulatory Maps

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? f) The site has been previously disturbed for farming and residential purposes, and no paleontological resources have been found. In addition, no physical changes to the environment are being proposed; therefore, no impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VIII. **GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION** *Would the project:*

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
a) The proposed project consists of a minor subdivision to separate existing house from farmland and would not cause physical changes to the environment, so there are no impacts regarding greenhouse gas emissions. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan or policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?
b) The regulations under AB 32⁶ and the updated California Air Resources Board's AB 32 Scoping Plan do not include an applicable threshold for GHG emissions for a project with these characteristics⁷ since there would be no physical changes to the property. Any future development shall be reviewed by applicable County agencies and would be subject to their approval prior to construction. At this time, no impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

IX. **HAZARDS 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 project does not include any handling of hazardous materials and would therefore, cause no impacts or hazards to the public or the environment. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?
b) As previously mentioned, the project will not use or release any hazardous materials; therefore, no impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
c) No hazardous materials are being proposed in the project, and the project site is not within a quarter mile of an existing school; therefore, no impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?
d) Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) the DTSC EnviroStor Database⁸ to compile and update a list of hazardous waste and substances sites. After review, it was found that the project was not located under a listed hazardous and substances site nor is within a mile of such a site; therefore, no impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

⁶ Assembly Bill 32 Overview

⁷ CEQA AB 32 Scoping Plan

⁸ EnviroStor Database

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? e) The project site is not located near a public airport or a known private airport; therefore, no impacts are expected to occur.				
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? f) The proposed subdivision will not create any physical changes to the environment, alter any access points to the property or cause for a situation where an emergency plan would be required or altered; therefore, no impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? g) According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection "Fire and Resource Assessment Program Map"⁹ for Imperial County, the project site is not within a fire hazard zone; therefore, no impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

X. HYDROLOGY 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 project does not include water discharge and will not degrade surface or ground water quality since no development is being proposed. Less than significant impacts are expected regarding water quality. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?
b) No groundwater will be impacted by the proposed separation of farmland from the existing house. Less than significant impacts are anticipated. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 project site is not near a stream or river; therefore, no impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
(i) Since no physical changes are being proposed on the environment, no impacts is expected to occur. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;
(ii) No development is being proposed, so surface runoff is not anticipated. No impacts are expected to occur. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (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;
(iii) No impacts are expected to occur regarding the existing stormwater drainage system capacity since no portion of the scope of work involves water and no future development is being proposed. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (iv) impede or redirect flood flows?
(iv) The existing drainage system will not be impacted by the proposed subdivision since no development is being proposed. No impacts are expected to occur. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

⁹ FRAP Fire Hazard Severity Zones

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? d) According to the California Emergency Management Agency and the Department of Conservation¹⁰, the project site is not within a Tsunami Inundation Area for Emergency Planning, and is not within a body of water; therefore, no impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (e)The site is currently developed with existing septic/wastewater system. The project does not intend to affect the existing system. The future construction of any new wastewater system requires the applicant, and project, to be in compliance with applicable Imperial County Public Health Department regulations, such compliance would assure that the impacts of the projects would be less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XI. **LAND USE AND PLANNING** *Would the project:*

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community?
a) The project site is not within any established community; therefore, no impacts can be expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 subdivision is in compliance with the Imperial County Land Use Element and Title 9 Land Use Ordinance Division 8. No impacts are expected regarding conflicts with the above referenced documents or with land use. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XII. **MINERAL 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 subdivision will not cause any physical changes to the environment. In addition, the project site is not within an area identified with mineral resources per Imperial County Conservation and Open Space Element, Figure 8. No impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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) As previously mentioned, this project will not cause impacts to mineral resources since it does not propose any development and the project site has been previously disturbed. No impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

XIII. **NOISE** *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 separation of farmland from the existing house would not cause for any type of noise; therefore, no impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
b) No earthmoving activities are expected since no development is being proposed; therefore, no impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

¹⁰ Department of Conservation Tsunami Inundation Maps

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

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?

c) The project site is not within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport. In addition, the project would not expose people to excessive noise levels since no development is being proposed. The existing farmland use would continue to generate noise from their daily operations; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

XIV. POPULATION 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | a) The project consists of subdividing land to separate existing the house from farmland. Less than significant impacts are expected to occur regarding a substantial increase in population growth. | | | | |
| b) | Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | b) The proposed subdivision does not include any future development or type of work that would cause for displacement of people. Less than significant impacts are expected. | | | | |

XV. PUBLIC 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: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | a) The project would not require governmental facilities to be altered since no physical activities are expected nor will this subdivision cause for an increase in provision of services since the existing uses will remain. Less than significant impacts are expected. | | | | |
| | 1) Fire Protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | 1) The project was circulated for review and comments within County agencies, including the Fire Department. We received a comment letter indicating that they had no comments at this time and that they reserved 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. Less than significant impacts are expected. | | | | |
| | 2) Police Protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | 2) The existing uses will continue as they are (farming and residential). Less than significant impacts are expected regarding the need to increase police protection. | | | | |
| | 3) Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | 3) The nearest schools are more than 10 miles away and would not be impacted by the proposed subdivision. No impacts are expected. | | | | |
| | 4) Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | 4) The proposed project does not include any activities related to parks, and will not cause for the need of one or to alter one; therefore, no impacts are being expected. | | | | |
| | 5) Other Public Facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | 5) The proposed project does not include any development or activities that might increase the need for alteration of public facilities services; therefore, no impacts are being expected. | | | | |

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

XVI. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of the existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
- a) An increase in use of recreational facilities is generally caused by population growth in an area, but the proposed subdivision is not expected to cause for substantial growth; therefore, no impacts are expected.**
- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
- b) No recreational facilities are being included in the scope of work for this project; therefore, no impacts are expected.**

XVII. TRANSPORTATION *Would the project:*

- a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
- a) The proposed subdivision is not expected to conflict with the Imperial County General Plan's Circulation and Scenic Highways Element and/or any applicable plan, ordinance or policy related to the transportation since no activities are being proposed to cause the need for increase in traffic. Less than significant impacts are expected.**
- b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
- b) The referenced section talks about the appropriate measure of transportation impacts¹¹. There are no "vehicle miles traveled" being referenced on the project since there is no development being proposed. The existing uses on the parcels are to remain; therefore, no impacts are expected.**
- c) Substantially increases hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
- c) The proposed project does not have any design features that could cause concern regarding traffic; therefore, no impacts are expected.**
- d) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
- d) The current access to the site is not known to be inadequate and the project would not block any emergency access; therefore, no impacts are expected.**

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
- a) According to the General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element, Figure 6, the project site is not within any Native American Cultural Sensitivity Area. Less than significant impacts are expected.**
- (i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as define in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
- (i) The proposed site was not listed under the California Historical Resources in County of Imperial¹² or seems to**

¹¹ Section 15064.3 Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts

¹² Office of Historic Preservation

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

be eligible under Public Resources Code Section 21074 or 5020.1 (k); therefore, no impacts are expected.

- (ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

(ii) There appears to be no history or association in the past with any evidence of historical resources for the property to be either identified as of significance nor as candidate for listing in the California Register; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS *Would the project:*

- 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 subdivision would not cause physical changes in the environment and is not expected to impact utilities nor service systems by separating the existing houses from farmland. Less than significant impacts are expected.

- b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) The project will not increase the need for additional water to be extracted. The existing uses will remain as they are, which are farmland and residential. Less than significant impacts are expected regarding water availability.

- c) 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?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

(c) The proposed project has an existing septic/wastewater systems. No increase in wastewater demand is expected. Impacts are considered less than significant

- d) 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?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

d) Solid waste is not expected to be generated in excess by the proposed subdivision since no activities are being proposed. Less than significant impacts are expected.

- e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) No impacts regarding federal, state and local management of solid waste are expected as a consequence of this subdivision.

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:

- a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

a) The project site is not located near or within any wildfire nor fire hazard severity zone. No impacts are expected.

- 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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
spread of a wildfire?				
b) The project site is not located near or within any wildfire nor fire hazard severity zone. No impacts are expected.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) No infrastructure will be required to exacerbate fire risks since the area is not within a fire zone. No impacts are expected.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Since no activities are being proposed, and the area is not within a wildfire area, no impacts are expected.				

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, 21083.3, 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 Amador 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

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 self-sustaining 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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
- Victoria Escalante, Planner I
- Imperial County Air Pollution Control District
- Fire Department
- Quechan Indian Tribe Office of Historic Preservation
- Environmental Health Services
- Imperial Irrigation District (IID)
-

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

V. REFERENCES

1. Imperial County General Plan "Circulation and Scenic Highways Element", page 30
2. Imperial County General Plan "Circulation and Scenic Highways Element", pages 80-108
3. California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>
4. Imperial County General Plan "Conservation and Open Space Element", Figure 2
5. Tribal Lands in U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 Map
<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2020-02/epa-r9-tribal-lands.png>
6. Department of Conservation Regulatory Maps
<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps>
7. Assembly Bill 32 Overview <https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/ab32/ab32.htm>
8. CEQA AB 32 Scoping Plan <https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/updatescopingplan2013.htm>
9. EnviroStor Database <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
10. FRAP Fire Hazard Severity Zones https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6680/fhszs_map13.pdf
11. Department of Conservation Tsunami Inundation Maps
<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=tsunami>
12. Section 15064.3 Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts
[https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I43ABB2050A37472B90E4B2F4F9D8EF29?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://govt.westlaw.com/calregs/Document/I43ABB2050A37472B90E4B2F4F9D8EF29?viewType=FullText&originationContext=documenttoc&transitionType=CategoryPageItem&contextData=(sc.Default))
13. 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: Parcel Map (PM#02502) Initial Study #22-0029

Project Applicant: Legacy Capital Solutions, LLC

Project Location: The project site ("site") is located at 590 Kubler Road, Calexico, CA. The parcel is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 052-180-042-000 and is legally described as Por E2 Sec1 17-13 179.24 AC N & W of Rds & W & S of Riv Bluff West ½, SE ¼, Section 1, T17S, R13E, SBBM.

Description of Project: The applicant intends to subdivide the parcel to separate the existing house from farmland. The current size of the property is approximately 191.08 acres and the project consists of splitting the parcel into two lots, one being 184.41 acres and the other being 6.67 acres approximately.

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

VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)

IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)

MA\AGIS\AllUsers\APN\052\180\042\PM02502\EEC\PM02502 Initial Study.docx

Attachment A- Comment Letters

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT



August 17, 2022

Jim Minnick
Planning & Development Services Director
801 Main Street
El Centro, CA 92243

SUBJECT: Parcel Map (PM) #02502 – Legacy Capital Solutions, LLC

Dear Mr. Minnick,

The Imperial County Air Pollution Control District ("Air District") appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on Parcel Map (PM) #02502 ("Project"). The Project would subdivide an approximately 180 acre lot located at 590 Kubler Road, Calexico, CA 92231 (APN 052-180-042) into two parcels in order to separate a home from farmland.

The Air District requests a copy of the finalized map for its records.

For your convenience, the Air District's rules and regulations are available via the web at <https://apcd.imperialcounty.org>. Please feel free to call should you have questions at (442) 265-1800.

Respectfully,

Ismael Garcia
Environmental Coordinator I

Via Email
Reviewed by,
Monica N. Soucier
APC Division Manager

Victoria Escalante

From: Quechan Historic Preservation Officer <historicpreservation@quechantribe.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 3, 2022 10:39 AM
To: Allison Galindo
Cc: Michael Abraham
Subject: RE: AB52 Letter for PM02502

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

This email is to inform you that we have no comments on this project.

From: Allison Galindo [mailto:allisongalindo@co.imperial.ca.us]
Sent: Wednesday, August 03, 2022 9:11 AM
To: H. Jill McCormick; Jordan D. Joaquin
Cc: Jim Minnick; Michael Abraham; Diana Robinson; Rosa Soto; Leslie Martinez; Aimee Trujillo; John Robb; Allison Galindo
Subject: AB52 Letter for PM02502

Good Morning,

Attached hereto please find the AB52 letter for **PM02502/ APN 052-180-042-001** with vicinity Map with updated APN.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Michael Abraham at 442-265-1736, or by email at michaelabraham@co.imperial.ca.us.

Thank you,

Allison Galindo
Office Assistant III
Imperial County Planning & Development Services
801 Main St.
El Centro, CA 92243
(442)265-1736



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Victoria Escalante

From: Andrew Loper
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2022 7:26 AM
To: Allison Galindo
Cc: Michael Abraham; Linda Hunt; Melissa Pacheco; Rosa Soto; Leslie Martinez; Aimee Trujillo; Maria Scoville; John Robb
Subject: RE: PM02502 Request for Comments

Good Morning

At this time Imperial County Fire Department has no comments in regards to PM02502.

Again thank you for the opportunity to comment. 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.

Andrew Loper
Imperial County Fire Department
Lieutenant/Fire Prevention Specialist
2514 La Brucherie Road, Imperial CA 92251
Office: 442-265-3021
Cell: 760-604-1828

From: Allison Galindo <allisongalindo@co.imperial.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:55 AM
To: Alfredo Estrada Jr <AlfredoEstradaJr@co.imperial.ca.us>; Alphonso Andrade <AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ana L Gomez <analgomez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Andrew Loper <AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us>; Belen Leon <BelenLeon@co.imperial.ca.us>; Carlos Ortiz <CarlosOrtiz@co.imperial.ca.us>; Chris Hamilton <chamilton@chp.ca.gov>; Donald Vargas <dvargas@iid.com>; Eric Havens <EricHavens@co.imperial.ca.us>; Guillermo Mendoza <GuillermoMendoza@co.imperial.ca.us>; H. Jill McCormick <historicpreservation@quechantribe.com>; Jeff Lamoure <JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Gay <JohnGay@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jolene Dessert <JoleneDessert@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jordan D. Joaquin <tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com>; Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jose Serrano <joseserrano@chp.ca.gov>; Leslie Martinez <lesliemartinez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Manuel Deleon <mdeleon@icso.org>; Marcus Cuero <marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov>; Margo Sanchez <MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Mario Salinas <MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us>; Matt Dessert <MattDessert@co.imperial.ca.us>; Miguel Figueroa <miguelfigueroa@co.imperial.ca.us>; Mitch Mansfield <mmansfield@saltoncsd.ca.gov>; Monica Soucier <MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ray Loera <rloera@icso.org>; Robert Benavidez <rbenavidez@icso.org>; Robert Malek <RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Lopez <RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sandra Mendivil <SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us>; Scott Sheppeard <scottsheppeard@icso.org>; Vanessa Ramirez <VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Luis Plancarte <LuisPlancarte@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ryan Kelley <RKelley@icso.org>
Cc: Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Linda Hunt <LindaHunt@co.imperial.ca.us>; Melissa Pacheco <MelissaPacheco@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Soto <RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us>; Leslie Martinez <lesliemartinez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Maria Scoville <mariascoville@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Robb <JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us>; Allison Galindo <allisongalindo@co.imperial.ca.us>
Subject: PM02502 Request for Comments

Good Morning,

Please see attached Request for Comments **revised** packet for **PM02502/ APN 052-180-042-001**

Comments are due by **August 17th, 2022 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 Michael Abraham at (442) 265-1736, or submit your comment letters to ICPDScommentletters@co.imperial.ca.us.

Thank you,

Allison Galindo

Office Assistant III

Imperial County Planning & Development Services

801 Main St.

El Centro, CA 92243

(442)265-1736



www.iid.com

Since 1911

August 8, 2022

Mr. Michael Abraham
Assistant Director
Planning & Development Services Department
County of Imperial
801 Main Street
El Centro, CA 92243

SUBJECT: Legacy Capital Solutions, LLC Parcel Map No. 02502

Dear Mr. Abraham:

On July 27, 2022, the Imperial Irrigation District received from the Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department, a request for agency comments on the Legacy Capital Solutions, LLC Parcel Map No. 02502. The applicant proposes to subdivide a parcel located on 590 Kubler Road, Calexico, CA (APN 052-170-042-001) to separate the house site from the farm ground.

The IID has reviewed the application and recommends applicant be advised to establish a point of water delivery and drainage discharge for each parcel. For additional information on water service the applicant may call and coordinate with IID's South End Division at (760) 482-9800.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 760-482-3609 or at dvargas@iid.com. 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., Energy Business, Regulatory & Transactions Admin.
Geoffrey Holbrook – Interim General Counsel
Michael P. Kemp – Superintendent, Regulatory & Environmental Compliance
Laura Cervantes – Supervisor, Real Estate
Jessica Humes – Environmental Project Mgr. Sr., Water Dept.

Victoria Escalante

From: Quechan Historic Preservation Officer <historicpreservation@quechantribe.com>
Sent: Monday, August 1, 2022 8:14 AM
To: Allison Galindo
Cc: Michael Abraham
Subject: RE: AB52 Letter for PM02502

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

This email is to inform you that we have no comments on this project.

From: Allison Galindo [mailto:allisongalindo@co.imperial.ca.us]
Sent: Wednesday, July 27, 2022 11:36 AM
To: H. Jill McCormick; Jordan D. Joaquin
Cc: Jim Minnick; Michael Abraham; Diana Robinson; Rosa Soto; Leslie Martinez; Aimee Trujillo; John Robb; Allison Galindo
Subject: AB52 Letter for PM02502

Good Morning,

Attached hereto please find the AB52 letter for **PM02502**.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Michael Abraham at 442-265-1736, or by email at michaelabraham@co.imperial.ca.us.

Thank you,

Allison Galindo
Office Assistant III
Imperial County Planning & Development Services
801 Main St.
El Centro, CA 92243
(442)265-1736



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Victoria Escalante

From: Jorge Perez
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2022 2:55 PM
To: Victoria Escalante
Subject: RE: PM02502 Request for Comments

Hi Victoria,

Please have the applicant provide an updated site plan showing the location of the septic system on the new parcel where the homesite is located. We want to ensure the septic system and its components do not cross any of the newly created property boundaries.

Please let me know if there are any questions.

Regards,

Jorge A. Perez

Imperial County Division of Environmental Health

P: 442-265-1888 – C: 760-427-1190

From: Allison Galindo <allisongalindo@co.imperial.ca.us>

Sent: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 9:55 AM

To: Alfredo Estrada Jr <AlfredoEstradaJr@co.imperial.ca.us>; Alphonso Andrade <AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ana L Gomez <analomez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Andrew Loper <AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us>; Belen Leon <BelenLeon@co.imperial.ca.us>; Carlos Ortiz <CarlosOrtiz@co.imperial.ca.us>; Chris Hamilton <chamilton@chp.ca.gov>; Donald Vargas <dvargas@iid.com>; Eric Havens <EricHavens@co.imperial.ca.us>; Guillermo Mendoza <GuillermoMendoza@co.imperial.ca.us>; H. Jill McCormick <historicpreservation@quechantribe.com>; Jeff Lamoure <JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Gay <JohnGay@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jolene Dessert <JoleneDessert@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jordan D. Joaquin <tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com>; Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jose Serrano <joseserrano@chp.ca.gov>; Leslie Martinez <lesliemartinez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Manuel Deleon <mdeleon@icso.org>; Marcus Cuero <marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov>; Margo Sanchez <MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Mario Salinas <MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us>; Matt Dessert <MattDessert@co.imperial.ca.us>; Miguel Figueroa <miguelfigueroa@co.imperial.ca.us>; Mitch Mansfield <mmansfield@saltoncsd.ca.gov>; Monica Soucier <MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ray Loera <rloera@icso.org>; Robert Benavidez <rbenavidez@icso.org>; Robert Malek <RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Lopez <RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sandra Mendivil <SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us>; Scott Sheppeard <scottsheppeard@icso.org>; Vanessa Ramirez <VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Luis Plancarte <LuisPlancarte@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ryan Kelley <RKelley@icso.org>

Cc: Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Linda Hunt <LindaHunt@co.imperial.ca.us>; Melissa Pacheco <MelissaPacheco@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Soto <RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us>; Leslie Martinez <lesliemartinez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Maria Scoville <mariascoville@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Robb <JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us>; Allison Galindo <allisongalindo@co.imperial.ca.us>

Subject: PM02502 Request for Comments

Good Morning,

Please see attached Request for Comments **revised** packet for **PM02502/ APN 052-180-042-001**

Comments are due by **August 17Th, 2022 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 Michael Abraham at (442) 265-1736, or submit your comment letters to ICPDScommentletters@co.imperial.ca.us.

Thank you,

Allison Galindo

Office Assistant III

Imperial County Planning & Development Services

801 Main St.

El Centro, CA 92243

(442)265-1736

Attachment B- Application

MINOR SUBDIVISION

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 -

1. PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME Legacy Capital Solutions, LLC	EMAIL ADDRESS jeff.hanson@legacy-group.biz	
2. MAILING ADDRESS 8362 Tamarack Village	ZIP CODE 55125	PHONE NUMBER 763-244-7651
3. ENGINEER'S NAME BJ Engineering & Surveying, Inc.	EMAIL ADDRESS mabel@bjengandsurv.com	
4. MAILING ADDRESS 341 W Crown Ct. Suite 100 Imperial, CA	ZIP CODE 92251	PHONE NUMBER (760) 353-3552
5. PROPERTY (site) ADDRESS 690 Corda Rd. Calexico, CA	LOCATION W. of La Brucherie & North of Kubler Rd.	
6. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO. 052-180-042	SIZE OF PROPERTY (in acres or square foot) 192.09 Acres	
7. LEGAL DESCRIPTION (attach separate sheet if necessary) A portion of the SW 1/4 of Sec. 1 & A portion of the NE 1/4 Sec 1 (17-13)		
8. EXPLAIN PURPOSE/REASON FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION To separate house site from farm ground.		

9. Proposed DIVISION of the above specified land is as follows:				
PARCEL	SIZE in acres or sq. feet	EXISTING USE	PROPOSED USE	ZONE
1 or A	184.41 AC	Agricultural	same	A2R
2 or B	6.67 AC	Rural Residential	same	A2R
3 or C		(farmhouse)		
4 or D				

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

10. DESCRIBE PROPOSED SEWER SYSTEM(s)	existing septic system
11. DESCRIBE PROPOSED WATER SYSTEM	existing septic system
12. DESCRIBE PROPOSED ACCESS TO SUBDIVIDED LOTS	existing County Rd - Corda Rd.
13. IS THIS PARCEL PLANNED TO BE ANNEXED? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	IF YES, TO WHAT CITY or DISTRICT?

I HEREBY APPLY FOR PERMISSION TO DIVIDE THE ABOVE SPECIFIED PROPERTY THAT I ☒ OWN ☐ CONTROL, AS PER ATTACHED INFORMATION, AND PER THE MAP ACT AND PER THE SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE.

I, CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE INFORMATION, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE, IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Legacy Capital Solutions, LLC

Print Name (owner)

By: **Jeff Hanson**
Signature (owner)

Print Name (Agent)

Signature (Agent)

7/16/2022

Date

Date

REQUIRED SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

- A. TENTATIVE MAP
- B. PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT (6 months or newer)
- C. FEE
- D. OTHER

Special Note:

An notarized owners affidavit is required if application is signed by Agent.

APPLICATION RECEIVED BY:

APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE BY:

APPLICATION REJECTED BY:

TENTATIVE HEARING BY:

FINAL ACTION: ☐ APPROVED ☐ DENIED

DATE

DATE

DATE

DATE

DATE


REVIEW / APPROVAL BY
OTHER DEPT'S required.

- ☐ P. W.
- ☐ E. H. S.
- ☐ A. P. C. D.
- ☐ O. E. S.
- ☐
- ☐

PM#

PM02502
1522-0029

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP



EASEMENTS:

- A) AN EXEMPT FOR THE PURPOSE SHOWN BELOW AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL
 THERETO, AS GRANTED IN A DOCUMENT
 Granted to: IMPERIAL COUNTY
 Purpose: RIGHT OF WAY
 Recorded: IN BOOK 40, PAGE 212 OF DEEDS
 Affects: THE WEST 20 FEET OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF
 SECTION 1, (17-13)
 B) CONDITIONS AND RESERVATIONS AS CONTAINED IN THE PATENT RECORDED
 APRIL 7, 1912 IN BOOK 2, PAGE 328 OF PATENTS, IMPERIAL COUNTY
 C) AN EXEMPT FOR THE PURPOSE SHOWN BELOW AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL
 THERETO, AS GRANTED IN A DOCUMENT
 Granted to: IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT
 Purpose: CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND/OR USE OF A CONCRETE
 LINER CANAL, OR GANNALS, OPEN AND/OR UNDERGROUND
 TELEPHONE AND ELECTRICAL POWER LINES TOGETHER
 WITH THE RIGHT OF INGRESS AND EGRESS THERETO
 Recorded: FEBRUARY 13, 1979, IN BOOK 1429, PAGE 491 OF OFFICIAL
 RECORDS
 Affects: THAT PORTION OF THE SOUTHERN QUARTER OF SECTION 1,
 INCLUDING WITHIN A STRIP OF LAND 50 FEET IN WIDTH, THE
 CENTER LINE OF WHICH SHALL BE THE CENTER LINE OF
 THE CANAL AS NOW CONSTRUCTED ACROSS THE SOUTH
 SIDE OF SAID PROPERTY
 D) AN EXEMPT FOR THE PURPOSE SHOWN BELOW AND RIGHTS INCIDENTAL
 THERETO, AS GRANTED IN A DOCUMENT
 Granted to: IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT
 Purpose: WESTERN CANAL
 Recorded: FEBRUARY 13, 1979 IN BOOK 1429, PAGE 491, OFFICIAL
 RECORDS
 Affects: A PORTION OF THE SOUTHERLY ARCS (AS SHOWN)
 E) A PERMIT DATED JUNE 8, 1980 DECEASED BY ERNEST G. COBIA AND
 CECILIA W. COBIA, AS PERMITTEE AND CHEVROK, L.A. CALIFORNIA,
 CORPORATION, AS PERMITOR, FOR THE PURPOSE OF INSTALLING, MAINTAINING,
 OPERATING, REPAIRING, REPLACING OR RELOCATING A SEGMENT MOVING
 TRANSMISSION LINE OF THE HIGH VOLTAGE ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION
 LINES AND COMMUNICATION UNDERSTOCK WITH THE RIGHT OF INGRESS
 AND EGRESS THERETO FOR THE TERM AND UPON THE CONDITIONS AND
 PROVISIONS SET FORTH AND RECORDED APRIL 23, 1981 IN BOOK 1468,
 PAGE 478 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

CURVE DATA TABLE

CURVE NO.	RADIUS	DELTA	LENGTH	CHORD	CHORD BEARING
C-1	1225.00	22°46'48"	686.31	620.71	N 243°47' E
C-2	815.00	18°22'54"	296.78	266.78	N 152°41' E
C-3	25.00	36°11'11"	13.44	13.38	N 56°50'11" E
C-4	340.00	48°12'54"	242.81	236.53	N 79°05'42" E
C-5	245.00	70°29'54"	206.50	177.02	N 64°02'22" E
C-6	80.00	53°08'56"	54.22	51.60	N 52°30'08" E
C-7	336.58	123°43'57"	94.66	94.04	N 88°12'54" E
C-8	183.27	39°52'42"	126.33	125.96	N 72°01'42" E
C-9	6076.00	0°01'14"	87.30	87.31	N 87°01'14" E

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A.P.N. 052-180-042

ALL OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 1 AND THAT PORTION OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 17 SOUTH, RANGE 13 EAST, S.B.M., IN THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF, LYING SOUTH AND WEST AND ABOVE NEW RIVER BLUFF AS SAID BLUFF WAS LOCATED APRIL 10, 1918.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE SOUTH 30 FEET AND THE WEST 20 FEET AS GRANTED TO THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, BY DEED RECORDED OCTOBER 15, 1971 IN BOOK 1317, PAGE 299 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

ALSO, EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PORTION GRANTED TO THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, BY DEED RECORDED OCTOBER 15, 1971 IN BOOK 1317, PAGE 289 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

INFORMATION

OWNER:
CRAIG ANDREW CORDA AND CATHY ANN CORDA, AS CO-TRUSTEES
OF THE CRAIG AND CATHY CORDA FAMILY TRUST, U/A DATED
APRIL 15, 2013.

PROJECT SITE ADDRESS:
3890 CORDA ROAD, CALEXICO, CA

LAND USE:
EXISTING: AGRICULTURAL FIELD AND "FARM SITE"

PROPOSED: SAME

ZONING:

FLOOD CERTIFICATION:

THIS PROPERTY IS DESIGNATED AS: ZONE "X"
 ZONE "X" = AREA DETERMINED TO BE OUTSIDE THE 0.20% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOODPLAIN.

MAP NO. 05025C 2075 C, DATED SEPT/ 28, 2008

ENGINEER:

BJ ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING, INC.
VICTOR RODRIGUEZ-FERNANDEZ
P.L.S. NO. 5335

LEGEND:

- PROPERTY LINE
 PROPOSED LOT LINE
 EXISTING OVERHEAD ELECTRIC LINE
 EXISTING EDGE OF AGG. FIELD

ENGINEER OF RECORD

PLANS PREPARED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

BY: VICTOR RODRIGUEZ-FERNANDEZ DATE: _____
R.C.E. NO.: 66,706

BJ 
ENGINEERING & SURVEYING, INC.
Phone (760) 353-3592 341 WEST CROWN COURT
SUITE 101
FAX (760) 353-3788 IMPERIAL, CA 92242

PORTION OF THE SE 1/4 AND PORTION OF THE NE 1/4 OF SEC. 1, LYING SOUTH OF THE NEW RIVER BLUFF (17-10) A.P.N. 052-180-042	SH
--	----

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP

IN THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL	DATE: 06-17-22	BY: E. G.
CLIENT: CRAIG CORDA	JOB NO.: 21-115	

52-18

