

PROJECT REPORT

TO: ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION
COMMITTEE

AGENDA DATE: October 13, 2022

FROM: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

AGENDA TIME 1:30 PM/ No. 4

PROJECT TYPE: Scaroni Properties, Inc. - Parcel Map# 02503 SUPERVISOR DIST: #2

LOCATION: 851 Pitzer Road APN: 054-260-002-000 & 054-260-003

Heber, CA 92249 PARCEL SIZE: ±93.35 AC. & ±69.68 AC.

GENERAL PLAN (existing) Heber Specific Plan Area GENERAL PLAN (proposed) N/A

ZONE (existing) A-2-G-SPA (General Agriculture, Geothermal & Specific Plan Area overlay 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: _____

☐ APPROVED ☐ DENIED ☐ OTHER

ENVIROMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE DECISION: HEARING DATE: 10/13/2022

INITIAL STUDY: #22-0030

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION ☐ MITIGATED NEG. DECLARATION ☐ EIR

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS / APPROVALS:

PUBLIC WORKS	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ATTACHED
AG COMMISSIONER	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ATTACHED
APCD	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ATTACHED
DEH/E.H.S.	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ATTACHED
FIRE / OES	<input type="checkbox"/> NONE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ATTACHED
OTHER	<u>Imperial Irrigation District, Quechan Indian Tribe, City of Calexico</u>	

REQUESTED ACTION:

(See Attached)

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

*Initial Study & Environmental Analysis
For:*

**Parcel Map #02503
Initial Study #22-0030
Scaroni Properties, Inc.**



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	16
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION	19
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	19
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	20
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING	21
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES	21
XIII. NOISE	22
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING	22
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES	22
XVI. RECREATION	23
XVII. TRANSPORTATION	23
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	21
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	24
XX. WILDFIRE	24
 <u>SECTION 3</u>	
III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	23
IV. PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED	24
V. REFERENCES	25
VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION - COUNTY OF IMPERIAL	26
27 FINDINGS	27
 <u>SECTION 4</u>	
VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)	28
IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) (IF ANY)	29

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 (Refer to Exhibit "A" & "B").

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pursuant to the County of Imperial 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 potentially significant impact, potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated, less than 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. **Potentially Significant Unless 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 #02503
2. **Lead Agency:** Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Gerardo A. Quero, Planner I, (442)265-1736, ext. 1748
4. **Address:** 801 Main Street, El Centro CA, 92243
5. **E-mail:** gerardoquero@co.imperial.ca.us
6. **Project location:** 851 Pitzer Road, Heber, CA 92249, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 054-260-002-000 and 054-260-003-000
7. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Scaroni Properties, Inc.
P.O. Box 96, Aptos, CA 95001
8. **General Plan designation:** Specific Plan Area (SPA)
9. **Zoning:** A-2-G-SPA (General Agriculture with Geothermal and Specific Plan Area Overlay)

10. **Description of project:** The applicant, Scaroni Properties, Inc., is proposing a minor subdivision to reconfigure two (2) parcels to separate an existing home site from farmland. APN 054-260-002-000, approximately 93.35 acres total, currently holds the existing home site and farmland. APN 054-260-003-000, approximately 69.68 acres, is an existing agricultural field. 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 one of the proposed parcels meets the conditions under Lot Reduction Exception #1, the proposed subdivision is consistent with the General Plan. The existing house on the property was built prior to April 1, 1976, and 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 application did not include any changes to the existing residential and agricultural uses.

Proposed Parcel 1 has an existing residence with legal and physical access from Pitzer Road. Proposed Parcel 1 will continue to receiving potable water from the Heber Public Utility District and discharge wastewater through an existing septic system. Proposed Parcel 1 is self-contained and does not drain onto Proposed Parcel 2. Proposed Parcel 1 would be approximately 10.01 acres.

Proposed Parcel 2 is an agricultural field with legal and physical access from Pitzer and Jasper Road. Proposed Parcel 2 will continue to receiving irrigation water from the Dogwood Canal Delivery "F" and will continue to drain to the east to the Strout Drain. Proposed Parcel 2 would be approximately 153.02 acres.

11. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project is located on the northeast corner of Pitzer Road and Jasper Road in the County of Imperial, California. The project is surrounded by parcels zoned as A-3-G-SPA (Heavy Agricultural with Geothermal and Specific Plan Area Overlays) and A-2-G-SPA (General Agriculture with Geothermal and Specific Plan Area Overlays) on the North; parcels zoned as A-2-G-U (General Agriculture with Geothermal and Urban Area Overlays) and the City of Calexico on the South; parcels zoned as A-2-G-SPA (General Agriculture with Geothermal and Specific Plan Area Overlays) on the East and West.

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

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

The Quechan Indian Tribe have requested to be consulted under Assembly Bill 52. Consultation letter was sent to the Quechan Indian Tribe. The County received on August 16, 2022, an email response from the Quechan Indian Tribe advising they had no comments for this project.

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 is located at 851 Pitzer Road, Heber, CA 92249; Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 054-260-002-000 and 054-260-003-000.
- B. **Project Summary:** The applicant, Scaroni Properties, Inc., is proposing a minor subdivision to reconfigure two (2) parcels to separate an existing home site from farmland. APN 054-260-002-000, approximately 93.35 acres total, currently holds the existing home site and farmland. APN 054-260-003-000, approximately 69.68 acres, is an existing agricultural field.

Proposed Parcel 1 has an existing residence with legal and physical access from Pitzer Road. Proposed Parcel 1 will continue to receiving potable water from the Heber Public Utility District and discharge wastewater through an existing septic system. Proposed Parcel 1 is self-contained and does not drain onto Proposed Parcel 2. Proposed Parcel 1 would be approximately 10.01 acres.


Proposed Parcel 2 is an agricultural field with legal and physical access from Pitzer and Jasper Road. Proposed Parcel 2 will continue to receiving irrigation water from the Dogwood Canal Delivery "F" and will continue to drain to the east to the Strout Drain. Proposed Parcel 2 would be approximately 153.02 acres.

- C. **Environmental Setting:** The proposed project parcels are generally flat and are located on the northeast corner of Pitzer Road and Jasper Road and adjacent to the City of Calexico on the south.
- D. **Analysis:** Under the Land Use Element of the Imperial County General Plan, the project site is designated as "Specific Plan Area." It is classified as A-2-G-SPA (General Agricultural with Geothermal and Specific Plan Area Overlay) per Zone Map #12 of the Imperial County Land Use Ordinance (Title 9).

The proposed subdivision is projecting (2) two parcels: proposed Parcel 1 with approximately ± 10.01 Acres, which complies with Section 90508 of the Imperial County Land Use Ordinance, Title 9, which states that where Onsite Wastewater Treatment System is proposed, the minimum lot size may be required to be larger than 2.5 Acres, as required by County Ordinance §8.80.150.

- E. **General Plan Consistency:** Under the Land Use Element of the Imperial County General Plan, the project site is designated as "Specific Plan Area." Both parcels are zoned as A-2-G-SPA (General Agricultural with Geothermal and Specific Plan Area Overlay). The proposed project will be consistent with the General Plan as it meets the conditions under Lot Reduction Exception #1 of the Land Use Ordinance, Title 9, Division 5, Chapter 8, Section 90508.04, since no change is being proposed to the existing use.

Exhibit "A" Vicinity Map



SCARIONI PROPERTIES, INC.
PM #02503
APN 054-260-002 AND 003





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



TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP

PORTION OF TRACT 46 IN TOWNSHIP 16 SOUTH, RANGE 14 EAST, S.B.M. IN AN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS

PARCEL 1:
THE WEST 1539.94 FEET OF TRACT 46, TOWNSHIP 16 SOUTH, RANGE 14 EAST, S.B.M., IN AN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID TRACT 46, THENCE EAST ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID TRACT, 1539.94 FEET, THENCE NORTH 0°47' WEST, 2640 FEET TO THE NORTH LINE OF SAID TRACT, 1539.94 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID TRACT 46, THENCE SOUTH ON THE WEST LINE OF SAID TRACT TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

PARCEL 2:
THE EAST 1539.94 FEET OF THE WEST 3079.88 FEET OF TRACT 46, TOWNSHIP 16 SOUTH, RANGE 14 EAST, S.B.M., IN AN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF, EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PORTION LYING EAST OF A LINE DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID PROPERTY, WHICH POINT IS 40 FEET EAST OF THE NORTH QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 17 SOUTH, RANGE 14 EAST, S.B.M., THENCE NORTHERLY TO A POINT IN THE NORTH LINE OF TRACT 46, WHICH POINT IS 2550 FEET WEST OF THE CENTER LINE OF STATE HIGHWAY 99 AS CONVEYED TO OLEIN GHEZZI, ET AL., BY DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 558, PAGE 193 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

GENERAL NOTES

1. ZONING: APN: 054-260-003 & APN: 054-260-003 ARE SUBJECT TO ZONE CLASSIFICATION: A-2-G-SPA
2. EXISTING PARCELS:
 - a. NUMBER OF PARCELS: TWO
 - b. EXISTING PARCEL 1 AREA: 93.35 ACRES±
 - c. EXISTING PARCEL 2 AREA: 69.68 ACRES±
3. PROPOSED PARCELS:
 - a. NUMBER OF PARCELS: TWO
 - b. PROPOSED PARCEL 1 AREA: 10.01 ACRES±
 - c. PROPOSED PARCEL 2 AREA: 153.02 ACRES±

LEGEND

- EXISTING BOUNDARY
- TRACT LINE
- EXISTING EASEMENT LINE
- PROPOSED PARCEL LINE
- EXISTING FENCE LINE
- SCHEDULE "B" ITEM FOUND IN CHICAGO TITLE COMPANY'S PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT: ORDER No. 7102116708-SB
- FOUND SURVEY MONUMENT
- EXISTING UTILITY POLE

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP No. _____	
SHEET 1	OF 2
DRAWN BY: A.D.	CHECKED BY: T.P.
CLIENT: STANLEY SCARONI	JOB No. 22-150
LOCATION: 851 PITZER ROAD HEDER, CA 92249	DATE: JULY 12, 2022

Precision Engineering & Surveying, Inc.
P.O. Box 3216
El Centro, CA 92244
Telephone: (760) 353-2684
799 E. Main Avenue
El Centro, CA 92243
Fax: (760) 353-2686

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) Four areas within the County have the potential as state-designated scenic highways; however, the project site is not located near any scenic vista or scenic highway according to the Imperial County General Plan Circulation and Scenic Highway Element¹. 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) As previously stated on section (I)(a), the proposed project is not located near a scenic vista or scenic highway and would not substantially damage any scenic resources. 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 substantially or physically degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings since the existing residential and agricultural uses are proposed to remain. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | d) The proposed project is a minor subdivision to reconfigure two parcels to separate the existing home site from farmland. However, it is not expected that a new source of substantial light or glare would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant. | | | | |

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) The proposed project site is listed as "Prime Farmland" per the California Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program: Imperial County Important Farmland 2018 Map². The proposed project is a minor subdivision to reconfigure two parcels to separate the existing home site from farmland. The residential and agricultural uses would continue and therefore the proposed project will not convert any type of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. 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 County of Imperial has no current active Williamson Act contracts; therefore, the proposed minor subdivision is not expected to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract. 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 | <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)
by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				
c) The proposed project is consistent with the zoning, and it is not located within a forestland or timberland; therefore, it is not expected to 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 5114(g)). No impacts are expected.				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) The proposed project is not located in a forest land, therefore, it is not expected to result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest. No impacts are expected.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) The proposed project is a minor subdivision to separate the existing home site from farmland by reconfiguring two parcels. The proposed project would continue the existing residential and agricultural uses of the parcels which are not located in a forestland; no new construction is proposed as a result of this project and it is not expected to change the existing environment that could result in the conversation of farmland. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) The proposed project is a minor subdivision, and it is not expected to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. If any construction and earthmoving, the applicant must adhere to Air District Rules and Regulations. Additionally, per Imperial County Air Pollution Control District's comment letter³ dated August 29, 2022, the District requests a copy of the finalized map for its records to assist in any future assessments. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant. | | | | |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) As previously stated under item (III)(a) above, any future construction shall comply with the rules and regulations of the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, therefore, it is not expected that the proposed project would substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant. | | | | |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) The proposed project is a minor subdivision to reconfigure (2) two parcels. No new construction or change to current use is proposed. The proposed subdivision is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations. Compliance with ACPD's requirements, rules and regulations would bring any impacts to less than significant. | | | | |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) As previously stated on item (III)(c) above, the proposed minor subdivision does not anticipate to create objectionable odors that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. Also, as previously stated on item (III)(b) above, compliance with ACPD's requirements, rules, and regulations and adhering to the California Building Code would bring any impacts to less than significant. | | | | |

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, | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
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) The proposed project site is located within disturbed land. According to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element ⁴ , Figure 1 "Sensitive Habitat Map" ^{4a} , the project is not located within a sensitive habitat area. Additionally, in accordance to Figure 2 "Sensitive Species Map" ^{4b} , the project is located within the Burrowing Owl Species Distribution Model area. However, the proposed project does not expect to have any physical changes to the environment. Consequently, it does not appear to have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, or to any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or of special status in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife Service. Any future developments on site, the applicant shall contact ICPDS; therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) According to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element ⁴ , the project site is not within a sensitive or riparian habitat, or on other sensitive natural community. Additionally, the existing agricultural use is proposed to remain; therefore, it does not appear to have a substantial effect in local regional plans, policies, and regulations with respect to sensitive natural communities or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) As previously stated on item (IV)(b) above, the proposed project is a minor subdivision that is not located within a riparian habitat and will not cause a substantial adverse effect on federal protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) The proposed project site has an existing agricultural use in an area of approximately ±153.02 acres where no physical alterations to the environment are proposed. Additionally, as previously stated on item (IV)(b) above, the project site is not located within a Sensitive Habitat ^{4a} ; therefore, it would not 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. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resource, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) The proposed project does not conflict with any local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation policies or ordinances. No impacts are expected.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) The proposed project is a minor subdivision to reconfigure (2) parcels and is not within a designated sensitive area according to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element ⁴ , therefore, it would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
a) According to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element ⁴ , Figure 5, "Areas of Heightened Historic Period Sensitivity Map ^{4c} ," the project site may be located within a Historic Period Railroad Town and on the Phillip Cooke Exploration and Trail Route (1770-1890). Additionally, in accordance with Figure 6, "Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity ^{4d} ," does not locate the proposed project within a designated area of possible impact. Also, on August 16, 2022, the project received an email from the Quechan Historic Preservation Officer stating they had no comments on this project ⁵ . The site is already disturbed with existing home site and agricultural operations with no documented nor known historical resources. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? b) The proposed project is located on already disturbed land with an existing home site and agricultural operations with no documented nor known archeological resources. The proposed minor subdivision is not likely to cause a substantial adverse change to any archeological resource. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.	<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) As previously stated on items (V)(a) and (V)(b) above, the proposed project site is not located within or adjacent to any cemeteries, therefore, the proposed minor subdivision would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.	<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) The proposed project is a minor subdivision that is not proposing any changes in the existing uses, currently agricultural and a home site, therefore, it will not result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, insufficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during the project construction or operation. Should any new developments occur, said developments would require compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code and ministerial building permit with the Imperial County Planning and Development Services Department. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?
b) As previously stated on item (VI)(a) above, the proposed project is for a minor subdivision which does not propose any changes in the existing uses. Future, new developments would require compliance with the latest energy efficiency and renewable energy standards and regulations. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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) The proposed subdivision does not appear to conflict with the geology and soils of adjacent parcels in the area as no proposed developments are anticipated at the time. Additionally, the existing home site and agricultural uses are proposed to remain. Should any new, future developments occur on either parcel, such will be subjected to compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code as well as to go through a ministerial building permit review. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause a potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving. Any expected are expected to be less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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) The proposed project a minor subdivision where existing agricultural operations and a home site will remain. The most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map ⁶ indicates the proposed site project is approximately 6.5 miles away, west of the Imperial Fault. However, Imperial County is classified as Seismic Zone 4 per the Uniform Building Code, which required that any developments within this zone be required to incorporate the most stringent earthquake resistant measures. Should any new, future developments are to occur on either parcel, such will be subject to | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code as well as to go through a ministerial building permit review. Adherence and compliance to these standards and regulations would bring any impacts to less than significant.				
2) Strong Seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) The proposed project is a minor subdivision where existing home site and agricultural operations are proposed to remain. According the California Fault Activity Map ⁷ and the United States Geological Survey's Quaternary Faults Map ⁸ , the proposed project site is located approximately 6.5 miles away, west of the Imperial Fault, indicating seismic ground shaking is expected. However, Imperial County is classified as Seismic Zone 4 per the Uniform Building Code, which required that any developments within this zone are required to incorporate the most stringent earthquake resistant measures. Should any new, future developments are to occur on either parcel, such will be subjected to compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code as well as to go through a ministerial building permit review. Adherence and compliance to these standards and regulations would bring any impacts to less than significant.				
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and seiche/tsunami?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) As previously stated on item (VII)(a)(2) above, the proposed project does not anticipate any new developments. Additionally, the project site is not located in a seiche/tsunami area per the California Tsunami Data Maps ⁹ . Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
4) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4) According to Imperial County General Plan's Seismic and Public Safety Element ¹⁰ , "Landslide Activity Map ^{10a} ," Figure 2, the proposed project is not located within a landslide activity area. The topography within the proposed project site is generally flat; therefore, no impacts are expected.				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) According to Imperial County General Plan's Seismic and Public Safety Element ¹⁰ , "Erosion Activity Map ^{10b} ," Figure 3, the proposed project is not located within an area of substantial soil erosion. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) The proposed project site is not located on a geological unit that would become unstable or collapse as a result of the proposed minor subdivision. Should any future construction occur on either parcel, such will be subjected to compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code as well through a ministerial building permit review. Adherence and compliance to these standards and regulations would bring any impacts to less than significant.				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the latest Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risk to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) The proposed project is a minor subdivision on already disturbed land with existing agricultural operations and a home site. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service "Soil Maps ¹¹ ," the proposed project site is located on an area containing Holtville, Imperial, Imperial-Glenbar, Indio, Meloland, and Vint clays and loams. However, as previously stated on section (VII)(c), any construction will require adherence and compliance to the latest version of the California Building Code, standards and regulations as well as to go through an administrative building permit review which would bring any impacts to less than significant.				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) The proposed project does not anticipate any changes to the existing agricultural operations and home site. The existing home is currently using a septic system and will continue to receiving potable water from Heber Public Utility District. Additionally, on September 15, 2022, ICPDS an email response from the Department of Environmental Health ¹² advising they had no comments for the project based on their preliminary review; however, they reserve the right to comment on such prior to its approval. Should any future construction is to occur on the agricultural parcel where a septic or alternative waste water disposal systems is to be proposed, it shall comply with applicable standards and regulations from the Imperial County Public Health Department, Division of Environmental Health. Adherence and compliance to these standards would bring any impacts to less than significant.				
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

or site or unique geologic feature?

f) The project site is located on already disturbed land with existing agricultural operations and a home site. The proposed subdivision does not appear to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site of unique geologic feature on site. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

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 is a minor subdivision on already disturbed land with existing agricultural operations and a home site. No improvements to existing uses are proposed at the time. Compliance with applicable Imperial County Air Pollution Control District's rules and regulations would bring any impacts to less than significant.

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan or policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

b) The proposed minor subdivision would not conflict with any regulations under AB 32 Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by 2020 provided that the applicant adheres to APCD's regulations. Less than significant impacts are expected.

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 is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as it does not involve the handling of any hazardous materials. No impacts are expected.

- 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) The proposed minor subdivision is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment as no hazardous materials are anticipated as part of the project. No impacts are expected.

- 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) The proposed project does not anticipate the emitting of hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste as previously stated on items (IX)(a) and (IX)(b) above. Additionally, the project site is not located within a ¼ mile of any schools. The nearest school in the area is Heber Elementary School, which is approximately 1.5 miles northwest of the proposed project site; therefore, it would not represent a risk to educational facilities. No impacts are expected.

- 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) The proposed project is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites according to California Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor¹³; therefore, no impacts are expected.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan per Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility

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

Maps¹⁴. The nearest airport in the area is the Calexico International Airport located approximately 3.3 miles south of the project site; therefore, it would not result or create a significant hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area. No impacts are expected.

- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

f) The proposed minor subdivision would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The applicant will meet any requirements requested by the Fire/OES Department. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

g) According to Cal Fire "Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas – Imperial County¹⁵" adopted November 7, 2007, the proposed project site is located within an unincorporated Local Responsibility Area. New improvements are not proposed. Should any future construction or developments are to occur, such may be subject to the inclusion of fire sprinklers and have either a private water or public source as pressurized hydrants for fire suppression. Compliance to ICFD standards would bring any impacts to less than significant.

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 proposed minor subdivision is to reconfigure two parcels to separate an existing home site from farmland and would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Additionally, on September 6, 2022, the County received an email response from the Imperial Irrigation District advising they had no comments for this project¹⁶. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) The proposed project proposes to continue the existing agricultural and residential uses and is not expected to substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) The proposed subdivision is not located near a body of water and does not anticipate a physical alteration to the site that would 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. Additionally, the proposed project will be required to submit a grading and drainage letter according to the Imperial County Public Works Department regulations prior to the recordation of the proposed parcel map. Compliance with Public Works Department would bring any impacts to less than significant.

- (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

(i) According to Imperial County General Plan's Seismic and Public Safety Element¹⁰, "Erosion Activity Map^{10b}," Figure 3, the proposed project is not located within an area of substantial soil erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Additionally, the proposed project will continue with the existing agricultural and residential uses with no new developments proposed. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

(ii) As previously stated on item (X)(c)(i) above, the proposed project does not anticipate new development; therefore, it is not expected to substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite. Compliance with Imperial County Public Works Department would bring any impacts to less than significant.

- (iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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

the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or;

(iii) As previously stated on item (X)(c) above, Imperial County Public Works Department will require drainage and grading letters prior to the recordation of the proposed parcel map which shall clearly show all on-site grading and shall demonstrate how off-site drainage resulting from the subdivision will be managed or controlled to prevent any adverse impacts. Compliance with Imperial County Public Works Department standards would ensure that any runoff water impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

(iv) According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Map Service Center¹⁷, Flood Insurance Rate Map, the proposed project site is located within "Zone X" of flood map 06025C2075C, effective September 26, 2008. However, since no new developments are proposed and existing agricultural operations are to remain and as a result, it would not impede or redirect flood flows. Additionally, a reviewed and approved grading and drainage letters are to be required by the Imperial County Public Works Department. Therefore, compliance with ICPWD's standards would bring any impacts to be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

d) The proposed project will continue with the existing agricultural and residential uses with no new developments proposed; therefore, impacts related to risk release of pollutants due to project inundation are considered to be less than significant.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

e) As previously stated on item (X)(c) above, the proposed project would require a grading plan approved by the Imperial County Public Works Department prior to the recordation of the parcel map; therefore, it is not expected that the minor subdivision would conflict with or obstruct the implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

a) The proposed minor subdivision is to reconfigure two parcels to separate an existing home site from farmland and would not physically divide an established community. Each proposed parcel does not anticipate to change the existing land use designation and zoning. Additionally, on September 16, 2022, the County received a response email from the City of Calexico²¹ advising they had no comments for this project. Furthermore, on September 27, 2022, ICPDS received a comment letter from the Imperial County Department of Public Works²³ advising that the parcel and/or dedication configurations shall take into account the existing boundary between the City of Calexico and the County of Imperial; no parcel and/or dedication shall be created in such a way that lies in two jurisdictions. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

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) As previously stated on item (XI)(a) above, the proposed project is consistent with the Imperial County General Plan and County's Land Use Ordinance; therefore, no impacts are expected.

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 project does not anticipate the removal of mineral resources and it is not located within the boundaries of an active mine per Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element⁴, "Existing Mineral Resources Map^{4e}" Figure 8. No impacts are expected.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

specific plan or other land use plan?

b) The proposed minor subdivision will not result in the loss of availability of locally-important mineral resources recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. No impacts are expected.

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 proposed project is a minor subdivision to reconfigure two parcels to separate an existing home site from farmland that would not result in the generation of temporary or permanent noise beyond that which already occurs on the site. However, should any future construction occur, such action would be subject to the Imperial County General Plan's Noise Element¹⁸ which states that construction equipment operation shall be limited to the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, and from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday. Additionally, construction noise from a single piece of equipment or combination, shall not exceed 75 dB Leq when averaged over an eight (8) hour period. Compliance with Imperial County General Plan's Noise Element would bring any impacts to less than significant.**
- b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- b) The proposed subdivision does not anticipate any changes to the existing agricultural and residential uses on the newly proposed parcels. Additionally, as previously stated on item (XIII)(a) above, any future construction would be subject to Imperial County General Plan's Noise Element. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.**
- c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- c) The proposed project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, no impact 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)? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- a) The proposed subdivision is to reconfigure two parcels to separate an existing house from farmland and would not induce a substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, as no changes to the existing uses are proposed. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.**
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- b) The minor subdivision will not displace substantial number of people necessitating the construction or replacement housing elsewhere as the existing agricultural and residential uses are proposed to remain. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.**

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: ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- a) The proposed subdivision would reconfigure two (2) parcels, separating an existing home site from farmland within**

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
agriculture and Specific Plan Area-zoned designations. Additionally, it is not anticipated that the project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios. Any impacts would be less than significant.				
1) Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1) The proposed minor subdivision is not expected to result in substantial impacts on fire protection. Any future construction or development may be subject to fire sprinklers and to have either a private or public source of water for fire suppression purposes such as pressurized hydrants. Compliance with ICFD would bring any impacts to less than significant.				
2) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) The proposed project is not expected to result in substantial impacts on police protection. Both the California Highway Patrol and Sheriff's Office South County Patrol have active policing and patrol operations in the area. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
3) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) The proposed subdivision is not expected to have a substantial impact on schools as the project would separate an existing home from farmland by reconfiguring two parcels where current uses are proposed to remain. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
4) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) The proposed project is not expected to create a substantial impact on parks as the project would reconfigure two parcels where existing agricultural and residential uses are proposed to remain. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.				
5) Other Public Facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) The proposed minor subdivision is not expected to have a substantial impact on other public facilities. Additionally, on September 6, 2022, the County received an email response from the Imperial Irrigation District ¹⁶ advising they had no comments for this project; therefore, no impacts are expected.				

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
- a) The proposed project is to reconfigure two parcels to separate an existing home site from farmland with existing agricultural and residential uses are proposed to remain. Subsequently, the proposed subdivision would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
- 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
- b) The proposed minor subdivision does not include nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities as it would reconfigure two parcels, separating an existing house from farmland; therefore, less than significant 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 project is to separate an existing home site from farmland by reconfiguring two parcels where the current uses are proposed to remain. The subdivision is not expected to create a substantial impact to surrounding roads nor conflicting with Imperial County General Plan's Circulation and Scenic Highway Element¹. However, any new impacts would appear to be less than significant.
- b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with the CEQA
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? a) The proposed subdivision is to reconfigure two parcels to separate an existing home from farmland which anticipates to continue with the existing residential and agricultural uses as no new developments are proposed. Additionally, it does not expect or result in the relocation or construction of a new expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunication facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Furthermore, on September 6, 2022 and September 15, 2022, ICPDS received response emails from the Imperial Irrigation District¹⁶ and Imperial County Department of Environmental Health¹² advising they had no comments for this project. Any impacts are considered to be less than significant.				
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 proposed project does not project a change to the existing agricultural and residential uses. Additionally, as previously stated on section "(X) - Hydrology and Water Quality," on September 6, 2022, the Imperial Irrigation District sent a response email to the County advising they had no comments for this project¹⁶. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 minor subdivision will reconfigure two parcels to separate an existing home site from farmland and it is not expected to 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 provider's existing commitments. Additionally, the existing septic system on the home site is in compliance and has adequate capacity to serve the existing use. Furthermore, on September 15, 2022, ICPDS received an email response from the Department of Environmental Health¹² advising they had no comments for the project based on their preliminary review; however, they reserve the right to comment on such prior to its approval. Less than significant impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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) Excess solid waste generation is not expected by the proposed subdivision as the existing agricultural and residential uses are proposed to remain. Less than significant impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? e) As previously stated on item (X)(d) above, the proposed project does not anticipate an expansion of the existing agricultural and residential uses as no new developments are proposed. The proposed subdivision shall comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Any impact are expected to be less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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) As previously stated on item (X)(g) – "Hazards and Hazardous Materials" above, per Cal Fire's "Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas – Imperial County¹⁵" adopted November 7, 2007, the proposed project site not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHZ). Therefore, the proposed subdivision would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additionally, on September 15, 2022, ICPDS a response email from the Imperial County Fire Department²⁰ advising they had no comments for this project, but reserved the right to comment and request additional requirements pertaining to such regarding fire and life safety measurements, California building and fire code, and National Fire Protection Association standards at a later time as necessary. Less than significant impacts are expected.**

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<p>b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?</p> <p>b) As previously stated on item (XX)(a) above, the proposed project is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHZ); therefore, impacts due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire are expected to be less than significant.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p> <p>c) The proposed subdivision does not anticipate any changes in the current uses other than reconfiguring two parcels, separating an existing house from farmland. Additionally, as previously stated on item (XX)(a) above, on September 15, 2022, ICPDS a response email from the Imperial County Fire Department²⁰ advising they had no comments for this project, but reserved the right to comment and request additional requirements pertaining to such regarding fire and life safety measurements, California building and fire code, and National Fire Protection Association standards at a later time as necessary. Less than significant impacts are expected.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p> <p>d) The proposed project site is generally flat and proposes to continue with the existing agricultural and residential uses. Additionally, as previously stated on item (XX)(a) above, the proposed project is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone per Cal Fire's "Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Areas – Imperial County"¹⁵; therefore impacts related to 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 are considered to be less than significant.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 Armador Waterways v. Armador 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
- Diana Robinson, Planning Division Manager
- Gerardo A. Quero, Project Planner
- Imperial County Air Pollution Control District
- Department of Public Works
- Fire Department
- Ag Commissioner
- Environmental Health Services
- Sheriff's Office

B. OTHER AGENCIES/ORGANIZATIONS

- Imperial Irrigation District
- City of Calexico
- Quechan Indian Tribe

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

V. REFERENCES

1. Imperial County General Plan: Circulation and Scenic Highway Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/circulation-scenic-highway-element-2008.pdf>
2. California Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program: Imperial County Important Farmland Map 2018
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>
3. Imperial County Air Pollution Control District comment letter dated August 29, 2022
4. Imperial County General Plan: Conservation and Open Space Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/conservation-open-space-element-2016.pdf>
 - a) Figure 1: Sensitive Habitat Map
 - b) Figure 2: Sensitive Species Map
 - c) Figure 5: Areas of Heighten Historic Period Sensitivity Map
 - d) Figure 6: Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity Map
 - e) Figure 8: Existing Mineral Resources Map
5. Quechan Indian Tribe comment email dated August 16, 2022
6. California Geological Survey Hazard Program: Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zones
<https://gis.data.ca.gov/maps/ee92a5f9f4ee4ec5aa731d3245ed9f53/explore?location=32.538703%2C-110.920388%2C6.00>
7. California Department of Conservation: Fault Activity Map
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>
8. United States Geological Survey's Quaternary Faults Map
<https://usgs.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=5a6038b3a1684561a9b0aadf88412fcf>
9. California Tsunami Data Maps
<https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps>
10. Imperial County General Plan: Seismic and Public Safety Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/seismic-and-public-safety.pdf>
 - a) Figure 2: Landslide Activity Map
 - b) Figure 3: Erosion Activity Map
11. United States Department of Agriculture- Natural Resources Conservation Service: Soils Map
<https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>
12. Imperial County Department of Environmental Health comment email dated September 15, 2022
13. California Department of Toxic Substances Control: EnviroStor
<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
14. Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility Map: Calexico International Airport
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/calexico-international-airport.pdf>
15. Cal Fire: Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps – Imperial County
https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6680/fhszs_map13.pdf
16. Imperial Irrigation District comment email dated September 6, 2022
17. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Map Service Center: Flood Insurance Rate Map
<https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=851%20pitzer%20road%20heber%20ca#searchresultsanchor>
18. Imperial County General Plan: Noise Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/noise-element-2015.pdf>
19. California Historic Resources: Imperial County
<https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/ListedResources/?view=county&criteria=13>
20. Imperial County Fire Department comment email dated September 15, 2022
21. City of Calexico Development Services Department email dated September 16, 2022
22. "County of Imperial General Plan EIR", prepared by Brian F. Mooney & Associates in 1993; and as Amended by County in 1996, 1998, 2001, 2003, 2006 & 2008, 2015, 2016.
23. Imperial County Department of Public Works comment letter dated September 27, 2022.

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 #02503

Project Applicant: Scaroni Properties, Inc.

Project Location: 851 Pitzer Road, Heber, CA 92249

Description of Project: The applicant is proposing a minor subdivision application to reconfigure two parcels to separate an existing house from farmland. The project site consists of (2) two parcels: Parcel 1, approximately 93.35 acres, currently contains the existing home site and farmland; Parcel 2, approximately 69.68 acres, is an existing agricultural field. Proposed Parcel 1 will be approximately 10.01 acres and will contain the existing house and Proposed Parcel 2 will be approximately 153.02 acres of farmland. Existing residential and agricultural uses will remain.

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 environment 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 MITIGATED 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)

COMMENT LETTERS



Imperial County Planning & Development Services Planning / Building

Jim Minnick
DIRECTOR

August 15, 2022
REQUEST FOR REVIEW
AND COMMENTS

The attached project and materials are being sent to you for your review and as an early notification that the following project is being requested and being processed by the County's Planning & Development Services Department. Please review the proposed project based on your agency/department area of interest, expertise, and/or jurisdiction.

To: County Agencies	State Agencies/Other	Cities/Other
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Executive Office – Rosa Lopez/ Miguel Figueroa	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IC Sheriff's Office – Robert Benavidez/Ray Loera/Scott Sheppard/ Ryan Kelley/ Manuel Deleon	<input type="checkbox"/> Heber Public Utility District- Laura Fisher
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Counsel – Eric Havens	<input type="checkbox"/> County Airport – Jenell Guerrero	<input type="checkbox"/> Calipatria Fire Dept. – Jesse Llanas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APCD – Monica Soucier/Belen Leon/Matt Dessert	<input type="checkbox"/> CHP – Chris Hamilton/Jose Serrano	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IID – Donald Vargas
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EHS – Jeff Lamoure/Mario Salinas/ Alphonso Andrade/Jorge Perez/Vanessa R Martinez	<input type="checkbox"/> Imperial County Applicator's – Byron Nelson	<input type="checkbox"/> Marine Corps Air Station – Yuma – Community Planning & Liaison Office – Mary Ellen Finch
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Works – Guillermo Mendoza/John Gay	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Campo Band of Mission Indians – Marcus Cuero	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans –District 11- Maurice Eaton
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessors – Robert Menvielle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Board of Supervisors – Luis Plancarte- District #2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fort Yuma – Quechan Indian Tribe - H. Jill McCormick/Jordan D. Joaquin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ag. Commissioner – Margo Sanchez/Ana L Gomez/Jolene Dessert/ Sandra Mendivil/ Carlos Ortiz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IC Fire/OES Office – Andrew Loper/ Alfredo Estrada/Robert Malek	<input type="checkbox"/> Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians – Thomas Torte

From: Michael Abraham, Assistant Director - (442) 265-1736 or ICPDSCCommentLetters@co.imperial.ca.us
Project ID: Parcel Map 02503
Project Location: 851 Pitzer Road Heber CA APN 054-260-002/003
Project Description: Applicant proposes a minor subdivision to separate the existing home site from farm ground.
Applicants: Scaroni Properties Inc.
Comments due by: August 30th 2022 at 5:00PM

COMMENTS: (attach a separate sheet if necessary) (if no comments, please state below and mail, fax, or e-mail this sheet to Case Planner)

No comments

Name: Ana Gomez Signature: *[Signature]* Title: Ag. Biologist III
Date: 08/23/2022 Telephone No.: 442 265 1500 E-mail: ana.gomez@co.imperial.ca.us

MAVAGIS:\AllUsers\APN\054\260\002\PM02503\Request for Comments\PM02503 Request for Comments .docx

Gerardo Quero

From: Quechan Historic Preservation Officer <historicpreservation@quechantribe.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 16 August, 2022 7:56 AM
To: Allison Galindo; Michael Abraham
Cc: ICPDSCommentLetters
Subject: RE: PM02503 Request for Comments

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: Monday, August 15, 2022 4:40 PM
To: Alfredo Estrada Jr; Alphonso Andrade; Ana L Gomez; Andrew Loper; Belen Leon; Carlos Ortiz; Chris Hamilton ; Donald Vargas ; Eric Havens; Guillermo Mendoza; H. Jill McCormick; Jeff Lamoure; John Gay; Jolene Dessert; Jordan D. Joaquin; Jorge Perez; Jose Serrano ; Leslie Martinez; Manuel Deleon; Marcus Cuero ; Margo Sanchez; Mario Salinas; Matt Dessert; Miguel Figueroa; Mitch Mansfield; Monica Soucier; Ray Loera ; Robert Benavidez ; Robert Malek; Robert Menvielle; Rosa Lopez; Sandra Mendivil; Vanessa Ramirez; Luis Plancarte; Ryan Kelley ; Scott Sheppeard ; lfischer@heber.ca.gov
Cc: Jim Minnick; Michael Abraham; Diana Robinson; Linda Hunt; Melissa Pacheco; Aimee Trujillo; Allison Galindo; John Robb; Maria Scoville; Rosa Soto
Subject: PM02503 Request for Comments

Good afternoon,

Please see attached Request for Comments packet for PM02503/ APN 054-260-002/003

Comments are due by **August 30th 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



Virus-free. www.avast.com

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT



August 29, 2022

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

SUBJECT: Parcel Map (PM) #02503 – Scaroni Properties Inc.

Dear Mr. Minnick,

The Imperial County Air Pollution Control District ("Air District") appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on Parcel Map (PM) #02503 ("Project"). The Project is located at 851 Pitzer Road, Heber, CA 92249 and proposes separating an existing home from farm ground. The location currently consists of two parcels: a 93.35-acre parcel (APN 054-260-002) and a 69.68-acre parcel (APN 054-260-003) and proposes two new parcels: a 10.01-acre parcel (home) and a 153.02-acre parcel (farm ground).

After reviewing the information provided to the Air District, which does not include an Initial Study or other Air Quality Analysis, 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

Reviewed by,
Monica N. Soucier
APC Division Manager

Gerardo Quero

From: Vargas, Donald A <DVargas@IID.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 6 September, 2022 3:30 PM
To: Gerardo Quero
Subject: Requests for Agency Comments on Kudu, Inc. Minor Subdivision PM No. 02501 and Scaroni Properties, Inc. Parcel Map No. 02503

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

Good afternoon Gerardo,

Per our conversation earlier today, on the matter of the above mentioned minor subdivisions IID has no comments.

Regards,

Imperial Irrigation District
333 E. Barioni Blvd.
Imperial CA 92251



Donald Vargas
Compliance Administrator II
Regulatory & Environmental
Compliance Section
General Services Department
Tel: (760) 482-3609
Cel: (760) 427-8099
E-mail: dvargas@iid.com

Gerardo Quero

From: Jorge Perez
Sent: Thursday, 15 September, 2022 5:20 PM
To: Allison Galindo
Cc: Gerardo Quero
Subject: RE: PM02503 Request for Comments

RECEIVED

SEP 15 2022

IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Hi Allison,

Based on our preliminary review, DEH has no comments. However, we reserve the right to comment on the project prior to its approval, if any project changes are made.

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: Monday, August 15, 2022 4:40 PM
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-nsg.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>; Robert Menvielle <RobertMenvielle@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Lopez <RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sandra Mendivil <SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us>; Vanessa Ramirez <VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Luis Plancarte <LuisPlancarte@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ryan Kelley <RKelley@icso.org>; Scott Sheppeard <scottsheppeard@icso.org>; Ifischer@heber.ca.gov
Cc: Jim Minnick <JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Diana Robinson <DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Linda Hunt <LindaHunt@co.imperial.ca.us>; Melissa Pacheco <MelissaPacheco@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Allison Galindo <allisongalindo@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Robb <JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us>; Maria Scoville <mariascoville@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Soto <RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us>
Subject: PM02503 Request for Comments

Good afternoon,

Please see attached Request for Comments packet for PM02503/ APN 054-260-002/003

Comments are due by August 30th at 5:00PM.

Gerardo Quero

From: Andrew Loper
Sent: Friday, 16 September, 2022 7:24 AM
To: Allison Galindo
Cc: Jim Minnick; Michael Abraham; Diana Robinson; Linda Hunt; Melissa Pacheco; Aimee Trujillo; John Robb; Maria Scoville; Rosa Soto
Subject: RE: PM02503 Request for Comments

Good Morning

At this time Imperial County Fire Department has no comments in regards to PM02503.

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: Monday, August 15, 2022 4:40 PM
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-nnsn.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>; Robert Menvielle <RobertMenvielle@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Lopez <RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sandra Mendivil <SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us>; Vanessa Ramirez <VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Luis Plancarte <LuisPlancarte@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ryan Kelley <RKelley@icso.org>; Scott Sheppard <scottsheppard@icso.org>; lfischer@heber.ca.gov
Cc: Jim Minnick <JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Diana Robinson <DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Linda Hunt <LindaHunt@co.imperial.ca.us>; Melissa Pacheco <MelissaPacheco@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Allison Galindo <allisongalindo@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Robb <JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us>; Maria Scoville

Gerardo Quero

From: Karen Osuna <kosuna@calexico.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, 16 September, 2022 11:37 AM
To: Gerardo Quero
Cc: Diana Robinson; Michael Abraham; Lisa Tylenda
Subject: RE: Request for Comments: Parcel Map 02503 - Scaroni Properties, Inc.

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

Good morning Mr. Quero,

On behalf of Development Services Director Lisa Tylenda, there are no comments or concerns regarding the project.

Thank you,

Karen Osuna
City of Calexico
Administrative Assistant
Development Services Department
(760) 768-2105
kosuna@calexico.ca.gov

RECEIVED

SEP 16 2022

IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



From: Gerardo Quero <gerardoquero@co.imperial.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2022 3:44 PM
To: Karen Osuna <kosuna@calexico.ca.gov>
Cc: Diana Robinson <DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>
Subject: Request for Comments: Parcel Map 02503 - Scaroni Properties, Inc.

Good afternoon Karen,

My name is Gerardo A. Quero, Planner I, for the County of Imperial Planning Department.

I've been assigned the Parcel Map project PM02503 and would like to know if the City of Calexico Planning Department had any comments in reference to this project.

Attached you will find copies of the following:

1. Tentative Parcel Map
2. Calexico Annexation Map

The proposed parcel map does not appear to conflict with the City of Calexico as it will take place north of the established boundaries according to Calexico Annexation Map.

I'll be looking forward to receiving your comments in reference to this matter.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Regards and thanks in advance.



COUNTY OF
IMPERIAL

DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC WORKS

155 S. 11th Street
El Centro, CA
92243

Tel: (442) 265-1818
Fax: (442) 265-1858

Follow Us:



[www.facebook.com/
ImperialCountyDPW/](http://www.facebook.com/ImperialCountyDPW/)



[https://twitter.com/
CountyDpw/](https://twitter.com/CountyDpw/)

Public Works works for the Public



September 27, 2022

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

Attention: Michael Abraham, Assistant Director

SUBJECT: Parcel Map 2503 Scaroni Properties Inc.
Located on 851 Pitzer Road, Heber, CA
APN 054-260-002 & 054-260-003

Dear Mr. Minnick:

This letter is in response to your submittal received on August 15, 2022 for the above-mentioned project. The applicant is proposing a minor subdivision to separate the existing home site from farm ground.

Department staff has reviewed the package information and the following comments:

- Pitzer Road is classified as a Major Collector, four (4) lanes, requiring eighty-four feet (84') of right-of-way, being forty-two feet (42') from existing centerline. It is required that sufficient right of way be provided to meet this road classification. **(As directed by Imperial County Board of Supervisors per Minute Order #6 dated 11/22/1994 per the Imperial County Circulation Element Plan of the General Plan.)**
- Parcel and/or dedication configurations shall take into account the existing boundary between the City of Calexico and the County of Imperial. No parcel and/or dedication shall be created in such a way that it lies in two jurisdictions.

Respectfully,

John A. Gay, PE
Director of Public Works

GM/gv

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 Scaroni Properties, Inc.	EMAIL ADDRESS lindasrossi@comcast.net	
2. MAILING ADDRESS P.O. Box 96 Aptos, CA	ZIP CODE 95001	PHONE NUMBER 831-320-8131
3. ENGINEER'S NAME Precision Engineering & Surveying	CAL. LICENSE NO. PLS 9436	EMAIL ADDRESS taylor@presurvinc.com
4. MAILING ADDRESS P.O. Box 2216 El Centro, CA	ZIP CODE 92244	PHONE NUMBER 760-353-2684
5. PROPERTY (site) ADDRESS 851 Pitzer Road Heber, CA 92249	LOCATION Dogwood Canal Gate F	
6. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO. 054-260-002 & 054-260-003	SIZE OF PROPERTY (in acres or square foot) 93.35 Ac. & 69.68 Ac.	
7. LEGAL DESCRIPTION (attach separate sheet if necessary) See attached Preliminary Title Report		
8. EXPLAIN PURPOSE/REASON FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION <u>Separate existing homesite from farmground</u>		

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	10.01 Ac.	Residential/Agriculture	Residential	A-2-G-SPA
2 or B	153.02 Ac.	Agriculture	Agriculture	A-2-G-SPA
3 or C				
4 or D				

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

10. DESCRIBE PROPOSED SEWER SYSTEM(s)	<u>None</u>
11. DESCRIBE PROPOSED WATER SYSTEM	<u>None</u>
12. DESCRIBE PROPOSED ACCESS TO SUBDIVIDED LOTS	<u>Pitzer & Jasper Road</u>
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.

Linda Rossi

Print Name (owner)

Date

Signature (owner)

Taylor Preece

Print Name (Agent)

Date

Signature (Agent)

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#

FLOOD ZONE

ACCORDING TO F.E.M.A. FLOOD INSURANCE MAP, PANEL No. 06025C2075C, DATED SEPTEMBER 26, 2008, THIS SITE IS LOCATED IN FLOOD ZONE "X", AREAS OF 0.2% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD.

VESTED IN:

SCARONI PROPERTIES, INC.

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP No.

PORTION OF TRACT 46 IN TOWNSHIP 16 SOUTH, RANGE 14 EAST, S.B.M. IN AN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS

PARCEL 1:

THE WEST 1539.94 FEET OF TRACT 46, TOWNSHIP 16 SOUTH, RANGE 14 EAST, S.B.M., IN AN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID TRACT 46, THENCE EAST ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID TRACT, 1539.94 FEET, THENCE NORTH 0°47' WEST, 2640 FEET TO THE NORTH LINE OF SAID TRACT, 1539.94 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID TRACT 46, THENCE SOUTH ON THE WEST LINE OF SAID TRACT TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

PARCEL 2:


THE EAST 1539.94 FEET OF THE WEST 3079.88 FEET OF TRACT 46, TOWNSHIP 16 SOUTH, RANGE 14 EAST, S.B.M., IN AN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF, EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PORTION LYING EAST OF A LINE DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID PROPERTY, WHICH POINT IS 40 FEET EAST OF THE NORTH QUARTER CORNER OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 17 SOUTH, RANGE 14 EAST, S.B.M., THENCE NORTHERLY TO A POINT IN THE NORTH LINE OF TRACT 46, WHICH POINT IS 2550 FEET WEST OF THE CENTER LINE OF STATE HIGHWAY 99 AS CONVEYED TO OLELIN GHEZZI, ET AL., BY DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 558, PAGE 193 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

GENERAL NOTES

1. ZONING: APN: 054-260-003 & APN: 054-260-003 ARE SUBJECT TO ZONE CLASSIFICATION: A-2-G-SPA
2. EXISTING PARCELS:
 - a. NUMBER OF PARCELS: TWO
 - b. EXISTING PARCEL 1 AREA: 93.35 ACRES±
 - c. EXISTING PARCEL 2 AREA: 69.68 ACRES±
3. PROPOSED PARCELS:
 - a. NUMBER OF PARCELS: TWO
 - b. PROPOSED PARCEL 1 AREA: 10.01 ACRES±
 - c. PROPOSED PARCEL 2 AREA: 153.02 ACRES±

LEGEND

- EXISTING BOUNDARY
- TRACT LINE
- EXISTING EASEMENT LINE
- PROPOSED PARCEL LINE
- EXISTING FENCE LINE
- SCHEDULE "B" ITEM FOUND IN CHICAGO TITLE COMPANY'S PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT: ORDER No. 7102116708-SB
- FOUND SURVEY MONUMENT
- EXISTING UTILITY POLE





PRINTED: 7/27/2022

SHEET	1	OF	2
TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP No.		CHECKED BY: T.P.	JOB No. 22-150
DRAWN BY: A.D.		CLIENT: STANLEY SCARONI	LOCATION: 851 PITZER ROAD HEBER, CA 92249
			DATE: JULY 12, 2022

Precision Engineering & Surveying, Inc.
P.O. Box 2216
El Centro, CA 92244
Telephone: (760) 353-2684
Fax: (760) 353-2686
789 E. Hill Avenue
El Centro, CA 92243

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP No. _____

PORTION OF TRACT 46 IN TOWNSHIP 16 SOUTH, RANGE 14 EAST, S.B.M. IN AN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, STATE OF CALIFORNIA



LEGEND

- EXISTING BOUNDARY
- TRACT LINE
- EXISTING EASEMENT LINE
- PROPOSED PARCEL LINE
- △ SCHEDULE "B" ITEM FOUND IN CHICAGO TITLE COMPANY'S PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT: ORDER No. 7102116708-SB
- FOUND SURVEY MONUMENT
- ⊙ EXISTING UTILITY POLE

Precision Engineering & Surveying, Inc.




P.O. Box 2216
El Centro, CA 92244
Telephone: (760) 353-2684
799 E. Hill Avenue
El Centro, CA 92243
Fax: (760) 353-2686

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP No. _____

DRAWN BY: A.D. CHECKED BY: T.P.
CLIENT: STANLEY SCARONI JOB No. 22-150
LOCATION: 851 PITZER ROAD HEBER, CA 92249 Date: JULY 12, 2022

SHEET
2
OF 2



Director _____

<i>Revision Dates:</i>	<i>Revision Dates Cont.:</i>
<i>July 24, 2002 - Map Correction</i>	<i>Jan 31, 2011 - Map Revision</i>
<i>Dec 5, 2002 - Map Correction</i>	<i>Oct 27, 2014 - Map Revision</i>
<i>April 2, 2003 - Map Correction</i>	<i>Jun 16, 2015 - Map Correction</i>
<i>Jan 15, 2004 - Map Correction</i>	
<i>Sept. 13, 2004 - Map Revision</i>	
<i>April 4, 2007 - Map Revision</i>	
<i>July 03, 2007 - Map Revision</i>	
<i>February 25, 2008 - Map Revision</i>	
<i>April 16, 2008 - Map Revision</i>	
<i>Oct 7, 2010 - Map Revision</i>	

Title 9 Division 25 Section 92512.00

Imperial County Planning/Building Department

MAP 12