

PROJECT REPORT

TO: ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION
COMMITTEE

AGENDA DATE: March 24, 2022

FROM: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

AGENDA TIME 1:30 PM/ No. 2

Parcel Map #02493
PROJECT TYPE: Luis and Eileen Zendejas SUPERVISORY DISTRICT #4

LOCATION: 6512 Riley Road APN: 023-050-011-000

Calipatria, CA PARCEL SIZE: +/- 20.08 acres

GENERAL PLAN (existing) Urban (Calipatria) GENERAL PLAN (proposed) NA

ZONE (existing) A-1-G-U (Limited Agriculture, Geothermal and Urban 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: 03/24/2022

INITIAL STUDY: #21-0028

NEGATIVE DECLARATION MITIGATED NEG. DECLARATION EIR

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS / APPROVALS:

PUBLIC WORKS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NONE	<input type="checkbox"/>	ATTACHED
AG	<input type="checkbox"/>	NONE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ATTACHED
APCD	<input type="checkbox"/>	NONE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ATTACHED
E.H.S.	<input type="checkbox"/>	NONE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ATTACHED
FIRE / OES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NONE	<input type="checkbox"/>	ATTACHED
SHERIFF.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NONE	<input type="checkbox"/>	ATTACHED
OTHER				

IID, Quechan Indian Tribe, City of Calipatria

REQUESTED ACTION:

(See Attached)

Planning & Development Services

801 MAIN ST., EL CENTRO, CA 92243 442-265-1736

(Jim Minnick, Director)

S:\AllUsers\APN\023\050\011\PM02493\EEC\IS 21-0028 PROJECT REP.docx

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

NEGATIVE DECLARATION
 MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

*Initial Study & Environmental Analysis
For:*

**Initial Study #21-0028 for
Parcel Map #02493
Luis & Eileen M. Zendejas**



Prepared By:

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

March 2022

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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.....	15
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES.....	15
III. AIR QUALITY.....	16
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	17
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	18
VI. ENERGY.....	18
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	18
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION.....	20
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	20
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....	21
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING.....	22
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES.....	23
XIII. NOISE.....	23
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	24
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.....	24
XVI. RECREATION.....	25
XVII. TRANSPORTATION.....	25
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	25
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	26
XX. WILDFIRE.....	27
<u>SECTION 3</u>	
III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	28
IV. PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED	29
V. REFERENCES	30
VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION - COUNTY OF IMPERIAL	31
VII. FINDINGS	32
<u>SECTION 4</u>	
VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)	33
IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) (IF ANY)	34

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

principal responsibility for approving the necessary environmental clearances and analyses for any project in the County.

C. INTENDED USES OF INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

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

D. CONTENTS OF INITIAL STUDY & NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

SECTION 1

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

SECTION 2

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

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

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

SECTION 3

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

IV. **PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED** identifies those persons consulted and involved in preparation of this Initial Study and Negative Declaration.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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

VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION – COUNTY OF IMPERIAL

VII. FINDINGS

SECTION 4

VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)

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

E. SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

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

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

F. POLICY-LEVEL or PROJECT LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

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

G. TIERED DOCUMENTS AND INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

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

1. Tiered Documents

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

“Tiering refers to using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR (such as the one prepared for a general plan or policy statement) with later EIRs and negative declarations on narrower projects.”

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

II. *Environmental Checklist*

1. **Project Title:** Parcel Map #02493
2. **Lead Agency:** Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Jim Minnick, (442)265-1736
4. **Address:** 801 Main Street, El Centro CA, 92243
5. **E-mail:** Jimminnick@co.imperial.ca.us
6. **Project location:** 6512 Riley Road, Calipatria CA 92233 Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 023-050-011-000
7. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Luis & Eileen M. Zendejas
947 Calle Luna St., Brawley CA 92227
8. **General Plan designation:** Urban
9. **Zoning:** A-1-G-U (Limited Agriculture with Geothermal and Urban Overlay)
10. **Description of project:** Applicant proposes a minor subdivision to create four parcels. The intent is to separate the house from the agricultural field and subdivide the agricultural field for trust reasons into separate legal parcels. The project totals 20 acres, approximately.

Proposed Parcel 1 has an existing residence with legal and physical access from Riley Road, and will continue to receive water from an IID service pipe from the "D" West Lateral, there is no need to drain any runoff water as the parcel is self-contained with berms. There is no proposed development on Parcel 1 or any changes in water delivery. Proposed parcel 1 would be approximately 3.96 acres.

Proposed Parcel 2 will have legal and physical access from Riley Road, and will continue to receive water from the "D" West Lateral Delivery 38; drain runoff water will be north to the "E" Drain. There is no proposed development on Parcel 2 or any changes in water delivery, if there is to be development in the future, a service pipe shall be installed from the "D" West Lateral and berms shall be constructed to contain any runoff water. Proposed parcel 2 would be approximately 4.15 acres.

Proposed Parcel 3 will have legal and physical access from Com Road, and will continue to receive water from the "D" West Lateral Delivery 38, drain runoff water will be through Parcel 2 to the "E" Drain. There is no proposed development on Parcel 3 or any changes in water delivery, if there is to be development in the future, a service pipe shall be installed from the "D" West Lateral and berms shall be constructed to contain any runoff water. Proposed parcel 3 would be approximately 7.82 acres.

Proposed Parcel 4 will have legal and physical access from Com Road, and will continue to receive water from the "D" West Lateral Delivery 38; drain runoff water will be through Parcel 2 to the "E" Drain. There is no proposed development on Parcel 4 or any changes in water delivery, if there is to be development in the future, a service pipe shall be installed from the "D" West Lateral and berms shall be constructed to contain any runoff water. Proposed parcel 4 would be approximately 4.15 acres.

11. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project is located on Eddins Road between Riley Road and Corn Road in the County of Imperial, California. The City of Calipatria boundary is located 1,300 feet east of the proposed project. The subject property is described as being the South Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 17, T.12S., R.14E., S.B.M.. Residences are located to the East and West of the proposed project and agricultural parcels to the North and South.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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 on September 14, 2021, no comments have been received to date on this project.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SVCS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OFFICE EMERGENCY SERVICES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
APCD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
AG	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SHERIFF DEPARTMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ICPDS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>


 Jim Minnick, Director of Planning/EEC Chairman

Date: 3-24-2022


EEC ORIGINAL PKG

PROJECT SUMMARY

- A. Project Location:** The project is located at 6512 Riley Road, Calipatria CA 92233. Assessor's Parcel Number 023-050-011-000.
- B. Project Summary:** Applicant proposes a minor subdivision to create four parcels. The intent is to separate the house from the agricultural field and subdivide the agricultural field for trust reasons into separate legal parcels. The project totals 20 acres, approximately. The existing uses are proposed to remain.
- C. Environmental Setting:** The proposed project parcel is generally flat and it is located on Eddins Road between Riley Road and Corn Road in the County of Imperial, California. The City of Calipatria boundary is located 1,300 feet east of the proposed project. Residences are located to the East and West of the project site and agricultural parcels to the North and South.
- D. Analysis:** Under the Land Use Element of the Imperial County General Plan, the project site is designated as "Urban". It is classified as A-1-G-U (Limited Agriculture with Geothermal and Urban overlays) under the Imperial County Land Use Ordinance (Title 9). Initial Study #21-0028 will analyze any impacts related with the proposed project.
- E. General Plan Consistency:** Under the Land Use Element of the Imperial County General Plan, the project site is designated as "Urban." The proposed project could be considered consistent with the General Plan since no change is being proposed to the existing residential and agricultural use. Additionally, the proposed parcel areas are above half acre net, the minimum are per Imperial County Land Use Ordinance Section 90507.00.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

Exhibit "A"
Vicinity Map




Luis and Eileen Zendejas
Parcel Map #02493
Initial Study #21-0028
APN 023-050-011-000

- Project Parcel
- Calpatria Limit
- Proposed Parcel Map**
- Parcel 1
- Parcel 2
- Parcel 3
- Parcel 4



EEC ORIGINAL PKG

Exhibit "B" Tentative Parcel Map



EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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?
 - 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 Circulation and Scenic Highway Element; therefore, no impact is expected.
- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
 - b) As previously stated, the proposed project is not located near a Scenic vista or Scenic Highway and would not substantially damage scenic resources. Therefore, no impact is 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?
 - c) The proposed project would not substantially physically degrade the existing visual character since the existing residential and agricultural uses are proposed to remain. Therefore, no impacts are expected.
- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
 - d) The proposed project does not anticipate a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
 - a) The proposed project would continue the residential and agricultural use of the parcel and it is listed as "Other Land" per the Imperial County Important Farmland 2016 Map, therefore the proposed project will not convert any type of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use; therefore, no impact is expected.
- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?
 - b) The proposed project is listed as Non-Enrolled land per Imperial County Williamson Act 2016/2017 Map², therefore it is not expected to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract; therefore, no impact is expected.

² Imperial County Williamson Act 2016/2017 Map

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<p>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?</p> <p>c) The proposed project is consistent with the existing 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 51104(g)). No impacts are expected.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p> <p>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 use. No impacts are expected.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p> <p>e) The proposed project would continue the existing residential and agricultural use of the parcel which is not located in a forestland; therefore, it is not expected to 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. Any impact would be less than significant.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

iii. AIR QUALITY

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p> <p>a) The proposed project is for a minor subdivision, and no change is proposed in the existing use. Any future development such as residential, must adhere to Air District rules and regulations. According to Air Pollution Control District comment letter dated September 22, 2021³. As no development is anticipated at this time, no impacts are expected.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>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?</p> <p>b) As previously stated, under item a) above, the proposed project does not anticipate any changes to the existing environment. Any future construction shall comply with the rules and regulations of APCD, therefore, it is not expected that proposed project would contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, any impact would be less than significant.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations?</p> <p>c) The project proposes a minor subdivision with no proposed change to current use and does not anticipate exposing receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations. As previously stated above under item b) compliance with APCD regulations would bring any impact less than significant.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?</p> <p>d) The proposed project is for a minor subdivision with no propose change to the existing use and</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

³ Air Pollution Control District comment letter dated September 22, 2021

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

does not anticipate in creating objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. As stated above under item b), compliance with APCD regulations would bring any impact 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, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

a) According to the Imperial County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element, Figure 1 "Sensitive Habitat Map", the project site is not located within a sensitive habitat map; and according to Figure 2 "Sensitive Species Map", 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, therefore, it does not appear to have a substantially adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, or any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plan, policies, or regulation, or by the Departments of Fish and Wildlife. For any future development on site, the applicant shall contact ICPDS; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) According to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element, the project site is not within a sensitive or riparian habitat, or other sensitive natural community; additionally, the existing use which is agricultural is proposed to remain, therefore, it does not appear to have a substantial effect in local or regional plan, policies, and regulations regarding sensitive natural communities or by the Departments of Fish and Wildlife. Less than significant impacts are expected.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

c) As previously stated on item a) above, the project proposes a minor subdivision 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. No impacts are anticipated

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

d) The proposed minor subdivision does not proposes any physical alterations to the environment; therefore, it would not interfere substantially with the movement of any residential or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife, corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No impacts are expected.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resource, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

e) The proposed project does not conflict with any local policy or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, no impact is expected.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? f) The proposed project is not within a designated sensitive area according to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element; 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. No impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?
a) The proposed project site has an existing residence with septic system and an agricultural field. According to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element, Figure 5, the project location is not within an area of Heightened Historic Period Sensitivity. Additionally, on September 15, 2021, we received an email from the Quechan Historic Preservation Officer stating that they had no comments on this project. As no physical changes to the site are proposed, impacts are expected to be less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
b) As previously mentioned under item a) above, the proposed project is located on disturbed land and it is not likely to cause a substantial change to an archeological resource. No impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?
c) As mentioned under Item a) above, the proposed project site is located on disturbed land with an existing residential and agricultural use and is not expected to result in the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries. Less than significant impacts are expected. | <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 for a minor subdivision and does not propose any changes in the existing use, therefore it will not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation. No impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?
b) As previously mentioned under item a), the proposed project is for a minor subdivision and does not propose any changes in the existing use, therefore it will not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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

a) The proposed project does not appear to conflict with the geology and soils of adjacent properties as no proposed development is anticipated, the existing residential and agricultural uses are proposed to remain. The project will be required to submit a grading plan/drainage letter per Public Works regulations. Compliance with Public Works Department is expected to bring impacts to less than significant levels.

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 most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps⁴ does not include the site within any Earthquake Fault Zones as created by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. Therefore, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

2) Strong Seismic ground shaking?

2) Imperial County has several faults that can result in ground shaking during events of seismic activity in the region. However, the proposed project does not include any development, therefore, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and seiche/tsunami?

3) As discussed above under item a), the proposed project does not anticipate any development; additionally, the project is not located in a Tsunami inundation area according to the California Official Tsunami Inundation Maps. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

4) Landslides?

4) The proposed project is not located within a Landslide Activity area according to the Imperial County Seismic and Public Safety Element, Figure 2 (Landslide Activity). The topography within the project site appears to be generally flat, and therefore will not be directly or indirectly affected by a landslide. No impacts are expected.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

b) The proposed project does not proposes any physical alteration to the environment and is not located within an area of substantial soil erosion according to Imperial County Seismic and Public Safety Element, Figure 3 (Erosion Activity). Any impact is 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?

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 project; compliance with California Building Code (CBC) for any future construction would make any impact 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?

d) The proposed project site may be underlain clay, however no proposed development is anticipated and the existing agricultural use is proposed to remain, therefore, any impacts are expected to be 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

⁴ Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps

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

water?

e) No proposed development is anticipated and the existing agricultural use is expected to remain. In the event there is any future construction related with the disposal of waste water, it shall be in compliance with applicable Imperial County Public Health Department regulations, compliance would assure that the impacts of the projects would be less than significant.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

f) The proposed project has an existing agricultural use and does not propose any physical change to the site and it is not expected to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Less than significant impacts are expected.

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 for a subdivision with an existing residential and agricultural use. No improvements to the site are being proposed. Compliance with applicable County Codes in the event there is future construction would make any impact 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 project is for a minor subdivision and will not conflict the regulations under AB32 of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases emission to 1990 levels by 2020 since there are no physical changes proposed to the environment. 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 since it does not include any handling of 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 project is not expected to 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. 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 is not located within ¼ mile of a school, thus, the project would not represent a risk to school facilities; therefore, 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?

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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

d) The proposed project site is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous material sites⁵; 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 within the City of Calipatria airport zone "B" per Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan⁶, approximately 1,300 feet West of the Calipatria airport. ALUC also acknowledge that several houses have been built in recent years and that County's A-1 zoning for this area allows residences on half-acre lots. However, no changes to the existing residential and rural uses are proposed and each of the proposed parcels are above one acre; therefore, would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Additionally, should any future development occur, an Aviation Easement Dedication will be required. Impacts are considered less than significant.

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

f) The proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; therefore, no impacts are expected.

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

g) The proposed project site is not located in an area susceptible to wildland fires; therefore, no impact is expected.

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 project has an existing residential and agricultural use that is proposed to remain and new no development is anticipated. The project will be required to submit a grading plan/drainage letter per Public Works regulations. Compliance with Public Works Department is expected to bring impacts to less than significant levels.

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 residential and agricultural use, 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 project does not anticipate a physical alteration to the site that would substantially

⁵ EnviroStor Database <http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
⁶ ALUC

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

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. The project will be required to submit a grading plan/drainage letter per Public Works regulations. Compliance with Public Works Department is expected to bring impacts to less than significant levels.

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

(i) The proposed project will continue the existing agricultural use, no new development is anticipated on site and therefore, it is not expected to result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. It is expected that compliance with Imperial County Public Works Department would bring impacts to less than significant levels.

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

(ii) As stated above under item (i), the proposed project does not anticipate new development, and 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 impact to less than significant levels.

(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or;

(iii) The proposed project is not expected to create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff since the current use is not proposed to be changed and a grading/drainage letter to be reviewed and approved by Imperial County Public Works will be required. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

(iv) The proposed project site is located within Zone "A" per Federal Emergency Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel 060065 0425 B. However, no new development is proposed and a grading/drainage letter to be reviewed and approved by Imperial County Public Works will be required, therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

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

d) The proposed project will continue the existing agricultural use and no new development is proposed, therefore, impacts related to risk release of pollutants due to project inundation are considered less than significant.

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

e) As mentioned above under item c), the proposed project will continue the agricultural use and no new development is proposed, therefore, it is not expected to conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Any impacts are considered less than significant.

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

a) Physically divide an established community?

a) The proposed project will not physically divide an established community and no changes to the

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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

existing use is proposed. Additionally, per City of Calipatria comment letter dated September 2021, the property falls within the City of Calipatria's Sphere of Influence and is planned as an R-1 Zone, which allows for single-family dwellings. It is assumed that all of the parcels within the City's Sphere of Influence will one day be annexed into the City. There is no new development is proposed; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

b) The proposed project could be considered consistent with the Imperial County General Plan since no change is being proposed to the existing use. Additionally, the proposed project does not anticipate to physically change the environment and it is not expected to 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. 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 include 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 Element, Figure 8 "Existing Mineral Resources". No impacts are expected.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

b) The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. Therefore, no 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 not expected to expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards as defined by Imperial County General Plan's Noise Element⁷ since no change in the existing use is proposed. Less than significant impacts are expected.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

b) The proposed project is not expected to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels since no change in the existing use or development is proposed. Less than significant impacts are expected.

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?

⁷ Imperial County General Plan Noise Element

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

c) As previously stated, the proposed project is within the City of Calipatria airport zone "B" per Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, approximately 1,300 feet West of the Calipatria airport. Per ALUC Table 2A substantial noise is expected within B zone, however, no development is anticipated, therefore any impact would be less than significant.

XIV. **POPULATION AND HOUSING** *Would the project:*

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) The proposed project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area either directly or indirectly, since the no changes to the current use are proposed. Therefore, any impact is expected to be less than significant. | | | | |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) The proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction or replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impact is expected. | | | | |

XV. **PUBLIC SERVICES**

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) The proposed project does not anticipate any changes in the current use other than creating four parcels; therefore, the proposed project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with potential impacts foreseen on public services. However, any impact would be less than significant. | | | | |
| 1) Fire Protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1) The proposed project is not expected to result in substantial impacts on fire protection, since no change to the existing use is proposed; any new impacts would be 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 have result in substantial impacts on police protection; any new impacts would be less than significant. | | | | |
| 3) Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3) The proposed project is not expected to have a substantial impact on schools. Any impact is 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. Any impact is expected to be less than significant. | | | | |
| 5) Other Public Facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5) The proposed project is not expected to create a substantial impact on other public facilities; however, any impacts would be less than significant. | | | | |

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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?
- a)** The proposed project is not expected to 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 since no changes to the current use are being proposed. Any impact would 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?
- b)** The proposed project does not include or require the construction of recreational facilities. No impacts are expected.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION *Would the project:*

- a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
- a)** The proposed project is not expected to create a substantial impact to surrounding roads and does not conflict with the Imperial County General Plan's Circulation and Scenic Highways Element; however any new impacts would appear to be less than significant.
- b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?
- b)** The proposed project will not conflict or be inconsistent with the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) since it is not expected to have a significant transportation impact within transit priority areas and no change is proposed in the existing use. However the proposed project site it is not located within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor. Less than significant impacts are expected.
- c) Substantially increases hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- c)** The proposed project does not appear to substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. The minor subdivision does not propose new development and is expected to continue the existing residential and agricultural uses; however, any impacts would be less than significant.
- d) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- d)** No change in the existing use is proposed, neither new development. Any impacts are considered less than significant.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place or object

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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

with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a) The proposed project has an existing residential and agricultural use that is proposed to continue and no new development is anticipated, and additionally, a notification via email was received from the Quechan Historic Preservation Officer stating that they do not wish to comment on this project at this time; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

(i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as define in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or

(i) The proposed project is not listed or is not likely that it would be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as define in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k) since as stated above under item a), the project area has an existing residential and agricultural use, and there is no evidence of cultural resources on site. Less than significant impacts are expected.

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

(ii) The proposed project site has an existing residential and agricultural use that is proposed to remain and no new development is anticipated. Therefore, no significant resources as defined in the Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 are expected to be impacted. Any impact would be less than significant.

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

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

a) The proposed project anticipates to continue the existing residential and agricultural use, as no new development is proposed, it is not expected to require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Less than significant impacts are expected.

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

b) The proposed project does not anticipate a change to the existing agricultural use, and as stated previously under Section X "Hydrology and Water Quality", Imperial Irrigation District provided an October 18, 2021 email stating no comments. The division of the property would have a less than significant impact.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

c) The proposed project is not expected to result in a determination by the wastewater treatment

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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

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. The division of the property would have a less than significant impact.

- 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) The proposed project does not anticipate an expansion of the existing agricultural use and no new development is proposed. Therefore, it is not expected to 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. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

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

e) As mentioned above under item d), the proposed project does not anticipate an expansion of the existing agricultural use and no new development is proposed. The proposed project shall comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Any future development would be subject to all statutes and regulations. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

a) The proposed project is located within an LRA classified as Unzoned according to the CAL FIRE map for Imperial County, and the closest Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) is located approximately 35 miles northwest of the proposed project; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected related to substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

- b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

b) As previously stated under item a) above, the proposed project is classified as Unzoned and not within a VHFHSZ; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected related 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. Therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.

- c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

c) The proposed project does not anticipate any changes in the current use other than creating four parcels; therefore, the proposed project will not result in installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk. Any new construction is subject to the inclusion of fire sprinklers and have either a private water source for firefighting or public source such as pressurize hydrants. Compliance with ICFD would lessen impacts to less than significant levels.

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) The proposed project site is generally flat and proposes to continue the existing agricultural use, and as stated above under item a) above, the proposed project is classified as Unzoned and not within a VHFHSZ; 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 less than significant.</p>				

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

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

SECTION 3
III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>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.)</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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
- Mariela Moran, 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
- Quechan Indian Tribe

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

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

V. REFERENCES

1. "County of Imperial General Plan EIR", prepared by Brian F. Mooney & Associates in 1993; and as Amended by County in 1996, 1998, 2001, 2003, 2006 & 2008, 2015, 2016.
2. Imperial County Circulation and Scenic Highway Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/circulation-scenic-highway-element-2008.pdf>
3. Air Pollution Control District comment letter dated September 22, 2021.
4. Imperial County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/conservation-open-space-element-2016.pdf>
5. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>
6. EnviroStor Database
<http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
7. Imperial Irrigation District comment email dated October 18, 2021.
8. Imperial County General Plan Noise Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/noise-element-2015.pdf>

VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION – County of Imperial

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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 #02493

Project Applicant: Luis & Eileen M. Zendejas

Project Location: 6512 Riley Road, Calipatria CA 92233

Description of Project: Applicant proposes a minor subdivision to create four parcels. The intent is to separate the house from the agricultural field and subdivide the agricultural field for trust reasons into separate legal parcels. The project totals 20 acres approximately. The existing uses of a single family home and agricultural fields are proposed to remain.

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

VII. FINDINGS

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

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

The Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects but:

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

A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

NOTICE

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

3-24-2022 Jim Minnick
 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.

[Signature]
 Applicant Signature

3-24-22
 Date

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

SECTION 4

VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)

S:\AllUsers\APN\023\050\011\PM02493\EEC\IS 21-0028forPM02493.docx

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

COMMENT LETTERS

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

Michael Abraham

From: Mario Salinas
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 2:55 PM
To: Valerie Grijalva
Cc: Mariela Moran; Michael Abraham; Carina Gomez; John Robb; Kimberly Noriega; Maria Scoville; Rosa Soto; Shannon Lizarraga; Jorge Perez
Subject: RE: Request for Comments PM#02493

Good afternoon Ms. Grijalva,

Pertaining to Request for Comments on PM# 02493, Division of Environmental Health does not have any comments at this time.

Thank you,

Mario Salinas, MBA

Environmental Health Compliance Specialist
Imperial County Public Health Department
Division of Environmental Health
797 Main Street Suite B, El Centro, CA 92243
mariosalinas@co.imperial.ca.us
Phone: (442) 265-1888
Fax: (442) 265-1903
www.icphd.org



The preceding e-mail message (including any attachments) contains information that may be confidential, be protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges, or constitute non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

From: Valerie Grijalva <ValerieGrijalva@co.imperial.ca.us>
Sent: September 14, 2021 2:47 PM
To: Carlos Ortiz <CarlosOrtiz@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sandra Mendivil <SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us>; Margo Sanchez <MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Matt Dessert <MattDessert@co.imperial.ca.us>; Monica Soucier <MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ryan Kelley <RyanKelley@co.imperial.ca.us>; Esperanza Colio <EsperanzaColio@co.imperial.ca.us>; Vanessa Ramirez <VanessaRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Alphonso Andrade <AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jeff Lamoure <JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us>; Mario Salinas <MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Malek <RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us>; Andrew Loper <AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us>; Benavidez, Robert <RBenavidez@icso.org>; Scott Sheppard <scottsheppard@icso.org>; Donald Vargas <dvargas@iid.com>; Leal, Rudy Z <rzleal@IID.com>; Romualdo Medina - City of Calipatria <rj_medina@calipatria.com>; jgalvan@theholtgroup.net; dkline@calipat.com; hhaines@augustinetribe.com; marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov; chairman@cit-nsn.gov; cocotcsec@cocopah.com; tashina.harper@crit-nsn.gov; wmiclin@leaningrock.net; Quechan Historic Preservation Officer <historicpreservation@quechantribe.com>; frankbrown6928@gmail.com; Quechan Indian Tribe

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

Valerie Grijalva

From: Quechan Historic Preservation Officer <historicpreservation@quechantribe.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 7:49 AM
To: Valerie Grijalva; Mariela Moran
Cc: ICPDSComentLetters
Subject: RE: Request for Comments PM#02493

RECEIVED

SEP 15 2021

IMPERIAL COUNTY

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

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: Valerie Grijalva [mailto:ValerieGrijalva@co.imperial.ca.us]

Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 2:47 PM

To: Carlos Ortiz; Sandra Mendivil; Margo Sanchez; Matt Dessert; Monica Soucier; Ryan Kelley; Esperanza Colio; Vanessa Ramirez; Alphonso Andrade; Jorge Perez; Jeff Lamoure; Mario Salinas; Robert Malek; Andrew Loper; Benavidez, Robert; Scott Sheppard; Donald Vargas; Leal, Rudy Z; Romualdo Medina - City of Calipatria; jgalvan@theholtgroup.net; dkline@calipat.com; hhaines@augustinetribe.com; marcuscuerdo@campo-nsn.gov; chairman@cit-nsn.gov; cocotsec@cocopah.com; tashina.harper@crit-nsn.gov; wmiclin@leaningrock.net; Quechan Historic Preservation Officer; frankbrown6928@gmail.com; Quechan Indian Tribe ; ljbirdsinger@aol.com; lp13boots@aol.com; Thomas.tortez@torresmartinez-nsn.gov; joseph.mirelez@torresmartinez-nsn.gov; katy.sanchez@nahc.ca.gov

Cc: Mariela Moran; Michael Abraham; Carina Gomez; John Robb; Kimberly Noriega; Maria Scoville; Rosa Soto; Shannon Lizarraga

Subject: Request for Comments PM#02493

Good Afternoon,

Please see attached Request for Comments Packet for Parcel Map #02493 Luis & Eileen M Zendejas.

Comments are due by **September 29, 2021 at 5:00 PM.**

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 regarding this project, please feel free to contact Planner Mariela Moran (442)265-1736 ext. 1747 or submit your comment letters to

icpdscommentletters@co.imperial.ca.us

Thank you,

Valerie Grijalva

Office Assistant II

Planning and Development Services

801 Main Street

El Centro, CA 92243

Office: (442)265-1779

Fax: (442) 265-1735

EEC ORIGINAL PKG



AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

September 22, 2021

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

SUBJECT: Parcel Map (PM) 02493—Luis and Eileen Zendejas (4 Parcels)

Dear Mr. Minnick:

The Imperial County Air Pollution Control District ("Air District") thanks you for the opportunity to review the application regarding Parcel Map (PM) 02493 at 6512 Riley Road in Calipatria, California (also identified as Assessor Parcel Number 023-050-011-000). The applicant proposes a minor subdivision to create four parcels.

The Air District has no comment except to request a copy of the Final Parcel Map. Although the intended use is agricultural, please keep in mind that any future development such as residential, must adhere to Air District rules and regulations.

The Air District's rule book can be accessed via the internet at <https://apcd.imperialcounty.org>. Click on "Rules & Regulations" on the top of the page. Should you have questions, please call our office at (442) 265-1800.

Sincerely,

Curtis Blondell
APC Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by,

Monica N. Soucier
APC Division Manager

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

From: [Vargas, Donald A](#)
To: [Mariela Moran](#)
Subject: RE: Request for Comments PM#02493
Date: Monday, October 18, 2021 9:46:17 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

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

Good morning Mariela,

We have no comments pertaining to the PM #02493.

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

From: Mariela Moran <MarielaMoran@co.imperial.ca.us>
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 4:08 PM
To: Vargas, Donald A <DVargas@IID.com>
Subject: RE: Request for Comments PM#02493

[CAUTION] This email originated from **outside** of the IID. Do not reply, click on any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon Mr. Vargas,

I am writing to follow up on any comments pertaining for this project.

Please let us know, thank you.

From: Valerie Grijalva <ValerieGrijalva@co.imperial.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 2:47 PM
To: Carlos Ortiz <CarlosOrtiz@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sandra Mendivil <SandraMendivil@co.imperial.ca.us>; Margo Sanchez <MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Matt Dessert <MattDessert@co.imperial.ca.us>; Monica Soucier <MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us>; Ryan Kelley <RyanKelley@co.imperial.ca.us>; Esperanza Colio <EsperanzaColio@co.imperial.ca.us>;

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

City of Calipatria



RECEIVED

SEP 29 2021

IMPERIAL COUNTY

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

125 North Park Ave.
Calipatria, CA 92233
Telephone: (760) 348-4141
Fax: (760) 348-7035

09/27/2021

Mariela Moran
Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department
801 Main Street
El Centro, CA 92243

RE: REQUEST FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT - PARCEL MAP #02493 LUIS & EILEEN M. ZENDEJAS

Dear Ms. Moran

The proposed minor subdivision of the property located at 6512 Riley Road, Calipatria, CA (APN: 023-050-011) is within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Calipatria.

The project is located on Eddins Road between Riley and Corn Road in the County of Imperial, CA. The applicant proposes a minor subdivision to create four parcels, with no proposed new development. The property is zoned A-2 under the Imperial County General Land Use Element. Parcel 1, located at the Southwest corner, with 3.96 acres, has an existing single-family dwelling. Parcels 2, 3, and 4 are proposed to remain as fields.

The property falls within the City of Calipatria's Sphere of Influence and is planned as a R-1 Zone. It is assumed that all of the land within the City's Sphere of Influence will one day be annexed into the City proper, with no anticipated date of annexation. R-1 Single-Residential zones allow for single-family dwellings.

With no new development being proposed as part of the subdivision, the impact on municipal services including sewer and emergency services will be negligible. In the 2018 Service Area Plan, it is identified that the City of Calipatria has the capacity for sewage and wastewater interconnection, with a daily surplus of .7 MGD. Parcel 1 is currently utilizing a septic tank. The nearest point of interconnection is between Main Street and International Boulevard, within city limits, at approximately one mile from the parcel site.


The parcels will be served with road access from Riley and Corn Road. Both roads are part of the County of Imperial General Land Use Circulation Element, which classifies the

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

roads as Minor Collectors that require a minimum right of way of 70 feet. Eddins Road runs within city limits and is classified as a Major Collector requiring a right of way of 100 feet.

In review of the minor subdivision site plan for (APN: 023-050-011), the City of Calipatria finds that it remains in conformance with the City's future land use plans. Should the proposed parcel use change, the City of Calipatria retains the option to provide additional comment. If I can provide further details regarding the City of Calipatria's General Plan Land Use Element, please do not hesitate to contact me via phone or e-mail: 760.337.3883 or cmancha@theholtgroup.net.

Sincerely,



Cynthia Mancha
Consultant Assistant Planner

Reviewed by:




George Galvan, AICP
Consultant City Planner

Attachments:
City of Calipatria General Plan – Land Use Map

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

II. Land Use Element



Land Use Map

Figure II-1

EEC ORIGINAL PKG



Imperial County Planning & Development Services Planning / Building

RECEIVED

Jim Minnick
DIRECTOR

SEP 30 2021

September 14, 2021

IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

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- Esperanza Collo-Warren	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Augustine Band of Cahulla Mission Indians- Amanda Vance/ Karen Kupcha	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Calipatria -Romualdo Medina/ Jorge Galvan
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Board of Supervisors- Ryan E. Kelloy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Campo Band of Mission Indians -Marcus Cuero	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Calipatria Unified School District - Douglas Kilne
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Works - John Gay/ Guillermo Mondoza/ Carlos Yee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chemehuevi Reservation -Charles Wood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> La Posta Band of Mission Indians - Gwendolyn Parada
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> APCD - Matt Dessert/Monica Soucier	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cocopah Indian Tribe - Sherry Cordova	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Torres-Martinez Desert Cahulla Indians - Thomas Torte/ Joseph Mirolez
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EHS Office - Jeff Lamoure/ Vanessa Martinez/ Jorge Perez/ Alphonso Andrade/ Mario Salinas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Colorado River Indian Tribe -Dennis Patch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Native American Heritage Commission - Katy Sanchez
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ag. Commissioner - Carlos Ortiz/ Sandra Mendivil/ Margo Sanchez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ewilaapaayp Tribal Office -Will Micklin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Manzanita Band of Kumeyaay Nation - Angela Elliot Santos
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IC Fire/OES Office - Robert Malek/ Andrew Loper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fort Yuma -Quechan Indian Tribe -H. Jill McCormick/ Jordan D. Joaquin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IC Sheriff's Office - Robert Benavidez/ Scott Sheppard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Inter-tribal Cultural Resource Protection Council -Frank Brown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Imperial Irrigation District -Rudy Leal
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IID Env. Compliance. - Donald Vargas		

From: Planner: Mariela Moran, Planner II - (442) 265-1736 Ext. 1747 or E-mail at ICPDScommentletters@co.imperial.ca.us

Project ID: Parcel Map #02493 Luis & Eileen M Zendejas

Project Location: 6512 Riley Road, Calipatria, CA 92233 APN: 023-050-011-000

Project Description: Applicant proposes a minor subdivision to create four parcels. The intent is to separate the house from the field and subdivide the field for trust reasons into separate legal parcels.

Applicant: Luis and Eileen M. Zendejas

Comments due by: September 29, 2021 at 05:00 p.m. **Environmental Evaluation Comm. Meeting:** TBD

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 Comment

Name: Sandra Mendivil Signature: [Signature] Title: Ag Biologist IV

Date: 9/30/21 Telephone No.: 442-265-1500 E-mail: sandra.mendivil@co.imperial.ca.us

MMWGIS:\AllUsers\APN\023\050\011\PM\02493\PM02493 Request for Review and Comments 09 14 21.docx

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

APPLICATION

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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 Luis Zendejas & Eileen M. Zendejas		EMAIL ADDRESS zendejashardware@sbcglobal.net	
2. MAILING ADDRESS 947 Calle Luna St. Brawley, CA		ZIP CODE 92227	PHONE NUMBER 760-455-0426
3. ENGINEER'S NAME Precision Engineering & Surveying, Inc.		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 6512 Riley Road Calipatria, CA		LOCATION Lateral D West Delivery 38	
6. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO. 023-050-011		SIZE OF PROPERTY (in acres or square foot) 20.08 Acres	
7. LEGAL DESCRIPTION (attach separate sheet if necessary) South Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 17, T.12S.,R.14E.,S.B.M.			
8. EXPLAIN PURPOSE/REASON FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION Seperate the house from the field and subdivide the field for trust reasons into seperate legal parcels.			

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	3.96 AC	Residential	Residential	A-1 GU
2 or B	4.15 AC	Agriculture	Agriculture	A-1 GU
3 or C	7.82 AC	Agriculture	Agriculture	A-1 GU
4 or D	4.15 AC	Agriculture	Agriculture	A-1 GU

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

10. DESCRIBE PROPOSED SEWER SYSTEM(s)	None
11. DESCRIBE PROPOSED WATER SYSTEM	None
12. DESCRIBE PROPOSED ACCESS TO SUBDIVIDED LOTS	Corn Road and Riley Road
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.

Luis Zendejas & Eileen M. Zendejas 8-15-21
 Print Name (owner) Date

 Signature (owner)
 Taylor Preece 8-30-21
 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: <u>MP</u>	DATE <u>8.30.2021</u>	REVIEW / APPROVAL BY OTHER DEPT'S required.
APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE BY: _____	DATE _____	<input type="checkbox"/> P. W.
APPLICATION REJECTED BY: _____	DATE _____	<input type="checkbox"/> E. H. S.
TENTATIVE HEARING BY: _____	DATE _____	<input type="checkbox"/> A. P. C. D.
FINAL ACTION: <input type="checkbox"/> APPROVED <input type="checkbox"/> DENIED	DATE _____	<input type="checkbox"/> O. E. S.
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____

PM#
02493
EEG ORIGINAL PKG

Parcel Map #02493

6512 Riley Road, Calipatria, CA

Project Description

The project is located on Eddins Road between Riley Road and Corn Road in the County of Imperial, California. The subject property is described as being the South Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Northeast quarter of Section 17, T.12S.,R.14E.,S.B.M. and containing 20.08 Acres.

The reasoning behind the proposed parcel map is for family legal trust issues.

Proposed Parcel 1 will have legal and physical access from Riley Road, will continue to receive water from an IID service pipe from the "D" West Lateral, and will not need to drain any runoff water as the parcel is self-contained with berms. There is no proposed development on Parcel 1 or any changes in water delivery.


Proposed Parcel 2 will have legal and physical access from Riley Road, will continue to receive water from the "D" West Lateral Delivery 38, and will continue to drain runoff water north to the "E" Drain. There is no proposed development on Parcel 2 or any changes in water delivery, if there is to be development in the future, a service pipe shall be installed from the "D" West Lateral and berms shall be constructed to contain any runoff water.

Proposed Parcel 3 will have legal and physical access from Corn Road, will continue to receive water from the "D" West Lateral Delivery 38, and will continue to drain runoff water through Parcel 2 to the "E" Drain. There is no proposed development on Parcel 3 or any changes in water delivery, if there is to be development in the future, a service pipe shall be installed from the "D" West Lateral and berms shall be constructed to contain any runoff water.

Proposed Parcel 4 will have legal and physical access from Corn Road, will continue to receive water from the "D" West Lateral Delivery 38, and will continue to drain runoff water through Parcel 2 to the "E" Drain. There is no proposed development on Parcel 4 or any changes in water delivery, if there is to be development in the future, a service pipe shall be installed from the "D" West Lateral and berms shall be constructed to contain any runoff water.

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 023-050-011
IN THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL

A PORTION OF SECTION 17 IN TOWNSHIP 12 SOUTH, RANGE 14 WEST, SBM 4, AN UNINCORPORATED AREA OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL.



CORNER DESCRIPTIONS

- ① CENTER CORNER SECTION 17 FOUND 1 1/2" IRON PIPE, NO TAG, FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ② SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ③ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ④ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑤ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑥ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑦ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑧ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑨ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑩ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑪ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑫ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑬ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑭ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑮ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑯ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑰ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑱ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑲ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ⑳ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉑ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉒ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉓ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉔ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉕ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉖ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉗ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉘ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉙ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉚ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉛ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉜ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉝ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉞ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㉟ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊱ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊲ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊳ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊴ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊵ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊶ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊷ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊸ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊹ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊺ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊻ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊼ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊽ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊾ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP
- ㊿ SOUTHWEST CORNER NORTH 1/2 SECTION 17 FOUND PER G.S.C. MAP


- LEGEND**
- CHARTER SECTION LINE
 - - - EXISTING BOUNDARY LINE
 - - - PROPOSED PARCEL LINE
 - - - EXISTING EASEMENT LINE
 - - - ITEM IN SCHEDULE "B" OF PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT
 - FOUND MONUMENT AS NOTED
 - △ UTILITY POLE
 - ⊕ MEASURED DATA
 - ⊗ WATER VALVE

- FLOOD ZONE**
- ACCORDING TO F.E.M.A. FLOOD INSURANCE MAP PANEL 95-0104-DATED SEPTEMBER 2002 THIS SITE IS LOCATED IN FLOOD ZONE "X". AREAS OF 0.2% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD.
- GENERAL NOTES:**
1. TOTAL EXISTING ACRES: 20.084
 2. EXISTING LAND USE: AGRICULTURE
 3. PROPOSED LAND USE: AGRICULTURE
 4. TOTAL NUMBER OF PARCELS: 4
 5. EXISTING ZONING: A1CU

VESTED IN:
LUIS ZENDEJAS AND EILEEN M. ZENDEJAS, TRUSTEES FOR THE BENEFIT OF JOHN TENANTS.

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER:
023-050-011

NOTE:
SOURCE DATA SHOWN ARE ROS 8-11, ROS 8-1, AND ROS 10-8B



8-30-21
DATE


PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER & SURVEYOR, INC.
P.O. Box 2214
10000 S. Main St., Suite 100
Imperial, CA 92543
Tel: (760) 335-2844
Fax: (760) 335-2844

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. _____
DRAWN BY: L.S. ZENDEJAS
CHECKED BY: L.S. ZENDEJAS
DATE: 8-30-21

SHEET 1 OF 2

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

ENLARGEMENT



- SCHEDULE B EXCEPTIONS FROM TITLE REPORT 710210675-59**
- 1. UNLAWFUL FOR THE SUBMITTED SHOWING BELOW AND NOT BEING RECORDED AS A DOCUMENT:
 - a. CANALS AND OTHERS OR PILES FOR SUBSIDIES.
 - b. EASEMENTS.
 - c. ENCUMBRANCES.
 - d. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - e. RIGHTS OF USE.
 - f. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - g. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - h. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - i. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - j. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - k. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - l. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - m. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - n. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - o. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - p. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - q. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - r. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - s. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - t. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - u. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - v. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - w. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - x. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - y. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - z. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - 2. UNLAWFUL FOR THE SUBMITTED SHOWING BELOW AND NOT BEING RECORDED AS A DOCUMENT:
 - a. CANALS AND OTHERS OR PILES FOR SUBSIDIES.
 - b. EASEMENTS.
 - c. ENCUMBRANCES.
 - d. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - e. RIGHTS OF USE.
 - f. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - g. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - h. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - i. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - j. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - k. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - l. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - m. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - n. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - o. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - p. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - q. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - r. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - s. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - t. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - u. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - v. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - w. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - x. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - y. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - z. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - 3. UNLAWFUL FOR THE SUBMITTED SHOWING BELOW AND NOT BEING RECORDED AS A DOCUMENT:
 - a. CANALS AND OTHERS OR PILES FOR SUBSIDIES.
 - b. EASEMENTS.
 - c. ENCUMBRANCES.
 - d. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - e. RIGHTS OF USE.
 - f. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - g. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - h. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - i. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - j. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - k. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - l. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - m. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - n. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - o. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - p. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - q. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - r. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - s. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - t. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - u. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - v. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - w. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - x. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - y. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - z. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - 4. UNLAWFUL FOR THE SUBMITTED SHOWING BELOW AND NOT BEING RECORDED AS A DOCUMENT:
 - a. CANALS AND OTHERS OR PILES FOR SUBSIDIES.
 - b. EASEMENTS.
 - c. ENCUMBRANCES.
 - d. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - e. RIGHTS OF USE.
 - f. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - g. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - h. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - i. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - j. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - k. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - l. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - m. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - n. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - o. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - p. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - q. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - r. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - s. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - t. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - u. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - v. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - w. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - x. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - y. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - z. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - 5. UNLAWFUL FOR THE SUBMITTED SHOWING BELOW AND NOT BEING RECORDED AS A DOCUMENT:
 - a. CANALS AND OTHERS OR PILES FOR SUBSIDIES.
 - b. EASEMENTS.
 - c. ENCUMBRANCES.
 - d. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - e. RIGHTS OF USE.
 - f. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - g. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - h. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - i. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - j. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - k. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - l. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - m. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - n. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - o. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - p. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - q. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - r. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - s. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - t. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - u. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - v. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - w. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - x. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - y. RIGHTS OF WAY.
 - z. RIGHTS OF WAY.

- LEGEND**
- EXISTING CONCRETE
 - EXISTING BOUNDARY LINE
 - PROPOSED BOUNDARY LINE
 - EASEMENT LINE
 - FENCE LINE
 - WATER LINE
 - SEWER LINE
 - UTILITY POWER POLE
 - WATER VALVE
 - SEWER SEPTIC
 - FOUND MONUMENT AS NOTED
 - MEASURED DATA
 - FROM AN SCHEDULE "B" OF THE UNIFORM LAND RECORDS ACT

Resolution Engineering & Surveying, Inc.
 P.O. Box 2276
 El Cerrito, CA 94534
 Telephone: (925) 753-8844
 CLIENT: 27522525
 LOCATION: 8571 ROAD, CALIFORNIA CA
 SHEET NO. 2
 DATE: 07/28/2021



EEC ORIGINAL PKG

N1/2 SEC. 17, T.125, R.14E.

Tax Area Code
58-000

23-05

EEC ORIGINAL PKG



- 9-10-98 RM
- 9-26-99 RM
- 8-10-98 RM
- 8-10-98 RM
- 4-9-83 RM
- 4-15-82 RM
- 1-15-73 D
- 5-3-77 D
- 10-16-14 MF
- 10-16-14 MF
- 12-15-11 MF

DISCLAIMER:
 THIS IS NOT AN OFFICIAL MAP.
 THIS MAP WAS CREATED FOR THE IMPERIAL COUNTY ASSESSOR, FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF AIDING IN THE PERFORMANCE OF THE DUTIES OF THE ASSESSOR. ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS IN THIS MAP ARE NOT THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL OR THE ASSESSOR. (REV. 8/10/06 SEC.227)

This map/chart is being furnished as an aid in locating the herein described land in relation to adjoining streets, natural boundaries and other land, and is not a survey of the land depicted. Except to the extent a policy of this insurance is expressly modified by endorsement, Eery, the Company does not assume any liability, obligation, or responsibility for any errors or omissions shown thereon.

Assessor's Map BK-23-Pg.05
 County of Imperial, Calif.



Imperial County Flood Insurance Rate Areas

Map of the Imperial County Flood Insurance Rate Areas (FIRAs) for the Colorado River. This map is a product of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and is used to determine the flood insurance rates for properties located in the designated areas. The map shows the Colorado River and the surrounding areas, including the Colorado River Delta and the Colorado River Water Conservation District (CRWCD). The map is divided into several zones, each with a different flood insurance rate. The zones are: Zone 1 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 1), Zone 2 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 2), Zone 3 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 3), Zone 4 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 4), Zone 5 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 5), Zone 6 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 6), Zone 7 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 7), Zone 8 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 8), Zone 9 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 9), Zone 10 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 10), Zone 11 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 11), Zone 12 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 12), Zone 13 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 13), Zone 14 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 14), Zone 15 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 15), Zone 16 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 16), Zone 17 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 17), Zone 18 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 18), Zone 19 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 19), Zone 20 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 20), Zone 21 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 21), Zone 22 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 22), Zone 23 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 23), Zone 24 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 24), Zone 25 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 25), Zone 26 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 26), Zone 27 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 27), Zone 28 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 28), Zone 29 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 29), Zone 30 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 30), Zone 31 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 31), Zone 32 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 32), Zone 33 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 33), Zone 34 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 34), Zone 35 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 35), Zone 36 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 36), Zone 37 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 37), Zone 38 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 38), Zone 39 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 39), Zone 40 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 40), Zone 41 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 41), Zone 42 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 42), Zone 43 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 43), Zone 44 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 44), Zone 45 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 45), Zone 46 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 46), Zone 47 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 47), Zone 48 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 48), Zone 49 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 49), Zone 50 (Flood Insurance Rate Area 50).

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

Imperial County Flood Insurance Rate Areas

Legend:

- Zone 1:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 1
- Zone 2:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 2
- Zone 3:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 3
- Zone 4:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 4
- Zone 5:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 5
- Zone 6:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 6
- Zone 7:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 7
- Zone 8:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 8
- Zone 9:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 9
- Zone 10:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 10
- Zone 11:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 11
- Zone 12:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 12
- Zone 13:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 13
- Zone 14:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 14
- Zone 15:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 15
- Zone 16:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 16
- Zone 17:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 17
- Zone 18:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 18
- Zone 19:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 19
- Zone 20:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 20
- Zone 21:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 21
- Zone 22:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 22
- Zone 23:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 23
- Zone 24:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 24
- Zone 25:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 25
- Zone 26:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 26
- Zone 27:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 27
- Zone 28:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 28
- Zone 29:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 29
- Zone 30:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 30
- Zone 31:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 31
- Zone 32:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 32
- Zone 33:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 33
- Zone 34:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 34
- Zone 35:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 35
- Zone 36:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 36
- Zone 37:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 37
- Zone 38:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 38
- Zone 39:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 39
- Zone 40:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 40
- Zone 41:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 41
- Zone 42:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 42
- Zone 43:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 43
- Zone 44:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 44
- Zone 45:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 45
- Zone 46:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 46
- Zone 47:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 47
- Zone 48:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 48
- Zone 49:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 49
- Zone 50:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 50

Scale: 0 to 300 Feet

Map Information:

- Map Scale: 1" = 200'
- Map Date: 10/15/2010
- Map Title: Imperial County Flood Insurance Rate Areas
- Map Author: EEC

Imperial County Flood Insurance Rate Areas

Map Information:

- Map Scale: 1" = 200'
- Map Date: 10/15/2010
- Map Title: Imperial County Flood Insurance Rate Areas
- Map Author: EEC

Legend:

- Zone 1:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 1
- Zone 2:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 2
- Zone 3:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 3
- Zone 4:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 4
- Zone 5:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 5
- Zone 6:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 6
- Zone 7:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 7
- Zone 8:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 8
- Zone 9:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 9
- Zone 10:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 10
- Zone 11:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 11
- Zone 12:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 12
- Zone 13:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 13
- Zone 14:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 14
- Zone 15:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 15
- Zone 16:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 16
- Zone 17:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 17
- Zone 18:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 18
- Zone 19:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 19
- Zone 20:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 20
- Zone 21:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 21
- Zone 22:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 22
- Zone 23:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 23
- Zone 24:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 24
- Zone 25:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 25
- Zone 26:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 26
- Zone 27:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 27
- Zone 28:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 28
- Zone 29:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 29
- Zone 30:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 30
- Zone 31:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 31
- Zone 32:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 32
- Zone 33:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 33
- Zone 34:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 34
- Zone 35:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 35
- Zone 36:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 36
- Zone 37:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 37
- Zone 38:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 38
- Zone 39:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 39
- Zone 40:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 40
- Zone 41:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 41
- Zone 42:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 42
- Zone 43:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 43
- Zone 44:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 44
- Zone 45:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 45
- Zone 46:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 46
- Zone 47:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 47
- Zone 48:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 48
- Zone 49:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 49
- Zone 50:** Flood Insurance Rate Area 50

Scale: 0 to 300 Feet

Map Information:

- Map Scale: 1" = 200'
- Map Date: 10/15/2010
- Map Title: Imperial County Flood Insurance Rate Areas
- Map Author: EEC