

# PROJECT REPORT

**TO: ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION  
COMMITTEE**

**AGENDA DATE: February 11, 2021**

**FROM: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

**AGENDA TIME 1:30 PM/ No. 2**

Parcel Map #02490  
PROJECT TYPE: Timothy Lloyd Allen & Roy Kyle Allen SUPERVISORY DISTRICT #4  
LOCATION: 6196 Lack Rd., APN: 020-150-016-000  
Brawley, CA PARCEL SIZE: +/- 298 acres  
GENERAL PLAN (existing) Agriculture GENERAL PLAN (proposed) N/A  
ZONE (existing) A-3 (Heavy Agriculture) 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

ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE DECISION: HEARING DATE: 02/11/2021

INITIAL STUDY: 20-0025

☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION ☐ MITIGATED NEG. DECLARATION ☐ EIR

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS / APPROVALS:

PUBLIC WORKS	<input type="checkbox"/>	NONE	<input checked="" 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		<u>IID, Quechan Indian Tribes</u>		

**REQUESTED ACTION:**

**(See Attached)**

☒ **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**  
☐ **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

*Initial Study & Environmental Analysis  
For:*

**Initial Study #20-0025 for  
Parcel Map #02490  
Timothy Lloyd Allen & Roy Kyle Allen**



*Prepared By:*

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

**February, 2021**

**EEC ORIGINAL PKG**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b><u>SECTION 1</u></b>	
I. INTRODUCTION	3
<b><u>SECTION 2</u></b>	
II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	8
PROJECT SUMMARY	10
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	13
I. AESTHETICS	14
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	14
III. AIR QUALITY	15
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	16
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	17
VI. ENERGY	17
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	18
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION	19
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	19
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	20
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING	22
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES	22
XIII. NOISE	23
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING	23
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES	23
XVI. RECREATION	24
XVII. TRANSPORTATION	24
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	25
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	26
XX. WILDFIRE	26
<b><u>SECTION 3</u></b>	
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
<b><u>SECTION 4</u></b>	
VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)	33
IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) (IF ANY)	34

## SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

### A. PURPOSE

This document is a ☐ policy-level, ☒ project level Initial Study for evaluation of potential environmental impacts resulting with the proposed Parcel Map (Refer to Exhibit "A" & "B").

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pursuant to the County of Imperial Guidelines for Implementing CEQA, depending on the project scope, the County of Imperial Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and/or Planning Director is designated the Lead Agency, in accordance with Section 15050 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Lead Agency is the public agency which has the

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **SECTION 1**

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

#### **SECTION 2**

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

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

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

#### **SECTION 3**

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

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

---

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

VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION – COUNTY OF IMPERIAL

VII. FINDINGS

SECTION 4

VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)

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

E. SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

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

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

F. POLICY-LEVEL or PROJECT LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

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

G. TIERED DOCUMENTS AND INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

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

1. Tiered Documents

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

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

incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR; and concentrating the later EIR or negative declaration solely on the issues specific to the later project.”

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

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

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

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

- (1) Were not examined as significant effects on the environment in the prior EIR; or
- (2) Are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the project, by the imposition of conditions, or other means.”

## **2. Incorporation By Reference**

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

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

- The incorporated document must be available to the public or be a matter of public record (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[a]). The General Plan EIR and updates are available, along with this document, at the County of Imperial Planning & Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243 Ph. (442) 265-1736.
- This document must be available for inspection by the public at an office of the lead agency (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[b]). These documents are available at the County of Imperial Planning & Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243 Ph. (442) 265-1736.
- These documents must summarize the portion of the document being incorporated by reference or briefly describe information that cannot be summarized. Furthermore, these documents must describe the

---

relationship between the incorporated information and the analysis in the tiered documents (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[c]). As discussed above, the tiered EIRs address the entire project site and provide background and inventory information and data which apply to the project site. Incorporated information and/or data will be cited in the appropriate sections.

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



---

## II. *Environmental Checklist*

---

1. **Project Title:** Parcel Map #02490
2. **Lead Agency:** Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Mariela Moran, Planner II, (442)265-1736, ext. 1747
4. **Address:** 801 Main Street, El Centro CA, 92243
5. **E-mail:** marielamoran@co.imperial.ca.us
6. **Project location:** 6196 Lack Rd., Calipatria CA 92233
7. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Timothy L. Allen & Roy K. Allen  
P.O. Box 772 Calipatria CA 92233
8. **General Plan designation:** Agriculture
9. **Zoning:** A-3 (Heavy Agricultural)
10. **Description of project:** Applicant is proposing to separate two existing deliveries and two existing fields into two separate legal parcels for family legal trust issues. Parcel 1 would be +/- 143 acres and parcel 2 would be +/- 155 acres, for a project's total of +/- 298 acres.  
The proposed Parcel 1 would have legal and physical access from Lack Road. Proposed Parcel 2 would have legal and physical access from Lack Road through an easement across the North 20.00 feet of proposed Parcel 1 shown on the tentative Map. Proposed Parcel 1 would continue to receive water from the O'Brien Lateral Delivery 958 and will continue to drain west to the Thompson Drain. Proposed Parcel 2 would continue to drain north to the Vail Drain. Both parcels would continue to be farmed in agriculture.
11. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project is located North of the New River and East of Lack Rd., the proposed project parcel agricultural lands are devoted to agriculture, surrounding parcels uses are agricultural as well. The City of Calipatria is located approximately 6 miles to the East of the proposed project site.
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 October 16, 2020 and an email from the Quechan Indian Tribe Historic Preservation Officer received on October 27, 2020 stated that they did not have comments on this project.

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

### ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE (EEC) DETERMINATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

☐ No

#### EEC VOTES

PUBLIC WORKS

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SVCS

OFFICE EMERGENCY SERVICES

APCD

AG

SHERIFF DEPARTMENT

ICPDS

YES

NO

ABSENT

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

  
Jim Minnick, Director of Planning/EEC Chairman

2-11-2021  
Date:


---

## PROJECT SUMMARY

---

- A. **Project Location:** The project is located at 6196 Lack Rd., Calipatria CA; Assessor's Parcel Number 020-150-016-000.
- B. **Project Summary:** Applicant is proposing to separate two existing deliveries and two existing fields into two separate legal parcels for family legal trust issues. Parcel 1 would be +/- 143 acres and parcel 2 would be +/- 155 acres, for a project's total of +/- 298 acres. The existing agricultural farming use is proposed to remain.
- C. **Environmental Setting:** The proposed project parcel is generally flat and it is located near the New River, the current use is agricultural. The surrounding parcel uses are agricultural and are farmed. The Salton Sea is located approximately 2.5 miles to the West of the proposed project.
- D. **Analysis:** Under the Land Use Element of the Imperial County General Plan, the project site is designated as "Agriculture". It is classified as A-3 (Heavy Agriculture) under the Imperial County Land Use Ordinance (Title 9). Pursuant to the Land Use Element of the General Plan, agriculture area is characterized by lands for agricultural production and related industries. An Initial Study #20-0025 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 "Agriculture." The proposed project could be considered consistent with the General Plan since no change is being proposed to the existing agricultural use. Additionally, the proposed parcel areas are above 40 acres gross, the minimum are per Imperial County Land Use Ordinance Section 90509.04.

# Exhibit "A" Vicinity Map



**TIMOTHY LLOYD & ROY KYLE  
ALLEN  
6196 LACK ROAD, BRAWLEY, CA  
PARCEL MAP 02490  
APN 020-150-016-000**

HIGHWAYS  
 PROJECT LOCATION



**TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP NO. 22493**  
**IN THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL**  
 APPROVED FOR THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL BY THE CLERK OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, CALIFORNIA, ON 10/10/1993

**SCALE 1"=200'**

**PROPOSED PARCEL 1**  
 142.03 ACRES

**PROPOSED PARCEL 2**  
 155.24 ACRES

**SECTION 16**

**TOWNSHIP 36N**

**RANGE 12E**

**COLORADO RIVER**

**COLORADO RIVER WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

**LEGEND**

**REFERENCES**

**NOTES**

**SIGNATURE**

**CLERK OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, CALIFORNIA**

**10/10/1993**

---

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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



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

## I. AESTHETICS

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

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>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>   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>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.</b>   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
| c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surrounding? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>c) The proposed project would not substantially physically degrade the existing visual character since the existing agricultural use is proposed to remain. Therefore, no impacts are expected.</b>   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>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.</b>   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |

## II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>a) The proposed project would continue the agricultural use of the parcel and it is listed as "Farmland of Statewide Importance" 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> |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>b) The proposed project would continue the agricultural use of the parcel, therefore it is not expected to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.</b>  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
c) The proposed project is consistent with the existing agricultural 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.				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) The proposed project is not located in a forest land, therefore, it is not expected to result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impacts are expected.				
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) The proposed project would continue the 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. No impacts are expected.				

### III. AIR QUALITY

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

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a) The proposed project is for a minor subdivision, and no change is proposed in the existing use which is agricultural. Any future construction and/or earth moving activities will be subject to Regulation VIII Fugitive Dust Rules, according to Air Pollution Control District comment letter dated October 28, 2020 <sup>2</sup> . Said measures would bring the project's impact less than significant. |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) As previously stated, under item 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, less than significant impact is expected.        |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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.  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) The proposed project is for a minor subdivision with no propose change to the existing use and 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.  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |

<sup>2</sup> Air Pollution Control District comment letter dated October 28, 2020



	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>a)</b> According to the Imperial County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element<sup>3</sup>, Figure 1 "Sensitive Habitat Map", the project is located northeast of the New River, however 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.</p>				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>b)</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.</p>				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>c)</b> 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. Less than significant impacts are anticipated</p>				
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>d)</b> The proposed minor subdivision is located near the New River, however the project 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. If there would be any impact, it is expected to be less than significant.</p>				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resource, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>e)</b> 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.</p>				
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>3</sup> Imperial County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element

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

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. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.

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

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- a)** According to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element, Figure 5 "Areas of Heightened Historic Period Sensitivity, the area is classified under "1000m buffer around Named Streams and Waterbodies", however the site has an existing agricultural use that is expected to remain and it is not likely that the project may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. Thus, Figure 6 "Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity" does not locate the project within a designated area of possible impact. Additionally, on October 20, 2020, we received an email from the Quechan Historic Preservation Officer stating that they had no comments on this project. Therefore, impacts are expected to be less than significant.
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- b)** 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. Less than significant impacts are expected.
- 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 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.

**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 proposes 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. Less than significant impacts are expected.
- 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 proposes 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. Less than significant impacts are expected.

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

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

- a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving: ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- a)** The proposed project does not appear to conflict with the geology and soils of adjacent properties as no proposed development is anticipated, and the existing agricultural use is proposed to remain. The project will be required to submit a drainage letter acceptable to the Public Works Department per Public Works comment letter dated January 21, 2021. 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 Maps<sup>4</sup> does not include the site within any Earthquake Fault Zones as created by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act; the Brawley Seismic Zone is located approximately 2 miles East of the proposed project. Per Public Works Comment letter dated January 21, 2021, should any future development occur on any of the properties, a Drainage and Grading Study/Plan shall be required by the Public Works Department. Impacts are expected to be less than significant.
- 2) Strong Seismic ground shaking? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- 2)** As discussed above, under item 1) the Brawley Seismic Zone is located 2 miles East of the proposed project, and therefore, ground shaking is expected in the event 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.

<sup>4</sup> Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Maps

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the latest Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risk to life or property? <b>d)</b> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? <b>e)</b> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? <b>f)</b> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?<br><b>a)</b> The proposed project is for a subdivision with an existing 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.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan or policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?<br><b>b)</b> The proposed project is for a minor subdivision and will not conflict the regulations under AB 32 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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

IX. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** *Would the project:*

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?<br><b>a)</b> 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.   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?<br><b>b)</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. Less than significant impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? <b>c)</b> The proposed project is not located within ¼ mile of a school, thus, the project would not represent a risk to school facilities; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? <b>d)</b> The proposed project site is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous material sites <sup>5</sup> ; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? <b>e)</b> The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area; therefore, no impact expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? <b>f)</b> The proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? <b>g)</b> The proposed project site is not located in an area susceptible to wildland fires; therefore, no impact is expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** *Would the project:*

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- a)** The proposed project has an existing agricultural use that is proposed to remain and no development is anticipated. Additionally, the Imperial Irrigation District<sup>6</sup> reviewed the project information and submitted a comment letter dated October 26, 2020 with the following comments:
1. The applicant should be advised to establish a point of water delivery and drainage discharge for each parcel. For additional information on water service the applicant should call IID's North End Division Office at (760) 482-9900.
  2. Any construction or operation on IID property or within its existing and proposed right of way or easements including but not limited to: surface improvements such as proposed new streets, driveways, parking lots, landscape; and all water, sewer, storm water, or any other above ground or underground utilities will require an encroachment permit, or encroachment agreement (depending on the circumstances). The IID encroachment permit application and instructions are available at <https://www.iid.com/about-iid/departement-directory/real-estate>. The IID Real Estate Section should be contacted at (760) 339-9239 for additional information regarding encroachment permits or agreements.
  3. Any new, relocated, modified or reconstructed IID facilities required for and by the project (which

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

<sup>6</sup> Imperial Irrigation District comment letter dated October 26, 2020

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
can include but is not limited to electrical utility substations, electrical transmission and distribution lines, etc.) need to be included as part of the project's CEQA and/or NEPA documentation, environmental impact analysis and mitigation. Failure to do so will result in postponement of any construction and/or modification or IID facilities until such time as the environmental documentation is amended and environmental impacts are fully analyzed. Any and all mitigation necessary as a result of the construction, relocation and/or upgrade of IID facilities is the responsibility of the project proponent. It is expected that compliance with IID's requirements would bring any impacts related to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or surface or ground water quality, 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>b) The proposed project proposes to continue the existing 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.</b>				
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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>c) The proposed project does not anticipate a physical alteration to the site that would substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces. Additionally, per Imperial County Public Works Department<sup>7</sup> comment letter dated January 21, 2021 a Drainage letter that takes into the account the prevention of sedimentation of damage to off-site properties and county road right-of way(s) from run-off may be accepted in lieu of a Grading Plan. However, should any future development occur on any of the properties, a Drainage and Grading Study/Plan shall be required. It is expected that compliance with Imperial County Public Works Department would bring impacts to less than significant levels.</b>				
(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>(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.</b>				
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>(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.</b>				
(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;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>7</sup> Imperial County Public Works Department comment letter dated January 21, 2021

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

(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, thus, the existing agricultural use is consistent with the surrounding uses; therefore, no impact is expected.

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

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

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. Less than significant impacts are expected.

XIII. **NOISE** *Would the project result in:*

- a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- a) The proposed project is not expected to expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards as defined by Imperial County General Plan's Noise Element<sup>8</sup> 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 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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- c) The proposed project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, no impacts are expected.

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

- a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- a) The proposed project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area either directly or indirectly, since the site has two existing dwelling units and no changes to the current use are proposed. Therefore, no impacts are expected.
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- 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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

<sup>8</sup> Imperial County General Plan Noise Element



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

a) The proposed project does not anticipate any changes in the current use other than splitting the parcel in two new 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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

3) The proposed project is not expected to have a substantial impact on schools. No impacts are expected.

4) Parks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

4) The proposed project is not expected to create a substantial impact on parks. No impacts are expected.

5) Other Public Facilities? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

5) The proposed project is not expected to create a substantial impact on other public facilities; however, any impacts would be less than significant.

#### 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. Less than significant impacts are expected.

#### XVII. TRANSPORTATION *Would the project:*

a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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

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

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 proposes new development and is expected to continue the existing agricultural use; 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. Additionally, a dedicated private street (Parcel A) is proposed under parcel "A". 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 with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- a)** The proposed project has an existing 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 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 is 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 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.

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b> <i>Would the project:</i>				

- 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 agricultural use, and 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 a comment letter stating that the applicant should be advise to establish a point of water delivery and drainage discharge for each parcel. In addition to compliance with IID, since no expansion to the existing agricultural use is anticipated, it is expected that the proposed project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. Any impacts are considered less than significant.
- 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 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. Compliance with Imperial Irrigation District comment letter dated October 26, 2020 would bring any impacts to less than significant levels.
- 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 statues and regulations related to solid waste. Any future development would be subject to all statutes and regulations. Therefore, less than significant impacts are be 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? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated (PSUMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
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 25 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.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.				
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Parcel "A" is proposed as a dedicated private street, however, the proposed project would not 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. Any impacts are considered less than significant.				
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"/>
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.				

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

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

## SECTION 3

### III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

## 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 October 28, 2020.
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 letter dated October 26, 2020.
8. Imperial County Public Works Department comment letter dated January 21, 2021.
9. Imperial County General Plan Noise Element  
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/noise-element-2015.pdf>

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

---

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

---

**Project Name:** Parcel Map #02490

**Project Applicant:** Timothy Lloyd Allen & Roy Kyle Allen

**Project Location:** 6196 Lack Rd., Brawley, CA

**Description of Project:** Applicant proposes to separate two existing deliveries and two existing fields into two separate parcels for family legal trust issues. The existing property totals approximately 298 acres and the proposed division of said property would create two parcels of 143 and 155 acres each approximately.



## VII. FINDINGS

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



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



The Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects but:

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

A 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.

2-12-2021 See initial study  
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

2-16-21  
Date

## **SECTION 4**

### **VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**

(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)

**IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)**

(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)

S:\AllUsers\APN\020\150\016\PM02490\EEC\IS (Revised by State 12282018 & ICPDS 2019).docx



# Precision Engineering & Surveying, Inc.

P.O. Box 2216 El Centro, CA 92244

799 E. Heil Ave., El Centro, CA 92243.

Tel (760) 353-2684 • Fax (760) 353-2686

October 30, 2020

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

Attn: Mariela Moran

Subject: Parcel Map No. 02490, Imperial Irrigation District response letter.

Dear Mr. Minnick:

Precision Engineering & Surveying, Inc. is providing this letter to address the response from the Imperial Irrigation District on the proposed Parcel Map.

1. The applicant will continue to have water delivered to Parcel 1 through the O'Brien Lateral Delivery 958 and will continue to discharge water to the west to the Thompson Drain. The applicant will also have a separate point of water delivery to Parcel 2 from the O'Brien Lateral Delivery 956 and will continue to discharge water north to the Vail Drain.
2. There is no construction planned for this parcel map. The proposed easement for access to Parcel 2 from Lack Road will be outside of IID right of way.
3. There will be no modifications to the existing IID facilities for this Parcel Map.

Sincerely,

Taylor Preece, P.L.S.  
Survey Manager



COUNTY OF  
IMPERIAL

DEPARTMENT OF  
PUBLIC WORKS

155 S. 11th Street  
El Centro, CA  
92243

Tel: (760) 482-4462  
Fax: (760) 352-1272

*Public Works works for the Public*



January 21, 2021

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

Attention: Mariela Moran, Planner II

**SUBJECT: Parcel Map 2490 Timothy Lloyd & Roy Kyle Allen;**  
Located on 6196 Lack Road, Brawley, CA  
APN 020-150-016-001

Dear Mr. Minnick:

This letter is in response to your submittal received on October 16, 2020 for the above-mentioned project. The applicant is proposing to separate two existing deliveries and two existing fields into two separate legal parcels for family legal trust issues. Parcel 1 would be +/- 143 acres and Parcel 2 would be +/- 153 acres, for project's total of +/- 298 acres. The intended use will remain agricultural.

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

1. Whenever Parcel Map are proposed. This Department normally require a Grading and Drainage Study/Plan be provided. In this case, since no new development is being proposed, a Drainage Letter that takes into account the prevention of sedimentation of damage to off-site properties and county road right-of-way(s) from storm run-off may be accepted in lieu of a Grading Plan. However, should any future development occur on any of the properties, a Drainage and Grading Study/Plan shall be required by this Department
2. Each parcel created or affected by this project shall abut a maintained road and/or have legal and physical access to a public road before the project documents are recorded
3. An encroachment permit shall be secured from this Department for any and all new, altered or unauthorized existing driveway(s) to access the properties through surrounding roads (Per Imperial County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 12.12 - Excavations on or Near a Public Road). However, should any future development occur on any of the properties, Street improvements shall be required in conjunction with, but not limited to, any construction, grading, or related work, including the construction of structures, buildings, or major additions thereto, on property located adjacent to any county street or on property utilizing any county street for ingress and egress (Per Section 12.10.020 - Street Improvement Requirements of Imperial County Ordinance).
4. Lack Road is classified as Minor Collector – Local Collector, two (2) lanes, requiring seventy feet (70) of right of way, being thirty five (35) feet from existing centerline. It is required that sufficient right of way be provided to meet this road classification. As directed by Imperial County Board of Supervisors per Minute Order #6 dated 11/22/1994 per the Imperial County Circulation Element Plan of the General Plan).

5. The corners and angle points of Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 shall be marked with durable survey monuments set in a manner ensuring the greatest permanence practicable
6. Tentative Parcel Map 2490 shows five (5) controlling survey corners in existence prior to the proposed subdivision. Corner records that show connections to at least three (3) nearby corner accessories shall be prepared and filed for each of the controlling survey corner monuments shown on the Tentative Parcel Map.

Informative at time of development:

The following items are for informational purposes only. Applicant is responsible to determine if the enclosed items affect the subject project.

- As this project proceeds through the planning and the approval process, additional comments and/or requirements may apply as more information is received.
- 
- All solid and hazardous waste shall be disposed of in approved solid waste disposal sites in accordance with existing County, State and Federal regulations (Per Imperial County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 8.72).
- The project may require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and Notice of Intent (NOI) from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) prior county approval of onsite grading plan (40 CFR 122.28).
- As this project proceeds through the planning and the approval process, additional comments and/or requirements may apply as more information is received.
- A Transportation Permit may be required from road agency(s) having jurisdiction over the haul route(s) for any hauls of heavy equipment and/or large vehicles which impose greater than legal loads on riding surfaces, including bridges. (Per Imperial County Code of Ordinances, Chapter 10.12 – Overweight Vehicles and Loads).

Respectfully,



John A. Gay, PE  
Director of Public Works

CY/dm

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT



October 28, 2020

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

**RECEIVED**  
OCT 28 2020  
IMPERIAL COUNTY  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

SUBJECT: Parcel Map (PM) 02490—Timothy Lloyd Allen and Roy Kyle Allen

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) 02490 that would separate two existing fields into two separate legal parcels of 153 acres and 143 acres for family legal trust issues. The intended use will remain agricultural. The project is located at 6196 Lack Road in Brawley, California (further described as Assessor's Parcel Number 020-150-016-000).

Upon review, the Air District has no comment at this time other than to receive a copy of the Final Parcel Map.

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





# IID

*A century of service.*

www.iid.com

*Since 1911*

October 26, 2020

Ms. Mariela Moran  
Planner II  
Planning & Development Services Department  
County of Imperial  
801 Main Street  
El Centro, CA 92243

RECEIVED  
OCT 26 2020  
IMPERIAL COUNTY  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

SUBJECT: Parcel Map No. 2490

Dear Ms. Moran:

On October 16, 2020, the Imperial Irrigation District received from the Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department, a request for agency comments on Parcel Map no. 02490. The applicant proposes to separate two deliveries (O'Brien Lateral Deliveries 956 and 958) and two agricultural fields located at 6196 Lack Road in Brawley, California (APN 020-150-016-001) into two legal parcel for family legal trust purposes.

The Imperial Irrigation District has reviewed the information and has the following comments:

1. The applicant should be advised to establish a point of water delivery and drainage discharge for each parcel. For additional information on water service the applicant should call IID's North End Division Office at (760) 482-9900.
2. Any construction or operation on IID property or within its existing and proposed right of way or easements including but not limited to: surface improvements such as proposed new streets, driveways, parking lots, landscape; and all water, sewer, storm water, or any other above ground or underground utilities; will require an encroachment permit, or encroachment agreement (depending on the circumstances). The IID encroachment permit application and instructions are available at <https://www.iid.com/about-iid/departments-directory/real-estate>. The IID Real Estate Section should be contacted at (760) 339-9239 for additional information regarding encroachment permits or agreements.
3. Any new, relocated, modified or reconstructed IID facilities required for and by the project (which can include but is not limited to electrical utility substations, electrical transmission and distribution lines, etc.) need to be included as part of the project's CEQA and/or NEPA documentation, environmental impact analysis and mitigation. Failure to do so will result in postponement of any construction and/or modification



## Mariela Moran

**From:** Leal, Rudy Z <rzleal@IID.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 21, 2020 4:26 PM  
**To:** Valerie Grijalva  
**Subject:** RE: PM02490 Request for Comments

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

Good afternoon Valerie,  
No comments from IID Transmission Planning.  
Thanks,



**Rudy Z. Leal**  
**Engineer I**  
**Transmission Planning**  
**Imperial Irrigation District**  
**Desk:** (760) 482-3644 **Cell:** (760) 996-8343  
**Email:** [rzleal@iid.com](mailto:rzleal@iid.com)

The foregoing electronic message, together with any attachments thereto, is confidential and may be legally privileged against disclosure other than to the intended recipient. It is intended solely for the addressee(s) and access to the message by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient of this electronic message, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete and immediately notify the sender of this error.

**From:** Valerie Grijalva <ValerieGrijalva@co.imperial.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 16, 2020 1:43 PM  
**To:** Carlos Ortiz <CarlosOrtiz@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sandra Mendivil <SandraMendivil@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>; Tony Rouhotas <TonyRouhotas@co.imperial.ca.us>; Esperanza Colio <EsperanzaColio@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jeff Lamoure <JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Mario Salinas <MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Menvielle <RobertMenvielle@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Malek <RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us>; Andrew Loper <AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us>; Janette Angulo <JanetteAngulo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Raymond Loera <rloera@icso.org>; rbenavidez@icso.org; Vargas, Donald A <DVargas@IID.com>; Leal, Rudy Z <rzleal@IID.com>; Kai.Dunn@waterboards.ca.gov; magdalena.rodriquez@wildlife.ca.gov; csahagun@blm.gov; historicpreservation@quechantribe.com; Quechan Indian Tribe <tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com>  
**Cc:** Mariela Moran <MarielaMoran@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Carina Gomez <CarinaGomez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Gabriela Robb <GabrielaRobb@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Robb <JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kimberly Noriega <KimberlyNoriega@co.imperial.ca.us>; Maria Scoville <mariascoville@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Soto <RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us>  
**Subject:** PM02490 Request for Comments

**[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 commenting agencies,

Please see attached Request for Comments Packet for **PM02490**. Comments are due by **November 02, 2020 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 Mariela Moran, Planner II at (442)265-1736 ext. 1747 or submit your comment letters to [icpdscommentletters@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto: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**





# Imperial County Planning & Development Services Planning / **RECEIVED**

NOV 02 2020

October 16, 2020

**Jim Minnick**  
DIRECTOR

**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**

- ☒ Board of Supervisors - Ryan E. Kelley
- ☒ County Executive Office - Tony Rouholias/Esperanza Collo
- ☒ IC Public Health - Jaqueline Angulo
- ☒ Public Works - John Gay/Carica Yee
- ☒ APCD - Matt Dessert/Monica Soucier
- ☒ Ag. Commissioner - Carlos Ortiz/Sandra Mandivil
- ☒ IC Fire/OES Office - Robert Malek/Andrew Loper
- ☒ IC Sheriff's Office - Robert Benavidez/Ray Loera
- ☒ EHS Office - Jeff Lamoure/Jorge Perez/Mario Salinas
- ☒ Assessor's Office - Robert Menvielle

**State Agencies/Other**

- ☒ CA RWQC Board - Kai Dunn
- ☐ CA Public Utilities Commission (Southern CA)
- ☒ Dept. of Fish and Wildlife - Magdalena Rodriguez
- ☐ Native American Heritage Commission - Katy Sanchez
- ☐ Torres - Martinez Indian Tribe - Joseph Mirelez
- ☐ Torres - Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians - Thomas Tortez
- ☐ La Posta Band of Mission Indians - Gwendolyn Parada
- ☐ Manzanita Band of KUMEYAAY Nation - Angela Elliott Santos
- ☐ KUMEYAAY Cultural Repatriation Committee
- ☐ Other..

**Cities/Other**

- ☐ Central Union High School District - Dr. Ward Andrus
- ☒ IID - Rudy Leal
- ☒ BLM - Carrie Sahagun
- ☒ IID Environ. Compliance - Donald Vargas
- ☐ Caltrans-District 11 - Melina Pereira/Roger Sanchez
- ☐ COCOPAH Indian Tribe - Sherry Cordova
- ☐ CHEMEHUEVI Reservation - Charles Wood
- ☐ Campo Band of Mission Indians - Ralph Goff
- ☐ Fort Yuma - Quechan Indian Tribe - Jill McCormick
- ☐ Fort Yuma - Quechan Indian Tribe - Jordan D. Joaquin

**From:** Mariela Moran, Planner II - (442) 265-1736 extension 1747 or via-email at [ICPDSCCommentLetters@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:ICPDSCCommentLetters@co.imperial.ca.us)  
**Project ID:** Parcel Map 02490  
**Project Location:** 6196 Lack Rd., Brawley, CA. APN 020-150-016-001  
**Project Description:** Applicant is proposing to separate two existing deliveries and two existing fields into two separate legal parcels for family legal trust issues. Parcel 1 would be +/- 143 acres and parcel 2 would be +/- 153 acres, for a project's total of +/- 298 acres. The intended use will remain agricultural.  
**Applicant:** Timothy Lloyd Allen & Roy Kyle Allen

Your written comments, recommendations, or conditions are requested by the deadline below so that the Director of Planning & Development Services can review them for appropriateness and incorporate it as part of project consideration. Please submit your response to the Case Planner.  
 Jim Minnick, Director, Thank You!

**Comments due by: November 2, 2020**

**EEC 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 Comments*

Name: Mary Sanchez Signature: [Signature] Title: Deputy Ag. Commissioner/Sealer  
 Date: 11/2/2020 Telephone No.: 81495 E-mail: marysanchez@co.imperial.ca.us

VGIMMIS:AIUsers\APN020150016\PM02490\PM02490 Request for Comments.docx

## Mariela Moran

---

**From:** Quechan Historic Preservation Officer <historicpreservation@quechantribe.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2020 8:50 AM  
**To:** Valerie Grijalva; Mariela Moran  
**Cc:** ICPDSCcommentLetters  
**Subject:** RE: PM02490 Request for Comments

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

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

---

**From:** Valerie Grijalva [mailto:ValerieGrijalva@co.imperial.ca.us]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 16, 2020 1:43 PM  
**To:** Carlos Ortiz; Sandra Mendivil; Matt Dessert; Monica Soucier; Ryan Kelley; Tony Rouhotas; Esperanza Colio; Jeff Lamoure; Jorge Perez; Mario Salinas; Robert Menvielle; Robert Malek; Andrew Loper; Janette Angulo; Raymond Loera; rbenavidez@icso.org; Donald Vargas - IID; Leal, Rudy Z; Kai.Dunn@waterboards.ca.gov; magdalena.rodriguez@wildlife.ca.gov; csahagun@blm.gov; historicpreservation@quechantribe.com; Quechan Indian Tribe  
**Cc:** Mariela Moran; Michael Abraham; Carina Gomez; Gabriela Robb; John Robb; Kimberly Noriega; Maria Scoville; Rosa Soto  
**Subject:** PM02490 Request for Comments

Good afternoon commenting agencies,

Please see attached Request for Comments Packet for **PM02490**. Comments are due by **November 02, 2020 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 Mariela Moran, Planner II at (442)265-1736 ext. 1747 or submit your comment letters to [icpdscommentletters@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto: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





## Mariela Moran

---

**From:** Mario Salinas  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2020 10:18 AM  
**To:** Valerie Grijalva  
**Cc:** Mariela Moran; Michael Abraham; Carina Gomez; Gabriela Robb; John Robb; Kimberly Noriega; Maria Scoville; Rosa Soto  
**Subject:** RE: PM02490 Request for Comments

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Good morning Ms. Grijalva,

Pertaining to PM02490, Division of Environmental Health does not have any comments at this time.

Thank you,

### Mario Salinas, MBA

Environmental Health Compliance Specialist I  
Imperial County Public Health Department  
Division of Environmental Health  
797 Main Street Suite B, El Centro, CA 92243  
[mariosalinas@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto:mariosalinas@co.imperial.ca.us)  
Phone: (442) 265-1888  
Fax: (442) 265-1903  
[www.icphd.org](http://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:** Friday, October 16, 2020 1:43 PM  
**To:** Carlos Ortiz <CarlosOrtiz@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sandra Mendivil <SandraMendivil@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>; Tony Rouhotas <TonyRouhotas@co.imperial.ca.us>; Esperanza Colio <EsperanzaColio@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jeff Lamoure <JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Mario Salinas <MarioSalinas@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Menvielle <RobertMenvielle@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Malek <RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us>; Andrew Loper <AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us>; Janette Angulo <JanetteAngulo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Raymond Loera <rloera@icso.org>; rbenavidez@icso.org; Donald Vargas - IID <DVargas@IID.com>; Leal, Rudy Z <rzleal@IID.com>; Kai.Dunn@waterboards.ca.gov; magdalena.rodriguez@wildlife.ca.gov; csahagun@blm.gov; historicpreservation@quechantribe.com; Quechan Indian Tribe <tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com>

Cc: Mariela Moran <MarielaMoran@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Carina Gomez <CarinaGomez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Gabriela Robb <GabrielaRobb@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Robb <JohnRobb@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kimberly Noriega <KimberlyNoriega@co.imperial.ca.us>; Maria Scoville <mariascoville@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Soto <RosaSoto@co.imperial.ca.us>  
**Subject:** PM02490 Request for Comments

Good afternoon commenting agencies,

Please see attached Request for Comments Packet for **PM02490**. Comments are due by **November 02, 2020 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 Mariela Moran, Planner II at (442)265-1736 ext. 1747 or submit your comment letters to [icpdscommentletters@co.imperial.ca.us](mailto: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



**PARCEL MAP APPLICATION AND  
SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTATION**

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 <b>Timothy Lloyd Allen &amp; Roy Kyle Allen</b>	EMAIL ADDRESS <b>office@timcohay.com</b>	
2. MAILING ADDRESS <b>P.O. Box 772 Calipatria, CA</b>	ZIP CODE <b>92233</b>	PHONE NUMBER <b>760-455-0027</b>
3. ENGINEER'S NAME <b>Precision Engineering &amp; Surveying, Inc.</b>	CAL. LICENSE NO. <b>PLS 9436</b>	EMAIL ADDRESS <b>taylor@presurvinc.com</b>
4. MAILING ADDRESS <b>P.O. Box 2216 El Centro, CA</b>	ZIP CODE <b>92244</b>	PHONE NUMBER <b>760-353-2684</b>
5. PROPERTY (site) ADDRESS <b>O'brien Lateral Deliveries 956 &amp; 958</b>	LOCATION <b>O'brien Lateral Deliveries 956 &amp; 958</b>	
6. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO. <b>020-150-016</b>	SIZE OF PROPERTY (in acres or square foot) <b>298.4250</b>	
7. LEGAL DESCRIPTION (attach separate sheet if necessary) <b>See attached list of legal descriptions</b>		
8. EXPLAIN PURPOSE/REASON FOR MINOR SUBDIVISION <b>Separate two existing deliveries and two existing fields into two separate legal parcels. For trust legal issues</b>		

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	<b>143.28 AC</b>	Agriculture	Agriculture	A-3
2 or B	<b>153.28 AC</b>	Agriculture	Agriculture	A-3
3 or C	<b>.24</b>			
4 or D				

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

10. DESCRIBE PROPOSED SEWER SYSTEM(s)	<b>None</b>	<b>RECEIVED</b> <b>SEP 24 2020</b> <b>IMPERIAL COUNTY</b> <b>PLANNING &amp; DEVELOPMENT SERVICES</b>
11. DESCRIBE PROPOSED WATER SYSTEM	<b>None</b>	
12. DESCRIBE PROPOSED ACCESS TO SUBDIVIDED LOTS	<b>Ruegger Road</b>	
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.

Timothy Lloyd Allen

Roy Kyle Allen

9-14-2020

Print Name (owner)

Date

Signature (owner)

Signature (owner)

Print Name (Agent)

Date

Signature (Agent)

9-18-2020

## 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:	<b>JDR</b>	DATE	<b>9/24/2020</b>	REVIEW / APPROVAL BY OTHER DEPT'S required. <input type="checkbox"/> P. W. <input type="checkbox"/> E. H. S. <input type="checkbox"/> A. P. C. D. <input type="checkbox"/> O. E. S. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ <input type="checkbox"/> _____
APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE BY:	_____	DATE	_____	
APPLICATION REJECTED BY:	_____	DATE	_____	
TENTATIVE HEARING BY:	_____	DATE	_____	
FINAL ACTION:	<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVED <input type="checkbox"/> DENIED	DATE	_____	

PM#

**02490**

IS20-0025

EEC ORIGINAL PKG



**Parcel Map #02490**

**O'brien Lateral Deliveries 956 & 958, Imperial County, CA**

**Project Description**

The project is located in the southeast quadrant of Lack Road and Vail Road, south of the Vail Canal in the County of Imperial, California. The subject property is described as being portions of the Northeast Quarter and the Northwest Quarter of Section 29, T.12S.,R.13E.,S.B.M. lying easterly of the new river and containing 298.46 Acres.

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

Proposed Parcel 1 will have legal and physical access from Lack Road. Proposed Parcel 2 will have legal and physical access from Lack Road through an easement across the North 20.00 feet of Proposed Parcel 1 shown on the tentative parcel map. Proposed Parcel 1 will continue to receive water from the O'brien Lateral Delivery 958 and will continue to drain west to the Thompson Drain. Proposed Parcel 2 will continue to receive water from the O'brien Lateral Delivery 956 and will continue to drain north to the Vail Drain. Both parcels will continue to be farmed in agriculture.

Neither of the proposed parcels drain onto any other parcels of land and are self contained.

10/13/2020

Page 1 of 1

**RECEIVED**

**OCT 13 2020**


IMPERIAL COUNTY  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

**EEC ORIGINAL PKG**



For more information, please call the FBI's toll-free 24-hour U.S. Department of Justice Computer Crime Center at 1-800-368-5848. For information on the FBI's Computer Crime Center, visit our website at [www.fbi.gov/computer](http://www.fbi.gov/computer).

WHEEL COUNTY  
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



<b>FIRM</b> <b>FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP</b> <b>IMPERIAL COUNTY,</b> <b>CALIFORNIA</b> <b>AND INCORPORATED AREAS</b>	<b>PANEL 1000 OF 2000</b> (SEE MAP INDEX FOR PANEL LOCATION)	
	<b>EXPIRATION</b> MONTHS	<b>DATE</b> MONTH DAY YEAR
<b>APPLICANT</b> NAME OF APPLICANT	<b>MAP NUMBER</b> 000557-NABC	