

PROJECT REPORT

TO: ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE

AGENDA DATE: February 12, 2026

FROM: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

AGENDA TIME 1:30 PM / No.2

PROJECT TYPE: Anita & Jacqueline Martinez
Parcel Map #02521 SUPERVISOR DIST #2

LOCATION: 22 East Fawcett Road APN: 054-331-012-000
Heber, CA 92249 PARCEL SIZE: +/-0.40 AC

GENERAL PLAN (existing) Low Density Residential GENERAL PLAN (proposed) N/A

ZONE (existing) R-1 (Low Density Residential Zone) 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: 2/12/2026

INITIAL STUDY: #25-0038

NEGATIVE DECLARATION MITIGATED NEG. DECLARATION EIR

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS / APPROVALS:

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

OTHER Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, IID

REQUESTED ACTION:

(See Attached)

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

AM\QL\S:\AllUsers\APN\054\331\012\PM02521-IS25-0038\EEC\PM02521 IS25-0038 PROJECT REPORT 2-12-26.docx

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

NEGATIVE DECLARATION
 MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

*Initial Study & Environmental Analysis
For:*

**Parcel Map #02521
Initial Study #25-0038
Anita Marie Martinez JT ETAL**



Prepared By:

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

February 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>SECTION 1</u>	
I. INTRODUCTION	3
<u>SECTION 2</u>	
II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	8
PROJECT SUMMARY	10
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	13
I. AESTHETICS	15
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	15
III. AIR QUALITY	16
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	16
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES	18
VI. ENERGY	18
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	16
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION	19
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	20
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	21
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	21
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	25
XX. WILDFIRE	25
<u>SECTION 3</u>	
III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	23
IV. PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED	24
V. REFERENCES	25
VI. NEGATIVE DECLARATION - COUNTY OF IMPERIAL	26
VII. FINDINGS	27
<u>SECTION 4</u>	
VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)	28
IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) (IF ANY)	29

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

This document is a policy-level, project level Initial Study for evaluation of potential environmental impacts resulting with the proposed Parcel Map #02521 (Refer to Exhibit "A").

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. INTENDED USES OF INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

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

D. CONTENTS OF INITIAL STUDY & NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

SECTION 1

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

SECTION 2

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

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

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

SECTION 3

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

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

preparation of this Initial Study and Negative Declaration.

V. REFERENCES lists bibliographical materials used in the 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:** Anita Marie Martinez JT ETAL
2. **Lead Agency:** Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department
3. **Contact person and phone number:** Alan C. Molina, Planner II, (442)265-1736, ext. 1747
4. **Address:** 801 Main Street, El Centro CA, 92243
5. **E-mail:** alanmolina@co.imperial.ca.us
6. **Project location:** 22 East Fawcett Road, Heber, CA 92249
Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 054-331-012-000
7. **Project sponsor's name and address:** Anita & Jacqueline Martinez
PO Box 462
Heber, CA 92249
8. **General Plan designation:** Low Density Residential
9. **Zoning:** R-1 (Low Density Residential Zone)

10. **Description of project:** The applicants, Anita Marie and Jacqueline Danila Martinez, are requesting approval for a minor subdivision of land. The proposed action involves dividing an existing ± 0.42 -acre parcel into two distinct lots. Proposed Parcel 1 would comprise approximately 0.10 acres and includes an existing residence that has been occupied by the Maldonado family since 1998. Legal and physical access to the parcel would continue to be provided via Fawcett Road. Water and sewer services would continue to be supplied through existing water and sewer service lines provided by Heber Public Utility District (HPUD). Proposed Parcel 2 would comprise approximately 0.32 acres and includes an existing residence which is currently occupied by the Martinez family. Legal and physical access to the parcel would continue to be provided via Fawcett Road. Water and sewer services would also be provided by HPUD. No changes to the existing zoning designation or land uses are proposed as part of this request.

11. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The project site is surrounded by parcels zoned as R-1 (Low Density Residential) on the North, East, and West. The parcel surrounding the project site North and West is an agriculture field and the parcels on the East are developed with single-family residences. The parcel abutting south is zoned A-2-G-SPA (General Agriculture Zone with a Geothermal and Specific Plan Area Overlay) and is currently an agricultural field.

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, Campo Band of Mission Indians, and Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians were contacted and invited to participate in the AB-52 Consultation and Request for Review and Comments as part of the Initial Study review process for a period of time between November 17, 2025, through December 17, 2025. A "no comment" letter from the Quechan and Agua Caliente Band was received on November 17, 2025. As of this moment no comments have been received from the Campo Band of Mission Indians.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

<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.

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



 Jim Minnick, Director of Planning/EEC Chairman

2-12-2026

 Date:

PROJECT SUMMARY

- A. **Project Location:** The proposed project would be located at 22 Fawcett Road, Heber, CA 92249; Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 054-331-012-000.
- B. **Project Summary:** The applicants, Anita Marie and Jacqueline Danila Martinez, propose a minor subdivision of land to create two distinct lots separating two existing single-family residences. The subject parcel is approximately 0.42-AC. According to official County records, the primary residence, located on the east side of the subject site and identified as 22 Fawcett Road, Heber, CA 92249 (Proposed Parcel 2), was legally established in 1971. In October 1977, the Imperial County Planning Commission issued Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 291-77 to Angel D. Martinez, authorizing the installation of a mobile home as a second dwelling unit. The mobile home is located on the west side of the subject site and is commonly known as 20 Fawcett Road, Heber, CA 92249 (Proposed Parcel 1). The Maldonado family is currently occupying the mobile home and has provided proof of residency since 1998 through documentation of utility services including water, sewer, and trash from the Heber Public Utility District (HPUD) and electricity from the Imperial Irrigation District (IID).

Proposed Parcel 1 would comprise approximately 0.10 acres and includes an existing residence. Legal and physical access to the parcel would continue to be provided via Fawcett Road. Water and sewer services would continue to be supplied through existing water and sewer service lines provided by Heber Public Utility District (HPUD). Proposed Parcel 2 would comprise approximately 0.32 acres and includes an existing residence. Legal and physical access to the parcel would continue to be provided via Fawcett Road. Water and sewer services would also be provided by HPUD. No changes to the existing zoning designation or land uses are proposed as part of this request.

- C. **Environmental Setting:** The proposed project parcel is within the Heber Urban Area Plan, zoned as R-1 (Low Density Residential), and surrounded by agricultural fields on the North, West, and South, and single-family residences on the East.
- D. **Analysis:** The proposed action described in this application qualifies as a minor subdivision, as it involves the creation of four (4) or fewer parcels, thereby meeting the criteria for a parcel map pursuant to Division 8 (Subdivision Ordinance), Section 90805.00 et seq. However, proposed Parcel 1, which is approximately 4,273.57 square feet, does not meet the minimum 6000 sq. ft. lot size requirement for a parcel within the R-1 Zone.

On May 25, 2007, a notarized Private "Sale-Purchase" Agreement was executed between Ms. Margarita K. Martinez, the previous property owner, and Elsa L. Maldonado for the purchase of land identified as proposed Parcel 1 including the existing mobile home on-site. Through a "Stipulation and Order Regarding Complaint to Quiet Title" (Court Order)¹ of the Superior Court of the State of California, CASE No. ECU 002866, the heirs of Ms. Martinez, Anita Marie and Jacqueline Danila Martinez, current property owners and applicants, agreed to the partition of the subject property to establish ownership of proposed Parcel 1 by Ms. Maldonado. The Court formally ordered and decreed that the applicants agree to the partition of the property and will provide a grant deed for the newly created parcel to Elsa Lara Maldonado. Both the applicants and Ms. Maldonado have expressed agreement with the conceptual layout of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map. See Exhibit "B" Tentative Parcel Map.

In accordance with the technical findings in the Court's Order, the Imperial County Planning Department (ICPDS) recognizes the Court Order as justification for any necessary waiver, deviation, and/or modification to the minimum lot size requirement for the R-1 zone. This would allow the creation of Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 through a Tentative Parcel Map, and subsequently, a Parcel Map.

-
- E. General Plan Consistency:** Per the Heber Urban Area Plan, the land use designation for this project is "Low Density Residential" and zoned as R-1 (Low Density Residential Zone) per Zone Map #12A of the Imperial County Land Use Ordinance (Title 9). The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and County Land Use Ordinance, Sections 90502.04 and 90805.00 et. al. through the justification for any necessary waiver, deviation, and/or modification to the minimum lot size requirement for the R-1 zone as provided by the Court Order.

Exhibit "A"
Vicinity Map

PROJECT LOCATION MAP



ANITA & JACQUELINE MARTINEZ
PM #02521 / IS #25-0038
APN: 054-331-012

-  Project Location
-  Parcels
-  Centerline
-  Proposed Parcel A
-  Proposed Parcel B



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)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	----------------

I. AESTHETICS

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

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

a) Four areas within the County have the potential as state-designated scenic highways; however, the project site is not located near any scenic vista or scenic highway according to the Imperial County General Plan Circulation and Scenic Highway Element² and California State Scenic Highway System Map³. No impacts are expected.
- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

b) As previously stated on section (I)(a), the proposed project is not located near a scenic vista or scenic highway and would not substantially damage any scenic resources. The nearest highway is State Highway 86 located approximately 0.5 miles north of the Project site. This highway is not a designated scenic highway. The project's vicinity does not contain any rock outcroppings and has very few trees. Additionally, according to the California Historic Resources⁴ in Imperial County, the nearest eligible historic building is the Calexico Carnegie Library which is located approximately 4.30 miles southeast of the project site, within the City of Calexico. Therefore, no substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcropping, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway is anticipated. No impacts are expected.
- c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surrounding? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

c) The proposed project is for a minor subdivision of land to create two distinct lots and separate two existing single-family residences. The proposed action would not substantially degrade or physically alter the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, as the current zoning designations and land uses are proposed to remain unchanged. No impacts are expected.
- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

d) The application does not include any proposals for new sources of light or glare; therefore, no impacts are expected.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

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

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

a) According to the California Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program: Important Farmland Finder (Imperial County) 2025⁵, the proposed project site is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land. The proposed action would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use. Furthermore, the existing zoning designations and land uses are proposed to remain unchanged. No impacts are expected.
- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

b) The County of Imperial has no current active Williamson Act contracts. Additionally, according to the California Williamson Act Enrollment Finder⁶, Imperial County is not participating in the 2024 Williamson Act; therefore, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract. No Impacts are expected.

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? c) The project is not within any forestland; therefore, no impacts related to the conversion of timberlands or forest land are expected. Therefore, no impact is expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? d) As previously stated, the project site is not within or close to any forest land; therefore, no impacts would occur. No impact is expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? e) No changes are proposed other than the minor subdivision to separate one 0.42-acre parcel into two distinct parcels. The purpose of the subdivision is to transfer ownership, and the current residential use will be maintained. No impact is expected to occur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

III. AIR QUALITY

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
a) The proposed project is for a minor subdivision of land to create two distinct lots, separating two existing single-family residences, and it is not expected to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Additionally, on December 2, 2025, ICPDS received a comment letter from the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District⁷ stating they had no comments on the proposed minor subdivision of land. Less than significant impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?
b) As previously stated under item (III)(a) above, the proposed project is for a minor subdivision of land to create two distinct lots, separating two existing single-family residences, and it is not expected to substantially contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations?
c) As previously stated under items III(a) and III(b), the proposed action is a minor subdivision to create two distinct lots, separating two existing single-family residences; therefore, the proposed project is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants concentrations. Additionally, on December 2, 2025, ICPDS received a comment letter from the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District⁷ stating they had no comments on the proposed minor subdivision of land. No earth moving activities are being proposed; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?
d) As previously referenced on item (III)(c) above, the proposed minor subdivision does not anticipate creating objectionable odors that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES *Would the project:*

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	----------------

policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

a) Although the Conservation and Open Space Element of the Imperial County General Plan (Figure 2 – “Sensitive Species Map^{8b}”) identifies a modeled distribution for the Burrowing Owl within the proposed project area and its vicinity, the proposed minor subdivision of land is not expected to result in any physical alterations to the environment. Furthermore, according to the California Department of Fish and Game Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation⁹, the type of action proposed, minor subdivision of land, is not considered an activity with the potential to take or adversely affect Burrowing Owls. Therefore, any potential impact on the species is expected to be less than significant.

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

b) According to the National Wetlands Inventory: Surface Waters and Wetlands Map¹⁰, the proposed project site is not located within or near any riparian habitat. As previously noted in Section (IV)(a), while the Imperial County General Plan’s Conservation and Open Space Element⁸ identifies a modeled distribution for the Burrowing Owl in the project area and its surroundings, the proposed action does not appear to conflict with any local or regional plans, policies, or regulations concerning sensitive natural communities, including those recognized by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Additionally, the proposed minor subdivision of land is not considered an activity likely to result in take or adverse effects on Burrowing Owls, as outlined in the California Department of Fish and Game Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation¹¹. Accordingly, any potential impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

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

c) According to the National Wetlands Inventory: Surface Waters and Wetlands Map¹⁰ the nearest water feature is the Dogwood Canal, which includes approximately 1.25 acres of Riverine habitat classified as R2UBHx (Riverine, Low Pennial, Unconsolidated Bottom, Permanently Flooded, Excavated). However, the proposed subdivision is not expected to result in any direct or indirect impacts to this waterbody or to other sensitive habitats such as marshes, vernal pools, or coastal wetlands. No removal, filling, alteration of hydrology, or similar disturbances are proposed. Therefore, any impact on these resources is anticipated to be less than significant.

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

d) According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species Mapper¹² and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lands Viewer¹³, there are no designated federal, state, or local parks, wildlife corridors, or conservation areas located on or adjacent to the project site. The proposed minor subdivision will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, nor will it disrupt established migratory corridors or impede access to wildlife nursery sites. Accordingly, any impacts associated with the project are expected to be less than significant.

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

e) The proposed subdivision does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; therefore, no impact is expected.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

f) According to the Imperial County General Plan’s Conservation and Open Space Element,⁸ (Figure 1 – “Sensitive Habitats^{8b}”) and (Figure 3 – “Agency-Designated Habitats Map^{8c}”) the proposed project area is not located within an area that is subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Although the proposed project site lies within the boundaries of the Imperial Irrigation District’s Imperial Valley Natural Community Conservation Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan (Planning Agreement No. 2810-2004-001-06),¹⁴ the proposed minor subdivision is not anticipated to conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other applicable local, regional, or state conservation plans. Furthermore, should there be any future development, adherence to the mitigation measures outlined in the California Department of Fish and

Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	----------------

Game's Incidental Take Permit No. 2081-2003-024-006¹⁵, as required by the Imperial Irrigation District, would reduce any impact to a level considered 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 6^{dd} – Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity^{de} indicates that the site is not situated within the immediate vicinity of any known areas of cultural sensitivity to Native American communities. In compliance with Assembly Bill 52, consultation letters regarding the proposed minor subdivision project were sent on November 17, 2025, to the Quechan Tribe, Campo Band of Mission Indians, and Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. Subsequently, ICPDS received an email from the Historic Preservation Officer of the Fort Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe¹⁶ and Agua Caliente Band¹⁷ indicating that they had no comments on the proposed project. As of the date of this writing, no response has been received from the Campo Band of Mission Indians. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
b) As previously stated, it was found that the site location is not in or near any "Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity", nor within any Tribal Lands area according to the Tribal Lands in U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 Map¹⁸; therefore, less than significant impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?
c) The proposed project site is not located within or adjacent to the vicinity of any cemeteries; therefore, the proposed minor subdivision would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries. Less than significant impacts are expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

VI. **ENERGY** *Would the project:*

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?
a) No consumption of energy is anticipated for this proposed subdivision, as no development is being proposed. However, as stated in IID's comment letter¹⁹ for any future development the applicant shall adhere to their rules and regulations. Therefore, no impact is expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?
b) No local or state plans regarding energy are anticipated and as mentioned above, the applicant shall adhere to IID's rules and regulations for future development; therefore, no impacts are expected to occur. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
a) According to the Department of Conservation's Regulatory Maps²⁰, the project site is not in a fault zone. Additionally, no proposed developments are anticipated at this time. Any future development would require compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code²¹ as well as going through a ministerial building permit review. Compliance with said codes and County agencies' approvals would bring potential impacts to less than significant levels at the time of future development. Consequently, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects regarding risk of loss, injury, or death; therefore, less than significant impact is expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
1) As previously mentioned, the project is not located in a fault zone, and the scope of work does not include any structures nor earthmoving activities. Compliance with applicable County agencies' requirements would bring any potential impact to less than significant levels.				
2) Strong Seismic ground shaking? 2) The proposed subdivision will not expose people to seismic ground shaking since the site is not near a known fault. As previously mentioned, if any development were to be proposed in the future, it shall have to incorporate appropriate design measures. Less than significant impacts are expected to occur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and seiche/tsunami? 3) The project site is not near a body of water of the characteristics that could cause any seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and seiche/tsunami. Therefore, no impact is expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4) Landslides? 4) The site is not located within a landslide hazard zone; therefore, no impacts are expected to occur.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? b) The proposed project is for a minor subdivision which does not include changes to the existing topography. Additionally, according to Imperial County General Plan's Seismic and Public Safety Element ²² (page 15), areas in Imperial County that are most susceptible to erosion include the Algodones Sand Dunes, as well as the Chocolate, Picacho, Cargo Muchacho, and Coast Range Mountains. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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. Should any future construction occur on either parcel, such will be subject to compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code as well as to go through a ministerial building permit review. Adherence and compliance to these standards and regulations would bring any impact to less than significant levels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the latest Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risk to life or property? d) The proposed subdivision will not cause physical changes in the environment. The applicant shall confirm with ICPDS Building Division Manager whether a Soils Report will be required prior to future development plans, if any. Compliance with County agencies' requirements will bring project impacts to less than significant.	<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? e) No new septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal systems are being proposed as part of the scope of work for this subdivision application and no new structures are being proposed that would create the need for a septic system; therefore, no impacts are expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? f) The project site is located on an already disturbed land with existing residential uses. The proposed subdivision does not propose any new development that would create any additional disturbance on the land that could cause direct or indirect destruction of a unique paleontological resource or site of unique geologic feature. Therefore, less than significant impact is 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
a) The action being proposed under the minor subdivision application does not anticipate nor expect the generation of greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. Additionally, on December 2, 2025, ICPDS received a comment letter from the Imperial County Air Pollution Control District ⁷ stating they had no comments on the proposed minor subdivision of land. Less than significant impacts are expected.				
b) Conflict with an applicable plan or policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? b) The proposed project would not conflict with any regulations under AB 32 Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases to 1990 levels by 2020 provided that the applicant adheres to APCD's regulations. Less than significant impacts are expected.	<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?
a) The proposed project involves a minor subdivision to create two distinct lots, separating two existing single-family residences. The project does not involve the use, storage, or handling of hazardous materials and, therefore, is not expected to pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, no impact is anticipated. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
b) The proposed project is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. This is because the project does not involve, nor anticipate, the use, storage, or generation of hazardous substances. Therefore, no impact is expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
c) The project site is within one-quarter mile of the existing Heber Elementary School District. Although the proposed minor subdivision does not involve, nor is it anticipated to result in, the emission of hazardous substances or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste, as previously noted in items (IX)(a) and (IX)(b). Therefore, the proposed project would not pose a risk to nearby educational institutions and no impact is expected. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
d) The proposed project site is not listed on any hazardous materials sites identified by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor database ²³ , nor is it located within or near any facilities or sites identified on page 35 of the Imperial County General Plan: Seismic and Public Safety Element ²² . Therefore, the potential for impacts related to hazardous materials is considered less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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?
e) The proposed minor subdivision is not located within an area governed by an airport land use plan, as identified in the Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility Maps ²⁴ . The nearest airport facility, Callexico International Airport, is located approximately three (3) miles south of the project site. As such, the project would not result in, or expose people to, significant safety hazards or excessive noise levels associated with airport operations. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	----------------

f) The proposed minor subdivision would not interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Furthermore, on November 18, 2025, the Imperial County Planning and Development Services Department (ICPDS) received confirmation via email from the Imperial County Fire Department²⁵ indicating that they had no comments or concerns regarding the proposed project. Therefore, any potential impacts related to emergency planning or public safety are expected to be less than significant.

- g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?
- g) According to the Office of the State Fire Marshall "Fire Hazard Severity Zones"²⁶ for Imperial County, the project site is not considered a fire hazard zone; therefore, no impacts are expected.

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

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?
- a) The proposed minor subdivision is not anticipated to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, nor is it expected to result in the substantial degradation of surface or groundwater quality. According to the minor subdivision application, water and sewer services for both proposed parcels would continue to be supplied through existing water and sewer service lines provided by HPUD. Based on the available information, less than significant impacts are expected.
- b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?
- b) As previously stated on item (X)(a) above, the proposed minor subdivision does not expect to substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Less than significant impacts are expected.
- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
- c) Per Imperial County Public Works regulations there shall be filed with each tentative map a grading plan/engineer's report showing any and all grading proposed or required for the creation of building sites within the subdivision or for construction or installation of improvements to serve the subdivision. This grading plan shall clearly show all on-site grading and shall show how off-site drainage resulting from the subdivision is managed or controlled to prevent adverse impacts. (Per Imperial County Code of Ordinances, Title 9 Division 8 Chapter 3 Section 90803.04 Grading plan). Grading plans shall be submitted for review and approval by Department of Public Works prior to recordation of the parcel map. It is expected that compliance with Public Works would bring any impact to less than significant levels.

- (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
- (i) Since no physical changes are being proposed on the environment, no erosion is expected to occur. Therefore, no impact is expected.
- (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;
- (ii) No physical changes are being proposed on the environment; therefore, no flooding is expected to occur. No impact is expected.
- (iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or;

(iii) No impacts are expected to occur regarding the existing stormwater drainage system capacity since no portion of the

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
--	--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	----------------

scope of work involves future development proposed. The division of this parcel will not change the stormwater drainage of either proposed parcel. Therefore, no impact is expected.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

(iv) The existing drainage system will not be impacted by the proposed subdivision since no development is being proposed. No impact is expected to occur.

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

d) According to the California Emergency Management Agency and the Department of Conservation²⁷, the project site is not within a Tsunami Inundation Area for Emergency Planning; therefore, no impact is expected.

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

e) The proposed subdivision will create no changes to the groundwater management plan. If there is future development, compliance with the HPUD and County water regulations will be required; therefore, no impact can be expected.

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

a) Physically divide an established community?

a) The proposed project is for a minor subdivision of land to create two distinct lots, separating two existing single-family residences and not physically dividing an established community. Additionally, the proposed action on the submitted application is considered as a minor subdivision of land, creating four (4) or fewer parcels, meeting the requirements for a parcel map under Division 8 (Subdivision Ordinance), Section 90805.00 et. al. Although Proposed Parcel 1, approximately 4273.57 square feet in size, does not meet the minimum lot size requirement for the R-1 (Low Density Residential) zone, ICPDS recognizes the Court Order¹ as justification for any necessary waiver, deviation, and/or modification to the minimum lot size requirement for the R-1 zone. This would allow the creation of Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 through a Tentative Parcel Map, and subsequently, a Parcel Map. 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) As noted previously in item (XI)(a), the proposed project is consistent with the Imperial County General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (Title 9), specifically Division 5, even though Parcel 1 does not meet the minimum lot size requirement of 6000 square feet since ICPDS recognizes the Court Order¹ as justification for any necessary waiver, deviation, and/or modification to the minimum lot size requirement for the R-1 zone. The project is not expected to result in any significant environmental impacts related to conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations adopted to avoid or mitigate environmental effects. No new construction or structural improvements are proposed for either parcel and any future developments will be made to County standards; therefore, no impact is 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 involve the extraction or removal of mineral resources and is not situated within the boundaries of an active mining site, as depicted in the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element, Figure 8 – "Existing Mineral Resources Map.^{8e}" Therefore, no impacts related to mineral resources are anticipated.

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

b) The proposed minor subdivision will not reduce the availability of locally important mineral resource recovery sites identified in the local General Plan, specific plans, or other land use documents. Furthermore, as noted in Section (XII)(a), the project site is not located within the boundaries of an active mining operation, as shown in the Imperial County General Plan's

Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	----------------

Conservation and Open Space Element, Figure 8 – “Existing Mineral Resources Map.”^{8e} Therefore, no impacts related to mineral resources are anticipated.

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 only for a minor subdivision with no development at this time and would not cause any type of noise; therefore, no impact is expected.

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

b) The proposed minor subdivision neither anticipates nor includes the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise. Additionally, as previously discussed in item (XIII)(a), any future development would be subject to the standards outlined in the Imperial County General Plan’s Noise Element²⁸. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

c) As noted previously in Section (IX)(e), the proposed minor subdivision is not located within the vicinity of any private airstrip or airport land use plan, according to the Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility Map²⁴. The nearest airport is Calexico International Airport, situated approximately three miles south of the project site. Therefore, the proposed action would not expose residents or workers in the project area to excessive noise levels. Additionally, as outlined in Section (XIII)(b), any future development would be subject to the standards of the Imperial County General Plan’s Noise Element²⁸. Accordingly, any noise-related impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING *Would the project:*

- a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and business) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

a) The proposed project involves a minor subdivision to create two separate lots, effectively separating two existing single-family residences. The proposed minor subdivision would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, as no changes to the existing uses are being proposed. Therefore, no impact is expected.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

b) The proposed subdivision does not include any future development or type of work that would cause displacement of people. 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:

a) The proposed project is for a minor subdivision which consists of dividing an existing parcel into two individual parcels, each containing an existing single-family residence. Additionally, the proposed action does not anticipate that the proposed

Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	----------------

project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios. Any impact would be less than significant.

1) Fire Protection?

1) The proposed minor subdivision is not expected to result in substantial impacts related to fire protection services. Additionally, on November 18, 2025, the Imperial County Planning and Development Services Department (ICPDS) received a "no comments" response from the Imperial County Fire Department²⁵ (ICFD), indicating that the department has no concerns regarding the proposed project. Compliance with all applicable ICFD standards and requirements would ensure that any impact remains less than significant.

2) Police Protection?

2) The proposed project is not expected to result in substantial impacts on police protection services. In the event that law enforcement assistance is needed, the project site is currently served by active patrol operations from both the California Highway Patrol and the Imperial County Sheriff's Office²⁹ – South County Patrol Division. Given the existing level of service and the nature of the proposed minor subdivision, any impacts related to police protection are anticipated to be less than significant.

3) Schools?

3) The project site is within one-quarter mile of the existing Heber Elementary School District, yet the proposed minor subdivision is not expected to have a substantial impact on schools since further residential development is not being proposed. Therefore, any impact would be less than significant.

4) Parks?

4) The proposed project is not expected to create a substantial impact on parks; therefore, no impact is expected.

5) Other Public Facilities?

5) The proposed project does not include any development or activities that might increase the need for alteration of public facilities services; therefore, no impacts are being expected.

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 involves a minor subdivision to create two separate lots, effectively separating two existing single-family residences. Furthermore, there are no neighborhood or regional parks located within the immediate project area. As a result, the proposed subdivision would not increase the use of existing parks or recreational facilities to a degree that would cause substantial physical deterioration or accelerated wear. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

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 recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment. Also, as previously stated on item (XVI)(a), there are no regional parks within the proposed project area; therefore, no impact is 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 does not anticipate nor expect any conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The subdivision is not expected to create a substantial impact on surrounding roads nor conflicting with Imperial County General Plan's Circulation and Scenic Highway Element². Any impact would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? b) The proposed minor subdivision would not conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), as it is not expected to generate a significant transportation impact. The project does not propose changes to the existing land use and is not located within a designated transit priority area. The project would create two new parcels from the existing developed parcel. The action does not anticipate subsequent development and is expected to have less than significant impacts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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) There are no design features being proposed that could cause concern regarding traffic. Although proposed Parcel 1 does not meet the minimum lot size requirement, ICPDS recognizes the Court Order¹ as justification for any necessary waiver, deviation, and/or modification to the minimum lot size requirement for the R-1 zone. The proposed project does not include any new development and expects current residential uses to remain. Additionally, any new future development in the residential parcel would be subjected to compliance with the latest edition of the California Building Code²¹ as well as to go through a ministerial building permit review. Adherence and compliance with these standards and regulations would bring any impact to less than significant levels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access? d) The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. No changes to the existing land use or zoning designations are proposed. Both newly created parcels would have legal and physical access via Fawcett Road and the proposed access points appear to be adequate for emergency response vehicles. Should any access improvements be required, they would be constructed in compliance with the standards and requirements of the Imperial County Fire Department. Therefore, any impacts related to emergency access are anticipated to be less than significant.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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) According to the Imperial County General Plan's Conservation and Open Space Element Figure 6^{8d}, the proposed project site is not located within any known Native American cultural sensitivity area. Additionally, as previously referenced in section (V)(a) above, in compliance with Assembly Bill 52, consultation letters regarding the proposed minor subdivision project were sent on November 17, 2025, to the Quechan Tribe, Campo Band of Mission Indians, and Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. Subsequently, ICPDS received an email from the Historic Preservation Officer of the Fort Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe¹⁶ and Agua Caliente Band¹⁷ indicating that they had no comments on the proposed project. As of the date of this writing, no response has been received from the Campo Band of Mission Indians. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.**
- (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) According to the California Historic Resources⁴ in Imperial County, the proposed project site is not listed or seems to be eligible under the Public Resources Code Section 21074 or 5020.1 (k); therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.
- (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

Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
--------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	----------------

American Tribe.

(ii) No significant resources listed as defined in the Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 are expected to be impacted by the proposed minor subdivision. Additionally, as previously discussed in item (XVIII)(a) above, AB 52 consultation letters regarding the proposed minor subdivision project were sent on November 17, 2025, to the Quechan Tribe, Campo Band of Mission Indians, and Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. Subsequently, ICPDS received an email from the Historic Preservation Officer of the Fort Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe¹⁶ and Agua Caliente Band¹⁷ indicating that they had no comments on the proposed project. As of the date of this writing, no response has been received from the Campo Band of Mission Indians. Any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

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

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

a) The proposed project involves a minor subdivision to create two separate lots, effectively separating two existing single-family residences and does not include nor anticipate any other changes and does not expect or result in the relocation or construction of a new expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas or telecommunication facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Additionally, as per the comment letter from IID¹⁹, the applicant will be required to provide rights of ways and easements for any proposed power line extensions and/or any other infrastructure needed to serve the project. Compliance with all applicable requirements and recommendations from IID would ensure that any impacts are less than significant.

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

b) The project will not increase the need for additional water. The existing uses will remain as they are, while receiving water from HPUD. Therefore, sufficient water supply is available to serve the project from existing and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years. Any impacts are expected to be 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 project will not increase the need for additional wastewater treatment. The existing uses will remain as they are, while being provided with wastewater services from HPUD. Therefore, any impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

d) Solid waste is not expected to be generated in excess by the proposed subdivision since the existing residential use will remain and no additional activities are being proposed. Less than significant impacts are expected.

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

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

XX. WILDFIRE

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

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

a) The project site is not located near or within any wildfire nor fire hazard severity zone, Additionally the Imperial County Fire Department sent a "No comment" email on November 18, 2025²⁵. Therefore, no impact is expected.

	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated (LTSMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? b) The project site is not located near or within any wildfire nor fire hazard severity zone; therefore, no impact is expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? c) The project site is not located near or within any wildfire nor fire hazard severity zone; therefore, no impact is expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? d) The project site is not located near or within any wildfire nor fire hazard severity zone; therefore, no impact is expected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?



IV. PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED

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

A. COUNTY OF IMPERIAL

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

B. OTHER AGENCIES/ORGANIZATIONS

- Imperial Irrigation District
- Fort Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe
- Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians

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

V. REFERENCES

1. "Stipulation and Order Regarding Complaint to Quiet Title" of the Superior Court of the State of California, CASE No. ECU 002866
2. Imperial County General Plan: Circulation and Scenic Highway Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/circulation-scenic-highway-element-2008.pdf>
3. California State Scenic Highway System Map
<https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>
4. California Historic Resources: Imperial County
<https://ohp.parks.ca.gov/ListedResources/?view=county&criteria=13>
5. California Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program: Imperial County Important Farmland Map 2025
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/>
6. California Williamson Act Enrollment Finder
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/WilliamsonAct/>
7. Imperial County Air Pollution Control District comment letter dated December 2, 2025.
8. Imperial County General Plan: Conservation and Open Space Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/conservation-open-space-element-2016.pdf>
 - a) Figure 1: Sensitive Habitats Map
 - b) Figure 2: Sensitive Species Map
 - c) Figure 3: Agency-Designated Habitats Map
 - d) Figure 6: Known Areas of Native American Cultural Sensitivity Map
 - e) Figure 8: Existing Mineral Resources Map
9. State of California Natural Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game: Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation
<https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83843>
10. National Wetlands Inventory Map: Surface Waters and Wetlands
<https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/>
11. State of California Natural Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game: Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation
<https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=83843>
12. U.S. Fish & Wildlife (USFWS) Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species Mapper
https://www.arcgis.com/apps/Embed/index.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77&extent=-124.1522,38.0501,-121.4496,39.2098&zoom=true&scale=true&details=true&disable_scroll=true&theme=light
13. California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lands Viewer
<https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/lands/>
14. Imperial Irrigation District: Imperial Valley Natural Community Conservation Plan and Habitat Conservation Plan (Planning Agreement No. 2810-2004-001-06)
www.iid.com/home/showpublisheddocument/2260/635648001335730000
15. California Department of Fish and Game
California Endangered Species Act: Incidental Take Permit No. 2081-2003-024-006 (Imperial Irrigation District)
www.iid.com/home/showpublisheddocument/2281/635648001335730000
16. Fort Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe comment email dated November 17, 2025.
17. Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians comment email dated November 17, 2025.
18. Tribal Lands in U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 Map
<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2020-02/epa-r9-tribal-lands.png>
19. Imperial Irrigation District comment letter dated December 1, 2025
20. California Department of Conservation: Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Maps and Reports
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/regulatorymaps/>
21. California Building Standards Commission, 2022 California Building Code.
California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2, Volume 2 of 2.

22. Imperial County General Plan: Seismic and Public Safety Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/seismic-and-public-safety.pdf>
23. California Department of Toxic Substances Control: EnviroStor
<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
24. Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility Maps
<https://www.icpds.com/planning/maps/airport-land-use-compatibility-maps>
25. Imperial County Fire Department comment email dated November 18, 2025.
26. CalFire: Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas – Imperial County Map
<https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones>
27. California Tsunami Data Maps
<https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps>
28. Imperial County General Plan: Noise Element
<https://www.icpds.com/assets/planning/noise-element-2015.pdf>
29. Imperial County Sheriff's Office: Patrol Operations Map
<https://icso.imperialcounty.org/operations/>
30. "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.

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 #02521

Project Applicant: Martinez Anita Marie JT ETAL

Project Location: The location of the proposed project is at 22 East Fawcett Road, Heber, CA 92249, also identified under Assessor's Parcel Number 054-331-012 and legally described as TR1 POR E 189.76 FT OF S 194.36 FT BLK B6 TSTE OF HEBER, in an unincorporated area of the County of Imperial. See Exhibit "A" Vicinity Map.

- A. Description of Project:** The applicants, Anita Marie and Jacqueline Danila Martinez, propose a minor subdivision of land to create two distinct lots separating two existing single-family residences. The subject parcel is approximately 0.42-AC. The primary residence at the subject site is located at and identified as 22 Fawcett Road, Heber, CA 92249. In October 1977, the Imperial County Planning Commission issued Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 291-77 to Angel D. Martinez, authorizing the installation of a mobile home as a second dwelling unit and is identified as 20 Fawcett Road, Heber, CA 92249. The Maldonado family has provided proof of residency for the mobile home since 1998 through documentation of utility services, including water, sewer, and trash from the Heber Public Utility District (HPUD) and electricity from the Imperial Irrigation District (IID).

In May 2007, a notarized Private "Sale-Purchase" Agreement was executed between Ms. Margarita K. Martinez (previous property owner) and Elsa L. Maldonado for the purchase of Parcel 1 and the existing mobile home. Through a "Stipulation and Order Regarding Complaint to Quiet Title" (Court Order)¹ of the Superior Court of the State of California, CASE No. ECU 002866, the heirs of Ms. Martinez, Anita Marie and Jacqueline Danila Martinez (current property owners and applicants), agreed to the partition of the subject property to establish ownership of Parcel 1 by Ms. Maldonado.

Per Section 90502.04 of Division 5 of Title 9 Imperial County Land Use Ordinance, no lot/parcel or portion thereof within the R-1 Zone shall contain less than 6000 sq. ft. net. However, proposed Parcel 1, which is approximately 4,273.57 square feet, does not meet this minimum lot size requirement.

In May 2024, the Court formally ordered and decreed that the applicants agree to the partition of the property and will provide a grant deed for the newly created parcel to Elsa Lara Maldonado. Both the applicants and Ms. Maldonado have expressed agreement with the conceptual layout of the proposed Tentative Parcel Map. See Exhibit "B" Tentative Parcel Map.

In accordance with the technical findings in the Court's Order, the Imperial County Planning Department (ICPDS) recognizes the Court Order as justification for any necessary waiver, deviation, and/or modification to the minimum lot size requirement for the R-1 zone. This would allow the creation of Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 through a Tentative Parcel Map, and subsequently, a Parcel Map.

VII. FINDINGS

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



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



The Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects but:

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

A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

NOTICE

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

2-12-2020 Jim Minnick
Date of Determination Jim Minnick, Director of Planning & Development Services

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

Anita AD
Applicant Signature

2/12/20
Date

SECTION 4

VIII. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)


IX. MITIGATION MONITORING & REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

(ATTACH DOCUMENTS, IF ANY, HERE)

ATTACHMENT “A”

VICINITY MAP

PROJECT LOCATION MAP



ANITA & JACQUELINE MARTINEZ
PM #02521 / IS #25-0038
APN: 054-331-012

-  Project Location
-  Parcels
-  Centerline
-  Proposed Parcel A
-  Proposed Parcel B



EEC ORIGINAL K0

ATTACHMENT “B”
APPLICANT SUBMITTAL

October 13, 2025

Mr. Jim Minnick, Planning Director
County of Imperial Building & Planning Department
801 Main Street
El Centro, CA 92243

SUBJECT: MINOR SUBDIVISION • SUBMITTAL No. 1 • PO Box 521 - 20 FAWCETT ROAD • 22 E. FAWCETT ROAD • APN 054-331-012

Dear Mr. Minnick

For your review and processing, Pro Terra submits the following Items 1 – 4 and the 6 EXHIBITS mentioned herein.

1. MINOR SUBDIVISION APPLICATION

- a. "MINOR SUBDIVISION" Application, General Indemnification Agreement, and a "Payment of Fees" Notice to Applicant, all signed by Anita M. Martinez and Jacqueline D. Martinez on 09-19-2024 and 10-02-2024 respectively ([EXHIBIT 1](#)).
- b. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM) signed by Jose Carlos Romero, PLS on 09-24-2025 ([EXHIBIT 2](#)) to subdivide an existing triangle shape Parcel APN 054-331-012 (±18,440 SF) in 2 new parcels: Parcel 1 = ± 14,167 SF and Parcel 2 = ± 4,273 SF as
- c. PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT (PTR) prepared by Chicago Title Company PTR-H / Order No. 7102406487-SB ([EXHIBIT 3](#)).
- d. PLANNING FEE \$7,500 Check by Ms. & Mr. Maldonado payable to the Imperial County Planning & Development ([EXHIBIT 4](#)).
- e. OTHER Project Background Documents (Items 2 – 4) which are also enclosed with this MINOR SUBDIVISION Application.

2. UTILITY SERVICES

Ms. Elsa Lara Maldonado & Mr. Eduardo Maldonado have occupied a small triangle area (New Parcel 2) of APN 054-331-012, shown in the STM ([EXHIBIT 2](#)), with an Address: PO Box 521/20 Fawcett Road, Heber, CA.

Attached for reference is a Heber Public Utility District (HPUD) letter dated 01-08-2025 ([EXHIBIT 5](#)) indicating proof of residency & proof of the Water, Sewer & Trash Services provided since 07-20-1998, through an account for Eduardo Maldonado.

Also attached for reference is an Imperial Irrigation District (IID) "Customer Overview" printout dated 01-13-2025 ([EXHIBIT 6](#)), indicating the Electrical Service established on 10-13-1999, through an account for Elsa Lara Maldonado.

3. PARCEL BACKGROUND

On MAY 2007 Private "Sale-Purchase" Agreement ([EXHIBIT 7](#)) was signed & notarized between Ms. Margarita K. Martinez (Previous Property Owner) and Elsa L. Maldonado, to purchase said small triangle area of APN 054-331-012, which had an existing Dwelling Unit where the Maldonado's had occupied since 1998 as previously indicated in the HPUD and IID letters.

4. COURT ORDER

Through a "Stipulation and Order Regarding Complaint to Quiet Title" ([aka Court Order](#)) of the Superior Court of the State of California, CASE No. ECU 002866 ([EXHIBIT 8](#)) Ms. Martinez heirs: Anita M. Martinez and Jacqueline D. Martinez, ([Now Property Owners per the PTR](#)) agree to the partition of the subject property with APN 054-331-02 in favor of Ms. Elsa Maldonado.

Please let us know should you have any questions or should you need additional information

Sincerely, Pro Terra




J. Carlos Romero, Principal
RCE 50,429 • PLS 7,671

POR TOWNSITE OF HEBER PARK TR 790
 OM 3-70
 ROS 2-47
 FM 12-3

Tax Area Code
66-002

54-33



7-11-95 RM
 6-6-94 RM
 3-6-94 LS
 From 54-21 & 23
 8-21-75 ID
 RETRACED 11-4-80 RW

DISCLAIMER:
 THIS IS NOT AN OFFICIAL MAP.
 THIS MAP WAS CREATED FOR THE IMPERIAL COUNTY
 ASSESSOR, FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF AIDING IN
 THE PERFORMANCE OF THE DUTIES OF THE ASSESSOR.
 THE PERSONS OR COMPANIES IN THIS MAP ARE NOT
 THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL
 OR THE ASSESSOR. (REV. & TAX. CODE SEC. 327)



Assessor's Map Bk. 54-Pg. 33
 County of Imperial, Calif.

Electronically Submitted on 05/2/24 10:51 AM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Ken Baker SBN 328358
The Law Offices of Tepper and Baker
836 West State Street. El Centro, CA 92243
760 352 7272

FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of Imperial
05/02/2024 at 04:11:47 PM
By: Marissa Moran, Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF IMPERIAL**

ELSA LARA MALDONADO,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANITA MARIE MARTINEZ & JACQUELINE
DANILA MARTINEZ, DOES 1-10,

Defendants,

Case No.: ECU 002866
**STIPULATION AND ORDER
REGARDING COMPLAINT TO QUIET
TITLE. (C.C.P. §761.020)**

**IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES THROUGH THEIR
PERSPECTIVE ATTORNEYS THAT THE FOLLOWING ORDER CAN BE MADE IN THE ABOVE
ENTITLED ACTION:**

1. Anita Marie Marinez & Jacqueline Danila Martinez, the defendants in the above entitled quiet title action agree to partition the property described in paragraph two (2) with plaintiff Elsa Lara Maldonado, the plaintiff. The details of the partition are detailed in paragraph three (3) of this stipulation.
2. The property located at 22 Fawcett Road, Heber, CA 92249, the legal description is as follows:

1 That portion of Block B-6 townsite of Heber, County of Imperial, State of California,
2 according to map #226 on file of County Recorder of Imperial County described as
3 follows: Beginning at Southwest corner of said Block B-6. Thence North along the
4 east line of said Block B-6 194.36 feet to point: thence South 44 degrees 18'50" West
5 271.63. Feet to a point on South line of said Block B-26 thence East 189.76 feet along
6 South line of said Block B-6 to point of beginning.

7
8 The street address of property is 22 Fawcett Road, Heber, CA 92249 (hereinafter
9 referred to as "the property." APN 054-331-006)

- 10
11
12 3. A preliminary engineering report (aka LETTER OF DECLARATION) was Prepared by Terra
13 Firma, Engineering & Surveying, Inc. see Exhibit 3, which is attached. The technicalities of
14 the partition are outlined in Exhibit 3. The parcel is to be divided as defined on Exhibit 1
15 which is attached to this stipulation order. Plaintiff's interest is defined as parcel one as
16 listed in Exhibit 1. The defendant's interest is defined as parcel two as listed in Exhibit 1. By
17 signing this stipulation and order the two parties agree to the technical findings listed below
18 in paragraph 3 (3).

19
20 1. TECHNICAL FINDINGS – UNDERSTANDING

21
22 1.1. Both Parties agree with the Conceptual Layout Plat (EXHIBIT 1 attached) for the Minor
23 Subdivision of the subject property into 2 new parcels depicting the approximate boundary
24 dimensions, the approximate areas, and the approximate location of the new proposed boundary
25 line between the 2 new parcels that would be created by a Minor Subdivision.

26
27 PARCEL 1 - Triangle Area = $\pm 4,275$ SF (± 0.10 Ac) to be conveyed by Grant Deed to: ELSA &
28 EDUARDO MALDONADO – OCCUPANTS (PARTY 2)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PARCEL 2 - Trapezoid Area = ±14,164 SF (±0.32 Ac) to be retained by: ANITA MARIE MARTINEZ AND JACQUELINE DANILA MARTINEZ – OWNERS (PARTY 1)

1.2. Both Parties acknowledge and agree that the final location of the boundary line between the two new parcels being created by the Minor Subdivision, and, that the final location of boundary dimensions and the final areas, for each of the said two parcels, may vary slightly after a boundary survey is completed and are recorded through a Parcel Map.

1.3. Both Parties acknowledge and agree that a Minor Subdivision Process Applications and Forms, pursuant to the Imperial County Planning Department and County Surveyor Office, will be signed by PARTY 1, and, that all Imperial County Processing Fees and Pro Terra's Surveying - Consulting Fees will be paid by PARTY 2.

1.4. According to a consultation of J. Carlos Romero - Land Surveyor with Jim Minnick - Planning Director Imperial County, on 10.04.23, the County would consider a Court Order as evidence to justify any waiver, deviation, and/or modification to the minimum lot size requirement for the R1 zone as part of the Minor Subdivision, in order to create PARCEL 1 and PARCEL 2 through a Tentative Parcel Map and thence through a Parcel Map.

- 4. Defendants in the above entitled quiet title action agree to sign the Imperial county application for the subdivision detailed in this subdivision of the property described herein.
- 5. Plaintiffs shall pay for all monetary costs related to the subdivision of the property described herein.
- 6. Plaintiffs shall revoke the lis pendens associated with the case herein within 15 days of the granting of this parcel subdivision.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 7. Each of the parties acknowledges, represents, and warrants that in all negotiations for this stipulation, each party had an adequate opportunity to be , and each party was, represented by the part's attorney of choice, and that each attorney signing this stipulation is duly and fully authorized to make this stipulation on behalf of the party represented.
- 8. Each attorney signing this stipulation acknowledges, represents, and warrants that he/she is duly and fully authorized to make this stipulation on behalf of the party represented.
- 9. This stipulation shall be governed by the laws of the State of California

Dated 4/3/2024

The Law Offices of Tepper and Baker

By: Ken Baker
KRB

Attorney for Plaintiff

Approved as to form and content only:

Dated 04/10/2024

ELSALARA MALDONADO

By: Elsa Lara Maldonado

Plaintiff

Dated April 1, 2024

Sheppard Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP

By: Paul Seesly

Attorney for Defendants

Approved as to form and content only:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated Apr 1, 2024

ANITA MARIE MARTINEZ

By: Anita M. Martinez
Defendant

Dated 04/01/2024

DANILA MARTINEZ
By: [Signature]
Defendant

Stipulation and order 5

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ORDER

The parties having so stipulated, and the Court having determined that the stipulation is regular and proper,

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

1. Defendants ANITA MARIE MARTINEZ & JACQUELINE agree to the partition and to sign the application allowing the County of Imperial to proceed with said partition of the property described herein this stipulation and order.
2. Plaintiff ELSA LARA MALDONADO agrees to pay for all costs associated with said partition.
3. Defendants will provide a grant deed of the new parcel deriving from said partition to Elsa Lara Maldonado.
4. Upon successful partitioning of said parcel described herein this stipulation and order, Plaintiff Elsa Lara Maldonado will remove the lis pendens connected to the parcel described herein this stipulation and order within 15 days.

Date 05/02/2024



Judge of the Superior Court
Jeffrey B. Jones

LEGEND


-  PARCEL EXTERIOR LIMITS LINES (*)
-  PROPOSED MINOR SUBDIVISION NEW PARCELS LINES
-  EXISTING CHAIN LINK FENCE
-  EXISTING FENCE BETWEEN PARCEL 1 & PARCEL 2
-  FOUND MONUMENT



(*) NOTES:

1. ALL LINES SHOWN ON THIS EXHIBIT ARE BASED ON THE IMPERIAL COUNTY ASSESSOR'S PLAT LINES.
2. A BOUNDARY SURVEY TO ASCERTAIN THE LOCATION OF BOUNDARY LINES AND BOUNDARY CORNERS WILL BE CONDUCTED DURING THE PARCEL MAP PREPARATION

SURFACE CALCULATIONS			
LOT / PARCEL	AREA SF	AREA AC	
LOT 15	18,440.87	0.42	
APN 054-331-006			
PARCEL 1	4,273.92	0.10	
PARCEL 2	14,166.95	0.32	



PROJECT DESCRIPTION: APN 054-331-006 * PROPOSED MINOR SUBDIVISION

DRAWING DESCRIPTION: CONCEPTUAL LAYOUT PLAT

CLIENT / LOCATION: FAWCETT ROAD - APN 054-331-006

SHEET: EXHIBIT 1

LAST REVISED DATE: JA 01.22.24

SHEET 1/1

TITLE 9

DIVISION 2: GENERAL PROVISIONS

- CHAPTER 1: ZONING MAPS
- CHAPTER 2: LAND USE PERMITS (VARIANCE)
- CHAPTER 3: LAND USE PERMITS (CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS)
- CHAPTER 4: ZONE CHANGE(S)
- CHAPTER 5: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT(S)

CHAPTER 1: ZONING MAPS

- § 90201.00 PURPOSE
- § 90201.01 ZONING BOUNDARIES
- § 90201.02 ZONING MAPS

§ 90201.00 PURPOSE

The purpose of this Chapter is to establish guidelines for the interpretation of this Title and to enumerate miscellaneous requirements generally applicable to all matters included within this Title. Specifically, this Chapter incorporates by reference the zoning maps that are too large and voluminous to be included within this Division. These maps are on file in the Planning & Development Services Department. Reduced (size) copies are contained in Division 25, along with all amendments thereto.

§ 90201.01 ZONING BOUNDARIES

Where uncertainty exists as to the exact boundary of any zoning area as shown on the official zoning map(s) the following rules shall apply:

- A. Where the boundaries are indicated as approximately following streets, highways, railroads, alley lines and/or lot lines, such lines shall be construed as extending to the center line of such street, highway, railroad or alley.
- B. For unsubdivided property or where a zoning area boundary divides a lot, parcel or portion of land, the location of the zoning boundaries (unless specified by exact dimension) shall be determined by the Planning & Development Services Department.
- C. In case any uncertainty exists, the Director of the Planning & Development Services Department shall determine the location of the zoning boundary.
- D. Where any public street or alley is officially vacated or abandoned the regulation applicable to abutting property shall apply to the vacated or abandon street or alley, to which the public street or alley is merged.
- E. Where any private right of way or easement of any railroad, railway, canal, transportation, or public utility company is vacated or abandoned the regulation applicable to abutting property shall apply to the centerline of such vacated or abandoned property.

§ 90201.02 ZONING MAPS


The County of Imperial encompasses some fifty two hundred (5,200) square miles, and it is necessary to designate the various Land Use Zones on several individual maps. Therefore in addition to the text and drawings contained within this Title, the following official maps are adopted herewith as part of this Ordinance; (Reference {92501.00 - 92570.00 et seq.).

Map No. 1 through 70: (Listed By Section/Name/Number)

Division 2 Adopted November 24, 1998 (Amended December 16, 2003) (Amended October 31, 2006) (Amended April 18, 2017)

§ 92501.00	El Centro Area	Map No. 1
§ 92502.00	Brawley Area	Map No. 2
§ 92503.00	Calexico Area	Map No. 3
§ 92504.00	Holtville Area	Map No. 4
§ 92505.00	Imperial Area	Map No. 5
§ 92506.00	Calipatria Area	Map No. 6
§ 92507.00	Westmorland Area	Map No. 7
§ 92508.00	Bombay Beach Area	Map No. 8
§ 92509.00	Seeley Area	Map No. 9
§ 92510.00	Eucalyptus Area	Map No. 10
§ 92511.00	Niland Area	Map No. 11
§ 92512.00	Heber Area	Map No. 12
§ 92513.00	Melon Area	Map No. 13
§ 92514.00	Keystone Area	Map No. 14
§ 92515.00	Meloland Area	Map No. 15
§ 92516.00	Rose School Area	Map No. 16
§ 92517.00	Heber Dunes Area	Map No. 17
§ 92518.00	Bonds Corner West Area	Map No. 18
§ 92519.00	Bonds Corner East Area	Map No. 19
§ 92520.00	Verde School Area	Map No. 20
§ 92521.00	Holtville South Area	Map No. 21
§ 92522.00	Date City Area	Map No. 22
§ 92523.00	Rockwood Area	Map No. 23
§ 92524.00	Ramer Lake Area	Map No. 24
§ 92525.00	Bard South Area	Map No. 25
§ 92526.00	Bard Area	Map No. 26
§ 92527.00	Mt. Signal Area	Map No. 27
§ 92528.00	Mt. Signal East Area	Map No. 28
§ 92529.00	Pine Union School Sandia Area	Map No. 29
§ 92530.00	Sandia East Area	Map No. 30
§ 92531.00	Curlew Area	Map No. 31
§ 92532.00	Highline School Area	Map No. 32
§ 92533.00	Keystone Bridge Area	Map No. 33
§ 92534.00	Mesquite School Area	Map No. 34
§ 92535.00	Alamorio Area	Map No. 35
§ 92536.00	Sunset Springs Area	Map No. 36
§ 92537.00	Munyon Area	Map No. 37
§ 92538.00	Munyon East Area	Map No. 38
§ 92539.00	Mc Cabe Area	Map No. 39
§ 92540.00	Westside School Area	Map No. 40
§ 92541.00	Turn Area	Map No. 41
§ 92542.00	Estelle East Area	Map No. 42
§ 92543.00	Brawley West Area	Map No. 43
§ 92544.00	Tamarack Area	Map No. 44
§ 92545.00	Imperial West Area	Map No. 45
§ 92546.00	Lantana School Area	Map No. 46
§ 92547.00	Fonda Station Area	Map No. 47
§ 92548.00	Estelle Station Area	Map No. 48
§ 92549.00	Wister Area	Map No. 49
§ 92550.00	Dixieland Area	Map No. 50
§ 92551.00	Westmorland West Area	Map No. 51
§ 92552.00	Poe Area	Map No. 52
§ 92553.00	Northend School Area	Map No. 53
§ 92554.00	Red Hill Area	Map No. 54
§ 92555.00	Kane Springs Area	Map No. 55
§ 92556.00	Bertram Station Area	Map No. 56

§ 92557.00	Palo Verde Area	Map No. 57
§ 92558.00	Palo Verde South Area	Map No. 58
§ 92559.00	Ocotillo Area	Map No. 59
§ 92560.00	Hot Mineral Spa Area	Map No. 60
§ 92561.00	Niland Marina Area	Map No. 61
§ 92562.00	Desert Shores Area	Map No. 62
§ 92563.00	Salton Sea Beach Area	Map No. 63
§ 92564.00	Southwest Salton City Area	Map No. 64
§ 92565.00	Winterhaven Townsite Area	Map No. 65
§ 92566.00	Southeast Salton City Area	Map No. 66
§ 92567.00	Central Salton City Area	Map No. 67
§ 92568.00	Northeast Salton City Area	Map No. 68
§ 92569.00	Vista Del Mar Area	Map No. 69
§ 92570.00	Open Space	Map No. 70
§ 92571.00	Renewable Energy Overlay Zone	Map No. 71



TITLE 9

DIVISION 2: GENERAL PROVISIONS

CHAPTER 2: LAND USE PERMITS (VARIANCE)

§ 90202.00	PURPOSE
§ 90202.01	VARIANCE DEFINED
§ 90202.02	VARIANCE LIMITATION
§ 90202.03	APPLICATION
§ 90202.04	AUTHORITY OF THE PLANNING DIRECTOR
§ 90202.05	ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS BY DIRECTOR
§ 90202.06	AUTHORITY OF PLANNING COMMISSION
§ 90202.07	NOTICE OF HEARING
§ 90202.08	ACTION ON A VARIANCE
§ 90202.09	EFFECTIVE DATE OF VARIANCE
§ 90202.10	TIME LIMIT/EXTENSION
§ 90202.11	REVOCACTION/MODIFICATION

§ 90202.00 PURPOSE

The purpose of this Chapter is to define and establish guidelines for the processing of applications for variances.

§ 90202.01 VARIANCE DEFINED

A variance is an approval granted upon a legal parcel of land to construct a structure not otherwise directly allowed by the exact interpretation of Title 9, Divisions 1 through 8. A variance runs with the land and allows for minimal deviation from the standards.

§ 90202.02 VARIANCE LIMITATION

As an example the variance procedure shall not be used for any of the following:

See the NEW EXHIBIT 1 (the one that has the wording "DRAFT" on top of the Exhibit 1 s be replaced)

- A. To reduce or change the minimum parcel size required for a new land division,
- B. To authorize land uses other than those specified or allowed under the specific land use categories as identified in this Title,
- C. To change the meaning or intent of a word/phase listed within this Title.

§ 90202.03 APPLICATION

A written application (form provided by Planning & Development Services Department) for a variance shall be filed with the Department, accompanied by all information required under Section 90104.00, along with requisite fee and any other information the Department deems necessary.

§ 90202.04 AUTHORITY OF THE PLANNING DIRECTOR

The Planning Director is hereby granted authority to investigate, consider, approve and/or deny a variance application. The Director, acting as a hearing officer, shall conduct a noticed public hearing (ref. 90104.03-A) and consider all relevant facts, and hear all proponents, and opponents.

The Planning Director may deny a variance administratively without holding a public hearing. Such a denial constitutes an automatic appeal to the Planning Commission for which the applicant shall not be required to pay the appeal fee.

Following a noticed hearing by the Planning Director, any party may appeal the Director's decision to the Planning Commission, provided any such appeal is filed within 10 calendar days from the date of decision and is in accordance with the procedures specified in Sections 90102.04 and 90104.05.

§ 90202.05 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS BY DIRECTOR

In order to streamline the review process and clearly delineate the standards and rules, the following administrative procedure is established and shall be followed by the Department for processing a variance application:

- A. Within ten (10) days of receipt, the application shall either be deemed complete or be returned to the applicant with a written explanation if deemed incomplete.
- B. Within ten (10) days from the date the application is deemed complete, a standardized public notice of pending variance shall be sent to all property owners pursuant to 90104.03.
- C. During the same ten- (10) day period as provided in Section B above, the Department will consult with the Department of Public Works, and Fire/OES and other applicable departments.
- D. An administrative hearing shall be held within 30 days from the date the application was deemed complete. This hearing shall be open to the public.
- E. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Director shall approve, conditionally approve or deny the variance. The Director may continue the hearing, or the decision for up to ten (10) days, if necessary.
- F. The Director may approve a variance only if the findings can be made under Section 90202.08 and with a written concurrence from the Director of Public Works and the Director of Fire/OES Department.
- G. Following the administrative hearing there shall be a 10-calendar day period during which any party may appeal the decision of the Director to the Planning Commission. No construction or other County permits shall be approved until the 10-day appeal period has terminated and no appeal has been filed.

§ 90202.06 AUTHORITY OF PLANNING COMMISSION

The Planning Commission, upon appeal, shall have the authority to grant or deny a variance. No appeal from the Director's decision shall be allowed to the Board of Supervisors unless and until the Commission has reached a decision.

§ 90202.07 NOTICE OF HEARING

After acceptance of a completed Variance application and the completion of a staff report, the Commission shall conduct a public hearing on the variance request. The notice and scheduling of the public hearing shall be pursuant to Section 90104.03(C).

§ 90202.08 ACTION ON A VARIANCE

The Planning Director, the Planning Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors, shall approve, approve subject to conditions or disapprove a variance with the following findings:

- A. FINDINGS: Approval or conditional approval may be granted only if the Director/Commission/Board of Supervisors first determines that the variance satisfies the criteria set forth in Government Code, Section 65906, and the following findings can be made:

1. That there are special circumstances applicable to the property described in the variance application that do not apply generally to the property or class of use in the same zone or vicinity.
 2. That the granting of such variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or vicinity in which the property is located.
 3. That because of special circumstances applicable to subject property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of zoning laws is found to deprive subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under identical zone classifications.
 4. That the granting of such variance will not adversely affect the comprehensive general plan.
- B. **CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:** In approving a variance, the Director/Commission/Board of Supervisors may impose such conditions deemed necessary to enable making the findings listed under Section 90202.08(a).
- C. **DENIAL OF VARIANCE:** Where the Director/Commission/Board of Supervisors cannot make the findings under paragraph (a) above (with or without conditions) the Variance shall be denied.

§ 90202.09 EFFECTIVE DATE OF VARIANCE

The approval of a variance shall become final and effective for purpose of construction permit issuance, on the 11th day after the action of the Director unless an appeal is filed within ten (10) days from the date of his/her decision.

The approval of a variance by the Commission shall become effective on the 11th day after the Commission action granting the Variance, unless an appeal is filed to the Board of Supervisors within 10 days. The approval of a Variance by the Board of Supervisors becomes final on the day of the Board's action.

§ 90202.10 TIME LIMIT/EXTENSION

An approved variance shall be valid for a period of twelve (12) months from effective date. At the end of such time period the Variance shall become null and void unless:

- A. A construction permit has been issued.
- B. The project is complete and the use continues.
- C. A time limit extension by the Director has been granted in writing.

At any time the variance ceases to be used for a period of twelve (12) months, or the use upon which the original approval was granted has ceased or changed, the Variance shall become null and void, without notice from the Planning & Development Services Department.


If an extension is necessary it must be requested at a minimum of 60 days prior to its expiration date and must state in writing the reasons for the extension. The Planning Director may extend any variance upon written request without notice or hearing. Under no condition shall a variance be extended or renewed after it has expired or if the property covered by the variance is in violation of this Title.

§ 90202.11 REVOCATION/MODIFICATION:

Any variance issued pursuant to this Title may be revoked by the Planning Commission after a duly noticed public hearing in which the Commission has found that subject variance is in violation of this Title or

applicable statutory law, or if it constitutes a health or safety hazard. The Commission may also modify a variance through the public hearing process if it determines a necessity for public health or safety considerations.

THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



January 22, 2024

Robert Baker, Law Attorney
Tepper & Baker, The Law Office
836 W. State Street,
El Centro, CA 92243

REGARDING: LETTER OF DECLARATION – TECHNICAL FINDINGS • COURT ORDER REQUEST

SUBJECT PROPERTY: APN 054-331-012 • 22 E. FAWCETT ROAD - HEBER CA 92249

PARTIES: ANITA MARIE MARTINEZ AND JACQUELINE DANILA MARTINEZ – OWNERS (PARTY 1) • ELSA & EDUARDO MALDONADO – OCCUPANTS (PARTY 2)

Dear Mr. Baker:

Pro Terra hereby submits this LETTER OF DECLARATION with Technical Findings, General Findings, and, Request to Property Owners, to accompany the Court Order Request to the Judge hearing this case, been prepared by Tepper & Baker Office.

1. TECHNICAL FINDINGS – UNDERSTANDING

1.1. Both Parties agree with the Conceptual Layout Plat (EXHIBIT 1 attached) for the Minor Subdivision of the subject property into 2 new parcels (see below) depicting the approximate boundary dimensions, the approximate areas, and the approximate location of the new proposed boundary line between the 2 new parcels that would be created by a Minor Subdivision.

PARCEL 1 - Triangle Area = $\pm 4,275$ SF (± 0.10 Ac) to be conveyed by Grant Deed to: ELSA & EDUARDO MALDONADO – OCCUPANTS (PARTY 2)

PARCEL 2 - Trapezoid Area = $\pm 14,164$ SF (± 0.32 Ac) to be retained by: ANITA MARIE MARTINEZ AND JACQUELINE DANILA MARTINEZ – OWNERS (PARTY 1)

1.2. Both Parties acknowledge and agree that the final location of the boundary line between the two new parcels being created by the Minor Subdivision, and, that the final location of boundary dimensions and the final areas, for each of the said two parcels, may vary slightly after a boundary survey is completed and are recorded through a Parcel Map.

1.3. Both Parties acknowledge and agree that a Minor Subdivision Process Applications and Forms, pursuant to the Imperial County Planning Department and County Surveyor Office, will be signed by PARTY 1, and, that all Imperial County Processing Fees and Pro Terra's Surveying - Consulting Fees will be paid by PARTY 2.

1.4. The Imperial County Ordinance Section 90202.01 "Variance Defined" and Section 90202.02 "Variance Limitation" (EXHIBIT 2 attached) a variance procedure cannot be used to reduce or change the minimum parcel size required for a new land division, hence

1.5. According to a consultation of J. Carlos Romero - Land Surveyor with Jim Minnick - Planning Director Imperial County, on 10.04.23, a Court Order would be convenient in for the Planning Commission to consider the approval of the Minor Subdivision, in order to create **PARCEL 1** and **PARCEL 2** through a Tentative Parcel Map and thence through a Parcel Map.

2. GENERAL FINDINGS

2.1. Pro Terra has not a copy, and hence, has not reviewed the Lawsuit Document with Elsa & Eduardo Maldonado as Plaintiffs against Anita Marie Martinez and Jacqueline Danila Martinez.

2.2. On 01.16.24 Pro Terra received a paper copy of Chicago Title's Preliminary Title Report No. 7102303135-SB dated 04.01.23 at the Law Office of Tepper & Baker.


2.3. It is Pro Terra's understanding that both Parties on the Lawsuit Document mentioned on Item 2.1 above, agree to reach a Settlement Agreement through a Stipulated Judgement process.

3. REQUESTS TO CURRENT PROPERTY OWNERS

3.1. Both parties acknowledge and agree that upon the recordation of the Parcel Map by the Imperial County Surveyor, thence, PARTY 1 to convey **PARCEL 1** to PARTY 2 through a signed, notarized and recorded Grant Deed at no additional cost.

Sincerely, Pro Terra

... a proactive approach for your project's success ...



J. Carlos Romero • PLS 7,671 • RCE 50,429

ATTACHMENT “C”
COMMENT LETTERS

Kayla Henderson

From: THPO Consulting <ACBCI-THPO@aguacaliente.net>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 9:14 AM
To: Kayla Henderson; THPO Consulting
Subject: RE: AB52 letter for PM02521/IS25-0038

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

Greetings,

A records check of the Tribal Historic Preservation Office’s cultural registry revealed that this project is not located within the Tribe’s Traditional Use Area. Therefore, we defer to the other tribes in the area. This letter shall conclude our consultation efforts.

Thank you,



Anthony Kline
Cultural Resources Analyst
akline@aguacaliente.net
C: (760) 413-5836 | D: (760) 883-1139
5401 Dinah Shore Drive, Palm Springs

RECEIVED

NOV 17 2025

**IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

From: Kayla Henderson <kaylahenderson@co.imperial.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 8:01 AM
To: THPO Consulting <ACBCI-THPO@aguacaliente.net>
Cc: Jim Minnick <JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Diana Robinson <DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Alan Molina <alanmolina@co.imperial.ca.us>; Adriana Ceballos <adrianaceballos@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kamika Mitchell <kamikamitchell@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kayla Henderson <kaylahenderson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Olivia Lopez <olivialopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Valerie Grijalva <valeriegrijalva@co.imperial.ca.us>; Vanessa DeLaTeja <vanessadelateja@co.imperial.ca.us>
Subject: AB52 letter for PM02521/IS25-0038

This email was sent by a person from outside your organization. Please verify the authenticity of this email before taking further action.

Good Morning,

Attached hereto please find the AB52 letter for **PM02521/IS25-0038**

The contact person for this project is Alan Molina, and can be reached at 442-265-1736, or via-email at alanmolina@co.imperial.ca.us.

Kayla Henderson

From: Jill McCormick <historicpreservation@quechantribe.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 9:33 AM
To: Kayla Henderson; Planning - ICPDSCCommentLetters
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL]:Parcel Map #02521 Request for Comments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

Good morning,
This email is to inform you that the Historic Preservation Office of the Ft. Yuma Quechan Tribe does not wish to comment on this project.

Jill

H. Jill McCormick, M.A.
Historic Preservation Office
Ft. Yuma Quechan Indian Tribe
P.O. Box 1899
Yuma, AZ 85366-1899
Office: 760-919-3631
Cell: 928-920-6521

RECEIVED

NOV 17 2025

IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



From: Kayla Henderson <kaylahenderson@co.imperial.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 9:26 AM
To: Jolene Dessert <JoleneDessert@co.imperial.ca.us>; Margo Sanchez <MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Belen Leon-Lopez <BelenLeon-Lopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Monica Soucier <MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jesus Ramirez <JesusRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Martha Singh <marthasingh@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kathleen Lang <KathleenLang@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Lopez <RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Bari Bean <baribean@co.imperial.ca.us>; Gilbert Rebolgar <GilbertRebolgar@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jeff Lamoure <JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us>; Alphonso Andrade <AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us>; Marco Topete <marcotopete@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sheila Vasquez-Bazua <SheilaVasquezBazua@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Menvielle <RobertMenvielle@co.imperial.ca.us>; David Lantzer

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT



RECEIVED

DEC 02 2025

IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

December 2, 2025

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

SUBJECT: Parcel Map 02521

Dear Mr. Minnick:

The Imperial County Air Pollution Control District ("Air District") thanks you for the opportunity to review the application for Parcel Map 02521 that would subdivide a 0.42 acre parcel into two (2) separate parcels, both of which include an existing residence. The site is located at 22 East Fawcett Road in Heber, also identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 054-331-012.

While the Air District has no comment on the subdivision itself, any future construction on either parcel is subject to all Air District rules and regulations.

Finally, the Air District requests a copy of the final **Parcel Map with the new Assessor Parcel Numbers**.

The Air District's rule book, Handbook, and other forms can be accessed via the internet at <https://apcd.imperialcounty.org>. Should you have questions, please call our office at (442) 265-1800.

Sincerely,

Curtis Blondell
APC Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by:
Mónica N. Soucier
APC Division Manager

Kayla Henderson

From: Andrew Loper
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2025 10:15 AM
To: Kayla Henderson
Cc: Alan Molina; Michael Abraham; Diana Robinson; Adriana Ceballos; Aimee Trujillo; Kamika Mitchell; Olivia Lopez; Valerie Grijalva; Vanessa DeLaTeja; David Lantzer; Planning - ICPDSCOMmentLetters
Subject: RE: Parcel Map #02521 Request for Comments

Good Morning

The Imperial County Fire Department has no comments at this time for Parcel Map #02521. ICFD does request the right to comment at a later date if necessary. Thank you



RECEIVED

NOV 18 2025

IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

From: Kayla Henderson <kaylahenderson@co.imperial.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 8:26 AM
To: Jolene Dessert <JoleneDessert@co.imperial.ca.us>; Margo Sanchez <MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Belen Leon-Lopez <BelenLeon-Lopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Monica Soucier <MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jesus Ramirez <JesusRamirez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Martha Singh <marthasingh@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kathleen Lang <KathleenLang@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Lopez <RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Bari Bean <baribean@co.imperial.ca.us>; Gilbert Rebollar <GilbertRebollar@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jeff Lamoure <JeffLamoure@co.imperial.ca.us>; Alphonso Andrade <AlphonsoAndrade@co.imperial.ca.us>; Marco Topete <marcotopete@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sheila Vasquez-Bazua <SheilaVasquezBazua@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Menvielle <RobertMenvielle@co.imperial.ca.us>; David Lantzer <davidlantzer@co.imperial.ca.us>; Andrew Loper <AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us>; rkelley@icso.org; Fred Miramontes <fmiramontes@icso.org>; Robert Benavidez <RBenavidez@icso.org>; iidenvironmental@iid.com; mdessert@heber.ca.gov; marcuscuero@campo-nsn.gov; dtosie@campo-nsn.gov; tribalsecretary@quechantribe.com; historicpreservation@quechantribe.com; THPO@aguacaliente.net; acbci-thpo@aguacaliente.net
Cc: Alan Molina <alanmolina@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Diana Robinson <DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Adriana Ceballos <adrianceballos@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kamika Mitchell <kamikamitchell@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kayla Henderson <kaylahenderson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Olivia Lopez <olivialopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Valerie Grijalva <valeriegrijalva@co.imperial.ca.us>; Vanessa DeLaTeja <vanessadelateja@co.imperial.ca.us>
Subject: Parcel Map #02521 Request for Comments

Good morning,

Please see attached Request for Comments packet for **PM02521** Anita & Jacqueline Martinez

Comments are due by **December 2nd, 2025 at 5:00PM.**

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

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

Thank you,

Kayla Henderson

Office Assistant III

IC Planning & Development Services

801 Main Street

El Centro, CA 92243

(442)265-1736

(442)265-1735 (Fax)

kaylahenderson@co.imperial.ca.us



IID

A century of service.

www.iid.com

Since 1911

Monday, December 1, 2025

Alan Molina
Planner II
Planning & Development Services
801 Main St.
El Centro, CA 92243

RECEIVED

DEC 02 2025

IMPERIAL COUNTY
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

SUBJECT: Anita & Jacqueline Martinez

Dear Alan Molina:

On Monday, November 17, 2025, the Imperial Irrigation District received a request from the Imperial County Planning & Development Services for agency review regarding the Anita & Jacqueline Martinez project located at 22 East Fawcett Road, Heber, CA 92249. The project consists of the Applicants proposing a minor subdivision of a 0.42-acre parcel to create two (2) separate parcels: Proposed Parcel A, approximately 0.10-acres, which includes an existing residence; and Proposed Parcel B, approximately 0.32-acres, which also contains an existing residence.

IID has reviewed the project information and has the following comments:

1. The project proponent will be required to provide and bear all costs associated with acquisition of land, rights of way, easements, and infrastructure relocations and realignments deemed necessary to accommodate the project. Any street or road improvements imposed by the local governing authority shall also be at the project proponent cost.
2. Public utility easements over all private and public roads and additional ten (10) feet in width on both side of the private and public roads shall be dedicated to IID for the construction, operation, and maintenance of its electrical infrastructure.
3. Any new, relocated, modified or reconstructed IID facilities required for and by the project (which may include but is not limited to the dedication of real property for the purpose of siting an electrical utility substations to support the project, the cost of acquisition and dedication of rights of way and/or easements for the construction of electrical transmission and/or distribution lines and ancillary facilities associated with the conveyance of energy service) are to be included as part of the project's CEQA and/or NEPA documentation, environmental impact analysis and mitigation.

Respectfully,



Wayne K. Strumpfer
General Counsel

Cc: Matthew H Smelser – Manager, Power Dept.
Mike Pacheco – Manager, Water Dept.
Tina Shields – Manager, Water Dept
Paul Rodriguez – Deputy Mgr. Power Dept. Power Dept.
Guillermo Barraza – Mgr. of Distribution Svcs. & Maint. Oprtns., Power Dept.
Laura Cervantes – Supervisor, Real Estate
Jessica Humes – Supervisor, Environmental Compliance Water



Outlook

RE: Parcel Map #02521 Request for Comments

From Carlos Yee <CarlosYee@co.imperial.ca.us>

Date Thu 1/15/2026 1:07 PM

To Planning - ICPDSCCommentLetters <ICPDSCCommentLetters@co.imperial.ca.us>

Cc Alan Molina <alanmolina@co.imperial.ca.us>

 1 attachment (636 KB)

90803.02- Imperial County, CA Code of Ordinances.pdf;

Good afternoon,

The Tentative Map provided needs to be revised to meet the minimum requirements per Imperial County Ordinance code 90803.02 (attached) before comments can be provided. Additionally, based on the said tentative map it appears that one of the existing buildings is encroaching onto the adjacent property to the west, the surveyor of record shall confirm. If there is an encroachment, it is recommended that that a lot line adjustment be prepared and recorded prior to the subdivision of the property.

Regards.

Carlos Yee | Permit Specialist

ICDPW - Engineering Division | 155 S. 11th Street. El Centro, CA 92243

Phone: (442)265-1818 x1838 | Fax: (442)265-1858 | Email: CarlosYee@co.imperial.ca.us

From: Kayla Henderson <kaylahenderson@co.imperial.ca.us>

Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 8:26 AM

To: Claudia Valadez <Claudia.Valadez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Veronica Atondo <VeronicaAtondo@co.imperial.ca.us>;

John Gay <JohnGay@co.imperial.ca.us>; Carlos Yee <CarlosYee@co.imperial.ca.us>

Cc: Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Diana Robinson

<DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Alan Molina <alanmolina@co.imperial.ca.us>; Adriana Ceballos

<adrianceballos@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kamika Mitchell

<kamikamitchell@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kayla Henderson <kaylahenderson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Olivia Lopez

<olivialopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Valerie Grijalva <valeriegrijalva@co.imperial.ca.us>; Vanessa DeLaTeja

<vanessadelateja@co.imperial.ca.us>

Subject: Parcel Map #02521 Request for Comments

Good morning,

Please see attached Request for Comments packet for **PM02521** Anita & Jacqueline Martinez

Comments are due by **December 2nd, 2025 at 5:00PM.**

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

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

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

Thank you,

Kayla Henderson

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

90803.02 - Tentative map to conform to rules of planning director, planning commission and the board of supervisors.

All tentative maps shall be in the form prescribed by the Planning Director, Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors and shall contain at a minimum the following:

- A. Tentative Tract Maps and Vesting Tentative Tract Maps: Eighteen (18) inches x twenty-four (24) inches minimum sheet size (two hard copies and one digital format are required).
- B. Tentative Parcel Maps drawn on the County's standard "Tentative Parcel Map" form or on standard engineering paper at a minimum of eighteen (18) inches x twenty-four (24) inches in size.
- C. Legal description and all Assessor's Parcel Numbers.
- D. Name and address of owner(s).
- E. Name, address, license number, seal or stamp, signature and date of signing of the person preparing the map.
- F. Show entire existing and proposed lot layout and design accurately.
- G. Map must be drawn to scale.
- H. Show all existing and proposed structures and their disposition (above and below surface) with dimensions.
- I. Show all existing and proposed easements, rights-of-way, public and private roads, canals and drains.
- J. Show north arrow, scale and date.
- K. Show all existing and proposed utilities (i.e. water, sewer and electrical).
- L. Show approximate existing and proposed net and gross acreage of all lots.
- M. Show roads/streets and rights-of-way providing legal and physical access to the property.
- N. Show radius of all curves.
- O. Show name, location and width of proposed roads/streets.
- P. Show existing culverts, bridges, drain pipes and other existing drainage facilities.
- Q. Indicate proposed drainage facilities including facilities for storm water run-off and provide for erosion control, including prevention of sedimentation or damage to off-site property.
- R. Land subject to overflow, inundation or flood hazard or identified as being in the flood zone per FEMA Flood Rate Maps, must be shown in detail.
- S. Soils report with a percolation test must be provided during application processing if subdivision proposes one or more lots of five acres or less. A soils report shall be required for every subdivision project. This report shall be provided prior to recordation, unless waived in writing by Public Works Director.

- T. Current Preliminary Title Report (no more than six months old), current vesting deed(s) and supporting documentation must be provided.
- U. Existing uses around the proposed subdivision must be shown.
- V. Land identified as being in the earthquake fault zone by the state geologist, pursuant to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Act is to be clearly depicted.
- W. Written statement from Imperial County Division of Environmental Health stating the type of sewer and water supply necessary for the subdivision is to be provided.
- X. Additional Tract Map requirements:
 - 1. Contours on a two-foot interval for zero to two percent slopes and five-foot intervals for steeper slopes.
 - 2. Subdividers Statement. The tentative final map shall be accompanied with a detailed statement showing the general intent for the development of the property. This shall include proposed usage, names and locations of adjacent streets, names and recording data of adjoining subdivisions. There shall also be a justification and/or reasons for exceptions requested from the provisions of the Ordinance.
 - 3. Phased map requires a detailed phase plan, timing each phase with an over-all plan not to exceed ten (10) years.
 - 4. A vicinity map.
 - 5. Land and parks to be dedicated to public are to be depicted.

(Ord. No. 1565, §§ 5, 6, 12-15-20; Ord. No. 1587, §§ 1, 2, 12-5-23)