

INITIAL STUDY

1. **Project Title:** Felix Annexation (APN's 044-200-077, 044-200-079, and 044-200-081)

2. **Lead Agencies Name and Address:** City of Imperial
420 South Imperial Avenue
Imperial, CA 92251

Imperial County Local Area Formation Commission (ICLAFCO)
420 South Imperial Avenue
El Centro, CA 92243

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Jorge Galvan (760)355-3326 (City of Imperial)
Jurg Heuberger (760) 353-4115 (ICLAFCO)

4. **Project Location:** The proposed project site consists of approximately 27.01 acres located in the City of Imperial's sphere of influence, within Imperial County's urban overlay designation. The site is located on the west side of Clark Road ("P" Street) approximately 1,318' (1/4 mile) north of Aten Road

5. **Project Address:** 2475 Clark Road, Imperial, CA 92251

6. **Project APN:** 044-200-077, 044-200-079, and 044-200-081

7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** T.O. Transportation Company
Justo Felix
2475 Clark Road, Imperial, CA 92251

8. **General Plan Designation(s):** The County of Imperial General Plan designation for the project site is Urban.

9. **Zoning:** The parcel is zoned (M2-U) Medium Industrial, Urban Overlay.

10. Description of the Project:

The Project Sponsor is requesting to annex approximately 27.01 acres into the City of Imperial to allow for the extension of water and sewer services. Approximately 4.9 acres of the entire annexation area (APN 044-200-079) will be developed as a truck parking and storage facility. The facility will include 20 truck parking stalls, open-air storage areas for cargo containers, an office trailer, and retention basin. The remaining parcels will remain undeveloped. The entire annexation area will be zone I-2 Rail-Served Industrial.

11. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site is surrounded by a combination of uses. The properties to the north and northeast are currently in agricultural use within the jurisdiction of the County of Imperial. The property to the south of the site is a vacant, industrially-zoned parcel. Immediately to the west of

INITIAL STUDY

the project site is the Crown Court Industrial Business Park separated from the project site by railroad right-of-way. Across the street on Clark Road is the Bratton Subdivision comprising of single-family residential development.

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

- Imperial County Air Pollution Control District
- Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)

13. Other Agencies whose approval may be required:

- None

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 Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <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/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis on this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) 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 in the checklist, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but must analyze only the effect that remains to be addressed.
- I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will NOT be a significant effect in this case 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.

Signature

Date

Jorge Galvan

Printed Name

INITIAL STUDY

PURPOSE OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This Initial Study has been prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15063, to determine if the IID Administration Site project ("project"), as proposed, may have a significant effect upon the environment. Based upon the findings contained within this report, the Initial Study will be used in support of the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.

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 cited. 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.
- 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, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) A "Less than Significant Impact" applies when the proposed project would not result in a substantial and adverse change in the environment. This impact level does not require mitigation measures.
- 4) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 5) "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact". The initial study must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* There are no identified scenic vistas within the viewshed of the proposed project site.
- b) *No Impact.* The project site is not visible from any portion of a designated state scenic highway. The nearest highways are State Route (SR)-86 and SR-111, which are not designated as scenic highways in the project area. The site does not contain scenic resources such as rock outcroppings trees, or historic buildings.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed development would be consistent with existing County zoning and proposed City zoning. Industrial uses already exist along Clark Road and within the Crown Court Industrial Business Park. As such, there would be no impact to the existing residential development within the Bratton Subdivision.
- d) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would introduce new light sources on previously undeveloped land, which may impact adjacent land uses. These light sources include, but are not limited to, street lighting, parking lot lighting, security lighting, private lighting, and automobile headlights. The proposed is subject to lighting regulations of the City of Imperial to reduce impacts to less than significant.

INITIAL STUDY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURE 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. Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a-c) *No Impact.* The project site is not located within designated important farmland. Although the entire annexation area is primarily undeveloped, remnants of previous industrial uses still remain on the site. Aerial photographs since 1972 show that no farming activities have occurred on the project site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a & b) *No Impact.* The proposed truck parking and storage facility would result in a maximum 150 average daily trips and will not conflict with or violate any air quality standard.

c) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Although there are no plans for development of the entire project area, future industrial development can contribute to a cumulative increase in criteria pollutant, albeit at a less-than-significant level. The City's I-2 zoning designation is more restrictive than the County's M2 zoning.

d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* There is existing residential development across the street from project site with an additional 50' buffer space. Any impact resulting in pollutant concentrations will be less than significant.

e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Diesel fumes from 20 truck traveling in and out of the project site will generate less than significant impact to the surrounding land uses.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

(a-f) *No Impact.* There are no known species of plants or animals in this area that have been listed as endangered, threatened, or otherwise protected. The entire annexation area has been previously disturbed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in ? 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to ? 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a-d) *No Impact.* There are no known cultural resources in the project area. The entire annexation area has been previously disturbed.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death, involving:				
i) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a-d) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project site does not lie within a State of California, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and is not considered to be at risk for surface rupture. The project site is located on relatively flat land. Development of the project will involve minor excavation and grading but will not result in soil erosion or significant loss of topsoil during construction.
- e) *No Impact.* The project will not use any septic tanks or other alternative wastewater disposal system; therefore there will be no impact.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. 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?	<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 reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<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?	<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 §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a-b) *No Impact.* Hazardous materials will not be allowed to be stored or transported to and from the project site.
- c) *No Impact.* There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site.

INITIAL STUDY

- d) *No Impact.* The proposed site is not listed as a hazardous material site
- e) *Less than Significant Impact.* The Imperial County Airport is less than three-quarters of a mile from the project site. A small portion of the project site is within the B2 zone but the majority of the site is within the C zone of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Warehousing, truck terminals, and light industrial uses are normally acceptable land uses in both the B2 and C zones.
- f) *No Impact.* There are no private air strips within the vicinity of the project site.
- g) *No Impact.* The proposed project is consistent with existing County zoning and proposed City zoning. The project will not impair and interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan.
- h) *No Impact.* There are no wildlands in the vicinity of the proposed project; therefore there will be no impact.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or any waste discharge requirements.

INITIAL STUDY

- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project would not utilize groundwater or prevent recharge of the aquifer volume groundwater.

- (c-f) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project may affect water quality, storm drainage and contribute to erosion. The proposed project is required to implement Best Management Practices comply with all mandatory regulations, file a Notice of Intent with the RWQCB to comply with the NPDES permits, and be required to prepare a SWPPP, and adhere to water quality regulations.

- (g-i) *No Impact.* The project site is outside the 100-year flood hazard area. The proposed project is not within a floodway or floodplain of any body of water. However, the Date

- j) *No impact.* The project is not located in the vicinity to substantial bodies of water. Therefore, there is no risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow and no impact.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will be adjacent to similar urban land uses that have been approved by the City of Imperial and no physical division of an established community will result; therefore there will be no impact.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and the proposed zoning designation of I-2 Rail-Served Industrial.
- c) *No Impact.* There is no adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in the County of Imperial or the City of Imperial; therefore, the project would not conflict with such plans and no impact is expected. This issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

INITIAL STUDY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* The property is currently vacant and does not appear to impact any known mineral resources.
- b) No Impact. (See discussion under a).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Truck traffic will result in increased noise levels along Clark Road but an existing noise wall and buffer space minimizes the impact to the residential land uses to the east of the project site.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not generate any groundborne vibration or noise.
- c & d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* See discussion in a) above.
- e) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The project is located less than three-quarters of a mile from the Imperial County Airport and within B2 and C zones of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The proposed use is considered a normally acceptable use.
- f) *No Impact.* There are not private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site.

INITIAL STUDY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project does not consist of a residential component and would include land uses that are consistent with existing surrounding uses. None of the aspects of the proposed project would induce substantial population growth.
- b-c) *No Impact.* The proposed project site is primarily vacant and currently being used for agriculture. Therefore, no displacement of existing housing will occur onsite that would require the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere; therefore, there will be no impact and this issue will not be further discussed in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. 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 following public services:				
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

a - b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would require police and fire services from the City of Imperial rather than the County but because of proximity to the City Police Station and City Fire Station, services are already being provided by the City of Imperial through mutual aid.

c - d) *No Impact.* The proposed project does not include a residential component so there will be no impact to schools or parks.

d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Water and wastewater lines will be extended to the project site by the Project Sponsor. The project site is located within the City's Sphere of Influence and sufficient capacity exists within the City's treatment facilities.

INITIAL STUDY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project does not include a residential component and therefore will not have any impacts to recreation.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a-b) *Less Than Significant Impact.* The truck parking facility will result in 120 average daily trips. Clark Road and adjacent intersections and roadways are operating at a Level of Service A. Sufficient capacity exist within the surrounding roadways and intersection that the addition of 120 trips is considered less than significant.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not change air traffic levels, patterns or locations. Therefore, there will be no impact.
- d) *Less Than Significant Impact.* Clark Road is a two-lane roadway with a center turn lane. The project includes a widening of the center turn lane and the addition of acceleration/deceleration lanes to minimize hazards related to turn movements into and out of the project site. Impact is less than significant.
- e) *No Impact.* The project site is accessible to emergency personnel and equipment.
- f) *No Impact.* Off-street parking is a component of the proposed project.

INITIAL STUDY

- g) *No Impact.* The addition of the proposed project to the existing public transportation services will not increase usage to levels that would exceed City of Imperial standards.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project will comply with requirement to prepare a Notice of Intent and Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Therefore, a less than significant impact is expected.
- b-e) *Less than Significant Impact.* The project is located within the City's Sphere of Influence and subject to the City's Service Area Plan. The proposed truck facility will result in additional demand equivalent to one dwelling unit which is considered less than significant. The City's treatment facilities have sufficient capacity to service the project area.
- f-g) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project would contribute solid waste to local facilities. Requirements established in all applicable federal, state and local statutes will be met, including but not limited to recycling requirements. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated to occur.

INITIAL STUDY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wild-life population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, 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 that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

- a) *No Impact.* There are no known biological resources within the project site.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact.* The proposed project, along with other previously approved projects within the vicinity, will have a cumulative impact upon the environment, but due to the limited scope of the project, its impacts are less than significant.
- c) *Less than Significant Impact.* Residents of the Bratton Subdivision will experience some effects as a result of the project, but due to the limited scope of the project, its impacts are less than significant.

REFERENCES

Airport Data.com. Website: <http://www.airport-data.com/airport/IPL/nearby-airports.html>. Accessed December 22, 2008.

City of Imperial. *The City of Imperial General Plan*. 1992

County of Imperial. *Imperial County Zoning Ordinance*. 1998.

City of imperial General Plan EIR, 1992

Imperial County. *Imperial County General Plan*. Imperial County, CA. October 2008.