

# PROJECT REPORT

**TO: ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

**AGENDA DATE: June 13, 2024**

**FROM: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPT. AGENDA TIME 1:30 PM/No.1**

**Information Item Only**

Specific Plan Amendment #24-0001, Tract Map #00994, Initial Study #22-0044

PROJECT TYPE: McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan SUPERVISOR DIST #2

LOCATION: McCabe, Dogwood and Correll Road APN: 054-130-072, 076, 077, 078

Heber, CA 92249 PARCEL SIZE: Approx. 351.2 acres

GENERAL PLAN (existing) McCabe Ranch Specific Plan GENERAL PLAN (proposed) n/a

ZONE (existing) Specific Plan ZONE (proposed) n/a

GENERAL PLAN FINDINGS  CONSISTENT  INCONSISTENT  MAY BE/FINDINGS

PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION:

HEARING DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED  DENIED  OTHER

PLANNING DIRECTORS DECISION:

HEARING DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED  DENIED  OTHER

ENVIROMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE DECISION: HEARING DATE: 06/13/2024

INITIAL STUDY: #22-0044

NEGATIVE DECLARATION  MITIGATED NEG. DECLARATION  Supplemental EIR

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS / APPROVALS:

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

**REQUESTED ACTION:**

(See Attached)

**Imperial County Planning & Development Services**  
(Jim Minnick, Director)

801 MAIN ST., EL CENTRO, CA, 92243 442-265-1736  
DB\AT\S:\AllUsers\APN\054\130\072\TR00994\EEC\PROJREPEEC.doc

**EEC ORIGINAL PKG**

***Initial Study***

***For:***

**McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (TR00094)  
Specific Plan Amendment #24-0001**



***Prepared By:***

**COUNTY OF IMPERIAL**

**Planning & Development Services Department**

801 Main Street  
El Centro, CA 92243  
(442) 265-1736  
[www.icpds.com](http://www.icpds.com)

**May 2024**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
SECTION I.	INTRODUCTION ..... 1
A.	PURPOSE..... 1
B.	CEQA REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPERIAL COUNTY “GUIDELINES AND REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT CEQA AS AMENDED” ..... 1
C.	INTENDED USES OF INITIAL STUDY ..... 2
D.	CONTENTS OF INITIAL STUDY ..... 2
E.	SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS ..... 3
F.	POLICY-LEVEL or PROJECT LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS ..... 4
G.	TIERED DOCUMENTS AND INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE ..... 4
SECTION II.	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST ..... 7
	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: ..... 12
	ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE (EEC) DETERMINATION ..... 12
	PROJECT SUMMARY ..... 13
	<i>Project Background</i> ..... 13
	<i>Project Description</i> ..... 13
	EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:..... 23
I.	AESTHETICS ..... 24
II.	AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES ..... 25
III.	AIR QUALITY ..... 26
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES..... 27
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES..... 29
VI.	ENERGY ..... 30
VII.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS ..... 31
VIII.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS..... 33
IX.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS..... 34
X.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY ..... 35
XI.	LAND USE AND PLANNING ..... 37
XII.	MINERAL RESOURCES ..... 38
XIII.	NOISE..... 39
XIV.	POPULATION AND HOUSING ..... 40
XV.	PUBLIC SERVICES ..... 41
XVI.	RECREATION ..... 42

	XVII. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC .....	43
	XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	44
	XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS .....	45
	XX. WILDFIRE.....	46
	XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	47
SECTION IV.	PERSONS & ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED/ REFERENCES.....	50
A.	PERSONS & ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED .....	50
	<i>County Of Imperial</i> .....	50
B	LIST OF PREPARERS .....	50
SECTION V.	REFERENCES.....	51

## FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
Figure 1	Regional Location.....	17
Figure 2	Project Location.....	18
Figure 3	Proposed Tract Map 994 .....	19
Figure 4	Proposed Phasing Plan.....	20
Figure 5	McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Land Uses.....	21

## TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
Table 1	Existing Land Uses, Zone Classification and General Plan Designation .....	8
Table 2	Potential Consultation and Permitting Requirements.....	9
Table 3	Detailed Development By Phase, McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994.....	15
Table 4	Summary of Land Uses within McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan.....	16

---

## SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

---

### A. PURPOSE

This document is a  policy-level;  project level Initial Study for evaluation of potential environmental impacts resulting with the proposed Project.

### B. CEQA REQUIREMENTS AND THE IMPERIAL COUNTY "GUIDELINES AND REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT CEQA AS AMENDED"

As defined by Section 15063 of the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines and Section 7 of the County's "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), Mitigated Negative Declaration, Negative Declaration, or other environmental document, would be appropriate for providing the necessary environmental documentation and clearance for any proposed project.

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

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

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

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

According to Section 15162, a **Supplemental to an EIR (Supplemental EIR)** is deemed appropriate when an EIR has been certified for a project, and the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following conditions occur:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;  
or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:

- 
- (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
  - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

This Initial Study has determined that substantial changes are proposed in the project and there are substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previously certified Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2008111037) for the proposed McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan. Therefore, a Supplemental EIR is deemed as the appropriate document to provide necessary environmental evaluation.

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**

This Initial Study is an informational document which is 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 Notice of Preparation, is prepared for the project, will be circulated for a period of 35 days for public and agency review and comments.

### **D. CONTENTS OF INITIAL STUDY**

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

#### **SECTION 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 II**

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

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

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

## **SECTION III**

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

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

V. **REFERENCES** lists bibliographical materials use in the preparation of this document.

VI. **FINDINGS**

## **SECTION 4**

VIII. **RESPONSE TO COMMENTS (IF ANY)**

IX. **MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (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 five (5) possible responses, including:

1. **Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions:** applies when substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. When a checklist question receives this response, a subsequent or supplemental EIR must be prepared.



- 
2. **Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions:** applies where substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. When a checklist question receives this response, a subsequent or supplemental EIR must be prepared.
  3. **New Information Showing Potentially New or Increased Significant Effects:** applies where new information, including regulatory changes, results in a potentially significant new impact or a potential increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect. When a checklist question receives this response, a subsequent or supplemental EIR must be prepared.
  4. **Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR:** some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred. No additional environmental analysis is required beyond that provided in the certified EIR.
  5. **No Impact** applies where a project does not create an impact in that category. 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 proposed (e.g., the project falls outside of 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).

## **F. POLICY-LEVEL OR PROJECT LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

This Initial Study 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]).

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 is available, along with this document, at the County of Imperial Planning & Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243, phone (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; phone (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 1993 County of Imperial General Plan Final EIR is SCH #93011023.
  - The material to be incorporated in this document will include general background information (CEQA Guidelines Section 15150[f]).

---

## SECTION II. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

---

- 1. Project Title:** McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:** Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:** David Black, Planner IV, 442-265-1736
- 4. Address:** 801 Main Street, El Centro CA, 92243
- 5. E-mail:** DavidBlack@co.imperial.ca.us
- 6. Project Location:** McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is an approximately 351.2-acre portion of the 468-acre McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area located in the general area north of the Community of Heber and south of the City of El Centro, in the County of Imperial, California (**Figure 1, Regional Location**). The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is bounded by McCabe Road on the north, Dogwood Road on the east, State Route 86 (SR-86) on the west, and the western extension of Correll Road on the south. The proposed Tract Map is bisected by the Imperial Irrigation District's Date Drain No. 3 and Dogwood Canal and is located in Section 20, Range 14 East, Township 16 South San Bernardino Base Meridian within the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Heber, California 7.5-minute topographic map.
- 7. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC  
3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1230  
Las Vegas, NV 89169
- 8. General Plan Designation:** SP (Specific Plan Area)
- 9. Zoning:** Mc Ra 2 SPA (McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan)
- 10. Description of Project:**
- McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC (Applicant) is seeking to process a Subdivision Tentative Map, referred to as the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994, for an approximately 351.2-acre portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area to accommodate the phased development of 1,610 residential units (single- and multiple-family units), a 12.3-acre elementary school site for the McCabe Union School District, parks, roadways, associated utilities, drainage and storm water treatment improvements. The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is an approximately 351.2-acre portion of the 468-acre McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area generally located north of the Community of Heber and south of the City of El Centro, in the County of Imperial, California (see **Figure 1, Regional Location and Figure 2, Project Location**). It is bounded by McCabe Road on the north, Dogwood Road on the east, State Route 86 (SR-86) on the west, and the western extension of Correll Road on the south. The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is located in Section 20, Range 14 East, Township 16 South within the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Heber, California 7.5-minute topographic.
- The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (Project or proposed Project) is comprised of four (4) parcels; County of Imperial Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 054-130-072, 054-130-076, 054-130-077, and 054-130-078. The Imperial Irrigation District's Date Drain No. 3 and Dogwood Canal both traverse the Project area in a north-south direction (Figure 3, Proposed McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994).

Development of the Tract Map will require an amendment to the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan, annexation to the Heber Public Utilities District. McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC also proposes to enter into a Development Agreement with the County.

**11. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is an approximately 351.2-acre portion of the 468-acre McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area (Specific Plan Area). The Specific Plan area is approximately 468 acres in size and is currently in multiple ownerships. McCabe Ranch Realty LLC is under ownership contract with the current owner, Tierra Partners LLC, of approximately 345 acres of the 468-acre total, consisting of APNs 054-130-078, 054-130-072, 054-130-077, and 054-130-076. The properties identified as APNs 054-130-079 and 054-130-042 are held in separate ownerships.

The Specific Plan Area consists of generally flat terrain with very gently topography sloping to the northwest. The site elevation is approximately 19 to 23 feet below mean sea level (msl). The area is under various phases of active cultivation with agricultural crops and contains canals and drains that are utilized to transport water to and from the agricultural fields. One lateral canal (the Dogwood lateral) and one drain (Date Drain #3) traverse the area in a north-south direction. Adjacent to Date Drain #3 is an above ground utility line owned by the Imperial Irrigation District that generally serves the area. Adjacent to both sides of the canal are unpaved access roads. The Date Drain #3-A runs in an east-west direction through the western half of the site in the approximate alignment of Black Hills Road.

Surrounding land uses include agricultural lands to the east and west of the Project site. There are several scattered single family residential structures to the northwest, northeast, and west. The residential subdivision known as "McCabe Ranch I Specific Plan" abuts the Project site on the south and east, and there is a small cluster of homes located along McCabe Road. The Heber Essential Services Facility housing, the Heber Public Utility District (HPUD), and the County Fire Department are located approximately one mile to the south along the eastside of Dogwood Road. HPUD's water treatment plant is located east and south of the Heber Essentials Facility

Existing land uses on and surrounding the Project site are presented on **Table -1**.

**TABLE 1: EXISTING LAND USES, ZONE CLASSIFICATION AND GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION**

Direction	Existing Land Uses	Zoning	General Plan
Project Site	Agriculture	Mc Ra 2 SPA	Specific Plan
North	Agriculture and Residential	A-1-U and A-2-U	Urban Area
South	Agriculture and Residential	A-2-G-SPA	Specific Plan
East	Agriculture	A-2-SPA	Specific Plan
West	Agriculture	A-2	Agriculture

**12. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

The federal, state and local permits and consultations that may be required for the Project are listed on **Table -2**.

**TABLE 2. POTENTIAL CONSULTATION AND PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS**

Jurisdiction Level	Type of Permit/Approval	Agency	Purpose
Federal	Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act Permit	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Regulates discharge of dredged and/or fill material into Waters of the United States.
Federal	Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 Consultation	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Required for any activity that may affect a federally listed endangered or threatened species or designated critical habitat.
State	Review of Hazardous Materials Business Plan and hazardous materials transportation plans.	California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)	Required for industrial developments' potential use and/or transport of hazardous materials.
State	1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement	California Dept. of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW)	Required for construction activities in or adjacent to rivers, streams, lakes, wetlands and waterbodies
State	California Streets and Highways Code 660 to 711.21, California Code of Regulations (CCR) 1411.1 to 1411.6	Caltrans, District 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Encroachment permit(s) for any encroachment or any improvements to SR-86, SR-111 or I-8 (if needed).</li> <li>▪ Traffic Control Plans</li> <li>▪ Permits required for oversized and/or overweight truckloads that exceed legal load limits</li> </ul>
State	Construction Stormwater General Permit (Order No. 2022-0057-DWQ NPDES No. CAS000002 as amended).	Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin, Region 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Management of stormwater during construction. Preparation and implementation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs).</li> <li>▪ Notice of Intent (NOI) to obtain covered under the general permit.</li> </ul>
State	401 Water Quality Certification, Waste Discharge Requirements, and/or Waivers of Waste Discharge Requirements	Regional Water Quality Control Board, Colorado River Basin, Region 7	Required for dredge or fill activities that may result in discharges of pollutants to Waters of the United States or Waters of the State

**TABLE 2. POTENTIAL CONSULTATION AND PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS**

Jurisdiction Level	Type of Permit/Approval	Agency	Purpose
Local	Specific Plan Amendment	Imperial County Board of Supervisors	Approval of modifications to adopted 2010 McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan
Local	Approval of Tentative Tract Map 994	Imperial County Planning and Development Services Department (ICPDSD)	Required for subdivision
Local	Approval of a Development Agreement with the County of Imperial related to the 351.2-ac portion controlled by McCabe Ranch Realty LLC.	County of Imperial	Require pursuant to Imperial County Land Use Ordinance Title 9, Division 23.
Local	Encroachment Permit	Imperial Irrigation District (IID)	Required for encroachment upon existing and proposed IID facilities and or rights of way (if any)
Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Authority to Construct</li> <li>▪ Permit for New Stationary Source(s)</li> <li>▪ Rule 207 Review;</li> <li>▪ Rule 310</li> <li>▪ Rule 403 Permit (Air Contaminants and Fugitive Dust)</li> <li>▪ Rule 415</li> <li>▪ Rules 800, 801, 803, 805 (Fugitive Dust Rules)</li> </ul>	Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD)	<p>Consultation and permitting for air pollution, including fugitive dust, and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions that may result from the implementation of future development activities.</p> <p>Authority to Construct - required prior to constructing, erecting, installing, modifying, or replacing any article, machine, equipment or contrivance, the use of which may emit or control air contaminants.</p>
Local	Permit to Operate, Permit for Alteration/Modification, Emission Reduction Credits, Rule 310 and Rule 403 Permit (Fugitive Dust)	Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (ICAPCD)	Permit to Operate – required prior to operation of any article, machine, equipment, or other contrivance that emits air contaminants associated with future commercial and/or industrial developments.
Local	Building Permit(s)	ICPDSD	New construction within the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area

**TABLE 2. POTENTIAL CONSULTATION AND PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS**

Jurisdiction Level	Type of Permit/Approval	Agency	Purpose
Local	Grading Permit(s)	ICPDSD/DPW	Excavation or earthwork that involves over 2 feet in depth and/or fills over 1 foot in depth.
Local	Encroachment Permit(s) (Public ROW)	Imperial County Department of Public Works (DPW)	Required any time work is performed within the public ROW (e.g., curb drains, lane closures, and utility trenches by utility agencies).
Local	Traffic Control Plan(s)	DPW	Traffic management for potential lane closures during construction.
Local	Development Agreement	Board of Supervisors	Approval of Development Agreement
Local	Water Supply Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Heber Public Utilities District (PUD)</li> <li>▪ Board of Supervisors</li> </ul>	Heber PUD and Board of Supervisor's review and approval of Water Supply Assessment
Local	Annexation to Special District	Heber Public Utilities District	Required for annexation to Heber Public Utilities District
Local	Annexation to Special District	Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCO)	Required for annexation to Heber Public Utilities District

**13. Native American Consultation: Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1?**

In compliance with Senate Bill 18 (SB 18; Government Code Section 65352.3), the Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department (ICPDSD) sent letters to federally recognized California Native American Tribes and/or tribal representatives providing notification of the Project and an invitation to participate in consultation. By law, California Native American Tribes have 90 days from the date of receipt of the notice to request consultation (Government Code 65352.3(a)(2)).

In compliance with Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes 2014), the ICPDSD sent letters to those tribes that have requested to be on the Imperial County Planning and Development Services Department's notification list for projects in their respective areas of traditional and cultural affiliation. AB-52 Consultation Letters provided notification of the Project and an invitation to participate in consultation. Under AB-52, California Native American Tribes have 30 days from the date of receipt of the notice to request consultation.



## 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality   | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire                            | <input checked="" 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 a SUPPLEMENTAL 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 Final EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier Final EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE DE MINIMIS IMPACT FINDING:  Yes  No

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Minnick, Director of Planning/EEC Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

---

## **PROJECT SUMMARY**

### **Project Background**

The McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan (SP07-004), which established a framework for the development of a variety of land uses within the approximately 468-acre Specific Plan Area (SPA), was approved by the Imperial County Board of Supervisors (Board) in December 2010. Additionally the Board approved a related Subdivision Tentative Map (TR 00979), which has subsequently expired. As part of the Specific Plan approval, the Board also certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (2010 Final EIR), Mitigation and Monitoring Program (MMRP) and CEQA Findings. The previously certified 2010 Final EIR (2010 Previous FEIR) analyzed the direct, indirect and cumulative changes to the physical environment that would result from development of a maximum of 2,300 single- and multiple-family dwelling units; 19.2-acres of parks; an 8.4-acre business park; 3.2 acres of commercial uses; two (2) elementary school sites for the McCabe Unified and Heber Unified School Districts (28.5 acres combined) and associated public improvements within the McCabe Ranch II SPA (1).

### **Project Description**

McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is an approximately 351.2-acre portion of the 468-acre McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area generally located north of the Community of Heber and south of the City of El Centro, in the County of Imperial, California (see **Figure 1, Regional Location** and **Figure 2, Project Location**). The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is bounded by McCabe Road on the north, Dogwood Road on the east, State Route 86 (SR-86) on the west, and the western extension of Correll Road on the south. The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is located in Section 20, Range 14 East, Township 16 South within the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Heber, California 7.5-minute topographic.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC (Applicant) is seeking to process a Subdivision Tentative Map, referred to as the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994, for an approximately 351.2-acre portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area to accommodate the phased development of 1,610 residential units (single- and multiple-family units), a 13-acre elementary school site for the McCabe Union School District, parks, roadways, associated utilities, drainage and storm water treatment improvements (**Figure 3, Proposed McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994**). The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (Project or proposed Project) is comprised of four (4) parcels; County of Imperial Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 054-130-072, 054-130-076, 054-130-077, and 054-130-078. The Imperial Irrigation District's Date Drain No. 3 and Dogwood Canal both traverse the Project area in a north-south direction.

Development of the proposed McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 is proposed to occur in phases (Phase 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C) over a 14 year period between 2025 and 2039 as shown on **Figure 4, Proposed Phasing Plan**. A detailed breakdown of development by phase for the proposed McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 is presented on **Table 3**. Development within that portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area outside of Tract Map 994, may develop prior to, concurrently with, or subsequent to the Tract Map 994 and is denoted as Phase 4. **Table 4** provides a summary of proposed land uses within the entirety of the Specific Plan Area

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Table 3.0-1, Proposed Land Uses. County of Imperial, 2010.

---

The development phasing for of the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994, and for the Phase 4 area differs from that identified in the adopted McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan. For this reason, an amendment to the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan is also proposed. Land uses included in the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan are shown on **Figure 5**.

Sewer, water, park maintenance, and landscape and lighting maintenance services would be provided by the Heber Public Utility District (HPUD). However, in order for services to be provided, the Specific Plan Area must be annexed into the HPUD. The Project also includes a Development Agreement with the County of Imperial related to the 351.2-ac portion controlled by McCabe Ranch Realty LLC pursuant to Imperial County Land Use Ordinance Title 9, Division 23.

**TABLE 3. DETAILED DEVELOPMENT BY PHASE, MCCABE RANCH II TRACT MAP 994**

PROPOSED LAND USES	PHASE 1 (a)			PHASE 2 (a)			PHASE 3 (a)			TOTALS
	1A	1B	2A	2B	3A	3B	3C			
	2025 - 2026	2026 -2027	2029 - 2031	2032 - 2033	2034 - 2035	2036 - 2037	2038 - 2039			
<b>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</b>									<b>DUs</b>	
<b>Single-Family</b>	<b>Density</b>									
Traditional Single Family	5 DU/AC	-0-	160	134	151	-0-	88		<b>533</b>	
Small Lot Single-Family	7 DU/AC	-0-	100	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-		<b>257</b>	
Flex Lot Single-Family	9 DU/AC	157	-0-	-0-	-0-	88	-0-		<b>245</b>	
Mini Estate	3 DU/AC	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	19		<b>19</b>	
Estate Lot	2 DU/AC	-0-	-0-	25	-0-	-0-	-0-		<b>25</b>	
<b>Single-Family Subtotal</b>		<b>157</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>107</b>		<b>1,079</b>	
<b>Multi-Family</b>	<b>Density</b>									
Multi-Family 1 (NW Corner)	20 DU/AC	-0-	-0-	196	-0-	-0-	-0-		<b>196</b>	
Multi-Family 2 (NE Corner)	19 DU/AC	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	335	-0-		<b>335</b>	
Multi-Family 3	22 DU/AC	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-		<b>0</b>	
<b>Multi-Family Subtotal</b>		<b>-0-</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>-0-</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>-0-</b>		<b>-0-</b>	
<b>TOTAL RESIDENTIAL</b>		<b>157</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>107</b>		<b>1,610</b>	
<b>NON - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</b>									<b>Acres</b>	
McCabe Elementary (K-5) School Site		-0-	12.3	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-		<b>12.3</b>	
Commercial		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	3.14		<b>-0-</b>	
Business Park		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-		<b>-0-</b>	
Park/Detention/Greenbelt (inc. IID Easement)		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-		<b>38.78</b>	
Major Collector Roads		-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-		<b>48.3</b>	

Notes: (a) Denotes property controlled by McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC. Included in TM 994.  
 DU = Dwelling Units.  
 AC = Acres  
 Source: McCabe Ranch Realty, April 2024.  
 -0- = No development during this phase


**TABLE 4. SUMMARY OF LAND USES WITHIN MCCABE RANCH II SPECIFIC PLAN AREA<sup>(1)</sup>**

Land Use	Approx. Gross Acres	% of Total Specific Plan Area	Dwelling Units
<b>Residential Uses</b>			
Traditional Lot – Single Family (5,000 SF+)	121.46	25.9	569
Small Lot – Single Family (4,000 SF – 5,000 SF)	58.02	12.4	406
Flex Lot – Single Family (2,000 SF – 4,000 SF)	65.54	14.0	482
Mini-Estate Lot – Single Family (9,000 SF+)	6.72	1.5	19
Estate Lot – Single Family (20,000 SF+)	19.85	4.2	25
<b>Single Family Subtotal</b>	<b>271.59</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>1,501</b>
Multi-Family 1 (Northwest Corner)	9.82	2.0	196
Multi-Family 2 (Northeast Corner)	17.57	3.8	335
Multi-Family 3	12.2	2.6	268
<b>Multi-Family Subtotal</b>	<b>39.59</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>799</b>
<b>Residential Uses Subtotal</b>	<b>311.18</b>	<b>66.4</b>	<b>2,300</b>
<b>Non-Residential Uses</b>			
Business Park	9.41	2.0	-0-
Commercial	3.14	0.7	-0-
Elementary School Site (McCabe)	12.3	2.6	-0-
Elementary School Site (Heber)	16.29	3.5	-0-
<b>Non-Residential Uses Subtotal</b>	<b>41.14</b>	<b>8.8</b>	
<b>Open Spaces/Recreation</b>			
Parks / Detention / Greenbelts (incl IID easement)	62.3	13.3	
<b>Open Space/Recreation Subtotal</b>	<b>62.38</b>	<b>13.3</b>	
<b>Major Collector Roads Subtotal</b>	<b>53.62</b>	<b>11.5</b>	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>468.32</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,300</b>

Notes: (a) Includes properties controlled by McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC. (McCabe Ranch II TM 994) as well as property under separate ownership (not controlled by McCabe Ranch Realty LLC).

Source: McCabe Realty, LLC, April 2024.






Source: Esri, 2024.



**Regional Location**  
 McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (TR000994)  
 Figure 1




Source: McCabe Realty, LLC, 2024

Project Location Map  
 McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (TR000994)  
 Figure 2








Source: McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC, 2024.

Proposed Tract Map  
McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994  
(TR000994) Figure 3



Source: McCabe Realty, LLC, 2024



Proposed Phasing Plan McCabe  
Ranch II Tract Map 994 (TR000994)  
Figure 4



Source: McCabe Realty, LLC, 2024



McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Land Uses  
McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (TR000994)  
Figure 5

---

---

## 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.

**I. AESTHETICS**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the Project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the Project is in an urbanized area, would the Project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character and impacts from the creation of new sources of light or glare associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR found that there are no scenic vistas nor scenic highways within the project vicinity. The Previous 2010 Final EIR also found that implementation of Specific Plan Policy Ae-1, Specific Plan Policy Ae-2 and Specific Plan Policy Ae-3, which establish design standards for residential uses, limit the height of buildings, and require all new residential developments to be compatible with the character and scale of nearby neighborhoods would ensure that potential impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources and visual character would be less than significant. Additionally, the Previous 2010 Final EIR found that implementation of Specific Plan Policy Ae-4 and mitigation measure MM 4.3.1 would reduce light and glare impacts to a level less than significant by minimizing the use of reflective materials and requiring all lighting and illumination to be shielded to minimize scatter.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, there have been no changes to the aesthetics environment or characteristics of the proposed project area.

**Questions a - d — Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. No changes are proposed in the Project nor is new information available which will require major revisions of the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

With implementation of Specific Plan Polices Ae-1, Ae-2, Ae-3, Ae-4 and MM 4.3-1, potential aesthetic resources would be reduced to less than significant.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The findings of the Previous 2010 Final EIR will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and MM 4.3-1 will be modified recommended, if required.

**II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)</b>	<b>No Impact (NI)</b>
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts to agricultural and forestry resources associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final found that implementation of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan would be consistent with the County's "Specific Plan" land use designation for the area and while future development would convert Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance, because the Specific Plan is consistent with the County's land use vision for the project area no significant

agricultural conversion impacts would occur. Therefore, the conversion of existing agricultural uses was found to be less than significant and no mitigation measures were required.

Since the certification of the Final EIR, there have been no changes to the agricultural environment or characteristics of the proposed project as evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR.

**Questions a, b, and e - Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. According to the most recent California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping (2022) the Specific Plan Area contains Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance, which would be converted to non-agricultural uses. However, because the Previous 2010 Final EIR found that implementation of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan would be consistent with the County's "Specific Plan" land use designation for the area; future development consistent with the Specific Plan would not result in significant agricultural impacts

**Questions c and d – No Impact.** The Previous 2010 Final EIR found that McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area does not support an agricultural preserve and contains no properties under a Williamson Act contract. Similarly, because the Project site is currently zoned "Mc Ra 2 SPA" (McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan), implementation of the Project would be consistent with zoning and not conflict with, nor cause the rezoning or conversion of forest land or timberlands. No impacts under these criteria are anticipated.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The Previous 2010 Final EIR's findings for potential impacts to agricultural resources will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR.

**III. AIR QUALITY**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)</b>	<b>No Impact (NI)</b>
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential air quality impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified mitigation measures MM 4.3.1, MM 4.3.2a, MM 4.3.2b, MM 4.3.2c, and MM 4.3.3 to reduce air quality impacts to less than significant.

Since certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, air quality management plans and other applicable plans have been updated, such as the ICAPCD's Air Quality Management Plan and the 2018 PM10 Plan approved by California Air Resources Board and by the Environmental Protection Agency. Similarly, CalEEMod is now the air quality model used to quantify emissions. These updated plans and models represent a substantial change in circumstances under which the Project would be implemented, requiring major EIR revisions.

**Questions a, b, c, and d — Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Implementation of the proposed uses would result in increases in short-term air pollutant emissions during construction and increases in long-term emissions from operational activities. Such emissions could result in potentially significant air quality impacts unless mitigation is incorporated

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is evidence that substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project would be undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR. An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Report will be prepared for the Project and the Supplemental EIR will evaluate these potentially significant air quality impacts. The Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission report will quantify air emissions using the most current version of the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod 2022.1); discuss the Project's consistency with current air quality management plans; and, identify mitigation measures. Potential sources of odors during construction and operation activities will also be evaluated along with carbon monoxide hotspots and exposure to toxic air contaminants. The findings of the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Report will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures MM 4.3.1, MM 4.3.2a, MM 4.3.2b, MM 4.3.2c, and MM 4.3.3 will be modified, as necessary.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	<b>No Impact (NI)</b>
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential biological resource impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. Due to the developed nature of the study area, no special-status plant species were identified in the Previous 2010 Final. However, a total of nine (9) special botanical species were identified within the nine (9) Quadrangle CNDDDB search conducted during preparation of this Initial Study. Additionally, the Previous 2010 Final EIR found five (5) special-status wildlife species had the potential to occur in the biological study area (BSA) including Colorado River toad (*Bufo alvarius*), mountain plover (*Charadrius montanus*), white-faced ibis (*Plegadis chihí*), vermilion flycatcher (*Pyrocephalus rubinus*), and western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*). Similarly, the Previous 2010 Final EIR recorded western burrowing owl and western yellow bat within 1 mile of the BSA.

The Previous 2010 Final EIR found that implementation of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan could result the following:

- The loss of populations or habitat for the Colorado River toad;
- The loss of populations or essential habitat for special-status avian species;

- The loss of populations or essential habitat for the western burrowing owl, a special-status species;
- The loss of jurisdictional waters of the U.S., including wetlands; and,
- The mortality and loss of habitat for special-status species.

The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified mitigation measures MM 4.4.1, MM 4.4.2, MM 4.4.3, and MM 4.4.4 to reduce direct and cumulative impacts to biological resources to less than significant.

Since certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, conditions under which the Project would be implemented have changed which require major EIR revisions.

**Questions a through f — Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Implementation of the proposed uses could result in impacts to sensitive biological resources similar to those identified in the Previous Final 2010 EIR.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is evidence that substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project would be undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR. A Habitat Assessment Survey will be conducted to update and supplement the Previous 2010 Final EIR. Focused nesting season burrowing owl surveys will be conducted, along with Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) nesting surveys. A Jurisdictional Delineation will be completed to determine the presence and potential impacts to blue line wash and flood areas. Bat surveys will also be conducted. Potential permitting will be presented and mitigation requirements updated as necessary. The findings of the Habitat Assessment Report and other surveys will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures MM 4.4.1, MM 4.4.2, MM 4.4.3, and MM 4.4.4 will be modified, as necessary.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts to cultural resources associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. While no historical resources or unique archaeological resources were identified within the boundaries of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area, the Previous 2010 Final EIR found project-related ground-disturbing activities could uncover previously unknown prehistoric resources, historic resources, or human remains because of the area's historical occupation by both Native Americans and Spanish peoples. The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified mitigation measures MM 4.5.1a and 4.5.1b to reduce impacts to less than significant.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, there have been no changes to the cultural resource environment or characteristics of the proposed project area.

**Questions a, b, and c — Less Than Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. No changes are proposed in the Project nor is new information available which will require major revisions of the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The findings of the Previous 2010 Final EIR will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures MM 4.5.1a and MM 4.5.1b will be modified, as necessary.

**VI. ENERGY**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)</b>	<b>No Impact (NI)</b>
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources or from conflicts with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency were not addressed in the Previous 2010 Final EIR.

Since certification of the Final EIR, the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G has been revised to incorporate the analysis of Energy impacts. This update represents a substantial change in circumstances under which the Project would be implemented, requiring major EIR revisions.

**Questions a and b — Potentially Significant.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Implementation of the proposed uses would result in increases in energy usage during construction and operational activities. This impact could be potentially significant.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. An Energy Memo will be prepared for the Project and the Supplemental EIR will evaluate potential energy conservation impacts.

**VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994),	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?				
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"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts to geologic and paleontological resources associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified mitigation measure MM 4.5.2 to reduce impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant and mitigation measures MM 4.6.1a, MM 4.6.1b, MM 4.6.7 and Specific Plan Policy Geo-1 to reduce geology and soil erosion impacts to less than significant.

Since certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR no changes are proposed in the Project nor is new information available which will require major revisions of the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**Questions a, b, c, d and f — Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Implementation of the proposed uses could uncover previously unknown paleontological resources and affect would result in geological and soil resource impacts.

**Question e – No Impact.** The proposed McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project proposes to obtain wastewater treatment services from the Heber Public Utilities District. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems or the disposal of wastewater are included in the Project. For this reasons, no impacts would occur under this criteria.

### Conclusion

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The findings of the Previous 2010 Final EIR will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and modifications to MM 4.5.2 4.6.1a, MM 4.6.1b, MM 4.6.7 and Specific Plan Policy Geo-1 will be modified, as necessary.

**VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan or policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential climate change and greenhouse gas impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR found that the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan would result in substantial net increases in GHG and CO2e emissions. The Previous Final 2010 Final EIR identified Specific Plan design features and mitigation measures MM 4.16.1 to reduce impacts to less than significant.

Since certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, California's Climate Change Scope Plan has been updated three times and the California Air Resources Board approved its final 2022 Scoping Plan update on December 15, 2022. The plan is the most ambitious in the country in terms of proposed greenhouse gas reduction efforts, chiefly aiming to reach carbon neutrality in the state by 2045 or earlier. California's Building Standards Code (Title 24, California Code of Regulations) have also been updated to assist in achieving California's climate and air quality goals. This updated regulatory environment represents a substantial change in circumstances under which the Project would be implemented, requiring major EIR revisions.

**Questions a and b — Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Implementation of the proposed uses would result in increases in GHG and CO2e emissions.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is evidence that substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project would be undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR. Using the recommendations of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and methodology proposed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Report will be prepared which will quantify project-related GHG emissions from area sources, transportation, electricity, and waste disposal. The GHG analysis will also discuss potential global climate change impacts, the effects of GHG emissions, and a history of GHG emissions regulation in California. Project consistency with statewide GHG emissions reduction strategies and measures taken by the City to reduce GHG in the adopted General Plan will also be reviewed. The findings of the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Report will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measure MM 4.16.13 will be modified, as necessary.

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)</b>	<b>No Impact (NI)</b>
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential hazard and hazardous materials impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR found no properties

within the Specific Plan area listed on hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Additionally, the Specific Plan area is located approximately 30 miles from the Imperial County Airport and is not within the influence area as defined by the County's Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The Previous 2010 Final EIR mitigation measures MM 4.7.1, MM 4.7.3a, MM 4.7.3b, and MM 4.7.4 and to reduce to less than significant those impacts related to the transportation and use of hazardous materials; residual pesticides, herbicides, and/or heavy metals; the potential to encounter contaminated groundwater; and near-by private airstrip's use by crop-dusting planes.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, there have been no changes to the environment or characteristics of the proposed project area.

**Questions a, b, c, and f— Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Implementation of the Project could result in hazard and hazardous materials impacts that would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Questions d, g and h - Less Than Significant.** The Supplemental EIR will include a review current of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 will be reviewed to determine whether any properties within the Project area are listed thereon. The Supplemental EIR will include a review current emergency response and/or evacuation plans as the State's wildland fire data.

**Question e – No Impact.** The project site is not located within the vicinity of an airport and is outside the areas included in the Imperial County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. For this reason, implementation of the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to airport related safety hazards. No impact has been identified under this criteria.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The findings of the Previous 2010 Final EIR will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures MM 4.7.1, MM 4.7.3a, MM 4.7.3b, and MM 4.7.4 will be modified, as necessary.

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)</b>	<b>No Impact (NI)</b>
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)</b>	<b>No Impact (NI)</b>
such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces in a manner which would:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional resources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to Project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential hydrology and water quality impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR found that the project is located outside of a 100 year floodplain and therefore is not within a flood hazard zone. No impacts were identified under this criteria. Conversion of the project site from agricultural to residential, open space/parks, commercial uses, and educational uses was identified as having the potential to cause groundwater levels to fluctuate and could affect recharge, this impact was considered less than significant. Mitigation measures MM 4.8.1 and MM 4.8.2 were identified to reduce hydrology and water quality impacts related to drainage and stormwater runoff to less than significant.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, there have been no changes to the environment or characteristics of the proposed project area.

**Questions a, c, e — Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. No changes are proposed in the Project nor is new information available which will require major revisions of the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

**Question b – Less Than Significant.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Conversion of the project site from agricultural to residential, open space/parks, commercial uses, and educational uses could cause groundwater levels to fluctuate and could affect recharge; however, this impact is anticipated to be considered less than significant.

**Question d – No Impact.** The project site is not located within a flood hazard zone. Similarly, it is not located within an area subject to tsunamis or seiches. For these reasons, no impacts to water quality associated with the release of pollutants due to Project inundation are anticipated.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The findings of the Previous 2010 Final EIR will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures MM 4.8.1 and MM 4.8.2 will be recommended, as necessary.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)</b>	<b>No Impact (NI)</b>
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential land use and planning impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified Specific Plan Policies LU-1 through LU-8 to ensure consistency with applicable planning documents, policies, and regulations and compatibility with neighboring land uses.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, several elements of the Imperial County General Plan have been updated, including the Noise Element, the Conservation and Open Space Element, the Housing Element, and the County is preparing an Environmental Justice Element. Additionally, the California Dept of Fish and Wildlife’s Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation was revised in Mary 2012 and SCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy was approved in April 2024

**Questions a and b – Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. The proposed uses and land use densities of the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 would be consistent with those evaluated for the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan.

---

---

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is evidence that substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project would be undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR. While it is not anticipated that the above referenced planning and policy upgrades would result in potentially new or increase significant effects, an updated land use and planning discussion will be included in the Supplemental EIR.

**XII. MINERAL RESOURCES**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)</b>	<b>No Impact (NI)</b>
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
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"/>

Potential mineral resource impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified no significant economic mineral resources within the limits of the project site and therefore included no mitigation measures.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, there have been no changes to the environment or characteristics of the proposed project area that would substantially affect mineral resources.

**Questions a and b — No Impact.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. The proposed uses and land use densities of the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 would be consistent with those evaluated for the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan and no impacts to mineral resources would result.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project would be undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR's findings for mineral resources will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR.

**XIII. NOISE**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential noise impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified mitigation measures MM 4.10.1a, through MM 4.10-1d to reduce impacts to Less Than Significant.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, there have been no changes to the noise environment or characteristics of the proposed project area. However, potential noise impacts including those from project-related vehicle trips, the assessment of which will be updated in the LMA to be prepared for the Project. The updated LMA represents a substantial change in circumstances under which the Project would be implemented, requiring major EIR revisions.

**Questions a, b, and c — Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Implementation of the proposed uses would result in increases in short-term long-term noise impacts.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is evidence that substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project would be undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR. A Noise Report will be prepared to address construction noise and traffic noise during project operations. The findings of the Noise Report will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures MM 4.10.1a, through MM 4.10-1d will be modified, as necessary.

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	<i>No Impact (NI)</i>
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of road or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential population and housing impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area was evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. Because the project area was identified in the County of Imperial General Plan as a "Specific Plan Area," the Previous 2010 Final EIR identified no significant impacts related to substantial unplanned population growth. It also found that implementation of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, the Previous 2010 Final EIR included no mitigation measures under this criteria.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, there have been no changes to the environment or characteristics of the proposed project area that would substantially affect population and housing.

**Questions a and b — Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. The proposed uses and land use densities of the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 would be consistent with those evaluated for the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan. Population and housing impacts would be similar to those identified in the Previous 2010 Final EIR and would be less than significant.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The Previous 2010 Final EIR's findings for population and housing will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR.

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)</b>	<b>No Impact (NI)</b>
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) 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 public services:				
1) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential public services impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area was evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified mitigation measures MM 4.12.1a, MM 4.12.1b, and MM 4.12.1c to reduce impacts to less than significant.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, there have been no changes to the environment or characteristics of the proposed project area that would substantially affect population and housing.

**Questions a thru e — Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Implementation of the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project would increase the demand for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and other public facilities over existing levels, which could result in potentially significant impacts on service providers.

The proposed Tract Map includes an elementary school site for the McCabe Elementary School District, along with park and recreational uses to support the anticipated increased demand. Similarly, the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan also includes park and recreation uses, along with an elementary school site for the Heber Elementary School District.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The findings of the Previous 2010 Final EIR will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and updated to reflect current population and student generation rates. Mitigation measures MM 4.12.1a, MM 4.12.1b, and MM 4.12.1c will be modified, as necessary.

**XVI. RECREATION**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential recreational impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR found that implementation of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan could increase the use of existing recreational facilities and would require additional parkland, facilities, and personnel. Although the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan included the provision of park and open space areas including community, neighborhood and mini-parks, the Previous 2010 Final EIR identified Mitigation Measure MM 4.13.1, which required the provision of a minimum of 53.4 acres of parkland for the entire Specific Plan area.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, there have been no changes to the environment or characteristics of the proposed project area that would substantially affect recreation facilities.

**Questions a and b — Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. The proposed uses and land use densities of the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 would be consistent with those evaluated for the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan and could increase the use of existing recreational facilities and require additional parkland, facilities, and personnel.

While the proposed McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project includes the provision of park and open space areas including community, neighborhood and mini-parks as well as a linear/greenbelt area along the east side of Farnsworth Road, potentially significant impacts to recreational resources are anticipated to be reduced to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM 4.13.1.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The Previous 2010 Final EIR's findings for recreation will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measure MM 4.13.1 will be modified, as necessary.

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts to traffic and transportation associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area was evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR found that development of McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan uses would add new vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian trips to key street segments and intersections in the project vicinity. The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified mitigation measures MM 4.14.1 through 4.14.10 to reduce project impacts.

Since certification of the Final EIR, the way in which local jurisdictions analyze transportation impacts in CEQA environmental reviews has changed due to the adoption of Senate Bill 743. As of July 1, 2020, traffic impacts are assessed by quantifying how much and how far people drive using a measure called Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) instead of measuring level of service (LOS) impacts. This legislative change represents a substantial change in circumstances under which the Project would be implemented, requiring major EIR revisions.

**Questions a, c and d — Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Implementation of the proposed uses would result in increases in vehicle and truck trips from construction and increases in vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian traffic from operational activities. Potentially significant impacts related to the Project's consistency with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system; impacts related to increased hazards based on geometric design features; and, impacts on emergency access are anticipated to be reduced with implementation of mitigation measures MM 4.14.1 through MM 4.14.10.

**Question b — Potentially Significant.** Project-related impacts to increased vehicle miles traveled could be potentially significant.



**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is evidence that substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project would be undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR. A Local Mobility Analysis (LMA) and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis will be prepared for the Project and the Supplemental EIR will summarize their findings. The LMA will identify existing conditions, estimate project trips and distribute/assign them to key street segments and intersections to identify necessary traffic improvements, by phase. The VMT Analysis will calculate project-related increases in VMT and compare it to the average VMT in the region. Necessary traffic improvements and feasible Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures will also be identified. The findings of the LMA and VMT will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures MM 4.14.1 through MM 4.14.10 will be modified, as necessary.

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 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:</b>				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts to Tribal cultural resources associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. While no historical resources or unique archaeological resources were identified within the boundaries of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area, project-related ground-disturbing activities could uncover previously unknown prehistoric resources, historic resources, or human remains because of the area’s historical occupation by both Native Americans and Spanish peoples. The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified mitigation measures MM 4.5.1a and 4.5.1b to reduce impacts to less than significant.

Since the certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, there have been no know changes to the tribal cultural resource environment or characteristics of the proposed project area.

**Questions a, b, and c — Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. No changes are proposed in the Project nor is new information available which will require major revisions of the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Conclusion

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The findings of the Previous 2010 Final EIR will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures MM 4.5.1a and 4.5.1b will be modified, as necessary. Results of the County's consultations with Native American Tribes pursuant to AB-52 and SB-18 will also be documented in the Supplemental EIR.

**XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>Would the Project:</b>				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Potential impacts to utilities and services systems associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. The Previous 2010 Final EIR identified mitigation measures MM 4.15.1 through 4.15.3 to reduce impacts to less than significant.

Since certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR no changes are proposed in the Project nor is new information available which will require major revisions of the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects

**Questions a through e — Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. Implementation of the proposed uses would increase demand for utilities and services. The Project would increase the demand for utilities and services systems, which could result in significant impacts. The Project site is located within the Heber Public Utilities District Sphere of Influence and the Project proposes to obtain such services primarily from the Heber Public Utilities District, which will require annexation to the District.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is no evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to substantial changes in the project or substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project would occur. The findings of the Previous 2010 Final EIR will be summarized in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures MM 4.15.1 through 4.15.3 will be modified, as necessary.

**XX. WILDFIRE**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:</b>				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				

Potential wildfire impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were not evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR.

**Questions a, b, c, and d — Less Than Significant.** The proposed Project includes a Tract Map for development of a portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area with residential, recreation, parks and school uses. The risk of wildfire is related to a variety of parameters, including fuel loading (vegetation), fire weather (winds, temperatures, humidity levels, and fuel moisture contents), and topography (degree of slope). Steep slopes contribute to fire hazards by intensifying the effects of wind and making fire suppression difficult. Fuels such as grass are highly flammable because they have a high surface area to mass ratio and require less heat to reach the ignition point.

According to CalFire's 2023 Fire Hazard Severity Zones in the State Responsibility Area's map <sup>(2)</sup>, the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site and surrounding area are not located on lands in or near state responsibility areas nor on lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones (CalFire, 2024).

The Project area is predominately agricultural with several scattered single family residential structures located to the northwest, northeast, and west. The residential subdivision known as "McCabe Ranch I Specific Plan" abuts the Project site on the south and east, and there is a small cluster of homes located along McCabe Road. There are no other factors of the project or the surrounding area that would exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations. Wildfire risks are anticipated to be less than significant.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to potentially new Significant Effects. Potential wildfire impacts will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures identified, as necessary.

**XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>The following are Mandatory Findings of Significance in accordance with Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>2</sup> Effective April 1, 2024.

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact (PSI)	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated (LTSWMI)	Less Than Significant Impact (LTSI)	No Impact (NI)
<b>The following are Mandatory Findings of Significance in accordance with Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.</b>				
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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
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 project, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cumulative impacts associated with development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project area were evaluated in the Previous 2010 Final EIR. With the exception of impacts to traffic/transportation, the Previous 2010 Final EIR found cumulative impacts to be less than cumulatively considerable with implementation of Specific Plan policies and identified mitigation measures.

Since certification of the Previous 2010 Final EIR, new information regarding the cumulative setting is now available which will require major revisions of the Previous 2010 Final EIR' cumulative analysis.

**Question a — Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Supplemental EIR will discuss project-specific direct and indirect impacts on plants, fish and wildlife species. The Supplemental EIR will also evaluate project-specific direct and indirect impacts on cultural and tribal cultural resources. Finally, the Supplemental EIR will evaluate the Project's contribution to cumulative impacts and propose feasible mitigation, as necessary, to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels.

**Question b — Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Project could contribute to cumulative impacts on air quality, biological resources (special status species), cultural and tribal resources, paleontological resources, hydrology and water quality, traffic noise, public services, traffic/transportation, utilities and service systems. Such contributions have the potential to be cumulatively considerable.

The Supplemental EIR will evaluate the project's contribution to "cumulative impacts" on all environmental resources for which a "direct" impact is identified.

---

**Question c — Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Project could potentially result in environmental effects that have adverse impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly. These impacts will be fully addressed in the Supplemental EIR.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information, there is evidence that the proposed project would require major revisions to the Previous 2010 Final EIR due to new information regarding the cumulative setting. Cumulative impacts will be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR and mitigation measures identified, as necessary.

*. 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 – CEQA*

---

---

## **SECTION IV. PERSONS & ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED/ REFERENCES**

---

---

### **A. PERSONS & ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED**

#### **County Of Imperial**

- Jim Minnick, Director of Planning & Development Services
- Michael Abraham, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning & Development Services
- Dave Black, Planner IV
- John Gay Director, Imperial County Department of Public Works

### **B LIST OF PREPARERS**

This Initial Study was prepared for the County of Imperial by Willis Environmental Planning, 238 Sychar Road, San Diego, CA 92114. The following professionals participated in its preparation:

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

Jim Minnick ..... Director  
Michael Abraham ..... Assistant Director  
Diana Robinson ..... Planning Manager  
Dave Black ..... Planner IV

#### **Willis Environmental Planning (Consultant to County)**

Christina J. Willis ..... Principal and Project Manager  
John Addenbrooke ..... Document Production/GIS Specialist

#### **McIntyre Environmental**

David McIntyre ..... Principal Environmental Scientist

---

## SECTION V. REFERENCES

---

- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire). 2024. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA. Available Online at: <https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=988d431a42b242b29d89597ab693d008>. Accessed April 19, 2024.
- County of Imperial, 2010a. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan (SCH No. 2008111037), February 2010
- County of Imperial, 2010b. Final Environmental Impact Report for the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan (SCH No. 2008111037), June 2010.
- McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC, 2024. Revised McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan, April 2024.



**Attachment B.**

**Application documents, TR 994 – Specific Plan  
Amendment**



## McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC

6623 LAS VEGAS BLVD., SOUTH

SUITE 340

LAS VEGAS, NV 89119

702-733-6218 OFFICE

March 15, 2024

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

**Re: McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Amendment**

Dear Mr. Minnick:

McCabe Ranch Realty LLC is under a long-term ownership agreement with the current property owner, Terra Partners LLC, of approximately 345 acres of the total 468-acre McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area. The property under McCabe Ranch Realty LLC control consists of APNs 054-130-072, -076 -077, & -078.

This letter is to request the processing of a Specific Plan Amendment to that McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan generally to modify the internal circulation system, partial re-designation of residential areas and unit types within those areas, modification of the phasing plan, and some text revisions to incorporate the current status and proposed modifications related solely to the portion of the Specific Plan area under McCabe Ranch Realty LLC control. No modifications to the portions of the Specific Plan area under separate ownership are proposed, nor is any change proposed to the overall maximum allowable dwelling units, nor the allocated dwelling units of those portions of the Plan area under separate ownership.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$3,000.00 as deposit pursuant to County requirements. Please advise when a Specific Plan number and deposit account number have been established.

Sincerely,

**McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC**



Benjamin F. Garfinkle

Enclosure: Ck # 3030

Cc: David Black, Senior Planner

File

EEC ORIGINAL PKG

## Comments

## David Black

---

**From:** Andrew Loper  
**Sent:** Friday, May 24, 2024 7:07 AM  
**To:** David Black  
**Cc:** Jim Minnick; Michael Abraham; Diana Robinson; Aimee Trujillo; Jenyssa Gutierrez; Kamika Mitchell; Olivia Lopez; David Lantzer  
**Subject:** RE: Notice of Preparation- McCabe Ranch II TR 994  
**Attachments:** McCabe Ranch II TM 994 IS (May 2024)V2.pdf

Good Morning Dave

Hope all is going well, Imperial County Fire Department would like to request the 2010 Final EIR, more specifically the Potential Public Services impact associated with the development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 99 project area. ICFD would like to inquire the mitigations measures MM4.12.1a, MM 4.12.1b, and MM4.12.1c . If you have any questions for us please feel free to contact us anytime and thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Andrew Loper  
Imperial County Fire Department  
Lieutenant/Fire Prevention Specialist  
2514 La Brucherie Road, Imperial CA 92251  
Office: 442-265-3021  
Cell: 760-604-1828

**From:** Laryssa Alvarado <laryssaalvarado@co.imperial.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 20, 2024 10:02 AM  
**To:** Antonio Venegas <AntonioVenegas@co.imperial.ca.us>; Margo Sanchez <MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Belen Leon-Lopez <BelenLeon@co.imperial.ca.us>; Monica Soucier <MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jenell Guerrero <JenellGuerrero@co.imperial.ca.us>; Eric Havens <EricHavens@co.imperial.ca.us>; Luis Plancarte <LuisPlancarte@co.imperial.ca.us>; Miguel Figueroa <miguelfigueroa@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Lopez <RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Menvielle <RobertMenvielle@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sergio Luna <SergioLuna@co.imperial.ca.us>; Andrew Loper <AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Malek <RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us>; Carlos Yee <CarlosYee@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Gay <JohnGay@co.imperial.ca.us>; RKelley@icso.org; dvargas@iid.com; jmontano@iid.com; mapacheco@iid.com; Esperanza Colio Warren <ecolio@calexico.ca.gov>; AngelHernandez@cityofelcentro.org; jeorge@theholtgroup.net; aortiz@calipat.com; wandrus@cuhsd.net; jcruz@hesdk8.org; laura.dubbe@muesd.net; krodriquez@musdk8.net; gponce@mail.sdsu.edu; mdessert@heber.ca.gov; eruedas@chp.ca.gov; roger.sanchez-rangel@dot.ca.gov; nadim.shukry-zeywar@waterboards.ca.gov; robert.krug@dtsc.ca.gov; energydivisioncentralfiles@cpuc.ca.gov; pac@cpuc.ca.gov; magdalena.rodriquez@wildlife.ca.gov; dave.kereazis@dtsc.ca.gov; jkhrata@scag.ca.gov; michelle.r.lynch@usace.army.mil; noemi.g.romes.civ@us.navy.mil; steve.u.chung@navy.mil; rand.k.center.civ@us.navy.mil; eduardo.t.demeza@usace.army.mil; ruben.guerena@sce.com; byronfrontier@yahoo.com  
**Cc:** Jim Minnick <JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Diana Robinson <DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us>; David Black <DavidBlack@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jenyssa Gutierrez <jenyssagutierrez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kamika Mitchell <kamikamitchell@co.imperial.ca.us>; Laryssa Alvarado <laryssaalvarado@co.imperial.ca.us>; Olivia Lopez <olivialopez@co.imperial.ca.us>  
**Subject:** Notice of Preparation- McCabe Ranch II TR 994

Good morning,

**David Black**

---

**From:** Christina Willis <christina@willisenvironmentalplanning.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 28, 2024 10:50 AM  
**To:** David Black; David McIntyre  
**Subject:** Re: Notice of Preparation- McCabe Ranch II TR 994  
**Attachments:** McCabe Ranch II FEIR MMRP (Fire Protection).pdf  
  
**Importance:** High

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

Good Morning Dave,

I am acknowledging receipt of the Fire Department's NOP Comment Email.

The mitigation measures from the 2010 Final EIR for project-related impacts to fire protection services are attached and are presented below.

Please let me know if you would like me to email these to Lt. Loper along with an explanation that these mitigation measures will be reviewed as part of the SEIR analysis, and modified as necessary.

<b>Proposed Mitigation</b>	<b>Summary of Measure</b>	<b>Monitoring Responsibility</b>	<b>Timing</b>
<b>MM 4.12.1.1</b>	For future developments within the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area, a traffic control plan shall be prepared and implemented for each phase of development. The plan shall be submitted to the County of Imperial Public Works Department prior to the initiation of any construction activities and shall include measures to maintain adequate circulation and access for emergency response vehicles.	<i>Imperial County Department of Planning and Development Services</i>	<i>Prior to approval of the grading plan</i>
<b>MM 4.12.1.2a</b>	For future development within the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area, project applicants shall be required to pay a fair share contribution for additional fire facilities, equipment, and staff. Construction of such facilities and the structure(s) size, amount of equipment, and personnel required for these services shall be determined in consultation with the Imperial County Fire Department	<i>Imperial County Fire Department; Imperial County Planning and Development Services Department</i>	<i>Prior to the initiation of any site development or ground-breaking activities</i>

**To:** David Black <DavidBlack@co.imperial.ca.us>

**Cc:** Jim Minnick <JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Diana Robinson <DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jenyssa Gutierrez <jenyssagutierrez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kamika Mitchell <kamikamitchell@co.imperial.ca.us>; Olivia Lopez <olivialopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; David Lantzer <davidlantzer@co.imperial.ca.us>

**Subject:** RE: Notice of Preparation- McCabe Ranch II TR 994

Good Morning Dave

Hope all is going well, Imperial County Fire Department would like to request the 2010 Final EIR, more specifically the Potential Public Services impact associated with the development within the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 99 project area. ICFD would like to inquire the mitigations measures MM4.12.1a, MM 4.12.1b, and MM4.12.1c . If you have any questions for us please feel free to contact us anytime and thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Andrew Loper

Imperial County Fire Department  
Lieutenant/Fire Prevention Specialist  
2514 La Brucherie Road, Imperial CA 92251  
Office: 442-265-3021  
Cell: 760-604-1828

**From:** Laryssa Alvarado <laryssaalvarado@co.imperial.ca.us>

**Sent:** Monday, May 20, 2024 10:02 AM

**To:** Antonio Venegas <AntonioVenegas@co.imperial.ca.us>; Margo Sanchez <MargoSanchez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Belen Leon-Lopez <BelenLeon@co.imperial.ca.us>; Monica Soucier <MonicaSoucier@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jenell Guerrero <JenellGuerrero@co.imperial.ca.us>; Eric Havens <EricHavens@co.imperial.ca.us>; Luis Plancarte <LuisPlancarte@co.imperial.ca.us>; Miguel Figueroa <miguelfigueroa@co.imperial.ca.us>; Rosa Lopez <RosaLopez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jorge Perez <JorgePerez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Menvielle <RobertMenvielle@co.imperial.ca.us>; Sergio Luna <SergioLuna@co.imperial.ca.us>; Andrew Loper <AndrewLoper@co.imperial.ca.us>; Robert Malek <RobertMalek@co.imperial.ca.us>; Carlos Yee <CarlosYee@co.imperial.ca.us>; John Gay <JohnGay@co.imperial.ca.us>; RKelley@icso.org; dvargas@iid.com; jmontano@iid.com; mapacheco@iid.com; Esperanza Colio Warren <ecolio@calexico.ca.gov>; AngelHernandez@cityofelcentro.org; jeorge@theholtgroup.net; aortiz@calipat.com; wandrus@cuhsd.net; jcruz@hesdk8.org; laura.dubbe@muesd.net; krodriquez@musdk8.net; gponce@mail.sdsu.edu; mdessert@heber.ca.gov; eruedas@chp.ca.gov; roger.sanchez-rangel@dot.ca.gov; nadim.shukry-zeywar@waterboards.ca.gov; robert.krug@dtsc.ca.gov; energydivisioncentralfiles@cpuc.ca.gov; pac@cpuc.ca.gov; magdalena.rodriguez@wildlife.ca.gov; dave.kereazis@dtsc.ca.gov; jkhrata@scag.ca.gov; michelle.r.lynch@usace.army.mil; noemi.g.romes.civ@us.navy.mil; steve.u.chung@navy.mil; rand.k.center.civ@us.navy.mil; eduardo.t.demeza@usace.army.mil; ruben.guerena@sce.com; byronfrontier@yahoo.com

**Cc:** Jim Minnick <JimMinnick@co.imperial.ca.us>; Michael Abraham <MichaelAbraham@co.imperial.ca.us>; Diana Robinson <DianaRobinson@co.imperial.ca.us>; David Black <DavidBlack@co.imperial.ca.us>; Aimee Trujillo <aimeetrujillo@co.imperial.ca.us>; Jenyssa Gutierrez <jenyssagutierrez@co.imperial.ca.us>; Kamika Mitchell <kamikamitchell@co.imperial.ca.us>; Laryssa Alvarado <laryssaalvarado@co.imperial.ca.us>; Olivia Lopez <olivialopez@co.imperial.ca.us>

**Subject:** Notice of Preparation- McCabe Ranch II TR 994

Good morning,

Please see attached **Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the McCabe Ranch II TR 994**. Also, attached is the McCabe Ranch Realty Initial Study Packet :

-  
-

**Attachment A.**  
**NOP w/Project Description**



**Imperial County  
Planning & Development Services Department  
NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL EIR  
TO THE MCCABE RANCH II SPECIFIC PLAN EIR  
FOR THE MCCABE RANCH II TRACT MAP 994 PROJECT AND  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING**

The Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department intends to prepare a Supplement Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2008111037) for the proposed McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (Project) in accordance with current County of Imperial Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 and the State CEQA Guidelines, as described below. The Supplemental EIR will tier off the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan EIR, which was certified by the County of Imperial in December 2010.

A public scoping meeting for the proposed Supplemental EIR will be held by the Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department at 6:00 PM on June 13, 2024. The scoping meeting will be held at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, County Administration Center located at 940 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243. Comments regarding the scope of the SEIR will be accepted at this meeting. Additionally, comments may be sent to the Planning & Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, El Centro, California 92243, attention Jim Minnick, Director.

**PROJECT BACKGROUND:** The McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan (SP07-004), which established a framework for the development of a variety of land uses within the approximately 468-acre Specific Plan Area (SPA), was approved by the Imperial County Board of Supervisors (Board) in December 2010. Additionally the Board approved a related Subdivision Tentative Map (TR 00979), which has subsequently expired. As part of the Specific Plan approval, the Board also certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (2010 Final EIR), Mitigation and Monitoring Program (MMRP) and CEQA Findings. The previously certified 2010 Final EIR (2010 Previous FEIR) analyzed the direct, indirect and cumulative changes to the physical environment that would result from development of a maximum of 2,300 single- and multiple-family dwelling units; 19.2-acres of parks; an 8.4-acre business park; 3.2 acres of commercial uses; two (2) elementary school sites for the McCabe Unified and Heber Unified School Districts (28.5 acres combined) and associated public improvements within the McCabe Ranch II SPA <sup>(1)</sup>.

**SUBJECT:** McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONSIDERATION:** Spring 2025.

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, Table 3.0-1, Proposed Land Uses. County of Imperial, 2010.

**PROJECT LOCATION:** McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is an approximately 351.2-acre portion of the 468-acre McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area generally located north of the Community of Heber and south of the City of El Centro, in the County of Imperial, California (see **Figure 1, Regional Location and Figure 2, Project Location**). The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is bounded by McCabe Road on the north, Dogwood Road on the east, State Route 86 (SR-86) on the west, and the western extension of Correll Road on the south. The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 Project site is located in Section 20, Range 14 East, Township 16 South within the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Heber, California 7.5-minute topographic.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC (Applicant) is seeking to process a Subdivision Tentative Map, referred to as the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994, for an approximately 351.2-acre portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Area to accommodate the phased development of 1,610 residential units (single- and multiple-family units), a 13-acre elementary school site for the McCabe Union School District, parks, roadways, associated utilities, drainage and storm water treatment improvements (**Figure 3, Proposed McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994**). The McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (Project or proposed Project) is comprised of four (4) parcels; County of Imperial Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 054-130-072, 054-130-076, 054-130-077, and 054-130-078. The Imperial Irrigation District's Date Drain No. 3 and Dogwood Canal both traverse the Project area in a north-south direction.

Development of the proposed McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 is proposed to occur in phases (Phase 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C) over a 14 year period between 2025 and 2039 as shown on **Figure 4, Proposed Phasing Plan**. A detailed breakdown of development by phase for the proposed McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 is presented on **Table 1**. Development within that portion of the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan area outside of Tract Map 994, may develop prior to, concurrently with, or subsequent to the Tract Map 994 and is denoted as Phase 4. **Table 2** provides a summary of proposed land uses within the entirety of the Specific Plan Area

The development phasing for of the McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994, and for the Phase 4 area differs from that identified in the adopted McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan. For this reason, an amendment to the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan is also proposed. Land uses included in the McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan are shown on **Figure 5**.

Sewer, water, park maintenance, and landscape and lighting maintenance services would be provided by the Heber Public Utility District (HPUD). However, in order for services to be provided, the Specific Plan Area must be annexed into the HPUD. The Project also includes a Development Agreement with the County of Imperial related to the 351.2-ac portion controlled by McCabe Ranch Realty LLC pursuant to Imperial County Land Use Ordinance Title 9, Division 23. The annexation and Development Agreement will also be addressed in the Supplemental EIR.

**DESIGNATED AREA PLAN:** The Project site is designated as SP (Specific Plan Area) by the General Plan and zoned as Mc Ra 2 SPA (McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan).

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DISTRICT:** District 2, Supervisor, Luis A. Plancarte

**ANTICIPATED SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS:** The Supplemental EIR will analyze potential impacts associated with the following: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Energy Conservation, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Public Services, Transportation/Traffic, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems and Wildfire.

Potential impacts to Aesthetics, Agricultural, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazard and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, and Recreation will also be evaluated in the Supplemental EIR. Impacts to these resources are anticipated to similar to those identified in the 2010 Previous Final EIR.

**COMMENTS REQUESTED:** The Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department would like to know your ideas about the effects this project might have on the environment and your suggestions as to alternatives, mitigation or ways the project may be revised to reduce or avoid any significant environmental impacts. Your comments will guide the scope and content of environmental issues to be examined in the Supplemental EIR . Your comments may be submitted in writing to: Jim Minnick, Director, Imperial County Planning & Development Services Department, 801 Main Street, El Centro, CA 92243. Available project information may be reviewed at this location. Due to the limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but no later than June 24, 2024.

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION REVIEW PERIOD:** May 20, 2024 through June 24, 2024.

TABLE 1. DETAILED DEVELOPMENT BY PHASE, MCCABE RANCH II TRACT MAP 994

PROPOSED LAND USES	PHASE 1 (a)			PHASE 2 (a)			PHASE 3 (a)			TOTALS
	1A	1B	2A	2B	3A	3B	3C			
	2025 - 2026	2026 -2027	2029 - 2031	2032 - 2033	2034 - 2035	2036 - 2037	2038 - 2039			
<b>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</b>										<b>DUs</b>
<b>Single-Family</b>										
Density										
Traditional Single Family	-0-	-0-	160	134	151	-0-	88			533
Small Lot Single-Family	-0-	157	100	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-			257
Flex Lot Single-Family	157	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	88	-0-			245
Mini Estate	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	19			19
Estate Lot	-0-	-0-	-0-	25	-0-	-0-	-0-			25
<b>Single-Family Subtotal</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>107</b>			<b>1,079</b>
<b>Multi-Family</b>										
Density										
Multi-Family 1 (NW Corner)	-0-	-0-	-0-	196	-0-	-0-	-0-			196
Multi-Family 2 (NE Corner)	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	335	-0-			335
Multi-Family 3	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-			0
<b>Multi-Family Subtotal</b>	<b>-0-</b>	<b>-0-</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>-0-</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>-0-</b>			<b>-0-</b>
<b>TOTAL RESIDENTIAL</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>107</b>			<b>1,610</b>
<b>NON - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</b>										<b>Acres</b>
McCabe Elementary (K-5) School Site	-0-	-0-	12.3	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-			12.3
Commercial	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	3.14			-0-
Business Park	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-			-0-
Park/Detention/Greenbelt (inc. I/D Easement)	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-			38.78
Major Collector Roads	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-			48.3

Notes: (a) Denotes property controlled by McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC. Included in TM 994.

DU = Dwelling Units.

AC = Acres

Source: McCabe Ranch Realty, April 2024.


-0- = No development during this phase

**TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF LAND USES WITHIN MCCABE RANCH II SPECIFIC PLAN AREA<sup>(1)</sup>**

Land Use	Approx. Gross Acres	% of Total Specific Plan Area	Dwelling Units
<b>Residential Uses</b>			
Traditional Lot – Single Family (5,000 SF+)	121.46	25.9	569
Small Lot – Single Family (4,000 SF – 5,000 SF)	58.02	12.4	406
Flex Lot – Single Family (2,000 SF – 4,000 SF)	65.54	14.0	482
Mini-Estate Lot – Single Family (9,000 SF+)	6.72	1.5	19
Estate Lot – Single Family (20,000 SF+)	19.85	4.2	25
<b>Single Family Subtotal</b>	<b>271.59</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>1,501</b>
Multi-Family 1 (Northwest Corner)	9.82	2.0	196
Multi-Family 2 (Northeast Corner)	17.57	3.8	335
Multi-Family 3	12.2	2.6	268
<b>Multi-Family Subtotal</b>	<b>39.59</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>799</b>
<b>Residential Uses Subtotal</b>	<b>311.18</b>	<b>66.4</b>	<b>2,300</b>
<b>Non-Residential Uses</b>			
Business Park	9.41	2.0	-0-
Commercial	3.14	0.7	-0-
Elementary School Site (McCabe)	12.3	2.6	-0-
Elementary School Site (Heber)	16.29	3.5	-0-
<b>Non-Residential Uses Subtotal</b>	<b>41.14</b>	<b>8.8</b>	
<b>Open Spaces/Recreation</b>			
Parks / Detention / Greenbelts (incl IID easement)	62.3	13.3	
<b>Open Space/Recreation Subtotal</b>	<b>62.38</b>	<b>13.3</b>	
<b>Major Collector Roads Subtotal</b>	<b>53.62</b>	<b>11.5</b>	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>468.32</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,300</b>

Notes: (a) Includes properties controlled by McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC. (McCabe Ranch II TM 994) as well as property under separate ownership (not controlled by McCabe Ranch Realty LLC).


Source: McCabe Realty, LLC, April 2024.



Source: Esri, 2024.




Regional Location  
McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (TR000994)  
Figure 1



Source: McCabe Realty, LLC, 2024

Project Location Map  
McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (TR000994)  
Figure 2






Proposed Tract Map  
 McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994  
 (TR000994) Figure 3

Source: McCabe Ranch Realty, LLC, 2024.







Source: McCabe Realty, LLC, 2024



Proposed Phasing Plan McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (TR000994) Figure 4



Source: McCabe Realty, LLC, 2024



McCabe Ranch II Specific Plan Land Uses  
McCabe Ranch II Tract Map 994 (TR000994)  
Figure 5