

- **Board of Directors**
Executive Committee

August 19, 2003 Board Meeting

8-8

Subject

Adopt final resolutions for annexation and to impose water standby charge for the 73rd and 74th Fringe Areas Annexations to Eastern Municipal Water District and Metropolitan

Description

The Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern) has requested final terms and conditions for the 73rd and 74th Fringe Areas Annexations concurrently to Eastern and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan).

The 73rd Fringe Area Annexation was granted conditional approval on March 11, 2003, from Metropolitan's Board. The total area for annexation is 13.72 acres. The property is located in the city of Murrieta. The area is uninhabited and the current zoning of the property is industrial park. Prior to completion of the annexation, Eastern will pay a fee of \$52,471.20, if the annexation is completed prior to December 31, 2003, or if completed later, at the then current annexation charge rate. The projected annual water demand on Metropolitan is approximately 33 acre-feet per year.

The 74th Fringe Area Annexation was granted conditional approval on April 8, 2003, from Metropolitan's Board. The total area for annexation is 17 acres. The property is located in the city of Murrieta. The area is uninhabited and the current zoning of the property is commercial. Prior to completion of the annexation, Eastern will pay a fee of \$58,664.60 if the annexation is completed prior to December 31, 2003, or if completed later, at the then current annexation charge rate. The projected annual water demand on Metropolitan is approximately 42 acre-feet per year.

Eastern also requests that Metropolitan impose a water standby charge within the proposed annexing territories. See the detailed reports as [Attachment 1](#) for the 73rd Fringe Area and [Attachment 2](#) for the 74th Fringe Area.

Policy

Territory may be annexed to Metropolitan upon terms and conditions fixed by the Board and in accordance with Chapter 1, Article 1, § 350 through § 356 of Metropolitan's Act and Division III, § 3100(b) of its Administrative Code.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

CEQA determination for Option #1:

Pursuant to the provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, Rancho California Water District, a subagency to Eastern and acting as the Lead Agency, adopted two Negative Declarations (NDs) on January 10, 2002 and July 11, 2002 for the proposed 73rd Fringe Area Annexation (also known as the Annexation No. 74, the Maudelene Dutton Trust Project) and the proposed 74th Fringe Area Annexation (also known as the Annexation No. 77, Superior Ready Mix Project, respectively). Metropolitan, as Responsible Agency under CEQA, is required to certify that it has reviewed and considered the information in the two NDs and adopt the Lead Agency's findings prior to approval of the formal terms and conditions for the proposed actions on both of the annexations. The two NDs are presented in [Attachment 7](#) and [Attachment 8](#).

The CEQA determination is: Review and consider information provided in the two adopted 2002 NDs and adopt the Lead Agency’s findings for both environmental documents as related to the proposed actions.

CEQA determination for Option #2:

None required

Board Options/Fiscal Impacts

Option #1

Adopt the CEQA determination and

- a. Adopt a resolution granting Eastern’s request for approval of the 73rd Fringe Area Annexation, concurrently to Metropolitan and Eastern, conditioned upon approval by the Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission, and establishing Metropolitan’s terms and conditions for this annexation (**Attachment 3**);
- b. Adopt a resolution granting Eastern’s request for approval of the 74th Fringe Area Annexation, concurrently to Metropolitan and Eastern, conditioned upon approval by the Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission, and establishing Metropolitan’s terms and conditions for this annexation (**Attachment 4**); and
- c. Adopt resolutions to impose water standby charge at a rate of \$6.94 per acre or per parcel of less than one acre within the proposed annexations. See **Attachment 5** for the 73rd Fringe Area and **Attachment 6** for the 74th Fringe Area.

Fiscal Impact: Receipt of annexation fee \$52,471.20 for the 73rd Fringe Area and \$58,664.60 for the 74th Fringe Area and water sales revenue from newly annexed territory


Option #2


Decline 73rd and 74th Fringe Areas Annexations

Fiscal Impact: Unrealized annexation fees and water sales revenue from non-annexed territory.

Staff Recommendation

Option #1

	7/15/2003
_____ Roy L. Wolfe Manager, Corporate Resources	Date

	7/15/2003
_____ Ronald R. Gastelum Chief Executive Officer	Date

- Attachment 1 – Detailed Report – Eastern 73rd Fringe Area Annexation**
- Attachment 2 – Detailed Report – Eastern 74th Fringe Area Annexation**
- Attachment 3 – Resolution Fixing Terms and Conditions – Eastern 73rd**
- Attachment 4 – Resolution Fixing Terms and Conditions – Eastern 74th**
- Attachment 5 – Resolution Fixing and Adopting Water Standby Charge – Eastern 73rd**
- Attachment 6 – Resolution Fixing and Adopting Water Standby Charge – Eastern 74th**
- Attachment 7 – Negative Declaration for Rancho California Water District's Annexation No. 74, the Maudelene Dutton Trust Project**
- Attachment 8 – Negative Declaration for Rancho California Water District's Annexation No. 77, Superior Ready Mix Project**

Detailed Report

Eastern 73rd Fringe Area Annexation

The Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern) requested final terms and conditions for the 73rd Fringe Area Annexation concurrently to Eastern and The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) and Eastern, by Resolution No. 3739, dated April 16, 2003. On March 11, 2003, Metropolitan's Board granted conditional approval for this annexation and adopted a resolution of intent to impose a water standby charge upon the annexing territory. The 13.72-acre annexation area, shown on the attached legal description and map, is located west of Jefferson Avenue at the intersection Elm Street west of Interstate-215 in the city of Murrieta. The territory is currently vacant although, once annexed, the development plan consists of a small industrial/commercial center. It is anticipated that development will occur within the next two to five years. The total estimated water demand for this project is approximately 33 acre-feet per year from Metropolitan through Eastern. Metropolitan's Board is asked to grant final approval, conditioned upon approval by the Riverside County Local Agency Formation Commission, by adopting the Resolution Fixing Terms and Conditions (Attachment 3).

The Board adopted a resolution of intention to impose a water standby charge within the proposed 73rd Fringe Area Annexation at its meeting on March 11, 2003. Pursuant to Resolution 8839 the Board held a public hearing on June 10, 2003. Interested parties were given the opportunity to present their views regarding the proposed charge and the Engineer's Report. Also, pursuant to Resolution 8839 and in accordance with the requirements of Article XIII D, Section 4, of the California Constitution, the Executive Secretary provided written notice by mail of such hearing to the owners of record of the parcels identified in the Engineer's Report. Enclosed in the mailed notice was an assessment ballot whereby the owners could indicate either support or opposition to the proposed water standby charge. No majority protest (as defined in Article XIII D, Section 4 of the California Constitution) was found to exist upon conclusion of the hearing; therefore, it will be requested that Metropolitan's Board consider and act upon the recommendation to adopt a second resolution (see Attachment 5), Resolution Fixing and Adopting Water Standby Charge, which imposes a Metropolitan water standby charge in the amount of \$6.94 per acre, or per parcel less than one acre, within the territory of the 73rd Fringe Area Annexation.

The annexation charge has been calculated pursuant to Section 3300 of Metropolitan's Administrative Code. Utilizing the current rate of \$3,460 per net acre and the sum of \$5,000 for processing costs, the annexation charge is \$52,471.20, if completed by December 31, 2003. The \$5,000 processing charge has already been paid. If the annexation is completed after December 31, 2003, the annexation will be calculated based on the then current charge.

Approval of Metropolitan's water standby charge in the amount noted above, which is equal to the amount of Metropolitan's water standby charge imposed elsewhere within Eastern's territory, is a condition to complete this annexation. Pursuant to the terms of the attached resolution (Attachment 5), Metropolitan may levy standby charge at the rate stated in this resolution beginning in a subsequent fiscal year.

EXHIBIT "A"

LAFCO NO.
RCWD ANNEXATION EXHIBIT

BEING THAT PORTION OF LOT 83 AND 84 OF THE MURRIETA PORTION OF THE TEMECULA RANCHO, AS SHOWN BY MAP ON FILE IN BOOK 8, PAGE 359 OF MAPS, RECORDS OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, LYING SOUTHWESTERLY OF THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF LAND CONVEYED TO THE CITY OF MURRIETA, BY GRANT DEED, INSTRUMENT NO. 2001-035567, RECORDED JANUARY 26, 2001, OFFICIAL RECORDS OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA,

BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE MOST NORTHERLY CORNER OF SAID PORTION LOT 84, SAID CORNER BEING ON THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF JEFFERSON AVENUE AS IT NOW EXISTS, SAID CORNER ALSO BEING THE BEGINNING OF A NON-TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE NORTHERLY HAVING A RADIUS OF 1255.00 FEET AND A RADIAL BEARING OF NORTH 44°52'31" EAST;

THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY OF JEFFERSON AVENUE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 11°02'58", A DISTANCE OF 242.02 FEET;

THENCE CONTINUING ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY OF JEFFERSON AVENUE, SOUTH 56°10'26" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 344.87 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A CURVE CONCAVE SOUTHERLY HAVING A RADIUS OF 1145.00 FEET;

THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 08°08'24", A DISTANCE OF 162.67 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A COMPOUND CURVE WITH A RADIUS OF 1199.77 FEET;

THENCE EASTERLY ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 24°06'03", A DISTANCE OF 504.67 FEET TO THE SOUTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID PORTION LOT 83 OF MB 8/359;

THENCE LEAVING SAID RIGHT OF WAY OF JEFFERSON AVENUE ALONG THE SOUTHEASTERLY LINE OF SAID PORTION LOT 83, SOUTH 46°10'11" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 175.93 FEET TO THE BEGINNING OF A NON-TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE SOUTHEASTERLY HAVING A RADIUS OF 889.00 FEET AND A RADIAL BEARING OF NORTH 26°47'46" WEST;

THENCE WESTERLY ALONG SAID CURVE THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 17°02'03", A DISTANCE OF 264.30 FEET;

THENCE SOUTH 46°10'11" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 47.72 FEET TO THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID PORTION LOT 83;

THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID PORTION LOT 83 NORTH 42°14'50" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 728.07 FEET TO THE WESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PORTION

**REVIEWED BY
THE METROPOLITAN WATER
DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
RIGHT OF WAY ENGINEERING TEAM**
DATE: 01-13-2003


EXHIBIT "A"

LOT 83, SAID CORNER ALSO BEING A POINT ON THE CENTERLINE OF ELM STREET AS IT NOW EXISTS;

THENCE CONTINUING ALONG THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID PORTION LOT 84 NORTH 42°12'08" WEST, A DISTANCE OF 477.91 FEET TO THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF SAID PORTION LOT 84;

THENCE ALONG THE NORTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID PORTION LOT 84 NORTH 47°42'37" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 393.11 FEET TO THE **POINT OF BEGINNING**.

THE ABOVE DESCRIBED PARCEL OF LAND CONTAINS 13.72 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.


DENNIS W. JANDA, PLS. 6359
EXP. 12/31/06

DATE: 12 DEC 02


REVIEWED BY
THE METROPOLITAN WATER
DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
RIGHT OF WAY ENGINEERING TEAM
DATE: 01-13-2003





RCWD
ANNEXATION EXHIBIT

EXHIBIT "B"
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA


OWNER
JEFFERY GRIFFIN
C/O ALLEN NUNEZ
41750 WINCHESTER ROAD, SUITE "J"
TEMECULA, CA 92590
(909) 296-9800 FAX (909) 296-9801



REVIEWED BY
THE METROPOLITAN WATER
DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
RIGHT OF WAY ENGINEERING TEAM
DATE: 01-13-2003



GRAPHIC SCALE



Detailed Report

Eastern 74th Fringe Area Annexation

The Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern) requested final terms and conditions for the 74th Fringe Area Annexation concurrently to Eastern and The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) and Eastern, by Resolution No. 3743, dated May 14, 2003. On April 8, 2003, Metropolitan's Board granted conditional approval for this annexation and adopted a resolution of intent to impose a water standby charge upon the annexing territory. The 17-acre annexation area, shown on the attached legal description and map, is located west of the intersection of Adams Avenue and Elm Street in the city of Murrieta. The territory is currently vacant although, once annexed, the development plan consists of a ready mix concrete plant. The total estimated water demand for this project is approximately 42 acre-feet per year from Metropolitan through Eastern. Metropolitan's Board is asked to grant final approval, conditioned upon approval by the Riverside County Local Agency Formation Commission, by adopting the Resolution Fixing Terms and Conditions (Attachment 4).

The Board adopted a resolution of intention to impose a water standby charge within the proposed 74th Fringe Area Annexation at its meeting on April 8, 2003. Pursuant to Resolution 8843 the Board held a public hearing on June 10, 2003. Interested parties were given the opportunity to present their views regarding the proposed charge and the Engineer's Report. Also, pursuant to Resolution 8843 and in accordance with the requirements of Article XIII D, Section 4, of the California Constitution, the Executive Secretary provided written notice by mail of such hearing to the owners of record of the parcels identified in the Engineer's Report. Enclosed in the mailed notice was an assessment ballot whereby the owners could indicate either support or opposition to the proposed water standby charge. No majority protest (as defined in Article XIII D, Section 4 of the California Constitution) was found to exist upon conclusion of the hearing; therefore, it will be requested that Metropolitan's Board consider and act upon the recommendation to adopt a second resolution (see Attachment 6), Resolution Fixing and Adopting Water Standby Charge, which imposes a Metropolitan water standby charge in the amount of \$6.94 per acre, or per parcel less than one acre, within the territory of the 74th Fringe Area Annexation.

The annexation charge has been calculated pursuant to Section 3300 of Metropolitan's Administrative Code. Utilizing the current rate of \$3,460 per net acre and the sum of \$5,000 for processing costs, the annexation charge is \$58,664.60, if completed by December 31, 2003. The \$5,000 processing charge has already been paid. If the annexation is completed after December 31, 2003, the annexation will be calculated based on the then current charge.

Approval of Metropolitan's water standby charge in the amount noted above, which is equal to the amount of Metropolitan's water standby charge imposed elsewhere within Eastern's territory, is a condition to complete this annexation. Pursuant to the terms of the attached resolution (Attachment 6), Metropolitan may levy standby charge at the rate stated in this resolution beginning in a subsequent fiscal year.

EXHIBIT A

SUPERIOR READY MIX CONCRETE, L.P.
ANNEXATION 74th FRINGE TO MWD

THAT PORTION OF LOT 4 OF THE TEMECULA LAND AND WATER COMPANY, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN BOOK 8, PAGE 359 OF MAPS, IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTER LINE OF ADAMS AVENUE AND ELM STREET; THENCE NORTH 42°14'59" WEST ON THE CENTER LINE OF ADAMS AVENUE 1320 FEET, TO THE INTERSECTION WITH THE NORTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 4 PROLONGED NORTHEASTERLY;

THENCE SOUTH 47°45'01" WEST ON SAID NORTHWESTERLY LINE AND SAID LINE PROLONGED NORTHEASTERLY, 237 FEET;

THENCE SOUTH 16°6'10" EAST, 1470.48 FEET TO A POINT ON THE CENTER LINE OF ELM STREET;

THENCE NORTH 47°45'01" EAST ON THE CENTER LINE OF ELM STREET, 885 FEET, TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.


GROSS ANNEXATION AREA = 17.00 ACRES
NET ANNEXATION AREA = 15.51 ACRES



Brian L. Jensen
BRIAN L. JENSEN, RCE 30534

3-13-03
DATED

REVIEWED BY
THE METROPOLITAN WATER
DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
RIGHT OF WAY ENGINEERING TEAM
DATE: 3-17-2003



RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
CONSENTING TO EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT'S
73rd FRINGE AREA ANNEXATION
AND FIXING THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF SAID ANNEXATION TO
THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

A. WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern), a municipal water district, situated in the County of Riverside, State of California, pursuant to Resolution No. 3739, in accordance with the provisions of the Metropolitan Water District Act, has applied to the Board of Directors of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) for consent to annex thereto certain uninhabited territory situated in the County of Riverside, particularly described in an application to the Riverside County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), concurrently with the annexation thereof to Eastern, such annexation to Metropolitan to be upon such terms and conditions as may be fixed by the Board of Directors of Metropolitan; and

B. WHEREAS, completion of said annexation shall be conditioned upon approval by the LAFCO; and

C. WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Rancho California Water District, a subagency to Eastern and acting as the Lead Agency, adopted a Negative Declaration (ND) on January 10, 2002 for the proposed annexation process (also known as the Annexation No. 74, the Maudelene Dutton Trust Project) associated with the 73rd Fringe Area Annexation. Also pursuant to CEQA, Metropolitan, as Responsible Agency, is required to certify that it has reviewed and considered the information in the ND and adopt the Lead Agency's findings prior to approval of the formal terms and conditions for the 73rd Fringe Area Annexation; and

D. WHEREAS, it appears to this Board of Directors that such application should be granted, subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.

E. NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of Metropolitan, acting as Responsible Agency, has reviewed and considered the information in the ND and adopt the Lead Agency's findings prior to approval of the formal terms and conditions for the 73rd Fringe Area Annexation; and subject to the following terms and conditions, does hereby grant the application of the governing body of Eastern for consent to annex the 73rd Fringe Area Annexation to Metropolitan and does hereby fix the terms and conditions of such annexation:

Section 1. The annexation of said area to Eastern shall be made concurrently with the annexation thereof to Metropolitan, and all necessary certificates, statements, maps, and other documents required to be filed by or on behalf of Eastern to effectuate the annexation shall be filed on or before December 31, 2004.

Section 2. Prior to filing a request for a Certificate of Completion of the annexation proceedings with LAFCO, Eastern shall submit a certified copy of LAFCO's resolution approving the annexation to the member agency, and shall pay to Metropolitan in cash \$52,471.20, if the annexation is completed by December 31, 2003. If the annexation is completed during the 2004 calendar year, the annexation charge will be calculated based on the then current rate, in accordance with Metropolitan's Administrative Code § 3106.

Section 3. All necessary steps (including without limitation, pursuant to Article XIII D of the California Constitution) for imposition of Metropolitan water standby charge in the amount of \$6.94 per acre or per parcel of less than one acre for fiscal year 2003/04 shall be completed.

Section 4. a. Metropolitan shall be under no obligation to provide, construct, operate, or maintain feeder pipelines, structures, connections, and other facilities required for the delivery of water to said area from works owned or operated by Metropolitan.

b. Eastern shall not be entitled to demand that Metropolitan deliver water to Eastern for use, directly or indirectly, within said area, except for domestic or municipal use therein.

c. The delivery of all water by Metropolitan, regardless of the nature and time of use of such water shall be subject to the water service regulations, including rates promulgated from time to time by Metropolitan.

d. Except upon the terms and conditions specifically approved by the Board of Directors of Metropolitan, water sold and delivered by Metropolitan shall not be used in any manner which intentionally or avoidably results in the direct or indirect benefit of areas outside Metropolitan, including use of such water outside Metropolitan or use thereof within Metropolitan in substitution for other water outside Metropolitan.

F. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Secretary be, and she hereby is, directed to transmit forthwith to the governing body of Eastern a certified copy of this resolution.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California at its meeting held August 19, 2003.

Executive Secretary
The Metropolitan Water District
of Southern California

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
CONSENTING TO EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT'S
74TH FRINGE AREA ANNEXATION
AND FIXING THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF SAID ANNEXATION TO
THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

- A. WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern), a municipal water district, situated in the County of Riverside, State of California, pursuant to Resolution No. 3743, in accordance with the provisions of the Metropolitan Water District Act, has applied to the Board of Directors of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan) for consent to annex thereto certain uninhabited territory situated in the County of Riverside, particularly described in an application to the Riverside County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), concurrently with the annexation thereof to Eastern, such annexation to Metropolitan to be upon such terms and conditions as may be fixed by the Board of Directors of Metropolitan; and
- B. WHEREAS, completion of said annexation shall be conditioned upon approval by the LAFCO; and
- C. WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Rancho California Water District, a subagency to Eastern and acting as the Lead Agency, adopted a Negative Declaration (ND) on July 11, 2002 for the proposed annexation process (also known as the Annexation No. 77, Superior Ready Mix Project) associated with the 74th Fringe Area Annexation. Also pursuant to CEQA, Metropolitan, as Responsible Agency, is required to certify that it has reviewed and considered the information in the ND and adopt the Lead Agency's findings prior to approval of the formal terms and conditions for the 74th Fringe Area Annexation; and
- D. WHEREAS, it appears to this Board of Directors that such application should be granted, subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.
- E. NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of Metropolitan, acting as Responsible Agency, has reviewed and considered the information in the ND and adopt the Lead Agency's findings prior to approval of the formal terms and conditions for the 74th Fringe Area Annexation; and subject to the following terms and conditions, does hereby grant the application of the governing body of Eastern for consent to annex the 74th Fringe Area Annexation to Metropolitan and does hereby fix the terms and conditions of such annexation:

Section 1. The annexation of said area to Eastern shall be made concurrently with the annexation thereof to Metropolitan, and all necessary certificates, statements, maps, and other documents required to be filed by or on behalf of Eastern to effectuate the annexation shall be filed on or before December 31, 2004.

Section 2. Prior to filing a request for a Certificate of Completion of the annexation proceedings with LAFCO, Eastern shall submit a certified copy of LAFCO's resolution approving the annexation to the member agency, and shall pay to Metropolitan in cash \$58,664.60, if the annexation is completed by December 31, 2003. If the annexation is completed during the 2004 calendar year, the annexation charge will be calculated based on the then current rate, in accordance with Metropolitan's Administrative Code § 3106.

Section 3. All necessary steps (including without limitation, pursuant to Article XIII D of the California Constitution) for imposition of Metropolitan water standby charge in the amount of \$6.94 per acre or per parcel of less than one acre for fiscal year 2003/04 shall be completed.

Section 4. a. Metropolitan shall be under no obligation to provide, construct, operate, or maintain feeder pipelines, structures, connections, and other facilities required for the delivery of water to said area from works owned or operated by Metropolitan.

b. Eastern shall not be entitled to demand that Metropolitan deliver water to Eastern for use, directly or indirectly, within said area, except for domestic or municipal use therein.

c. The delivery of all water by Metropolitan, regardless of the nature and time of use of such water shall be subject to the water service regulations, including rates promulgated from time to time by Metropolitan.

d. Except upon the terms and conditions specifically approved by the Board of Directors of Metropolitan, water sold and delivered by Metropolitan shall not be used in any manner which intentionally or avoidably results in the direct or indirect benefit of areas outside Metropolitan, including use of such water outside Metropolitan or use thereof within Metropolitan in substitution for other water outside Metropolitan.

F. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Executive Secretary be, and she hereby is, directed to transmit forthwith to the governing body of Eastern a certified copy of this resolution.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California at its meeting held August 19, 2003.

Executive Secretary
The Metropolitan Water District
of Southern California

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
FIXING AND ADOPTING WATER STANDBY CHARGE
CONTINGENT UPON EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
73rd FRINGE AREA ANNEXATION

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution 8839, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California's ("Metropolitan") Resolution of Intention to Impose Water Standby Charge, adopted by the Board of Directors (the "Board") of Metropolitan at its meeting held March 11, 2003, the Board gave notice to the public and to each member public agency of Metropolitan of the intention of the Board to consider and take action on the Chief Executive Officer's recommendation to impose a water charge for fiscal year 2003/04 on the property described in the Engineer's Report, dated December 2002 (the "Engineer's Report"), which was prepared by a registered professional engineer certified by the State of California and was attached to Resolution 8839;

WHEREAS, the owner of the parcel identified in the Engineer's Report has applied for annexation into the Eastern Municipal Water District ("Eastern ") and Metropolitan;

WHEREAS, upon annexation, Metropolitan water will be available to such property and such parcels will receive the benefit of the projects provided in part with proceeds of Metropolitan water standby charges, as described in the Engineer's Report;

WHEREAS, Eastern has requested that Metropolitan impose water standby charges on such property at the rate specified in the Engineer's Report and provided herein, following annexation of such property into Metropolitan;

WHEREAS, Resolution 8839 provides that the Board would meet in regular session to hold a public protest hearing at which interested parties could present their views regarding the proposed water standby charges and the Engineer's Report;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the terms of Resolution 8839 the Executive Secretary provided written notice in accordance with the requirements of Article XIII D, Section 4 of the California Constitution of the proposed water standby charge by mail to the record owner of the property identified in the Engineer's Report of such public hearing, and the notice included an assessment ballot whereby the owner could indicate his or her name, reasonable identification of his or her parcel, and his or her support for or opposition to the proposed water standby charge;

WHEREAS, the Board has conducted in conformance with Resolution 8839 a public hearing. The hearing was held June 10, 2003, at which interested parties were given the opportunity to present their views regarding the proposed water standby charge and the Engineer's Report and to protest the charges, if they so desired, and the Board duly considered any such protests and other views presented to it at the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, prior to the conclusion of the public hearing the Executive Secretary reviewed the assessment ballots submitted, and it was found that no majority protest (as defined in Article XIII D, Section 4 of the California Constitution) exists;

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Directors of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California does hereby resolve, determine and order as follows:

Section 1. That the Board of Metropolitan, pursuant to the Engineer's Report, finds that the land described in said Engineer's Report upon annexation to Metropolitan will be benefited as described in such report and on that basis, hereby fixes and adopts a water standby charge for fiscal year 2003/04 on such land to which Metropolitan water is made available for any purpose, whether water is actually used or not.

Section 2. That the water standby charge per acre of land, or per parcel of land less than an acre, as shown in the Engineer's Report, shall be \$6.94 which is equal to the amount of Metropolitan's existing water standby charge on other properties located within the territory of Eastern.

Section 3. That no water standby charge on any parcel exceeds the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that parcel, as shown in the Engineer's Report. The Engineer's Report separates the special benefits from the general benefits and identifies each of the parcels on which a special benefit is conferred.

Section 4. That the water standby charge shall be collected on the tax rolls, together with the ad valorem property taxes, which are levied by Metropolitan for the payment of pre-1978 voter-approved indebtedness. Any amounts so collected shall be applied as a credit against Eastern's obligation to pay its readiness-to-serve charge for fiscal year 2003/04. After such member agency's readiness-to-serve charge allocation is fully satisfied, any additional collections shall be credited to other outstanding obligations of such member agency to Metropolitan or future readiness-to-serve obligations of such agency.

Section 5. That the water standby charge is fixed and adopted contingent upon completion of annexation of the land described in the Engineer's Report. If such annexation is not completed in time to permit imposition of standby charges for fiscal year 2003/04, Metropolitan may levy standby charges at the rate stated in this resolution beginning in a subsequent fiscal year.

Section 6. That in the event that the water standby charge, or any portion thereof, is determined to be an unauthorized or invalid fee, charge or assessment by a final judgment in any proceeding at law or in equity, which judgment is not subject to appeal, or if the collection of the water standby charge shall be permanently enjoined and appeals of such injunction have been declined or exhausted, or if Metropolitan shall determine to rescind or revoke the water standby charge, then no further water standby charge shall be collected within the territory described in the Engineer's Report and Eastern shall pay its readiness-to-serve charge obligation to Metropolitan in full, as if imposition of such water standby charges had never been sought.

Section 7. That pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Rancho California Water District, a subagency to Eastern and acting as the Lead Agency, adopted a Negative Declaration (ND) on January 10, 2002 for the proposed annexation process (also known as the Annexation No. 74, the Maudelene Dutton Project) associated with the 73rd Fringe Area Annexation. Also pursuant to CEQA, Metropolitan, as Responsible Agency, is required to certify that it has reviewed and considered the information in the ND and adopt the Lead Agency's findings prior to approval of fixing and adopting water standby charges for the 73rd Fringe Area Annexation.

Section 8. That the Chief Executive Officer is hereby authorized and directed to take all necessary action to secure the collection of the water standby charges by the appropriate county officials, including payment of the reasonable cost of collection.

Section 9. That the Chief Executive Officer and General Counsel are hereby authorized to do all things necessary and desirable to accomplish the purposes of this resolution, including, without limitation, the commencement or defense of litigation.

Section 10. That if any provision of this resolution or the application to any member agency, property or person whatsoever is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect the other provisions or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid portion or application, and to that end the provisions of this resolution are severable.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, at its meeting held on August 19, 2003.

Executive Secretary
The Metropolitan Water District
of Southern California

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
FIXING AND ADOPTING WATER STANDBY CHARGE
CONTINGENT UPON EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
74th FRINGE AREA ANNEXATION

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution 8843, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California's ("Metropolitan") Resolution of Intention to Impose Water Standby Charge, adopted by the Board of Directors (the "Board") of Metropolitan at its meeting held April 8, 2003, the Board gave notice to the public and to each member public agency of Metropolitan of the intention of the Board to consider and take action on the Chief Executive Officer's recommendation to impose a water charge for fiscal year 2003/04 on the property described in the Engineer's Report, dated April 2003 (the "Engineer's Report"), which was prepared by a registered professional engineer certified by the State of California and was attached to Resolution 8843;

WHEREAS, the owner of the parcel identified in the Engineer's Report has applied for annexation into the Eastern Municipal Water District ("Eastern ") and Metropolitan;

WHEREAS, upon annexation, Metropolitan water will be available to such property and such parcels will receive the benefit of the projects provided in part with proceeds of Metropolitan water standby charges, as described in the Engineer's Report;

WHEREAS, Eastern has requested that Metropolitan impose water standby charges on such property at the rate specified in the Engineer's Report and provided herein, following annexation of such property into Metropolitan;

WHEREAS, Resolution 8843 provides that the Board would meet in regular session to hold a public protest hearing at which interested parties could present their views regarding the proposed water standby charges and the Engineer's Report;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the terms of Resolution 8843 the Executive Secretary provided written notice in accordance with the requirements of Article XIII D, Section 4 of the California Constitution of the proposed water standby charge by mail to the record owner of the property identified in the Engineer's Report of such public hearing, and the notice included an assessment ballot whereby the owner could indicate his or her name, reasonable identification of his or her parcel, and his or her support for or opposition to the proposed water standby charge;

WHEREAS, the Board has conducted in conformance with Resolution 8843 a public hearing. The hearing was held June 10, 2003, at which interested parties were given the opportunity to present their views regarding the proposed water standby charge and the Engineer's Report and to protest the charges, if they so desired, and the Board duly considered any such protests and other views presented to it at the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, prior to the conclusion of the public hearing the Executive Secretary reviewed the assessment ballots submitted, and it was found that no majority protest (as defined in Article XIII D, Section 4 of the California Constitution) exists;

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Directors of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California does hereby resolve, determine and order as follows:

Section 1. That the Board of Metropolitan, pursuant to the Engineer's Report, finds that the land described in said Engineer's Report upon annexation to Metropolitan will be benefited as described in such report and on that basis, hereby fixes and adopts a water standby charge for fiscal year 2003/04 on such land to which Metropolitan water is made available for any purpose, whether water is actually used or not.

Section 2. That the water standby charge per acre of land, or per parcel of land less than an acre, as shown in the Engineer's Report, shall be \$6.94 which is equal to the amount of Metropolitan's existing water standby charge on other properties located within the territory of Eastern.

Section 3. That no water standby charge on any parcel exceeds the reasonable cost of the proportional special benefit conferred on that parcel, as shown in the Engineer's Report. The Engineer's Report separates the special benefits from the general benefits and identifies each of the parcels on which a special benefit is conferred.

Section 4. That the water standby charge shall be collected on the tax rolls, together with the ad valorem property taxes, which are levied by Metropolitan for the payment of pre-1978 voter-approved indebtedness. Any amounts so collected shall be applied as a credit against Eastern's obligation to pay its readiness-to-serve charge for fiscal year 2003/04. After such member agency's readiness-to-serve charge allocation is fully satisfied, any additional collections shall be credited to other outstanding obligations of such member agency to Metropolitan or future readiness-to-serve obligations of such agency.

Section 5. That the water standby charge is fixed and adopted contingent upon completion of annexation of the land described in the Engineer's Report. If such annexation is not completed in time to permit imposition of standby charges for fiscal year 2003/04, Metropolitan may levy standby charges at the rate stated in this resolution beginning in a subsequent fiscal year.

Section 6. That in the event that the water standby charge, or any portion thereof, is determined to be an unauthorized or invalid fee, charge or assessment by a final judgment in any proceeding at law or in equity, which judgment is not subject to appeal, or if the collection of the water standby charge shall be permanently enjoined and appeals of such injunction have been declined or exhausted, or if Metropolitan shall determine to rescind or revoke the water standby charge, then no further water standby charge shall be collected within the territory described in the Engineer's Report and Eastern shall pay its readiness-to-serve charge obligation to Metropolitan in full, as if imposition of such water standby charges had never been sought.

Section 7. That pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Rancho California Water District, a subagency to Eastern and acting as the Lead Agency, adopted a Negative Declaration (ND) on July 11, 2002 for the proposed annexation process (also known as the Annexation No. 77, Superior Ready Mix Project) associated with the 74th Fringe Area Annexation. Also pursuant to CEQA, Metropolitan, as Responsible Agency, is required to certify that it has reviewed and considered the information in the ND and adopt the Lead Agency's findings prior to approval of fixing and adopting water standby charges for the 74th Fringe Area Annexation.

Section 8. That the Chief Executive Officer is hereby authorized and directed to take all necessary action to secure the collection of the water standby charges by the appropriate county officials, including payment of the reasonable cost of collection.

Section 9. That the Chief Executive Officer and General Counsel are hereby authorized to do all things necessary and desirable to accomplish the purposes of this resolution, including, without limitation, the commencement or defense of litigation.

Section 10. That if any provision of this resolution or the application to any member agency, property or person whatsoever is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect the other provisions or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid portion or application, and to that end the provisions of this resolution are severable.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, at its meeting held on August 19, 2003.

Executive Secretary
The Metropolitan Water District
of Southern California

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. Name, if any, and a brief description of project:

Annexation No. 74, the Maudelene Dutton Trust project, to the Rancho California Water District (RCWD). The proposed annexation consists of approximately fifteen (15) acres to be concurrently annexed to RCWD, Eastern Municipal Water District, and Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

2. Location:

Generally, Jefferson Avenue at Elm Street, City of Murrieta, within the southwest portion of Riverside County.

3. Entity or person undertaking project:

Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Temecula, CA 92590

The RCWD Board of Directors (Board), having reviewed the Initial Study of this proposed project and having reviewed the written comments received prior to its public meeting, including the recommendation of RCWD staff, does hereby find and declare that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A brief statement of the reasons supporting the Board's findings is as follows:

The proposed annexation and sphere of influence modification is required to provide domestic water service to customer properties located within RCWD's service area. No potential environmental impacts were identified in the Initial Study for this project. The Environmental Impact Assessment concludes that no mitigation measures are required for this project.


The Board hereby finds that the Negative Declaration reflects its independent judgment. A copy of the Initial Study may be obtained at:

Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Temecula, California 92590

The location and custodian of the documents and any other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which RCWD based its decision to adopt this Negative Declaration are:

Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Post Office Box 9017
Temecula, California 92589-9017
(909) 296-6900

Date Received for Filing: _____


Stephen F. Brannon, Development Engineering Manager



NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

TO: _____ Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
or
_____ County Clerk
_____ County of Riverside:

FROM: Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Post Office Box 9017
Temecula, CA 92589-9017

FILED
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

_____ Office of Planning and Research (if the project requires state approval)
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

JAN 10 2002

GARY L. ORSO
By *J. Hyton* J. Hyton
Deputy

SUBJECT: FILING OF NOTICE OF DETERMINATION IN COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 21152 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE.

Project Title: Annexation No. 74, the Maudelene Dutton Trust project

Project Location: Generally, Jefferson Avenue at Elm Street, City of Murrieta, within the southwest portion of Riverside County.

Project Description: Annexation No. 74, the Maudelene Dutton Trust project, to the Rancho California Water District (RCWD). The proposed annexation consists of approximately fifteen (15) acres to be concurrently annexed to RCWD, Eastern Municipal Water District, and Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

This is to certify that the *Rancho California Water District* approved the above-described project on *January 10, 2002* and made the following determinations:

1. The project *will not* have a significant effect on the environment.
2. A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA and reflects the independent judgment of the Lead Agency.
3. Mitigation measures *were not* made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Statement of Overriding Considerations *was not* adopted for this project.
5. Findings *were* made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
6. The location and custodian of the documents which comprise the record of proceedings for the Final EIR (with comments and responses) or Negative Declaration are specified as follows:

Custodian: Rancho California Water District
Location: 42135 Winchester Road, Temecula, California

COUNTY CLERK
Neg Declaration/Ntc Determination
Final EIR 21152
POSTED

JAN 10 2002

Removed: *2-11-02*
By: *C. Kohler* Dept.
County of Riverside, State of California

Jan. 10, 2002
Date

Stephen F. Brannon
Stephen F. Brannon, Development Engineering Manager

Date Received for Filing



**RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT
42135 WINCHESTER ROAD
POST OFFICE BOX 9017
TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92589-9017**

**INITIAL STUDY
FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
OF
ANNEXATION NO. 74
[PROJECT NO. AX074]**

**Prepared by
Rancho California Water District**

01\W:at383-2\AX074



General Information

Project

The proposed project consists of approximately fifteen (15) acres of land located in the City of Murrieta, generally on the south side of Jefferson Avenue at Elm Street, City of Murrieta, within the southwest portion of Riverside County.

Authority

The project is located within the sphere of influence of Rancho California Water District (RCWD). As such, the proposed action would be a concurrent annexation to RCWD, Eastern Municipal Water District, and Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

Documents Incorporated by Reference

1. *City of Murrieta General Plan*, June 1994

This document is a comprehensive general plan, which provides guidelines for physical development within the city boundaries and sphere of influence.

1. Rancho California Water District *Water & Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update*, SCH No. 97031053, August 27, 1997

The Impact Report addresses the cumulative environmental effects associated with the implementation of the 1997 Water & Wastewater Master Plan Updates. The updated Program Environmental Impact Report identifies District-wide baseline environmental conditions, impact analyses, mitigation measures, and mitigation monitoring programs that are likely to occur with implementation of the 1997 Water & Wastewater Master Plans.

01\W:at383-2\AX074



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
(STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY)

1. Name or description of project:

Annexation No. 74, the Maudelene Dutton Trust project, is a proposed request to annex to the Rancho California Water District (RCWD). The proposed project consists of approximately fifteen (15) acres to be concurrently annexed to RCWD, Eastern Municipal Water District, and The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

2. Location:

Generally on the south side of Jefferson Avenue at Elm Street, City of Murrieta, within the southwest portion of Riverside County.

3. Entity or Person undertaking project:


Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Post Office Box 9017
Temecula, California 92589-9017
(909) 296-6900

4. Staff Determination:

The Rancho California Water District staff, having undertaken and completed an Initial Study of this project in accordance with the District's "Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)" for the purpose of ascertaining whether the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, has reached the following conclusion:

- (a) X The project could not have a significant effect on the environment; therefore, a Negative Declaration should be adopted.
- (b) The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects on the environment but revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant would avoid the effects, or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur; therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration should be adopted.
- (c) The project may have a significant effect on the environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Report will be required.

Date: Nov. 28, 2001



Stephen F. Brannon, Development Engineering Manager



ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Annexation of The Maudelene Dutton Trust Project to Rancho California Water District, Eastern Municipal Water District, and Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Post Office Box 9017
Temecula, CA 92589-9017

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Laurie Williams (909) 296-6900

4. **Project Location:** Maudelene Dutton Trust Project
Assessor's Parcel Number 910-230-006
City of Murrieta
Southwestern Portion of Riverside County

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** The Maudelene Dutton Trust
Jeffrey Griffin, Trustee
9940 Westwanda Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

6. **General Plan Designation:** Multiple Use, Business Park I

7. **Zoning:** Same as Above

8. **Description of Project:**

Concurrent annexation to Rancho California Water District, Eastern Municipal Water District, and Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

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

General Industrial exists south of the project; multiple use industrial exists to the east and west of the project; and business park exists north of the project.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:**

Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
Eastern Municipal Water District (WMWD)
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD)



ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards / Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have 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.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant 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.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Stephen F. Brannon
Signature

Nov. 28, 2001
Date

Stephen F. Brannon, Development Engineering Manager Rancho California Water District
Printed Name For



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 is 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 Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," 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 Analyses 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.

SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, tress, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.				
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	X
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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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"/>	X
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial 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 type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
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 of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



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



Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |



Issues:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat or 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |



**RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT
42135 Winchester Road
Post Office Box 9017
Temecula, California 92589-9017**

**EXPLANATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

Source Reference:

City of Murrieta General Plan, June 1994

I. Aesthetics

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

II. Agricultural Resources

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
Industrial Zoning
References: None

III. Air

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

IV. Biological Resources

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

V. Cultural Resources

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None



VI. Geology and Soils

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

IX. Land Use and Planning

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

X. Mineral Resources

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XI. Noise

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XII. Population / Housing

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None



XII. Population / Housing

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XIII. Public Services

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XIV. Recreation

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XV. Transportation / Traffic

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems

a., c., e., f., and g.: No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

b. and d.: Future facilities are planned to provide satisfactory services for all properties located within Rancho California Water District's Sphere of Influence.
References: Rancho California Water District *Water & Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update*, August 1997

XVII. Mandatory Findings at Significance

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. Name, if any, and a brief description of project:

Annexation No. 77, the Superior Ready Mix project, to the Rancho California Water District (RCWD). The proposed annexation consists of approximately 15.51 acres to be concurrently annexed to RCWD, Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD).

2. Location:

Generally located south of Adams Avenue and west of Elm Street in the City of Murrieta, within the southwest portion of Riverside County.

3. Entity or person undertaking project:

Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Temecula, California 92590

The RCWD Board of Directors (Board), having reviewed the Initial Study of this proposed project and having reviewed the written comments received prior to its public meeting, including the recommendation of RCWD staff, does hereby find and declare that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A brief statement of the reasons supporting the Board's findings is as follows:

The proposed annexation and sphere of influence modification is required to provide domestic water service to customer properties located within RCWD's service area. No potential environmental impacts were identified in the Initial Study for this project. The Environmental Impact Assessment concludes that no mitigation measures are required for this project.


The Board hereby finds that the Negative Declaration reflects its independent judgment. A copy of the Initial Study may be obtained at:

Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Temecula, California 92590

The location and custodian of the documents and any other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which RCWD based its decision to adopt this Negative Declaration are:

Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Post Office Box 9017
Temecula, California 92589-9017
(909) 296-6900

Date Received for Filing: _____


Stephen F. Brannon, Development Engineering Manager

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

TO: _____ Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
or
_____ County Clerk
County of Riverside:

FROM: Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Post Office Box 9017
Temecula, CA 92589-9017

_____ Office of Planning and Research (if the project requires state approval)
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: FILING OF NOTICE OF DETERMINATION IN COMPLIANCE WITH RIVERSIDE COUNTY SECTION 21152 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE.

FILED

JUL 16 2002

Project Title: Annexation No. 77, Superior Ready Mix

GARY L. ORSO
By *J. Hyton* J. Hyton
Deputy

Project Location: City of Murrieta, within the southwest portion of Riverside County. Generally located south of Adams Avenue and west of Elm Street.

Project Description: Annexation No. 77, the Superior Ready Mix project, to the Rancho California Water District (RCWD). The proposed annexation consists of approximately 15.51 acres to be concurrently annexed to RCWD, Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD).

This is to certify that the Rancho California Water District approved the above-described project on July 11, 2002 and made the following determinations:

1. The project *will not* have a significant effect on the environment.
2. A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA and reflects the independent judgment of the Lead Agency.
3. Mitigation measures *were not* made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Statement of Overriding Considerations *was not* adopted for this project.
5. Findings *were* made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
6. The location and custodian of the documents which comprise the record of proceedings for the Final EIR (with comments and responses) or Negative Declaration are specified as follows:

Custodian: Rancho California Water District
Location: 42135 Winchester Road, Temecula, California

July 11, 2002
Date

Stephen F. Brannon
Stephen F. Brannon, Development Engineering Manager

COUNTY CLERK
Neg Declaration/Ntc Determination
Filed per P.R.C. 21152
POSTED

JUL 16 2002

Date Received for Filing

Removed: _____

By: _____ Dept.
County of Riverside, State of California



**RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT
42135 WINCHESTER ROAD
POST OFFICE BOX 9017
TEMECULA, CALIFORNIA 92589-9017**

**INITIAL STUDY
FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
OF
ANNEXATION NO. 77
[PROJECT NO. AX077]**

**Prepared by
Rancho California Water District**

02\LW:at220-1\AX077



General Information

Project

The proposed project consists of the annexation of approximately 15.51 acres of land located in the city of Murrieta, generally located south of Adams Avenue and east of Elm Street.

Authority

The project is located within the sphere of influence of Rancho California Water District. As such, the proposed action would be a concurrent annexation to Rancho California Water District (RCWD), Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD).

Documents Incorporated by Reference

1. *City of Murrieta General Plan*, June 1994

This document is a comprehensive general plan, which provides guidelines for physical development within the city boundaries and sphere of influence.

1. Rancho California Water District *Water & Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update*, SCH No. 97031053, August 27, 1997

The Impact Report addresses the cumulative environmental effects associated with the implementation of the 1997 Water & Wastewater Master Plan Updates. The updated Program Environmental Impact Report identifies District-wide baseline environmental conditions, impact analyses, mitigation measures, and mitigation monitoring programs that are likely to occur with implementation of the 1997 Water & Wastewater Master Plans.

02\LW:at220-3\AX077



ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
(STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY)

1. Name or description of project:

Annexation No. 77, the Superior Ready Mix project, to the Rancho California Water District (RCWD). The proposed annexation consists of approximately 15.51 acres to be concurrently annexed to RCWD, Eastern Municipal Water District, and Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

2. Location:

City of Murrieta, within the southwest portion of Riverside County. Generally located south of Adams Avenue and east of Elm Street.

3. Entity or Person undertaking project:


Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Post Office Box 9017
Temecula, California 92589-9017
(909) 296-6900

4. Staff Determination:

The Rancho California Water District staff, having undertaken and completed an Initial Study of this project in accordance with the District's "Local Guidelines for Implementing the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)" for the purpose of ascertaining whether the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, has reached the following conclusion:

- (a) X The project could not have a significant effect on the environment; therefore, a Negative Declaration should be adopted.
- (b) The Initial Study identified potentially significant effects on the environment but revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant would avoid the effects, or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur; therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration should be adopted.
- (c) The project may have a significant effect on the environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Report will be required.

Date: June 13, 2002


Stephen F. Brannon, Development Engineering Manager

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project Title:** Annexation of Murrieta Valley property within the existing Rancho California Water District Sphere of Influence

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** Rancho California Water District
42135 Winchester Road
Post Office Box 9017
Temecula, CA 92589-9017

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Laurie Williams (909) 296-6900

4. **Project Location:** Superior Ready Mix
City of Murrieta
Southwestern Portion of Riverside County

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Superior Ready Mix
Arnold L. Veldkamp
1508 West Mission Road
Escondido, CA 92029

6. **General Plan Designation:** General Industrial

7. **Zoning:** Same as Above

8. **Description of Project:**

Concurrent annexation to Rancho California Water District, Eastern Municipal Water District, and Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

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

General Industrial north and east of project; Civic Institutional south and west of project.

10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:**

Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD)
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD)



ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:


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

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards / Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have 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.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant 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.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.


Signature


Date


Stephen F. Brannon, Development Engineering Manager
Printed Name

Rancho California Water District
For



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 is 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 Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," 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 Analyses 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.

SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	X
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 for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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"/>	X
XI. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.				
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial 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 type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
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 of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

XIV. RECREATION. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC.
Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |



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



Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat or 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X



RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT
42135 Winchester Road
Post Office Box 9017
Temecula, California 92589-9017

EXPLANATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

Source Reference:

City of Murrieta General Plan, June 1994

I. Aesthetics

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

II. Agricultural Resources

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

III. Air

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

IV. Biological Resources

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

V. Cultural Resources

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None



VI. Geology and Soils

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

IX. Land Use and Planning

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

X. Mineral Resources

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XI. Noise

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XII. Population / Housing

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None



XII. Population / Housing

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XIII. Public Services

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XIV. Recreation

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XV. Transportation / Traffic

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems

a., c., f., and g.: No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

b., d., and e.: Existing facilities or future facilities are planned to provide satisfactory services for all properties located within Rancho California Water District's Sphere of Influence. References: Rancho California Water District *Water & Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update*, August 1997

XVII. Mandatory Findings at Significance

No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
References: None

