MWD
METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

BOARD ACTION

- **Board of Directors**
  Executive Committee

December 9, 2003 Board Meeting

8-6

Subject

Adopt final resolutions for annexation and impose water standby charge for the 76th Fringe Area Annexation to Eastern Municipal Water District and Metropolitan

Description

The Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern) board of directors has requested final terms and conditions for the 76th Fringe Area Annexation, concurrently to Eastern and The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan), by Resolution 3829, dated September 24, 2003. On September 9, 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 total area for annexation is 5.9 acres of which 0.1 acre is for road right-of-way. The property is located near the intersection of Jefferson Avenue and Elm Street in the city of Murrieta. The territory is currently vacant although, once annexed, the development plan consists of a storage business. The total estimated water demand for this project is approximately 13 acre-feet per year from Metropolitan through Eastern. Metropolitan's Board is asked to grant final approval, conditioned upon approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County, by adopting the Resolution Fixing Terms and Conditions (**Attachment 2**). See **Attachment 1** for the detailed report.

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 a Negative Declaration (ND) on April 10, 2003, for the proposed annexation process (also known as the Annexation No. 81, Murrieta Mini Storage Project). Metropolitan, as Responsible Agency under CEQA, 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 proposed actions. The ND is in **Attachment 4**.

The CEQA determination is: Review and consider information provided in the adopted 2003 ND and adopt the Lead Agency's findings 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 76th Fringe Area Annexation, concurrently to Metropolitan and Eastern, conditioned upon approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County, and establishing Metropolitan's terms and conditions for this annexation (**Attachment 2**); and

b. Adopt a resolution to impose water standby charge at a rate of $6.94 per acre or per parcel of less than one acre within the proposed annexation (**Attachment 3**).

Fiscal Impact: Receipt of annexation fee ($25,065) and water sales revenue from newly annexed territory.

Option #2

Decline annexation of 76th Fringe Area to Eastern.

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

Staff Recommendation

Option #1

Roy L. Wolfe 11/13/2003
Roy L. Wolfe *Date*
Manager, Corporate Resources

Ronald R. Gastelum 11/19/2003
Ronald R. Gastelum *Date*
Chief Executive Officer

Attachment 1 – Detailed Report

Attachment 2 – Resolution Fixing Terms and Conditions

Attachment 3 – Resolution Fixing and Adopting Water Standby Charge

Attachment 4 – Negative Declaration for Rancho California Water District's Annexation No. 81, Murrieta Mini Storage Project

BLA #2591

Detailed Report

Eastern 76th Fringe Area

The Eastern Municipal Water District (Eastern) board of directors has requested final terms and conditions for the 76th Fringe Area Annexation, concurrently to Eastern and The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan), by Resolution 3829, dated September 24, 2003. On September 9, 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 5.9-gross acre (5.8-net acre) annexation territory, shown on the attached legal description and map, is located near the intersection of Jefferson Avenue and Elm Street in the city of Murrieta. The territory is currently vacant although, once annexed, the development plan consists of a mini-storage business. The total estimated water demand for this project is approximately 13 acre-feet per year from Metropolitan through Eastern. Metropolitan's Board is asked to grant final approval, conditioned upon approval by the Local Agency Formation Commission of Riverside County, by adopting the Resolution Fixing Terms and Conditions (Attachment 2).

Metropolitan's Board adopted a resolution of intention to impose a water standby charge within the proposed 76th Fringe Area Annexation at its meeting on September 9, 2003. Pursuant to Resolution 8868, the Board held a public hearing on November 18, 2003. Interested parties were given the opportunity to present their views regarding the proposed charge and the Engineer's Report. Also, pursuant to Resolution 8868 and in accordance with the requirements of Article XIII D, § 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, § 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 3), 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 76th Fringe Area Annexation.

The annexation charge has been calculated pursuant to § 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 $25,065, if completed by December 31, 2004. If the annexation is completed after December 31, 2004, the annexation will be calculated based on the then current charge. The $5,000 processing charge has already been paid.

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 3), Metropolitan may levy a standby charge at the rate stated in this resolution beginning in a subsequent fiscal year.



NOTES:

AREA: 5.9± ACRES GROSS
AREA: 5.8± ACRES NET

VICINITY MAP
Not To Scale

Date: 7/9/03

Note: This exhibit was prepared from a search of available records and not from a field survey.

CLE ENGINEERING	26608 PIERCE CIRCLE, STE. B MURRIETA, CA 92562 909-698-1830	EXHIBIT "B" 76th Fringe Annexation
	SHEET 1 OF 1	
SCALE: 1"=300'	DRAWN BY: BJS DATE: 5/02/03	SUBJECT: PORTION OF LOT 77, MB 8, PAGE 359 SD CO.

EXHIBIT "A"

REORGANIZATION TO INCLUDE CONCURRENT ANNEXATIONS TO EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT, RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT AND THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA. LAFCO

76th Fringe Annexation

A PORTION OF LOT 77 OF THE MURRIETA PORTION OF THE TEMECULA RANCHO, RIVERSIDE COUNTY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN BY MAP ON FILE IN BOOK 8, PAGE 359 OF MAPS, SAN DIEGO COUNTY RECORDS, DESCRIBED MORE PARTICULARLY AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE CENTERLINE INTERSECTION OF (OLD JEFFERSON AVENUE) AND ELM STREET ALSO BEING THE MOST EASTERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 77, THENCE S48°19'03"W 195.00 FEET ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF ELM STREET TO THE INTERSECTION WITH A LINE 195.00 FEET SOUTHWESTERLY OF AND PARALLEL WITH THE CENTERLINE OF (OLD JEFFERSON AVENUE);

THENCE, N41°40'19"W 1321.96 FEET ON SAID PARALLEL LINE TO THE NORTH-WESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 77;

THENCE, N48°17'31"E 195.00 FEET ALONG SAID NORTHWESTERLY LINE TO THE MOST NORTHERLY CORNER OF SAID LOT 77 ALSO BEING ON THE CENTERLINE OF (OLD JEFFERSON AVENUE);

THENCE, S41°40'19"E 1322.08 FEET ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF (OLD JEFFERSON AVENUE) TO THE **POINT OF BEGINNING**.

THE ABOVE DESCRIBED AREA CONTAINS 5.9 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

SEE PLAT ATTACHED HERETO AND MADE A PART HEREOF.

REVIEWED BY
THE METROPOLITAN WATER
DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
RIGHT OF WAY ENGINEERING TEAM
DATE: 7-25-2003

DATE: 7/9/03

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
THE METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
CONSENTING TO EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT'S
76th 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 3829, 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 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 April 10, 2003 for the proposed annexation process (also known as the Annexation No. 81, Murrieta Mini Storage Project) associated with the 76th 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 76th Fringe Area Annexation; and

D. WHEREAS, it appears to Metropolitan's 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 adopted the Lead Agency's findings prior to approval of the formal terms and conditions for the 76th 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 76th 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 $25,065, if the annexation is completed by

December 31, 2004. If the annexation is completed during the 2005 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 2004/05 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 December 9, 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'S
76TH FRINGE AREA ANNEXATION

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution 8868, 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 November18, 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 2004/05 on the property described in the Engineer's Report, dated July 2003 (the "Engineer's Report"), which was prepared by a registered professional engineer certified by the State of California and was attached to Resolution 8868;

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 8868 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 8868 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 8868 a public hearing. The hearing was held November 18, 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 2004/05 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 2004/05. 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 2004/05, 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 April 10, 2003 for the proposed annexation process (also known as the Annexation No. 81, Murrieta Mini Storage Project) associated with the 76th 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 76th 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 December 9, 2003.

_____

Executive Secretary
The Metropolitan Water District
of Southern California

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. **Name, if any, and a brief description of project:**
   Annexation No. 81, the Murrieta Mini Storage project, to the Rancho California Water District (RCWD). The proposed annexation consists of approximately 5.69 acres to be concurrently annexed to RCWD, Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD).

2. **Location:**

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

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

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

INITIAL STUDY

FOR

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF ANNEXATION NO. 81 [PROJECT NO. AX081]

Prepared by

Rancho California Water District

03\LW:at077-1\AX081

General Information

Project

The proposed project consists of the annexation of approximately 5.69 acres of land located in the city of Murrieta, generally located south of Jefferson Avenue and west 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.

2. 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.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
(STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY)

1. **Name or description of project:**

Annexation No. 81, the Murrieta Mini Storage project, to the Rancho California Water District (RCWD). The proposed annexation consists of approximately 5.69 acres to be concurrently annexed to RCWD, Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

2. **Location:**

City of Murrieta, within the southwest portion of Riverside County. Generally located south of Jefferson Avenue and west 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: December 12, 2003

for 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:** The Murrieta Mini Storage Project
   Southwestern Portion of Riverside County

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Murrieta Mini Storage
   10731 Treena Street, No. 100
   San Diego, CA 92131

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 the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

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

   General Industrial

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.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology / Soils
☐ Hazards / Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ 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 form 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?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, tress, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	**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?	☐	☐	☐	X
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	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)?	☐	☐	☐	X
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	X
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	X
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	X
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	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:	☐	☐	☐	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.	☐	☐	☐	X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	X
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
VIII.	**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	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)?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	X
IX.	**LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	X
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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)?	☐	☐	☐	X
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X

	Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	X
	Schools?	☐	☐	☐	X
	Parks?	☐	☐	☐	X
	Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	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)?	☐	☐	☐	X
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	X
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	X
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	X
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	X
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	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?	☐	☐	☐	**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?	☐	☐	☐	X
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?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	**X**	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	**X**
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	**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?	☐	☐	☐	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.)	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	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:

Riverside County – Southwest Area Plan

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

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

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
RIVERSIDE COUNTY
APR 10 2003
GARY L. ORSO
By J. Hylton Deputy

_____ 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 SECTION 21152 OF THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE.

Project Title: Annexation No. 81, the Murrieta Mini Storage project

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

Project Description: Annexation No. 81, the Murrieta Mini Storage project, to the Rancho California Water District (RCWD). The proposed annexation consists of approximately 5.69 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 April 10, 2003 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

April 10, 2003
Date

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

_____
Date Received for Filing

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

APR 10 2003

Removed: _____

By: _____ Dept.

County of Riverside, State of California
03LW:al077-9\AX081

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - THE RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

ENVIRONMENTAL FILING FEE CASH RECEIPT

Receipt # 200300353

Lead Agency: RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT *Date:* 04/10/2003

County Agency of Filing: Riverside *Document No:* 200300353

Project Title: ANNEXATION NO 81 THE MURRIETA MINI STORAGE PROJECT

Project Applicant Name: RANCHO CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT *Phone Number:*

Project Applicant Address: 42135 WINCHESTER ROAD TEMECULA, CA 92589-9017

Project Applicant: Special District

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:

☐ *Environmental Impact Report*	
☒ *Negative Declaration*	1250.00
☐ *Application Fee Water Diversion (State Water Resources Control Board Only)*	
☐ *Project Subject to Certified Regulatory Programs*	
☒ *County Administration Fee*	$64.00
☐ *Project that is exempt from fees (DeMinimis Exemption)*	
☐ *Project that is exempt from fees (Notice of Exemption)*	
Total Received	1314.00

Signature and title of person receiving payment: Jan Hylton

Notes: