Staff Report

DATE: August 10, 2015
TO: Local Agency Formation Commission
FROM: Elliot Mulberg, Executive Officer
       Michelle McIntyre, Analyst
SUBJECT: 2015-02 Frank, King, Keune, and Wood Properties Annexation to the Solano Irrigation District (SID)

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends:
1) The Commission approve the change of organization proposal for Frank Property (Area 1) and King, Keune, Wood Properties (Area 2) subject to the terms and conditions in the attached draft resolution;
2) Review, consider, and adopt the Lead Agency’s Notice of Exemption for Area 1 and the Negative Declaration for Area 2 pursuant to CEQA;

Proposal and Analysis Summary:

The Solano Irrigation District (SID) has submitted a request by resolution to annex approximately 16.53 acres total in two areas, 3.71 acres for Area 1 and 12.82 acres for Area 2. The purpose of annexation for Area 1, the Frank Property, is to provide the property owner with raw surface water for landscaping/exterior use only. Potable water is available from an existing private well on the property. For Area 2, the property owners are requesting annexation in order to obtain both non-potable and potable water from SID.

To briefly summarize the analysis.
1. The proposal complies with the Commission’s policies.
2. The proposal is consistent with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH).
3. The proposal is consistent with the District’s municipal service review (MSR) and sphere of influence (SOI).
4. There are no effects on prime agricultural land and open space.
5. There are no negative effects to other agencies.
6. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis was submitted with the proposal.
General Location:
Figure 1 shows the general vicinity map, included as a point of reference. The Frank Property, Area 1, is located west of Pleasants Valley Road, south of Cantelow Road, northwest of the City of Vacaville, Assessor Parcel Number (APN): 0102-240-020. The King, Keune, and Wood Properties, Area 2, are located east of Gibson Canyon Road, north of Vine Street, and adjacent to the City of Vacaville city limits, APNs: 0129-010-150, -170, and -180.

Background:
SID submitted an application on February 19, 2015. Staff solicited comments from affected and interested agencies on March 13, 2015. As required by the Master Tax Sharing Agreement, the Auditor’s office calculated the property tax exchange amounts and found the tax base exchange to be zero. All of the owners of the subject areas submitted written consent for the change of organization, therefore; the Commission may waive the protest hearing.

Analysis:
The analysis of the proposal requires an evaluation for consistency with the sphere of influence, compliance with the requirements of the Commission’s adopted Standards, compliance with CKH, compliance with CEQA requirements, and a determination of the need for a protest hearing, GC §56662. The following sections provide a detailed analysis on those requirements.
Consistency with the Sphere of Influence (SOI) GC §56425:

CKH and the Commission’s SOI policy require all changes of organizations to be consistent with an agency’s adopted SOI. The SOI must be current; that is it must have been updated within the last five years. In 2014, the Commission updated the District’s MSR and SOI. The SOI includes the areas within the proposal area. Therefore this requirement has been met.

Written Standards GC §56375(g):
The Commission has adopted eleven written Standards or policies in accordance GC §56375(g) for the evaluation of a proposal.

Standard 1 – Consistency with Sphere of Influence

Explanation: An area proposed for change of organization or reorganization shall be within the affected agency’s sphere of influence.

Analysis: When the Commission updated the District’s SOI and MSR in 2014, the proposed annexations were included within the District’s SOI. Therefore the proposal meets this Standard.

Standard 2 – Annexation to the Limits of the Sphere of Influence

Explanation: Annexation to the limits of the SOI boundary shall not be allowed if the proposal includes land designated for open space use by the affected city’s general plan for city change of organization or reorganization or County General Plan for district change of organizations or reorganization unless such open space logically relates to existing or future needs of the agency. Open space uses which may be located within agency limits include but are not limited to community and city-wide parks, recreation facilities, permanently protected open space lands, reservoirs, and storm water detention basins.

Analysis: This Standard is not applicable as it applies only to proposals with areas designated as open space. The proposed annexations are designated rural residential.

Standard 3 – Consistency with City General Plan, Specific Plan, Area-Wide Plan and Zoning Ordinance

Explanation: An application for a city change of organization or reorganization which involves the conversion of open space lands to urban use shall be denied by LAFCO if the proposed conversion is not consistent with appropriate city plans (general plans, specific plans, area-wide plans and associated zoning ordinance).

Analysis: This Standard is not applicable as it applies to city annexation proposals; no conversion of open space lands to urban use is proposed.
Standard No. 4 - Consistency With The County General Plan Of Proposed Change Of Organization Or Reorganization Or Reorganization Outside Of A City’s Sphere Of Influence Boundary

Explanation: An application for a change of organization or reorganization for lands outside an adopted city sphere of influence boundary in unincorporated territory, shall be denied by LAFCO if the land use proposed within the affected territory is not consistent with the Solano County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Analysis: This Standard is not applicable as it applies to city annexation proposals. The proposal consists of an annexation to a special district.

Standard No. 5 - Requirement For Pre-Approval

Explanation: Prior to approval by LAFCO of a district change of organization or reorganization, the affected agency shall pass a resolution supporting the proposal.

Analysis: The Solano Irrigation District’s Board of Directors passed Resolutions 14-50 and 14-64 supporting the proposal and requesting LAFCO initiate the annexations. Consequently, this Standard has been met.

Standard No. 6 - Effect On Natural Resources

Explanation: LAFCO shall certify that provisions of the Environmental Guidelines for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) have been complied with.

Analysis: Pursuant to CEQA, SID is the Lead Agency for the subject proposal. As the Responsible Agency, the Commission must consider the Lead Agency’s CEQA documents and certify it reviewed and considered the information contained in the documents (Section 15050). SID adopted a Notice of Exemption for Area 1, the Frank Property, which was filed and posted for public review with the County Clerk on November 14. A Negative Declaration was adopted for Area 2, the King, Keune, and Wood properties, on December 16, 2014. It was filed and posted for public review with the County Clerk on December 19, 2014. Those documents are attached for the Commission’s review and consideration. Consequently this Standard has been met.

Standard No. 7 - Relationship To Established Boundaries Streets And Roads, Lines Of Assessment, Remaining Unincorporated Territory, Proximity To Other Populated Areas, Assessed Valuation

Explanation: This Standard sets forth guidelines for establishing the boundaries of proposals. LAFCO shall, where possible, avoid irregularities and overlapping of established boundaries in proposals for change of organization or reorganization which would otherwise create problems for taxing districts, including the loss of tax revenues required for district operation.

Analysis: One of the main purposes of this Standard is to discourage the creation of unserved islands and irregular boundaries. Attached are the maps and legal boundary descriptions that have been prepared identifying the boundaries of the proposal areas. With respect to the Frank (APN 102-240-020), Wood (APN 129-010-180), and King (APN 0129-010-150) properties, entire parcels are being proposed for annexation. The majority area of the Keune property was annexed to the District in 1961 and the remaining 0.24 acres is being proposed for annexation. If approved, the change of organization would not result in the creation of islands or
irregular boundaries.

The subject areas are surrounded by rural residential areas. While the area to the south of the King, Keune, and Wood properties is within the City of Vacaville’s city limits, those areas are developed with large lots consisting of several acres.

As required by this Standard, Table 1 below shows the assessed valuations for all parcels within the two proposal areas.

Table 1: Assessed Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APNs</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Tax Area Code</th>
<th>Value - Full Cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0102-240-020</td>
<td>91124</td>
<td>$751,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King, Keune, Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0129-010-150</td>
<td>91011</td>
<td>$111,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0129-010-170</td>
<td>91020</td>
<td>$164,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0129-010-180</td>
<td>91011</td>
<td>$185,486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard No. 8 - Likelihood Of Significant Growth And Effect On Other Incorporated Or Unincorporated Territory

*Explanation:* Prior to approving an annexation, LAFCO shall make a determination that the proposed conversion of open space lands to urban use is justified by probable urban growth within a 10-year period of time. A determination on the likelihood of significant growth justifying the conversion shall be based on an analysis of local and regional demand for the proposed use.

*Analysis:* This Standard is not applicable as it applies to changes of organizations that propose conversion of open space lands to urban use. The proposed annexation areas consist of rural residential properties and there are no proposed changes of land use in the application.

Standard No. 9 - Protection Of Prime Agricultural Land

*Explanation:* Urban growth shall be guided away from prime agricultural land unless such action would not promote planned, orderly, and efficient development for the agency.

*Analysis:* This Standard is not applicable to this proposal as the subject properties do not meet the definition of prime agricultural land pursuant to CKH.

Standard No. 10 - Provision and Cost of Community Services

*Explanation:* Adequate urban services shall be available to areas proposed for a change of organization or reorganization.

*Analysis:* The proposal does not involve annexation to a city, however; potable water is considered an urban service. A number of local and state agencies assess fees for an annexation. Costs to the landowners that are
associated with this proposal include: SID, LAFCO, County, and State fees. SID and LAFCO fees have been paid while Solano County mapping and CA State Board of Equalization fees are included as conditions of approval.

For Area 1, there are no additional costs for the installation of a pipeline, as there is an existing one on the property. However, the District will have to install a new meter.

The Area 2 properties will need both potable and non-potable pipelines. The potable water pipeline requires the installation of approximately 650 feet of 4-inch PVC with three (3) 1-inch metered water services to the King, Keune, and Wood properties. The non-potable water pipeline requires the installation of approximately 650 feet of 8-inch PVC with three (3) 2-inch metered services to the affected properties. The meters are to be installed in clusters located in the northwest corner of the Wood property. Private potable and non-potable water lines will have to be installed by the landowners within a private easement along the westerly portion of the Wood property and extend to the other property owners. The total costs of all installations will be borne by the property owners.

**Standard No. 11 - The Effect Of The Proposed Action On Adjacent Areas, Mutual Social And Economic Interests, And On Local Government Structure**

*Explanation:* The application shall describe the effect which the annexation could have on adjacent areas and outside the agency. It shall also describe any social and economic benefits, or detriments, which will accrue to the agency and other affected agencies. The proposal should not be motivated by intercity rivalry, land speculation, or other motives not in the public interest, and should create no significant negative social or economic effects on the county or neighboring agencies.

*Analysis:* The Frank property on Pleasant Valley Road is not within a SOI of another agency. The landowners have an existing privately owned well that is able to provide potable water. The property owner only requests non-potable water for landscaping needs. No other agencies are affected and SID’s municipal service review found the District has the capability to provide water to the subject area.

If approved for annexation to SID, the King, Keune, and Wood properties will obtain raw surface water from the District’s non-potable water system and potable water from the Gibson Canyon Improvement District (GCID) water treatment plant. The rules and regulations of the improvement district state that if more than one third of the current property owners of the GCID deny the request from prospective customers for connection to the water treatment plant, the SID Board may not proceed with annexation. The District mailed a questionnaire to each landowner within GCID, totaling 183 questionnaires. Only 72 questionnaires were returned and of those 56 voted yes and 16 voted no. With less than 9% voting no, the SID Board was able to allow the annexation to the improvement district to proceed.

The King, Keune, and Wood properties are within the General Plan planning area of the City of Vacaville. While there are no current annexation requests from the City of Vacaville, it is anticipated that at some time in the future, it is the intent of the City to annex these areas into their jurisdiction. Should annexation to the City of Vacaville occur with an associated detachment from SID, the property owners may be subject to SID detachment fees.
Factors to be Considered in Review of a Proposal (GC §56668):

The Commission is required to consider sixteen (a-p) specific factors when reviewing proposals for a change of organization to assist the Commission in its decision making process.

(a) Population and population density; land area and land use; per capita assessed valuation; topography, natural boundaries, and drainage basins; proximity to other populated areas; the likelihood of significant growth in the area, and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas, during the next 10 years.

The Frank property is located within census tract 2529.03 with a population estimate of 4,368 persons in 2010. For the King, Keune, Wood properties, the population for census tract 2532.04 was 7,098 persons in 2010. However; if one were to use the census.gov estimate of 2.85 persons/household estimate, total population amongst the four parcels can be estimated at 11 persons.

The assessed valuation for the Frank Property is $751,000 and for the King, Keune, Wood properties, the total assessed valuation is $460,935. The total assessed value for all areas is $1,211,935 and the per capita assessed valuation can be estimated at approximately $110,176.

Topography for the Frank property is relatively flat and ranges from 380-390 feet above sea level. Topography for the King, Keune, Wood parcels are hilly and ranges from 260-465 feet above sea level. There does not appear to be natural boundaries or drainage basins. The areas are surrounded by rural residential areas, while the King, Keune, Wood properties are adjacent to the City of Vacaville. Properties in the surrounding areas are generally developed on large lots consisting of several acres.

Given that the King, Keune, Wood parcels are within the City’s General Plan planning area, it is likely the adjacent incorporated and unincorporated area will experience growth in the next ten years.

(b) The need for organized community services; the present cost and adequacy of governmental services and controls in the area; probable future needs for those services and controls; probable effect of the proposed incorporation, formation, annexation, or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the area and adjacent areas.

The Frank property landowners would like to conserve potable water and use untreated water for landscaping. The Frank property is not within the SOI of another agency and should the Commission deny the request the property owner will have to continue to use their existing well for potable and non-potable water.

The King, Keune, and Wood landowners are requesting potable and non-potable water from SID as the District’s systems are a more reliable source of water. As previously noted, the King, Keune, and Wood properties are within the SOI of the City of Vacaville. While the City has no current plans to annex the properties, it is anticipated that at some point in time, the City may request annexation of these properties. At that time, these properties will have to detach from SID and may be subject to SID detachment fees.

(c) The effect of the proposed action and of alternative actions, on adjacent areas, on mutual social and economic interests, and on the local governmental structure of the county.
The Frank annexation will have no effect on the local government structure of the County. There are no alternative service providers. Should the Commission deny the request, the property owners will have to continue to use their private well for potable and non-potable water.

The Wood property is currently zoned rural residential 2.5 acres and may be subdivided upon approval by the County. If that happens, those newly subdivided parcels will have to connect to the Gibson Canyon Improvement District for potable water. The King and Kuene properties are currently developed to the maximum density allowed by the County zoning ordinance.

Should the Commission deny the request for annexation of Area 2 to the Solano Irrigation District, there are other alternative courses of action available to the property owners. The property owners may request annexation to the City of Vacaville, but this may take some time as the City is currently going through their General Plan Update. Alternatively, the Commission may authorize SID or the City of Vacaville to extend services (without annexing to either agency) to these parcels. Government Code Section 56133(b) allows the Commission to authorize a city or special district to provide new or extended services outside its jurisdictional boundaries but within its SOI in anticipation of a later change of organization. This may be advantageous to the property owners as it allows them to receive services, but should their properties be annexed to the City of Vacaville, at a later time, they will not have to detach from the District. Staff has not received a statement from SID, the City of Vacaville, or the property owners on whether these alternative courses of action are acceptable.

(d) The conformity of both the proposal and its anticipated effects with both the adopted commission policies on providing planned, orderly, efficient patterns of urban development, and the policies and priorities set forth in Section 56377.

With respect to, Area 1, the Frank property there are no effects on providing efficient patterns of urban development as it is not located within the SOI or General Plan planning area of the City of Vacaville.

The King, Keune, and Wood, Area 2, properties are in the planning area of the City of Vacaville. It is anticipated that at a later time, the City may request annexation of these areas. Should the Commission, approve annexation to SID and subsequently approve annexation of Area 2 to the City of Vacaville, the Commission will have to concurrently detach these lands from SID.

(e) The effect of the proposal on maintaining the physical and economic integrity of agricultural lands, as defined by Section 56016.

This factor is not applicable as the proposal areas are not considered agricultural lands.

(f) The definiteness and certainty of the boundaries of the territory, the nonconformance of proposed boundaries with lines of assessment or ownership, the creation of islands or corridors of unincorporated territory, and other similar matters affecting the proposed boundaries.

Annexations of entire parcels are proposed for the Frank, Wood, and King properties. The proposal also includes annexing the remaining .24 acres of the Keune property thus eliminating an irregular boundary. If approved, the change of organizations would not result in islands or irregular boundaries.
(g) A regional transportation plan adopted pursuant to Section 65080.
The proposal has no impact to the regional transportation plan.

(h) The proposal’s consistency with city or county general and specific plans.
The proposal, to provide non potable water to the Frank property, does not affect the City or County’s General Plans as there is no anticipated change in land use.

The King, Keune, and Wood properties are in the unincorporated portion of Solano County. Land use is consistent with the County’s designation of rural residential 2.5 acres. The annexation to SID will have no effect on land use.

(i) The sphere of influence of any local agency which may be applicable to the proposal being reviewed.
All properties are in SID’s sphere of influence. The Frank property is not located in another agency’s Sphere of Influence. The King, Keune, Wood properties are located within the City of Vacaville’s General Planning Area and the City’s planned SOI. While there is not yet a proposal for City annexation, it is assumed that since these properties are included within the City’s planning areas, at some point, the City may request annexation from LAFCO. At present the City has no interest in annexation.

(j) The comments of any affected local agency or other public agency.
Referrals we sent to affected agencies. The proposal was noticed in accordance with CKH Act and the Brown Act. As of the writing of this report, staff has not received any comments.

(k) The ability of the newly formed or receiving entity to provide the services which are the subject of the application to the area, including the sufficiency of revenues for those services following the proposed boundary change.
The MSR and SOI for SID were completed in 2014. The MSR took into consideration those areas in the District’s proposed SOI, and indicated SID has sufficient revenues and capacity to serve their existing boundaries as well as those in their SOI.

(l) Timely availability of water supplies adequate for projected needs as specified in Section 65352.5.
Upon annexation to the District’s boundary, the Frank property will be able to receive non-potable water. As previously noted, upon annexation two pipelines and water meters will have to be installed for the King, Keune, and Wood properties before they can receive services.

(m) The extent to which the proposal will affect a city or cities and the county in achieving their respective fair shares of the regional housing needs as determined by the appropriate council of governments consistent with Article 10.6 (commencing with Section 65580) of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7.
This factor is not applicable as the proposal is only to obtain potable and non-potable water and not for new development.
(n) Any information or comments from the landowner or owners, voters, or residents of the affected territory.

Staff has noticed the proposal per the requirements of CKH and the Brown Act, and have not received comments as of the writing of this report.

(o) Any information relating to existing land use designations.

As previously noted, the Wood property which totals 11.08 acres is currently zoned rural residential 2.5 acres and may be subdivided upon approval by the County. Staff is not aware of any existing plans to subdivide the property to the maximum density allowed under the County’s General Plan.

(p) The extent to which the proposal will promote environmental justice. As used in this subdivision, "environmental justice" means the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the location of public facilities and the provision of public services.

At this time, there is no documentation or evidence suggesting the proposal will have a measurable effect for or against promoting environmental justice.

GC §56662 Protest Hearing Proceeding:

The subject property is considered uninhabited and all of the property owners have submitted a letter to LAFCO in support of the change of organization. Should the Commission approve the proposal, staff recommends the Commission waive the protest hearing proceedings pursuant to GC §56662.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

Staff recommends the Commission approve the proposed change of organization with the following conditions:

1. The proposed change of organization is assigned the following short term designation “2015-02 Frank, King, Keune, and Wood properties annexation to the Solano Irrigation District”
2. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Completion, the applicant shall forward a check for the California State Board of Equalization in the amount of $1,150 (Frank - $350, King, Keune, Wood - $800).
3. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Completion, the applicant shall forward a check for the Solano County Assessor-Recorder Mapping Division in the amount of $460.
4. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Completion, the applicant shall forward a check to Solano LAFCO for any charges in excess of the deposit.
5. Upon the effective date of the change of organization the subject proposal area will be annexed to the Solano Irrigation District to reflect the change of organization.
6. The effective date of the change of organization is the date the signed Certificate of Completion is recorded with the County Recorder’s Office (G.C. 57202).
RESOLUTION NO. 15-xx

RESOLUTION OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION OF SOLANO COUNTY APPROVING THE CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION FOR LANDS KNOWN AS FRANK, KING, KEUNE, AND WOOD PROPERTIES (PROPOSED – SOLANO IRRIGATION DISTRICT BY RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, a resolution to initiate LAFCO proceedings was duly executed requesting a change of organization of certain lands known as Frank, King, Keune, and Wood properties has been duly received and filed with the Local Agency Formation Commission of Solano County, California; and

WHEREAS, the proposed change of organization is consistent with the sphere of influence of the Solano Irrigation District; and,

WHEREAS, this matter was noticed in the Daily Republic 21 days in advance of the public hearing scheduled for August 10, 2015 at 1:30 p.m.; and,

WHEREAS, this Commission received the Executive Officer’s report which analyzed the proposal according to Solano LAFCO standards and policies for evaluation of proposals and requirements of Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg; and

WHEREAS, this Commission has considered and made findings with respect to the reorganization’s compliance with Solano LAFCO’s "Standards for Evaluation of Annexation Proposals"; and,

WHEREAS, this Commission has considered each of the Factors to be Considered (GC§56668); and,

WHEREAS, it has been determined by this Commission that the proposed boundaries are definite; and certain; and,

WHEREAS, a full and impartial public hearing was held on August 10, 2015, at which time the Commission received and considered public testimony on the proposed change of organization; and,

WHEREAS, a master tax sharing agreement exists for Solano County and zero property tax base exchange will occur as a result of this change of organization; and,

WHEREAS, the subject property is considered uninhabited; and,

WHEREAS, all land owners have signed a petition to annex the Solano Irrigation District; and

WHEREAS, the Solano Local Agency Formation Commission is acting as the responsible agency as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); and

WHEREAS, as the responsible agency, the Solano LAFCO finds the Frank property area of the project is
exempt under CEQA Section 15061(b)(3) – General Rule Exemption and adopts the Notice of Exemption (NOE) prepared for the annexation;

WHEREAS, as the responsible agency, the Solano LAFCO adopts the Negative Declaration prepared by the Lead Agency for the King, Keune, and Wood properties;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDERED by the Local Agency Formation Commission of Solano County that the change of organization of land known as Frank, King, Kuene, and Wood properties described in the attached maps and legal boundary descriptions and made part hereof, is approved with the following conditions:

1. The proposed change of organization is assigned the following short term designation “2015-02 Frank, King, Keune, and Wood properties annexation to the Solano Irrigation District”
2. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Completion, the applicant shall forward a check for the California State Board of Equalization in the amount of $1,150 (Frank - $350, King, Keune, Wood - $800).
3. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Completion, the applicant shall forward a check for the Solano County Assessor-Recorder Mapping Division in the amount of $460.
4. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Completion, the applicant shall forward a check to Solano LAFCO for any charges in excess of the deposit.
5. The Commission waives the protest proceedings.
6. Upon the effective date of the change of organization the subject proposal area will be annexed to the Solano Irrigation District.
7. The effective date of the change of organization is the date the signed Certificate of Completion is recorded with the County Recorder’s Office (G.C. 57202).

UPON MOTION of Commissioner ______ seconded by Commissioner ______, the foregoing resolution is adopted this 10th day of August 2015 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

______________________________
John Saunderson, Chair
Local Agency Formation Commission
County of Solano, State of California

ATTEST:

______________________________
Elliot Mulberg, Executive Officer
AREA 1:
Frank property, APN 0102-240-020
Annexation No. 2014-206
Annexation to the Solano Irrigation District

All that certain real property situated in the County of Solano, State of California, located in Section 35, Township 7 North, Range 2 West, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, said property having been detached from the Solano Irrigation District by the Frank/Krebs Property Detachment No. 2010-293, LAFCO Resolution No. 10-03, dated December 3, 2010, SID Resolution No. 10-62, dated December 21, 2010, Certificate of Completion dated April 21, 2011, filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on April 21, 2011, as Document No. 201100035394, (hereinafter referred to as Detachment No. 2010-293), said property shown on that certain Record of Survey entitled “Record of Survey, Lands of Krebs & Juelson, Portion of Projected Section 35, T.7N., R.2W., M.D.M., Certificate of Compliance CC-95-01, Book 1995 O.R., Page 22622”, dated March 1995, filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on August 28, 1995, in Book 21 of Surveys, at Page 69, (hereinafter referred to as 21 RS 69), and described in the Grant Deed from Lorne Bruchet and Nikki Bruchet, husband and wife as joint tenants to Robert D. Frank and Lori A. Frank, husband and wife as joint tenants, dated December 27, 2004, and filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on January 6, 2005, as Document No. 200500002750, (hereinafter referred to as Frank property), more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the intersection of the Southeast corner of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, said corner lying on the Westerly right-of-way line of Pleasants Valley Road, (County Road No. 67), said corner also being the Northeast corner of Parcel 1 as shown on that certain Record of Survey entitled “Lands of Stan Boddy Et. Ux., Book 1977, Official Records, Page 16059”, dated September 1993, filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on March 1, 1991, in Book 20 of Surveys, at Page 37, (hereinafter referred to as 20 RS 37), said point lying North 17° 44’ 30” West, a distance of 13,615.4117 feet from Monument A02I (having a California State Plane Coordinate System Values: North 1900252.020, East 6553606.533), as shown on that certain Record of Survey entitled “City of Vacaville Record of Survey G.P.S. Control Network”, filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on January 15, 1997, in Book 22 of Record of Survey, at Page 10, said point having a California State Plane Coordinate System Values: North 1913219.8937, East 6549457.5949; thence from said Point of Beginning, leaving the Westerly right-of-way line of said Pleasants Valley Road, and along the Southerly line of said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, and the Northerly line of said 20 RS 37, (L01) North 86° 54’ 18” West, a distance of 243.73 feet to the Northwest corner of said Parcel 1 per said 20 RS 37; thence continuing along the Southeasterly line of said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, and the Westerly line of said 20 RS 37, (L02) South 12º 18’ 38” East, a distance of 107.31 feet to the Southwest corner of said Parcel 1 per said 20 RS 37; thence continuing along the Southeasterly line of said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, and the Southerly line of said 20 RS 37, (L03) South 86º 54’ 18” East per said 21 RS 69 and said 20 RS 37, (said bearing also shown as South 86º 64’ 18” East per said Frank property), a distance of 40.16 feet to a point on the Northwest corner of Parcel 2 per said 20 RS 37; thence leaving the Southerly line of said Parcel 1 per said 20 RS 37, and along the Westerly line of said Parcel 2 per said 20 RS 37, and continuing along the Southeasterly line of said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, (L04) South 03º 05’ 42” West, a distance of 33.48 feet; thence (L05) North 86º 54’ 18” West, a distance of 41.92 feet to a point on the centerline of Pond
Creek; thence leaving the Westerly line of said Parcel 2 per said 20 RS 37, and continuing along the Southerly line of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, and along the centerline of said Pond Creek, \(L_06\) North 06º 08’ 27” East, a distance of 16.26 feet; thence leaving the centerline of said Pond Creek, and continuing along the Southerly line of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, \(L_07\) North 89º 11’ 49” West, a distance of 223.77 feet to the Southwest corner of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property; thence along the Westerly line of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, \(L_08\) North 05º 30’ 39” West, a distance of 405.60 feet to a point that lies South 05º 30’ 39” East, a distance of 10.98 feet from the Northwest corner of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property; thence leaving the westerly line of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, \(L_09\) South 87º 30’ 39” East, a distance of 55.08 feet; thence \(L_{10}\) North 60º 52’ 03” East, a distance of 52.57 feet; thence \(L_{11}\) South 87º 30’ 39” East, a distance of 23.46 feet; thence \(L_{12}\) South 29º 07’ 57” East, a distance of 19.60 feet to a point on the Northerly line of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, said point also being the Southerly line of the Lands of Krebs per said 21 RS 69; thence along the Northerly line of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, the following three courses:

\(L_{13}\) South 87º 30’ 39” East, a distance of 76.63 feet; thence \(L_{14}\) South 79º 26’ 39” East, a distance of 81.15 feet per said 21 RS 69, (said distance also shown as 81.16 feet per said Frank property); thence \(L_{15}\) North 85º 28’ 49” East, a distance of 177.09 feet to a point on the Westerly right-of-way line of said Pleasants Valley Road, said point being the Northeasterly corner of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, said point also being the Southeasterly corner of said Lands of Krebs per said 21 RS 69; thence leaving the Southeasterly corner of said Lands of Krebs per said 21 RS 69, and along the Westerly right-of-way line of said Pleasants Valley Road, and the Easterly line of said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69 and said Frank property, the following two courses:

\(L_{16}\) South 04º 21’ 19” East, a distance of 249.59 feet per said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69, (said distance also shown as 249.69 feet per said Frank property); thence \(L_{17}\) South 00º 05’ 42” West, a distance of 49.96 feet per said Lands of Juelson per said 21 RS 69, (said distance also shown as 40.96 feet per said Frank property) to the POINT OF BEGINNING and the TERMINATION of this description.

Containing: 3.708 Acres
APN: APN 0102-240-020, Frank property

Legal Description prepared by:

Frank Weber, Real Property Administrator
Solano Irrigation District
Dated: January 7, 2015
Revision 1: April 15, 2015
Revision 2: April 27, 2015

This description of the Solano Irrigation District’s boundary is NOT a legal property description as defined in the Subdivision Map Act and may NOT be used as a basis for an offer for sale of the land described. It is for assessment purposes only.
AREA 2:  
King, Keune and Wood properties
Annexation No. 2014-207
Annexation to the Solano Irrigation District

All that certain real property situated in the County of Solano, State of California, located in a Portion of Lot 37, Rancho Los Putos, and in the South half of Section 8, Township 6 North, Range 1 West, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, said property being a portion of Parcels 1 and 2, and the Unsurveyed Remainder, as shown on that certain Parcel Map entitled “Parcel Map of the Land of Wood”, filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on September 26, 1997, in Book 40 of Parcel Maps, at Page 68-70 (hereinafter referred to as 40 PM 68), said Parcel 1 also described in the Grant Deed from Mardell A. Powell, Successor Trustee of the Howard J. Wood and Mable Z. Wood Family Revocable Living Trust, under Trust Agreement dated September 24, 1991 to Richard D. Keune and Gale M. Keune, Husband and Wife, as Joint Tenants, dated November 11, 1997, and filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on November 20, 1997, as Document No. 1997-00079138 (hereinafter referred to as Keune property), said Parcel 2 also described in the Grant Deed from Charles David King and Sharon Rose King, as Joint Tenants to Charles David King and Sharon Rose King, as co Trustees of the Charles David King and Sharon Rose King 2001 Family Trust, dated December 14, 2001, and filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on January 13, 2002, as Document No. 2002-00005527 (hereinafter referred to as King property), said Unsurveyed Remainder described in the Grant Deed from Mardell A. Powell, Successor Trustee of the Howard J. Wood and Mable Z. Wood Family Revocable Living Trust, under Trust Agreement dated September 24, 1991 to Howard F. Wood and Laura O. Wood, husband and wife as Community Property with Right to Survivorship, dated May 21, 2002, and filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on May 28, 2002, as Document No. 2002-00066583 (hereinafter referred to as Wood property), more particularly described as follows:

AREA 1:

BEGINNING at a point of intersection of the Southwest corner of Lot 57 as shown on that certain Subdivision Map entitled “North Vine Street Estates”, filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on June 13, 1991, in Book 60 of Subdivision Maps, at Page 87-91 (hereinafter referred to as 60 SD 87) and the Northerly right-of-way line of Vine Street (County Road No. 426), said Point of Beginning also lying on the East line of said King property; thence from said Point of Beginning, along a prolongation of the East line of said King property, (L01) South 00° 37’ 00” West, a distance of 10.00 feet to the Southeast corner of said King property, said point also lying on the Northerly right-of-way line of said Vine Street; thence continuing along a prolongation of the East line of said King property, (L02) South 00° 37’ 00” West, a distance of 20.00 feet, more or less to the centerline of said Vine Street, said centerline shown on that certain Parcel Map, filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on December 21, 1984, in
Book 27 of Parcel Maps, at Page 50-51, and also shown on that certain Record of Survey, filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on January 6, 2006, in Book 27 of Surveys, at Page 14; thence along said centerline, \( L03 \) North 89° 22' 15" West, a distance of 296.51 feet to the intersection of said centerline and the prolongation of the West line of said King property and the East line of the Lot Line Adjustment also shown on said 40 PM 68, said point lying on the boundary line of the Solano Irrigation District being established and approved by the State Board of Equalization in 1975 by Change #237 (hereinafter referred to as SID boundary), said point of intersection also being the Southeast corner of the Mabel Z. Wood, 5.70 acre property annexed to Solano Irrigation District, by Inclusion No. 33, approved by the Solano Irrigation District’s Board of Directors on October 16, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as Annexation No. 33), thence leaving said centerline, and along the prolongation of the West line of said King property and the East line of said Lot Line Adjustment, along said Annexation No. 33 and said SID boundary, \( L04 \) North 20° 43’ 54” West, a distance of 21.48 feet to the Southwest corner of said King property and the Southeast corner of said Lot Line Adjustment, said point also lying on the Northerly right-of-way line of said Vine Street; thence leaving said Northerly right-of-way line, and along the West line of said King property, the East line of said Lot Line Adjustment, said Annexation No. 33 and said SID boundary, \( L05 \) North 20° 43’ 54” West per said King property, (said bearing also shown as North 20° 00’ 00” West per said Annexation No. 33), a distance of 281.93 feet to a point (hereinafter referred to as Point “A”), said Point “A” having a California State Plane Coordinate System Values: North 1899518.882, East 6563352.380, and lying South 85° 41’ 53” East, a distance of 9,773.5431 feet from Monument A02i, as shown on that certain Record of Survey entitled “City of Vacaville Record of Survey G.P.S. Control Network”, filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on January 15, 1997, in Book 22 of Record of Survey, at Page 10, said Monument A02i having a California State Plane Coordinate System Values: North 1900252.020, East 6553606.533 (NAD83), said Point “A” being the intersection of the Northwest corner of said King property, the East line of said Wood property, the Southwest corner of Lot 55 per said 60 SD 87, and lying on said SID boundary; thence leaving the East line of said Wood property and said SID boundary, along the North line of said King property and the South line of said Lot 55, \( L06 \) South 86° 29’ 25” East, a distance of 407.47 feet to the Northeast corner of said King property, said point being the Southeast corner of said Lot 55 and on the Westerly line of Lot 56 per said 60 SD 87; thence along the East line of said King property and the Westerly lines of said Lot 56 and Lot 57 per said 60 SD 87, \( L07 \) South 00° 37’ 00” West, a distance of 232.09 feet, more or less to the Southwest corner of said Lot 57 and to the POINT OF BEGINNING and the TERMINATION of this description for Area 1 of Area 2 Annexation.

**Area 1:**

Containing: 2.05 acres, more or less of APN 0129-010-150  
0.14 acres, more or less of Vine Street  

Totaling: 2.19 acres, more or less
AREA 2:

COMMENCING at said Point “A”, thence from said point, along the East line of said Wood property, the Westerly line of said Lot 55, and along said SID boundary, (L08) North 20° 43’ 54” West per said Wood property, a distance of 65.95 feet (calculated), (said bearing and distance shown as North 20° 00’ 00” West, a distance of 24.60 feet per said Annexation No. 33), to the POINT OF BEGINNING, said Point of Beginning being the Northeast corner of said Annexation No. 33 and lying on the East line of said Wood property and the Westerly line of said Lot 55; thence leaving the East line of said Wood property, the Westerly line of said Lot 55, and along the North line of said Annexation No. 33 and said SID boundary the following three courses:

(L09) South 84° 04’ 12” West, a distance of 179.54 feet to a point that lies on the East line of said Keune property; thence continuing along the North line of said Annexation No. 33 and said SID boundary, (L10) South 84° 04’ 12” West, a distance of 392.74 feet to a point that lies on the West line of said Keune property, said point also being the Northeast corner of that certain property described in the Grant Deed from Everett W. Roush and Shizu I. Roush, Husband and Wife, as Joint Tenants, dated July 9, 2014, and filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on July 17, 2014, as Document No. 201400053138 (hereinafter referred to as Bruno property); thence continuing along the North line of said Annexation No. 33, the North line of said Bruno property and said SID boundary, (L11) South 84° 04’ 12” West, a distance of 283.50 feet per said 40 PM 68 to the Northwest corner of said Bruno property, said point also being the Southwest corner of said Wood property and lying on the Easterly right-of-way line of Gibson Canyon Road (County Road No. 93); thence leaving the North line of said Annexation No. 33 and said Bruno property, along the Westerly line of said Wood property, said Easterly right-of-way line, and said SID boundary, the following two courses:

(L12) North 25° 35’ 00” West, a distance of 336.80 feet per said 40 PM 68; thence (L13) North 30° 00’ 00” West, a distance of 102.96 feet per said 40 PM 68 to the Northwest corner of said Wood property, said Northwest corner lying South 67° 01’ 55” West, a distance of 5.05 feet from the Southwest corner of Parcel 2 as shown on that certain Parcel Map entitled “Parcel Map Parcel 4 Book 11 Parcel Maps Page 60”, filed for record in the Office of the Solano County Recorder on June 27, 1977, in Book 13 of Parcel Maps, at Page 15, as Instrument No. 27138 (hereinafter referred to as 13 PM 15); thence leaving the Westerly line of said Wood property, said Easterly right-of-way line, and along the North line of said Wood property and said SID boundary, (L14) North 67° 01’ 55” East per said 13 PM 15, (said bearing also shown as North 67° 40’ 00” East per said Wood property), a distance of 5.05 feet to a the Southwest corner of said last mentioned Parcel 2; thence continuing along the North line of said Wood property, the South line of said last mentioned Parcel 2, and said SID boundary, (L15) North 67° 01’ 55” East, 888.67 feet per said 13 PM 15, (said bearing and distance shown as North 67° 40’ 00” East, a distance of 892.55 feet per said Wood property) to the Northeast corner of said Wood property, said point also being the Southeast corner of said last mentioned Parcel 2, and
on the West line of said 60 SD 87; thence leaving the South line of said last mentioned Parcel 2 and said SID boundary, and along the East line of said Wood property and the West line of said 60 SD 87, (L16) South 20° 21’ 19” East, a distance of 260.21 feet per 60 SD 87; thence continuing along said 60 SD 87, (L17) South 20° 43’ 54” East, a distance of 463.58 feet per said 60 SD 87, more or less to the POINT OF BEGINNING and the TERMINATION of this description for Area 2 of Area 2 Annexation..

Area 2:
Containing: 0.24 acres, more or less of APN 0129-010-170
10.66 acres, more or less of APN 0129-010-180
Totaling: 10.90 acres, more or less

Totals:
Area 1: 2.19 acres, more or less
Area 2: 10.90 acres, more or less
Totaling: 13.09 acres, more or less.

Legal Description prepared by:

[Signature]
Frank Weber, Real Property Administrator
Solano Irrigation District
Dated: February 17, 2015
Revision 1: April 15, 2015
Revision 2: April 27, 2015

This description of the Solano Irrigation District’s boundary is NOT a legal property description as defined in the Subdivision Map Act and may NOT be used as a basis for an offer for sale of the land described. It is for assessment purposes only.
Notice of Exemption

To: Office of Planning and Research  From: Solano Irrigation District
P.O. Box 3044, Room 212  810 Vaca Valley Parkway
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044  Suite 201
County Clerk  Vacaville, CA 95687
County of Solano
675 Texas Street
Fairfield, CA 94533

Project Title: Frank property annexation to Solano Irrigation District,

Project Location: The subject property, APN 0102-240-020, 3.71± acres is located
west of Pleasants Valley Road, south of Cantelow Road, north of
Mix Canyon Road, in the upper Pleasants Valley area, northwest
of Vacaville.

Project Location - City: Vacaville  Project Location - County: Solano

Description of Nature, Purpose and Beneficiaries of Project:
The project consists of annexing approximately 3.71± acres to the Solano
Irrigation District. The purpose for annexation is to receive raw surface water for
exterior use only. The existing private potable well is capable of providing the
necessary water for domestic purposes. Rural residential and agricultural lands
surround the subject property.

Name of Public Agency Approving Project: Solano Irrigation District

Exempt Status: (check one)
☐ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268);
☐ Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a));
☐ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c));
☐ Categorical Exemption. State type and section number: _____________________________
☐ Statutory Exemption. State code number. 15061(b)(3)

This document posted from 11-12-14 to ___________________________

Deputy Clerk of the Board
Reasons why project is exempt:
The subject project changes only the boundary of the Solano Irrigation District with this annexation.

Lead Agency:
Contact Person: Frank Weber, Temporary Real Property Administrator
Telephone: (707) 455-4032

If filed by applicant:
1. Attach certified document of exemption finding.
2. Has a Notice of Exemption been filed by the public agency approving the project?
   ☒ Yes  ☐ No

Signature: ___________________________ Date: November 6, 2014
Frank Weber
Temporary Real Property Administrator

☒ Signed by Lead Agency
☐ Signed by Applicant  Date received for filing at OPR: ____________
SOLANO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. 14-63

APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT FOR THE
ANNEXATION OF PORTIONS OF THE KING, KEUNE and WOOD PROPERTIES
and WATER LINE EXTENSIONS TO PROVIDE POTABLE and NON-POTABLE WATER SERVICE
TO THE KING, KEUNE, BRUNO and WOOD PROPERTIES

At a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of Solano Irrigation District held at the District Office on the 16th day of December, 2014, the following resolution was approved and adopted:

WHEREAS, the Solano Irrigation District Environmental Review Committee at its meeting of November 13, 2014, did authorize the giving of notice and the posting of Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration for the project entitled: Annexation of portions of the King, Keune and Wood properties and Water Line Extensions to provide Potable and Non-Potable water service to the King, Keune, Bruno and Wood properties, APN’s 0129-010-050, 0129-010-150, 0129-010-170 and 0129-010-180, 17.82 Acres, Vacaville; and,

WHEREAS, that Notice was filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Solano on November 13, 2014, and posted; and,

WHEREAS, the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration was published in the Vacaville Reporter newspaper on November 16, 2014; and,

WHEREAS, the public review period of at least twenty-one (21) days, which is the time for response or comment, has elapsed; and,

WHEREAS, no written or oral comments were received by the District during the public review period; and,

WHEREAS, no oral comments were received by the Board of Directors at its meeting on December 16, 2014; and,

WHEREAS, within five days of the adoption of said Negative Declaration, a Notice of Determination will be filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Solano.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Solano Irrigation District does hereby adopt the Initial Study of the Annexation of portions of the King, Keune and Wood properties and Water Line Extensions to provide Potable and Non-Potable water service to the King, Keune, Bruno and Wood properties, APN’s 0129-010-050, 0129-010-150, 0129-010-170 and 0129-010-180, 17.82 Acres, Vacaville.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Solano Irrigation District does hereby find, determine and resolve that the execution and implementation of the Annexations of portions of the King, Keune and Wood properties and Water Line Extensions to provide Potable and Non-Potable water service to the King, Keune, Bruno and Wood properties, APN’s 0129-010-050, 0129-010-150, 0129-010-170 and 0129-010-180, 17.82 Acres, Vacaville, will have no
significant impact upon the environment and that no mitigation measures are necessary to avoid significant impact upon the environment.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Solano Irrigation District does hereby adopt the Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact for the Annexation of portions of the King, Keune and Wood properties and Water Line Extensions to provide Potable and Non-Potable water service to the King, Keune, Bruno and Wood properties, APN's 0129-010-050, 0129-010-150, 0129-010-170 and 0129-010-180, 17.82 Acres, Vacaville.

PASSED AND ADOPTED the 16th day of December, 2014, by the Board of Directors of the Solano Irrigation District, County of Solano, State of California, by the following vote:

AYES:  BISHOP, COLLA, GRANT, GERMAN, KLUGE

NOES:  NONE

ABSTAIN:  NONE

ABSENT:  NONE

DATED:  December 16, 2014

Glen A. Grant, President of the Board of Directors
Solano Irrigation District

ATTEST:  I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly made, seconded and adopted by the Board of Directors of Solano Irrigation District at a regular meeting of this Board held December 16, 2014:

Cary Keaten, General Manager
Solano Irrigation District
Notice of Determination

To: County Clerk
   County of Solano
   Fairfield, California 94533

Subject: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code

Project Title: Annexation of portions of the King, Keune and Wood properties and Water Line Extensions to provide Potable and Non-Potable Water Service to the King, Keune, Bruno, and Wood properties

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to State Clearinghouse): Not Applicable.

Contact Person: Justin Hopkins, P.E., Associate Civil Engineer
                 Solano Irrigation District
                 810 Vaca Valley Parkway
                 Suite 201
                 Vacaville, California 95688
                 (707) 455-4007
                 jhopkins@sidwater.org

Project Location: The project site is located in the southeast ¼ of Section 8, Township 6 North, Range 1 East, Mount Diablo Base & Meridian. The properties involved are APN 0129-010-150 (King), APN 0129-010-170 (Keune), APN 0129-010-050 (Bruno) and APN 0129-010-180 (Wood). The project is located west of Gibson Canyon Road, north of Vine Street, north of the City of Vacaville approximately 1.5 miles.

Project Description: The project involves the annexation of approximately 2.00 acres of APN 0129-010-150 (King), approximately 0.25 acres of APN 0129-010-170 (Keune), and approximately 10.57 acres of APN 0129-010-180 (Wood), totaling 12.82± acres. The project also involves the installation of two (2) pipelines (potable and non-potable). The potable water pipeline requires the installation of approximately 650 feet of 4-inch PVC with four (4) 1-inch metered water services to the King, Keune, Bruno and Wood properties. The non-potable water pipeline requires the
installation of approximately 650 feet of 8-inch PVC with three (3) 2-inch metered water services to the King, Keune and Wood properties.

This is to advise that the SOLANO IRRIGATION DISTRICT approved the above described project on December 16, 2014, after complying with CEQA, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

1. The project □ WILL, ☑ WILL NOT, have a significant effect on the environment.

2. ☐ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
  ☑ A NEGATIVE DECLARATION was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. The Negative Declaration and record of project approval may be examined at the District offices at:

  Justin Hopkins, P.E., Associate Civil Engineer
  Solano Irrigation District
  810 Vaca Valley Parkway
  Suite 201
  Vacaville, California 95688
  (707) 455-4007
  jhopkins@sidwater.org

3. Mitigation Measures □ were, ☑ WERE NOT, made a condition of the approval of the project.

4. A statement of Overriding Considerations □ was, ☑ WAS NOT, adopted for this project.

Date: December 16, 2014

Cary Keaten, General Manager
Solano Irrigation District

Document posted from 12-19-14 to ________

Deputy Clerk of the Board
Negative Declaration
Regarding Environmental Impact

1. Notice is Hereby Given that the project described below has been reviewed pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Public Resources Code 21100, et seq.) and a determination has been made that it will not have a significant effect upon the environment.

2. Project Name:  
Annexation of portions of the King, Keune and Wood properties and Water Line Extensions to provide Potable and Non-Potable Water Service to the King, Keune, Bruno, and Wood properties

3. Description of Project:  
The project involves the annexation of approximately 2.00 acres of APN 0129-010-150 (King), approximately 0.25 acres of APN 0129-010-170 (Keune), and approximately 10.57 acres of APN 0129-010-180 (Wood), totaling 12.82 acres. The project also involves the installation of two (2) pipelines (potable and non-potable). The potable water pipeline requires the installation of approximately 650 feet of 4-inch PVC with four (4) 1-inch metered water services to the King, Keune, Bruno and Wood properties. The non-potable water pipeline requires the installation of approximately 650 feet of 8-inch PVC with three (3) 2-inch metered water services to the King, Keune and Wood properties.

4. Location of Project:  
The project site is located in the southeast ¼ of Section 8, Township 6 North, Range 1 East, Mount Diablo Base & Meridian. The properties involved are APN 0129-010-150 (King), APN 0129-010-170 (Keune), APN 0129-010-050 (Bruno) and APN 0129-010-180 (Wood). The project is located west of Gibson Canyon Road, north of Vine Street, north of the City of Vacaville approximately 1.5 miles.
5. **Name and Address of Project Proponents:**
   Solano Irrigation District
   810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Suite 201
   Vacaville, CA 95688

6. **Mitigation Measures:** None Required

7. A copy of the Initial Study regarding the environmental effect of this project is on file at:
   Justin Hopkins, P.E., Associate Civil Engineer
   Solano Irrigation District
   Engineering Department
   810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Suite 201
   Vacaville, California 95688
   (707) 455-4007
   jhopkins@sidwater.org

**This study was:**
☑ Adopted as presented.
☐ Adopted with changes. Specific modifications and supporting reasons are attached.

8. A public hearing on this Negative Declaration was held by the District Board of Directors of the Solano Irrigation District on December 16, 2014.

9. **Determination:**
   On the basis of the Initial Study of Environmental Impact, the information presented at hearings, comments received on the proposal and our own knowledge and independent research:

☐ We find the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** is hereby adopted.

☐ We find that the project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment but will not in this case, because of attached mitigation measures described in Item 6 above which are by this reference made conditions of project approval. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** is hereby adopted.

Dated: December 16, 2014

Cary Keaten, General Manager
Solano Irrigation District
Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative Declaration

Project Title: Annexation of portions of the King, Keune and Wood properties and Water Line Extensions to provide Potable and Non-Potable Water Service to the King, Keune, Bruno, and Wood properties

Project Location: The project site is located in the southeast ¼ of Section 8, Township 6 North, Range 1 East, Mount Diablo Base & Meridian. The properties involved are APN 0129-010-150 (King), APN 0129-010-170 (Keune), APN 0129-010-050 (Bruno) and APN 0129-010-180 (Wood). The project is located west of Gibson Canyon Road, north of Vine Street, north of the City of Vacaville approximately 1.5 miles.

Project Description: The project involves the annexation of approximately 2.00 acres of APN 0129-010-150 (King), approximately 0.25 acres of APN 0129-010-170 (Keune), and approximately 10.57 acres of APN 0129-010-180 (Wood), totaling 12.82± acres. The project also involves the installation of two (2) pipelines (potable and non-potable). The potable water pipeline requires the installation of approximately 650 feet of 4-inch PVC with four (4) 1-inch metered water services to the King, Keune, Bruno and Wood properties. The non-potable water pipeline requires the installation of approximately 650 feet of 8-inch PVC with three (3) 2-inch metered water services to the King, Keune and Wood properties.

The site ☐ is ☒ is not present on any of the lists enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5.

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines adopted by Solano Irrigation District, a proposed NEGATIVE DECLARATION on the above named project has been prepared and is available for review starting during normal business hours, 8:00 am – 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday, starting November 14, 2014 until December 16, 2014, during which the District will receive comments at its main office complex located at 810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Suite 201, Vacaville, California, 95688.
Final adoption of the **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be considered at the Solano Irrigation District Board of Directors meeting on December 16, 2014, at the above address. Any appeals to this action may be made to the District in writing at any time prior to said Board meeting, or verbally during said Board meeting.

Mailing Address:

Cary Keaten, Chairman  
Environmental Review Committee  
Solano Irrigation District  
810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Suite 201  
Vacaville, California 95688  
(707) 448-6847  

Dated: November 13, 2014  
Cary Keaten, General Manager  
Solano Irrigation District
Environmental Impact Assessment

Name of Project: Annexation of portions of the King, Keune and Wood properties and Water Line Extensions to provide Potable and Non-Potable Water Service to the King, Keune, Bruno, and Wood properties

Location: The project site is located in the southeast ¼ of Section 8, Township 6 North, Range 1 East, Mount Diablo Base & Meridian. The properties involved are APN 0129-010-150 (King), APN 0129-010-170 (Keune), APN 0129-010-050 (Bruno) and APN 0129-010-180 (Wood). The project is located west of Gibson Canyon Road, north of Vine Street, north of the City of Vacaville approximately 1.5 miles.

Project Description: The project involves the annexation of approximately 2.00 acres of APN 0129-010-150 (King), approximately 0.25 acres of APN 0129-010-170 (Keune), and approximately 10.57 acres of APN 0129-010-180 (Wood), totaling 12.82 acres. The project also involves the installation of two (2) pipelines (potable and non-potable). The potable water pipeline requires the installation of approximately 650 feet of 4-inch PVC with four (4) 1-inch metered water services to the King, Keune, Bruno and Wood properties. The non-potable water pipeline requires the installation of approximately 650 feet of 8-inch PVC with three (3) 2-inch metered water services to the King, Keune and Wood properties.

Entity or Person Undertaking Project:
Solano Irrigation District.
Attn: Justin Hopkins, P.E., Associate Civil Engineer
810 Vaca Valley Parkway, Suite 201
Vacaville, California 95688
(707) 455-4007
jhopkins@sidwater.org
**Staff Determination:**

The District's staff, having undertaken and completed an Initial Study of this project in accordance with Title 14, California Administrative Code Section 15063 for the purpose of ascertaining whether the proposed project might have a significant effect on the environment, has reached the following conclusion:

- [ ] 1. The project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment; therefore, a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** should be prepared.

- [ ] 2. The project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment; therefore, an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** will be required.

Dated: November 13, 2014

Cary Keane, General Manager, Solano Irrigation District
CEQA
The California Environmental Quality Act

Initial Study

1. **Project Name:** Annexation of portions of the King, Keune and Wood properties and Water Line Extensions to provide Potable and Non-Potable Water Service to the King, Keune, Bruno, and Wood properties

2. **Lead Agency:** Solano Irrigation District
   810 Vaca Valley Parkway
   Suite 201
   Vacaville, CA 95688

3. **Contact Person:** Justin Hopkins, P.E., Associate Civil Engineer
   Solano Irrigation District
   (707) 455-4007
   jhopkins@sidwater.org

4. **Project Location:** The project site is located in the southeast ¼ of Section 8, Township 6 North, Range 1 East, Mount Diablo Base & Meridian. The properties involved are APN 0129-010-150 (King), APN 0129-010-170 (Keune), APN 0129-010-050 (Bruno) and APN 0129-010-180 (Wood). The project is located west of Gibson Canyon Road, north of Vine Street, north of the City of Vacaville approximately 1.5 miles.

5. **Applicants:** Solano Irrigation District
   810 Vaca Valley Parkway
   Suite 201
   Vacaville, CA 95688

6. **General Plan:** Rural Residential

7. **Zoning:** RR-2.5
8. **Project Description:**
The project involves the annexation of approximately 2.00 acres of APN 0129-010-150 (King),
approximately 0.25 acres of APN 0129-010-170 (Keune), and approximately 10.57 acres of APN
0129-010-180 (Wood), totaling 12.82± acres. The project also involves the installation of two (2)
pipelines (potable and non-potable). The potable water pipeline requires the installation of
approximately 650 feet of 4-inch PVC with four (4) 1-inch metered water services to the King,
Keune, Bruno and Wood properties. The non-potable water pipeline requires the installation of
approximately 650 feet of 8-inch PVC with three (3) 2-inch metered water services to the King,
Keune and Wood properties.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is surrounded by rural residential and
residential estates lots. The project is located approximately 1.5 miles north of the City of
Vacaville.

10. **Other agencies whose approval is required:** None

**Environmental Checklist**

Pursuant to Section 15063, CEQA Guidelines, the Solano Irrigation District has utilized an
Environmental Checklist to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the project. The checklist
provides a determination of these potential impacts and includes the substantiation developed in support
of the conclusions checked on the form.

**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
- Biological Resources
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Agriculture Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Traffic
Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **CANNOT** 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 impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- I find that although the proposed project **MAY** 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.

Dated: November 12, 2014

Prepared by:

By: [Signature]
Justin Hopkins, P.E., Associate Civil Engineer
Solano Irrigation District

Dated: November 12, 2014

Under the direction of:

By: [Signature]
Paul Fuchslin, P.E., Director of Engineering
Solano Irrigation District
**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 the District 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 District has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The District must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   
a) **Earlier Analysis Used.** Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) **Impacts Adequately Addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) The District is 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 the District is free to use different formats; however, the District 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.
Evaluation of Environmental Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I. AESTHETICS:**
The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. There is no scenic vista to be affected by the project.

b. The project will not be disturbing any trees or historic buildings.

c. The project will be temporarily affected during the construction (excavation and installation) of the two pipelines. The affected area will be restored back to its original condition.

d. No additional lighting will be added to the project area. Construction of the two pipelines will only take place during normal daylight hours.
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, the District 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:

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?  

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. The subject properties are current zoned Rural Residential 2.5 Acres (RR2.5) and not zoned for agricultural use. There are existing homes located on the subject properties.

b. The current zoning is Rural Residential 2.5 Acres (RR2.5), and no zoning changes to the subject properties are being proposed at this time, or in the future.

c. Refer to a and b above.
### 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

---

### III. AIR QUALITY:
The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. Construction activities are temporary activities that will comply with applicable air quality plans.

b. Construction activities shall comply with applicable air quality standards.

c. The emission of pollutants during construction will not contribute significantly to a net increase of any criteria pollutant.

d. The construction activities will not produce substantial pollution concentrations due to the brief temporary operation.

e. The construction activities are located within inhabited rural residential lands. The construction activity will not produce sufficient quantities of objectionable odors to affect the surround rural residents.
### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?

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?

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 species or with established native resident or migratory corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

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

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?
IV. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:**

The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

The answers to these questions are based on the results of a site survey conducted by Mr. Jeff Null, a biologist acceptable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to conduct such services and evaluations for Solano Irrigation District under the Solano Project Habitat Conservation Plan which is currently being developed.

a. No such species were identified within the proposed construction area during the biological site survey. Annexation of the subject properties will have no impact on specially identified species as 2 of the 3 subject properties are improved with homes, buildings and extensive landscape. The third subject property is improved with a home and out buildings, with minimal landscaping. The balance of this property is left in its natural state with vegetation control as needed for fire protection.

b. No such species were identified within the proposed construction area during the biological site survey.

c. The subject properties are located on flat, gently sloping to a fairly steep hillside and there are no wetlands observed during the biological site survey.

d. There are no conflicts based the Solano Project Site Assessment Checklist prepared by the District’s Biologist on October 15, 2014.

e. Removal of trees is not being proposed with the annexation and/or construction of the two pipelines.

f. No additional explanation.
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:
The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. There are no known historical resources on the project site. This was confirmed by a Cultural Resources Site Survey performed by Solano Archaeological Services on June 18, 2014.

b. There are no known historical resources on the project site. This was confirmed by a Cultural Resources Site Survey performed by Solano Archaeological Services on June 18, 2014.

c. No additional explanation.

d. No additional explanation.
### VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS:**
The District's responses to the above mentioned issues:

a (i). As presented on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map on the California Geological Survey's web site, there is no known earthquake fault zone near the project site, indicating that the likelihood of substantial adverse effects of the fault rupture are unlikely.

a (ii). Review of ABAG shaking intensity maps on its web site indicates that the project site has a shaking potential of 30-40 out of a scale of 0-176.

a (iii). As presented on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map on the California Geological Survey's web site, the project site is not likely to experience any liquefaction.

a (iv). The property to be annexed ranges from flat, gently sloping to a fairly steep hillside. The construction area is located on relatively flat to gently sloping lands.

b. The two proposed pipelines will be installed below grade and will not result in soil erosion or the loss of top soil.

c. Refer to a and b above.

d. The project is located in 2-50 percent slopes, slow permeable Dibble-Los Osos clay loams (DIF2) and Rincon clay loam (RoC), as reported in Soil Survey of Solano County, California by United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service. The PVC pipelines will not be affected by expansive soils, if any are present.

e. The property to be annexed currently has residential homes and existing potable wells and septic tanks. The proposed pipelines will be for potable (interior) use and for non-potable (exterior) landscape irrigation use. No new septic facilities are being planned with this project.
**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:
The District's responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. There will be no hazardous materials used at the project site.

b. The proposed pipelines will be for potable (interior) use and for non-potable (exterior) landscape irrigation use. There is no impact.

c. The proposed pipelines will be for potable (interior) use and for non-potable (exterior) landscape irrigation use. There is no impact.

d. The site is on no known list of hazardous materials sites.

e. The project is not within an airport land use plan.

f. The project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

g. The project is located on private property with some pipeline construction to take place within Gibson Canyon Road.

h. The proposed pipelines will be located adjacent to and east of Gibson Canyon Road and near an agricultural field that is regularly disked.
### VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 the alteration 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:**

The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. The proposed pipelines are designed for the distribution of potable (treated raw surface water) for interior use and for non-potable (untreated raw surface water) for exterior landscape irrigation use.

b. The proposed pipelines are designed for the distribution of potable (treated raw surface water) for interior use and for non-potable (untreated raw surface water) for exterior landscape irrigation use.

c. The site will be re-graded to return it to the undisturbed condition and will not alter existing drainage patterns.

d. Minor re-grading of the site will restore existing drainage patterns.

e. Minor re-grading of the site will not significantly increase runoff water.

f. The proposed pipelines are designed for the distribution of potable (interior) water and for non-potable (exterior) landscape irrigation water.

g. There are existing residential homes within the proposed annexation area which are located on relatively flat, gently sloping to steep hillside, all of which are not in areas of flooding.

h. There are existing residential homes within the proposed annexation area which are located on relatively flat, gently sloping to steep hillside, all of which are not in areas of flooding.

i. The subject properties are not near a levee or dam.

j. The subject properties are not near a large body of water.
**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Physically divide an established community?

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?

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING:**

The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. The subject properties are currently zoned Rural Residential 2.5 (RR2.5). The King property (2.10 acres), Keune property (2.51 acres) and Bruno property (2.13 acres) are not large enough to be subdivided with the current zoning. The Wood property (11.08 acres) has been zoned RR2.5 prior to the Wood family owning the property. Although this property is large enough to be subdivided into four 2.50 acre parcels, per the owner, there are no plans for future subdividing of the property. If at some time in the future, the then current landowner proposes to subdivide the property, the subdivision of that property would be governed by the land use authority of Solano County and from Solano Irrigation District to determine whether there is sufficient potable water available and services available from the Gibson Canyon Water Treatment Plant. The proposed pipelines will be located adjacent to and east of Gibson Canyon Road and near an agricultural field that is regularly disked.

b. The existing zoning for the project area is Rural Residential 2.5 Acres (RR2.5) by the County of Solano.

c. The project is consistent with the Solano Project Biological Opinion, a precursor to an HCP/NCCP for the Solano Project.
**X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

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. MINERAL RESOURCES:**

The District's responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. There is no known valuable mineral resource available on the subject properties.

b. There is no delineated mineral resource recovery site on the subject properties.
### XI. NOISE — Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XI. **NOISE:**

The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. The construction activities will only occur during weekday work hours and will not generate noise in excess of the nearby roadway.

b. During construction activities, there will be temporary groundbourne vibration and noise that will not be excessive to the nearby occupied residential homes.

c. There is no equipment included in this project to permanently increase the ambient noise level.

d. The construction activities will only occur during weekday work hours and will not generate noise in excess of the nearby roadway.

e. The subject properties are not located within an airport land use plan.

f. The subject properties are not in the vicinity of a private airstrip.
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 roads or other infrastructure)?

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

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:
The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. Annexation of the project area to the District’s boundary will be for boundary purposes only. The construction of the two proposed pipelines are to provide potable (interior) water to the existing homes and residents, and for non-potable (exterior) landscape irrigation water to the subject properties. Each of the subject properties (King, Keune, Bruno and Wood) has existing homes. It is not anticipated there will be a substantial population growth in the area as no new homes or businesses, extension of roads or construction of other infrastructures will be a part of the subject annexation and/or construction of the two proposed pipelines. However, as noted in IX (a) above, if at some time in the future, the then current landowner proposes to subdivide the property, the subdivision of that property would be governed by the land use authority of Solano County and from Solano Irrigation District to determine whether there is sufficient potable water available and services available from the Gibson Canyon Water Treatment Plant.

b. No housing will be displaced with the subject annexation and/or construction of the two proposed pipelines.

c. No persons will be displaced with the subject annexation and/or construction of the two proposed pipelines.
### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- a) Fire protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- b) Police protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- c) Schools? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- d) Parks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- e) Other public facilities? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

#### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES:
The District's responses to the above mentioned issues:

a - e. The subject annexation and construction of the two proposed pipelines will have no adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of the public services listed.
XIV. RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

XIV. RECREATION:
The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. The subject annexation and construction of the two proposed pipelines will not increase the use of recreational facilities.

b. The subject annexation and construction of the two proposed pipelines does not include or affect recreational facilities.
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XV.  TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:
The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. The subject annexation will not result in an increased amount of traffic as no new homes or businesses are being planned for the subject properties. There will be a short term increase in traffic during construction of the two proposed pipelines.

b. The subject annexation and construction of the two proposed pipelines will not cause a change in the level of service of Gibson Canyon Road, located west of the subject properties.

c. No additional explanation.

d. The construction of the two proposed pipelines will follow a straight alignment (on private property) parallel to and east of the existing right-of-way of Gibson Canyon Road.

e. Emergency vehicle access to rural residential properties will be maintained during the construction of the two proposed pipelines.

f. No additional explanation.

g. No additional explanation.
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Significantly</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

The District’s responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. No wastewater is proposed for the subject properties.

b. The Gibson Canyon Water Treatment Plant was designed with additional capacity to provide potable water to additional homes. No new water treatment facilities are planned as a result of the annexation of the subject properties, or the construction of the two proposed pipelines.

c. Existing storm water drainage facilities are adequate to deal with the runoff from the subject properties.

d. The Gibson Canyon Water Treatment Plant was designed with additional capacity to provide potable water to additional homes. The District has sufficient water to supply both potable water as well as raw surface water for non-potable landscape irrigation water for the subject properties.

e. There is no wastewater treatment required for the subject properties. Each property has its own private septic system.

f. There will be no change to the landfill capacity with the annexation of the subject properties or the insignificant amount of solid waste produced by the construction of the two proposed pipelines.

g. Yes. See f above.
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

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

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:
The District's responses to the above mentioned issues:

a. No additional explanation.
b. No additional explanation.
c. No additional explanation.

End of Initial Study.