



County of Orange

MEMO

MS Word Export To Multiple PDF Files Software - Please purchase license.

DATE: July 11, 2000
TO: Josh McDonnell Site Planning
FROM: Environmental & Project Planning Services Division (E&PPSD)
SUBJECT: IS No. PA 000006- Descartes/Pauling Industrial Building Foothill Ranch PC

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A site development permit for the construction of a concrete tilt-up building on an approximate.99 acre (43,305 sq. ft.) gross acre site. The building area totals 15,349 square feet in size, with 7,345 square feet for office use, 6,004 sq. ft. of manufacturing use, and 2,000 square feet of warehouse with 45 parking spaces including 2 handicap accessible stalls. The building will be for light manufacturing, research and development types of use.

PROJECT LOCATION: The proposed site is located in Planning Area 13, Lot 21 of Tract 14046, northeast of the Foothill Transportation Corridor on the corner of Pauling and Descartes in the Foothill Ranch Planned Community. The site is within Supervisorial District 3 of south Orange County.

CEQA DETERMINATION: The CEQA review of the subject project has been completed by the Environmental & Project Planning Services Division. Based upon its review, E&PPSD has determined that the proper CEQA documentation for the Project is FEIR 481. The following information is attached to this memo for your consideration:

- I. Instructions for Filing CEQA Documents with the County Clerk; and
- II. CEQA Statements, Actions and Findings which should be used for Staff Reports and AITs for the Project, including:
 - A. CEQA Compliance Statement(s) for AITs and Staff Reports; and
 - B. Recommended Action for Decision-maker(s) to Approve Project; and
 - C. Fish and Game Code Findings for Approval of Project; and
 - D. NCCP Finding for Approval of Project.
- III. IS PA 000006

If clarification is needed regarding this Memo or if there are questions, please contact the following staff person from PDS/Environmental & Project Planning Services Division:

E&PPSD Staff Contact: Chris Uzo-Diribe Telephone Number: 834-2542
George Britton, Manager, Environmental & Project Planning Services Division

By: _____ Date: _____

Title: Chief, Environmental Section

- Attachments: Attachment 1: Filing Instructions for County Clerk
- Attachment 2: Recommended CEQA Statements, Actions, and Findings
- Attachment 3: IS PA 000006
- Attachment 4: NOD

ATTACHMENT 1

FILING CEQA DOCUMENTS WITH THE COUNTY CLERK

Your division will be responsible for filing the CEQA documentation and paying its related \$38.00 filing fee with the County Clerk for your project. The County Clerk needs your CEQA document(s) with your project charge number in the upper right corner in order to post the document and recover this fee. You must, however, obtain a fee receipt from the County Clerk, which must then be turned in immediately to Management Services/Accounting Services. The County Clerk requires the \$38.00 documentary handling fee for the following items:

- * Negative Declarations (ND);
- * Notices of Determinations (NOD); and
- * Notices of Exemption (NOE)

Please note the following:

1. Within 5 days of Project approval by the Board, Planning Commission, Zoning Administrator, Subdivision Committee or Director of PDS, a Notice of Determination (NOD) must be filed with the County Clerk.
2. If E&PPSD has determined that the Project is exempt from the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) fees, a De Minimis Finding (Certificate of Fee Exemption) will be provided by E&PPSD and must accompany your project's NOD.
3. If E&PPSD has determined that the Project is exempt from the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) fees because the required fees were previously paid, a memo will be provided by E&PPSD and must accompany your project's NOD.
4. If E&PPSD cannot find your project exempt from the DFG fees and has no record of the fee payment, the Applicant will be required to pay \$888.00 for the EIR, including the \$38.00 handling fee.

You will need to fill in the information on the NOD form and get an original authorizing signature from your division after the approval action on your project. You will need to take the original set, and at least one set of copies to the EIR Clerk located in the Records/Clerks Office, Building 12, Civic Center Plaza. The Clerk will stamp the NOD and keep the original set. The Clerk will issue a receipt for the environmental document, which must be returned to Management Services/Accounting Services by the end of the day. A copy of a stamped NOD must be sent to E&PPSD for the file.

ATTACHMENT 2

RECOMMENDED CEQA STATEMENT ACTION AND FINDINGS FOR STAFF REPORTS/AITs

A. CEQA COMPLIANCE STATEMENT (FOR TEXT OF STAFF REPORT/AIT):

The CEQA compliance statement, located in the text of the staff report or body of the AIT under "Additional Data", shall include the following statement unless advised otherwise by County Counsel or the Manager, Environmental & Project Planning Services Division.

The proposed project is covered by Final EIR 481, previously certified on 4/20/88. Prior to project approval, the decision-maker must assert that this EIR is adequate to satisfy the requirements of CEQA for the proposed project.

B. RECOMMENDED ACTION STATEMENT FOR APPROVING PROJECT:

State law requires that action on a CEQA document be taken by the decision-maker prior to approval of the project for which it has been prepared. The following action must be taken before action on the project, unless directed otherwise by County Counsel or the Manager, Environmental & Project Planning Services Division.

The decision-maker has determined that Final EIR 481, previously certified on 4/20/88 satisfies the requirements of CEQA and is approved as a Program EIR for the proposed project based upon the following findings:

- a. Based on the Initial Study, it is found that the EIR serves as a Program EIR for the proposed project; and
- b. The approval of the previously certified Final EIR for the project reflects the independent judgment of the Lead Agency.

C. FISH AND GAME CODE FINDING FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECT:

Find that pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code, this project is subject to the required fees as it has been determined that potential adverse impacts to wildlife resources may result from the project. However, the required fees were paid previously (Receipt No. **67012**).

D. NCCP FINDING FOR APPROVAL OF PROJECT:

Find that the project has the potential of adversely affecting significant Coastal Sage Scrub habitat and, therefore, may preclude the ability to prepare an effective Subregional Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) Program.

ATTACHMENT 3

Environmental Analysis for Descartes/Pauling Industrial Building in Foothill Ranch P.C. IS PA 000006

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A site development permit for the construction of a concrete tilt-up building on an approximate .99 acre (43,305 sq. ft.) gross acre site. The building area totals 15,349 square feet in size, with 7,345 square feet for office use, 6,004 sq. ft. of manufacturing use, and 2,000 square feet of warehouse with 45 parking spaces including 2 handicap accessible stalls. The building will be for light manufacturing, research and development types of use.

PROJECT LOCATION: The proposed site is located in Planning Area 13, Lot 21 of Tract 14046, northeast of the Foothill Transportation Corridor on the corner of Pauling and Descartes in the Foothill Ranch Planned Community. The site is within Supervisorial District 3 of south Orange County.

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

Each lot has been pre-graded, with an unbuildable slope to the northeast that is described as a scenic easement. The sites are somewhat flat with a slight slope to facilitate drainage from northeast. The sites were graded using standard practice to protect slopes and reduce runoff. All drainage is currently handled by absorption and proper berming.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Under Section 15002(d) of the California Environmental Quality Act/Guidelines a project is defined as an activity subject to CEQA. Further, the term project refers to an activity, which is being proposed and has a potential for resulting in a physical change in the environment directly or ultimately.

A private project (Sec. 15377) means a project, which will be carried out by a person other than a governmental agency, but the project will need a discretionary approval from one or more governmental agency. Proposed project PA 000006 is regarded as a private project subject to a discretionary approval and is part of a previously approved Tract Map 14046, of which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) 481 addressed project site, impacts and was previously certified on April 20, 1988.

In accordance with Sec. 15063 Initial Study was completed IS PA000006 on the subject project by the Environmental Planning Division (EPD), and it was determined that EIR 481 adequately analyzes the proposed project. No subsequent changes are proposed, and no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances surrounding this project, and no new information would substantially affect the validity of the EIR has become available.

The following is the analysis of the subject proposal and compilation of pertinent mitigation measures/conditions derived from EIR 481, approved and adopted for the entirety of the Foothill Ranch Planned Community. These mitigation measures/conditions have been updated to reflect the latest requirements of CEQA in addition to County ordinances, policies and guidelines.

(1) LAND USE AND PLANNING Would the proposal:

- a) *Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?*
- b) *Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies of agencies with jurisdiction over the project?*
- c) *Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (e.g. low income, minority)?*
- d) *Conflict with adjacent, existing or planned land uses?*

ANALYSIS:

The Foothill Ranch Planned Community site development standards as approved will ensure that no land use inconsistencies will occur. The project is consistent with all General Plan Elements, the Foothill Ranch Planned Community Regulations, the Feature Plan, Planning Area 13 (Industrial) and Area Plan 88-08P. The use of the proposed site, along with the adjacent existing buildings will be light manufacturing, Research and Development and warehousing. No adverse significant impact is anticipated.

However, all the mitigation measures and conditions of the previous approvals are still applicable to the proposed project.

(2) AGRICULTURE. Would project:

- a) *Convert Farmlands listed as "Prime", "Unique" or of "Statewide Importance" as shown on the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, to non-agricultural use?*
- b) *Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?*

ANALYSIS:

There is no farmland conversion involved with the proposed project. The impacts to farmland and dedication of land have already been completed prior to this action. The scope of the project is such that no other changes in the existing environment will result in conversion of more Farmland, to non-agricultural use.

No mitigation is necessary.

(3) POPULATION AND HOUSING would project:

- a) Cumulatively exceed adopted regional or local population projections?*
- b) Induce substantial growth in an area directly or indirectly through project in an undeveloped areas or extension of major infrastructure?*
- c) Displace existing housing affecting a substantial number of people?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project consists, of an industrial development use, the population and housing will not cumulatively exceed adopted regional or local population projection neither will it induce substantial growth in the area or displace existing housing. All the analyses and impacts regarding population and housing have all been addressed in the EIR 481.

However, the mitigation measures and conditions of the previous approvals are still applicable to the proposed project.

(4) GEOPHYSICAL Would project result in or expose people to impacts involving:

- a) Local fault rupture?*
- b) Seismicity: ground shaking or liquefaction?*
- c) 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?*
- d) Landslides or mudslides?*
- e) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill?*
- f) Subsidence of the land?*
- g) Expansive soils?*
- h) Unique geologic or physical features?*

ANALYSIS:

Under the IMPACT section of LANDFORM/TOPOGRAPHY of EIR 481 impacts have been identified regarding unstable earth conditions, an inactive earthquake fault, and change in topography. The subject property has been rough graded and relevant mitigation measures were satisfied prior to the issuance of the first grading permit. Precise grading operation will be required for site construction and a total of 9 cubic yards of cut and 4,285 cubic yards of fill (import) are expected, however, all grading must be in compliance with the County's Grading and Excavation Codes.

The mitigation measures and conditions of the previous approvals regarding standard grading conditions, adequate grading plan with proposed finish grading, is required prior to issuance of any grading permit.

(5). HYDROLOGY & DRAINAGE. Would the proposal result in:

- a) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in manner which would result in:*
 - i) *Substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*
 - ii) *A substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*
- b) *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?*
- c) *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?*
- d) *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, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

ANALYSIS:

Under the HYDROLOGY Section of EIR 481 impacts were identified regarding potential increase in peak run-off resulting in increased erosion potential, increased urban pollution and an increase in downstream peak flows. Most of the earthwork has been performed, however, the development of impervious surfaces onto the project site would increase downstream water run-off and there may be alterations to natural drainage patterns within the subject area. The proposed grading will direct all water to existing, storm drains around the property. All drainage is currently handled by absorption and proper berming via two swales, one along the existing driveway to the street and one interior swale with riprap to reduce runoff.

The proposed project is still required to comply with all the applicable mitigation measures and conditions of approval of the Tract Maps regarding drainage study, Storm-water Discharge Permit, interior and exterior water conservation.

(6). WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*
- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of a local groundwater table level?*
- c) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

ANALYSIS:

As with most new industrial projects, the subject project may violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or substantially deplete or degrade water quality due to type of use. However, the following mitigation measure which was included in FEIR 481, will ensure that any adverse significant impact will be reduced below a level of significance:

Mitigation Measures/Conditions #1

Prior to issuance of building permits, permit applicant shall submit for approval of the Manager, Subdivision & Grading Division, in consultation with the Manager, Environmental Resources, a proposal specifically identifying Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be used on site to control predictable pollutant runoff.

This proposal shall identify the types of structural and non-structural measures to be used, the location(s) of structures, and assignment of long-term maintenance responsibilities (specifying the developer, parcel owner, maintenance association, lessee, etc.). Regarding and/or construction of special features to adequately control pollutant runoff may be required.

(7) TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion beyond adopted policies and/or forecasts?*
- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*
- c) Safety hazards from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?*
- d) Inadequate emergency access of access to nearby uses?*

- e) *Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?*
- f) *Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?*
- g) *Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*
- h) *Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?*
- i) *Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project would generate additional traffic but not beyond projected regional analysis and therefore development of the project will not create internal circulation problems; in addition adequate parking has been proposed and therefore no impact on the existing parking facilities is anticipated. The Parking Plan shall be in accordance with Zoning Code Sec.7-9-143.4. The site plan shows that a total of 44 spaces are required and 45 spaces are to be provided. Access to the building site will be provided through a private driveway off of Pauling. The site plan for the proposed site is adequate from a traffic circulation standpoint.

However, all the mitigation measures and conditions of the previous approvals regarding payment of fees, adequate site distance and Foothill Circulation Phasing Plan are still applicable to the proposed project.

(8). AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- a) *Violate any SCAQMD standard or contribute to air quality deterioration beyond projections of SCAQMD?*
- b) *Expose sensitive population groups to pollutants in excess of acceptable levels?*
- c) *Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?*
- d) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people*

ANALYSIS:

Under the IMPACTS section of Air Quality of EIR 481 impacts were identified regarding the pollutants emitted by construction equipment, dust generated as a result of soil movement, and the long-term distribution of local and areawide traffic.

The proposed project may significantly contribute to air emissions, but this was addressed in EIR 481 and found to not significantly deteriorate air quality, create objectionable odors, cause a change in air movement, moisture or temperature either locally or regionally, or elevate levels of air pollution beyond South Coast Air Quality Management Plan forecasts. Also, the traffic community plan has air quality goals incorporated as part of the overall community design. Dust pollutants may be generated during site preparation and construction, however, the dust abatement program in the county's Grading and Excavation Code will ensure that this impact is reduced below the level of significance. The long-term impacts have already been addressed in FEIR 481 and the subject project will not generate any impact beyond what was discussed in the FEIR.

(9). NOISE. Would the proposal:

- a) Increase existing noise levels?*
- b) Expose people to noise levels exceeding adopted County standards?*
- c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such 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?*

ANALYSIS:

Under the IMPACT Section of NOISE of the EIR 481 acoustical impacts were identified regarding construction and aircraft noise. The project site lies within the 65 dB CNEL zone of routine overflight from the El Toro Marine Air Station; however, the site is not within a noise sensitive area, and no long-term impacts are anticipated. In addition, all the mitigation measures and conditions of the previous approvals for a detailed Noise Report and statement of overflight acknowledgment, are still applicable to the proposed project. Further to ensure that the short-term impact is reduced within a level of insignificance the additional following site specific mitigation measures are brought forward from the FEIR 481 and must be complied with:

Mitigation Measures/Conditions #2

- A.** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the project proponent shall produce evidence acceptable to the Manager, Subdivision & Grading, that:
 - (1) All construction vehicles or equipment fixed or mobile, operated within 1,000' of a dwelling shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.
 - (2) All operations shall comply with Orange County Codified Ordinance Division 6 (Noise Control).
 - (3) Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practicable from dwellings.

- B.** Notations in the above format, appropriately numbered and included with other notations on the front sheet of grading plans, will be considered as adequate evidence of compliance with this condition.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions#3

All non-residential structures shall be sound attenuated against the combined impact of all present and projected noise from exterior noise sources to meet the interior noise criteria as specified in the Noise Element and Land Use/Noise Compatibility Manual.

Prior to the issuance of any building permits, evidence prepared under the supervision of a County-certified acoustical consultant that these standards will be satisfied in a manner consistent with applicable zoning regulations shall be submitted to the Manager, Subdivision & Grading Division, in the form of an acoustical analysis report describing in detail the exterior noise environment and the acoustical design features required to achieve the interior noise standard and which indicate that the sound attenuation measures specified have been incorporated into the design of the project.

(10). BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project impact:

- a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats including, but not limited to, plants, fish, insects, animals and birds?*
- b) Locally designated species e.g. heritage trees?*
- c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?*
- d) Wetland habitat e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool?*
- e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?*
- f) Adopted conservation plans and policies (e.g. Natural Community Conservation Plan or Resource Management Plan)?*

ANALYSIS:

Under the IMPACTS section of BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES of EIR 481, impacts were identified regarding the interruption of wildlife movement corridors, potential decline of remaining oak woodland, and the diminishment of wildlife abundance and diversity in non-reserve open space. The subject property has already been rough graded and the proposed project would not have additional impacts on biological resources. Relevant mitigation measures were complied with, prior to the issuance of the previous grading permit.

However, all the mitigation measures and conditions of the previous approvals are still applicable to the proposed project.

(11) AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- a) Affect a scenic vista or view open to the public?*
- b) Affect a designated scenic highway?*
- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*
- d) Create light or glare beyond the physical limits of the project site?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposal would not result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, nor would the project result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site. The project has been designed to blend in with the proposed and existing surrounding community. Though the project site is adjacent to a slope that has scenic easement, the site is located outside of this area and will not impact the preservation of the area. The area shall be properly landscaped in accordance with Foothill Ranch Area Plan also in compliance with the conditions of approval on Tract 14046, including site design to be consistent with the original landscape design, plant materials and planting plan.

In addition, all the mitigation measures and conditions of the previous approvals are still applicable to the proposed project.

12. CULTURAL/SCIENTIFIC RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Disturb archaeo or paleo resources?*
- b) Affect historical resources?*
- c) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?*

ANALYSIS:

Under the IMPACTS section of CULTURAL/SCIENTIFIC RESOURCES of the EIR 481 impacts were identified regarding archaeological and paleontological resources. The project site has been rough graded and relevant mitigation measures were tied to the issuance of the first grading permit.

However, all the mitigation measures and conditions of the previous approvals are still applicable to the proposed project.

13. RECREATION. Would proposal:

- a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration or the facility would occur or be accelerated?*
- b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*
- c) Conflict with adopted recreational plans or policies?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project would not have a significant impact on the quality or quantity of existing recreational opportunities. No park credit is required due to nature of the project. Therefore, no significant adverse impact is anticipated.

No mitigation is required.

14. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*
- 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?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project, the construction of an office/warehouse is not expected to result in the loss of any mineral resources or any local site of any importance. No adverse impact is anticipated.

No mitigation measures are warranted.

15. HAZARDS. Would the project:

- a) Create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*
- b) Create a 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) *Exposure of people to existing sources of health hazards?*
- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such 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?*

ANALYSIS:

There are no public health and safety issues associated with the proposed project. The subject site will be used for industrial, type of use. Though the site has since been graded for a planned mixed-use development, no hazardous materials such as hydrocarbon fuels, lubricating oil and pesticides are expected to be used on site.

However, to ensure that no significant impact occurs all the mitigation measures and conditions of approval of the previous approvals are still applicable to the proposed project.

16. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would project result in needs for new/altered government facilities/services in:

- a) *Fire protection?*
- b) *Police protection?*
- c) *Schools?*
- d) *Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?*
- e) *Other government services?*

ANALYSIS:

The proposed project would not create the need for new facilities or the extension of existing facilities, which could have adverse physical impacts. The public services for the Foothill Ranch Planned Community which include fire protection, police protection, schools, maintenance of public facilities, and community services were considered and incorporated into the development plan as shown in EIR 481.

However, all the mitigation measures and conditions of the previous approvals are still applicable to the proposed project.

17. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would project result in needs for new or substantial alterations:

- a) *Power or natural gas?*

- b) Communications systems?*
- c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?*
- d) Sewer or septic tanks?*
- e) Solid waste disposal?*

ANALYSIS:

The public services for the Foothill Ranch Planned Community which include water supply, wastewater disposal, solid waste, telephone, natural gas, electrical services, and community services were considered and incorporated into the development plan as shown in EIR 481.

However, all the mitigation measures and conditions of the previous approvals are still applicable to the proposed project.

FINDINGS

Find that pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code, this project is subject to the required fees as it has been determined that potential adverse impacts to wildlife resources may result from the project. However, the required fees were paid previously (Receipt No. **67012**).

Final EIR 481, which was certified on April 20, 1988, satisfies the requirements of CEQA for this project.

CUD:cud7111709523947

Prepared by:

_____ **Date:** _____
Chris Uzo-Diribe
Environmental & Project Planning Services Division