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NOTICE OF INTENT
TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, CALIFORNIA

The City of Ventura has prepared an Initial Study (IS) to evaluate the environmental impacts
of the project identified below, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act
(CEQA):

A. Project Description for Case # EIR-2-18-43790 Draft Mitigated Negative
Declaration:

The City of San Buenaventura City Council directed the General Plan Refinement
project, which consists of General Plan Amendment GPA-2-18-43787, Zone Change
Z-2-18-43788, and Ordinance Amendment OA-2-18-43789 proposing the following
actions to refine the City’s General Plan and the zoning code portion of the City’s
Municipal Code.

- City-wide General Plan designation and zoning code modifications relating to
mixed-use land use designations, zoning classifications, and development
standards including: A new Mixed-Use land use designation that requires a mix of
commerce and residential and amend General Plan Figure 3-5 to designate
portions of the Midtown Main Street and Thompson Boulevard Corridors and
Ventura Avenue Corridor with the Mixed Use designation; Revise the General Plan
Commerce, Industry, and Public Institutional land use definitions; Zone Text
Amendment creating an Optional Residential Mixed –Use (ORMU) Overlay Zone
and Zoning Map Amendment to create a new Optional Residential Mixed-Use
(ORMU) overlay zone in the zoning code. Apply the proposed ORMU overlay zone
to Commerce land use designations with C-1, C-1A, C-2, CPD and MXD zoning.
The ORMU overlay zone would permit residential as an option when incorporated
into a mixed use type of development. The ORMU overlay zone would apply to the
Telegraph Road Corridor from Main Street to Ashwood Avenue, the Neighborhood
Center at Telegraph Road and Day Drive, the Victoria Corridor between Ralston
Street and Highway 126, the Pacific View Mall District, the Bristol Road
Neighborhood Center, the Wells Road Corridor both north and south of Highway
126, the Main Street and Thompson Boulevard Corridors, the Ventura Avenue
Corridor, and the Johnson Drive area with exception of freeway fronting parcels.

- Amend the Housing Element to reflect changes in the Housing Element Land
Inventory (HELI) sites, available on the City’s “2017 Housing Element Amendment”
webpage (City of Ventura, January 2018).

- Amend the Victoria Avenue Corridor Development Code and areas of the Montalvo
Planning Neighborhood to address issues of building height and massing.

- Amend the General Plan to resolve inconsistencies among land use designations, zoning designations, and existing use in the following areas: Montalvo Community Area, 2325 Vista Del Mar Drive, 2842 and 2960 North Ventura Avenue, 2223 North Ventura Avenue, 1250 and 1272 North Olive Street and 133 Sunnyway Drive, 4440 Olivas Park Drive, Hospitals and convalescent homes, City and Linear Park parcels that are part of the City's park and trail system, and Saticoy & Wells Development Code.

- Amend the Our Prosperous Community Chapter of the General Plan to reflect the 2013-2018 Economic Strategy and the Wellness District concept.

- Incorporate the principles for infill as they relate to Ventura into the Our Well Planned and Designed Community Chapter of the General Plan.

- Amend Chapter 5, Our Sustainable Infrastructure, and Chapter 1, Our Natural Community, of the General Plan to reflect new policies related to water, wastewater, stormwater quality, climate action, greenhouse gas emissions and reclaimed water; and add one new policy related to urban forestry.

B. Proposed finding. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resource Code Section 21000 et seq.), and consistent with State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations) Section 15070, and following the completion of an Initial Study (IS), the Planning Division of the City of Ventura has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project would have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and that a mitigated negative declaration (MND) may be adopted.

C. Fish and Wildlife Impacts: On the basis of the information contained in the Initial Study, and on the record as a whole, there is no evidence that there will be an adverse effect on fish or wildlife habitats or resources since none of the factors listed in Section 2R.450.530 of the Municipal Code are present.

D. Hazards: The project site is not on any of the lists enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5 including, but not limited to, lists of hazardous waste facilities, land designated as hazardous waste property, and hazardous waste disposal sites.

E. Document Review and Comment. A 30-day public review period for the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration will be held from February 9, 2018 and ends on March 12, 2018. The document and reference materials are available for public review at the City of Ventura, Planning Division, Room 117, 501 Poli Street, Ventura, CA 93001 or on the city’s website at: https://www.cityofventura.ca.gov/450/Current-Environmental-Documents-for-Revi

F. Public Hearing and Comments. Public hearings will be set at a later date, at a properly noticed public hearing approximately in April 2018 before the Planning Commission and the City Council at a subsequent date to consider the General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Ordinance Amendment and the Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. This meeting will be separately noticed when
the date and time are set. All comments concerning the draft MND should be provided in writing and received before 5:00 p.m. on the last day of the review period. Inquiries should be directed to Iain Holt, AICP at (805) 654-7752. Written comments may be mailed or faxed (805-654-7560) to the City of Ventura, Planning Division, 501 Poli Street, CA 93001, or emailed directly to iholt@cityofventura.ca.gov.

2/7/18
Date

Iain Holt, AICP Principal Planner
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INITIAL STUDY

1. Project Title:

General Plan Refinement Project

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of San Buenaventura
501 Poli Street
Ventura, CA 93001

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Iain Holt, AICP, Principal Planner
Community Development Department
805-654-7752

4. Project Location:

City of San Buenaventura, California

5. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address

City of San Buenaventura
501 Poli Street
Ventura, CA 93001

6. General Plan Designation:

City-wide within the following designations: Commerce, Industry, Neighborhood High, Neighborhood Medium

7. Zoning:

City-wide within the following zoning districts: C-1, C-1A, C-2, C-P-D, M-X-D; Midtown Corridor T4.5 and T5.2; Victoria Avenue Corridor Development Code T4.5, T4.8; Saticoy Wells Development Code T4.10, Parks and Open Space-Residential Overlay

8. Description of Project:

Background

From September 2014 to February 2016, a City Council Ad Hoc Committee convened to study growth management, land use designation and zoning consistency, and creation of a Mixed-Use land use designation. Staff presented the Ad Hoc Committee’s findings to the
City Council, and the City Council made recommendations to staff for General Plan amendment and Zoning Ordinance revisions.

The City Council-directed General Plan Refinement process is intended to address a range of land use issues that have arisen during the implementation of the 2005 General Plan, where the City chose a land use policy and growth vision focused on Infill-first within the City’s Districts, Corridors and Neighborhood Centers, and using form-based codes as the tool for improved urban design. Code Refinement will follow adoption of the General Plan amendment.

Proposed Actions

The City of San Buenaventura is contemplating the following actions to refine the City’s General Plan and the zoning code portion of the City’s Municipal Code. These actions are listed below and shown in Figures 2 through 5.

1. Make the following City-wide General Plan designation and zoning code modifications relating to mixed-use land use designations, zoning classifications, and development standards:
   - Create a new Mixed-Use land use designation that requires a mix of commerce and residential and amend General Plan Figure 3-5 to designate portions of the Midtown Main and Thompson Corridors and Ventura Avenue Corridor with the Mixed Use designation.
   - Revise the following General Plan land use designations:
     - Commerce: restrict residential use in existing Commerce designations (as shown on the 2005 General Plan Diagram, Figure 3-5), unless allowed by the proposed Optional Residential Mixed Use (ORMU) Overlay Zone
     - Industry: eliminate residential as a permissible use
     - Public Institutional: remove the word public from the name of this land use designation in order to clarify that both public and private institutions are allowed
   - Zone Text Amendment creating an Optional Residential Mixed -Use (ORMU) Overlay Zone and Zoning Map Amendment. Create a new Optional Residential Mixed-Use (ORMU) overlay zone in the zoning code. In selected areas (Figure 3), apply the proposed ORMU overlay zone to Commerce land use designations with C-1, C-1A, C-2, CPD and MXD zoning. The ORMU overlay zone would permit residential as an option when incorporated into a mixed use type of development. The ORMU overlay zone would apply to the Telegraph Road Corridor from Main Street to Ashwood Avenue, the Neighborhood Center at Telegraph Road and Day Drive, the Victoria Corridor between Ralston Street and Highway 126, the Pacific View Mall District, the Bristol Road Neighborhood Center, the Wells Road Corridor both north and south of Highway 126, the Main Street and Thompson Boulevard Corridors, the Ventura Avenue Corridor, and the Johnson Drive area with exception of freeway fronting parcels.
Amend the Housing Element to reflect changes in the Housing Element Land Inventory (HELI) sites, and provide a consistency analysis to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for its approval, in order to maintain Housing Element certification. Materials related to this task are available on the City’s “2017 Housing Element Amendment” webpage (City of Ventura, January 2018).

- Rezone underutilized parcels added to the Housing Element Land Inventory (N. Ventura Ave/Franklin Lane M-2 to R-3-1, N. Ventura Ave. M-1 to R-3-5, Telegraph/Day Road R-1-1AC & R-1-7 to CPD, Capri Avenue MPD to CPD.

2. Amend the Victoria Avenue Corridor Development Code and areas of the Montalvo Planning Neighborhood to address issues of building height and massing:

- Reduce the height limit from six stories to three stories with an overall height of 45 feet within the T4.8 General Urban Zone, and reduce the height limit from six stories to four stories with an overall height of 55 feet within the T5.3 Town Center Zone
- Reduce the height limit from six stories to two stories in the T4.8 zone within the Moon Drive Overlay
- Redefine the Height measurement to be consistent with Municipal Code Section 24.405.040
- Change the area currently zoned T4.9 General Urban zone to T4.8 General Urban zone
- Remove the Four Story Height Overlay from the Regulating Plan and replace with the Height Transition Overlay; rename Section 24V.202.060, from 1 to 4 Story Height Limit Overlay to Height Transition Overlay and modify regulation
- Amend the General Urban Zone 8 (T4.8) to allow Villa, Row House Live/Work, Side Court Housing, Courtyard Housing and Stacked Dwelling building types
- Amend the General Urban Zone 5 (T4.5) standards to change the minimum floor to floor height of 15 feet to a minimum floor to floor height of 15 feet on the ground floor shopfront
- Montalvo Community Area. Apply a Two Story Height Limit Overlay to Commercial Planned Development (CPD) and Manufacturing Planned Development (MPD) zones in an area bounded by Seahawk Street, Alameda Avenue, Ventura Boulevard and Montalvo Drive
- Bristol Neighborhood Center. Change property from Intermediate Commercial C1-A to Limited Commercial C-1, reducing the maximum height from 6 stories to 3 stories

3. Amend the General Plan to resolve inconsistencies among land use designations, zoning designations, and existing use in the following areas:

- Montalvo Community Area. Amend the General Plan to revise land use designations to more appropriately reflect the zoning designations of the area’s 255 parcels, as follows:
- Change the General Plan land use designation of three parcels that are currently zoned Commercial Planned Development (CPD) from residential Neighborhood Medium (NM) to Commerce (C)
- Change the General Plan land use designation of 202 parcels that are currently zoned R-1-6 from residential Neighborhood Medium (NM) to residential Neighborhood Low (NL)
- Change the General Plan land use designation of three parcels that are zoned R-2 from Neighborhood High (NH) to residential Neighborhood Medium (NM)
  - 2325 Vista Del Mar Drive. Amend the General Plan to revise this property’s land use designation from Residential Neighborhood High to Industry, in order to more appropriately reflect its MPD zoning and its use as a citrus processing plant.
  - 2842 and 2960 North Ventura Avenue. Change the General Plan land use designation of two parcels from Industry to Commerce
  - 2223 North Ventura Avenue (North of Stanley Avenue, east of Hwy 33). Change the General Plan land use designation of two parcels from Commerce to Industry
  - 1250 and 1272 North Olive Street and 133 Sunnyway Drive. Change the General Plan land use designation of three parcels from Industry to Neighborhood Medium
  - 4440 Olivas Park Drive. Change the General Plan land use designation of one parcel from Open Space to Agriculture and change the zoning from Residential Single Family (R-1-1AC) to Agriculture (A)

4. Amend the General Plan to resolve citywide zoning and General Plan inconsistencies for the following types of parcels:

  - Inconsistent parcels:
    - Hospitals and convalescent homes with General Plan and zoning designations in disagreement. Change from Neighborhood High to Institutional
  
  - Atypical parcels:
    - City and Linear Park parcels that are part of the City’s park and trail system. Change the General Plan Designation to Parks and Open Space (POS) and change Zoning to Parks (P) for city-owned parks and trail system.
    - Private parcel designated Parks and Open Space. Change to Commerce on North Ventura Avenue.
    - City parking lots. Change the General Plan Designation from Neighborhood Low to Commerce to be consistent with the Main and Thompson Corridor Development Code Area.
    - Saticoy & Wells Development Code. Amend the land use limitations and amend the overlay language for the Open Space-Residential Overlay to allow residential improvements to be consistent with the T3.3 zone. This would affect four properties at 10722, 10736, 10748, and 10758 Darling Road, and would allow the four existing single family homes on these properties to remodel and be able to put second units on their properties, neither of which is allowed under the current land use limitations and overlay language.
o Changes to address these inconsistencies would generally change designations to reflect existing conditions, and would not produce or lead to any physical change in the environment. An exception to this is the following:

- APN 087-0-050-305. This 2.51-acre parcel is currently occupied by a church, but is designated POS (Parks Open Space). Under the proposed project, this designation would be changed from POS to NM (Neighborhood Medium, 9-20 du/ac).

5. Amend the Our Prosperous Community Chapter of the General Plan to reflect the 2013-2018 Economic Strategy, reference partnering organizations, remove economic visions for the Westside, include the Wellness District concept, and revise the mixed-use development strategy.

6. Incorporate the principles for infill as they relate to Ventura (developed by the ad hoc Committee to better define infill) into the Our Well Planned and Designed Community Chapter of the General Plan.

7. Make administrative changes to the General Plan Diagram to depict all General Plan Amendments in land use designations and Sphere of Influence (SOI) adjustments that have been previously approved since adoption of the 2005 General Plan. CEQA analysis was previously conducted as part each of these changes to the General Plan.

8. Amend Chapter 5, Our Sustainable Infrastructure, and Chapter 1, Our Natural Community, of the General Plan to reflect the June 2, 2008 Administrative Council Report recommendations (Appendix A), which would replace existing policies and actions in Chapter 5 with new policies related to water, wastewater, and reclaimed water; and add one new policy related to urban forestry to Chapter 1.

9. Amend Chapter 5 Our Sustainable Infrastructure of the General Plan to reflect the November 9, 2009 Administrative Council Report recommendations (Appendix B). This action would add a section entitled “Stormwater Quality” to General Plan Chapter 5, Our Sustainable Infrastructure, and also add a section entitled “Climate Action” to General Plan Chapter 1, Our Natural Community, with new policies and actions related to reducing greenhouse (GHG) emissions and enhancing the City’s resiliency (adaptation) to climate change.

The actions listed above would affect the amount of housing that could be built on certain parcels in the City and would therefore affect the Inventory of Sites for Housing Development, or Housing Element Land Inventory (HELI), as shown in the Housing Element of the City’s General Plan. The HELI is compared to the City’s Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), which is based on the estimate of the amount of housing needed locally, regionally, and state-wide as determined by the State in consultation with regional and local governments. State Housing Element Law requires that the City demonstrate that its HELI can accommodate the RHNA in order for the City’s Housing Element to be certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) (Department of Housing and Community Development, State of California 2017). The effect on the City’s HELI, by district, neighborhood center, or corridor, is summarized in Table 1.
9. Environmental Setting:

The proposed project would be carried out City-wide. The City of San Buenaventura (Ventura) has an estimated 2015 population of 108,557 (State of California, Department of Finance, May 2016). As shown in Figure 1, Ventura is situated 25 miles southeast of Santa Barbara and 60 miles northwest of Los Angeles, and is bordered by the Pacific Ocean and Ventura River on the west, the Ventura foothills on the north, and the Santa Clara River on the southeast. The City is located at the northwestern edge of the Oxnard Plain, an alluvial plain that covers over 200 square miles in the southern portion of Ventura County. Much of the City is on relatively flat coastal plain that gradually slopes up to the foothills, but some areas of the City are within the foothills themselves, including some areas with steep slopes. The western portion of the City stretches north along the Ventura River and is characterized by a narrow valley bordered by steeply sloped hills along both sides.

Ventura has a Mediterranean climate and the coastline helps to produce moderate temperatures year round, with rainfall concentrated in the winter months. Ocean breezes cool the region in the summer and warm it in the winter. Average daytime summer temperatures in the area are usually in the high 70s to 80s (Fahrenheit). Nighttime low temperatures during the summer are typically in the high 50s to low 60s, while the winter high temperature tends to be in the 60s. Characteristic of Ventura’s semi-marine microclimate, the winter low temperatures are in the 40s. Annual average rainfall in Ventura is about 15 inches. The region is subject to various natural hazards, including earthquakes, landslides, flooding, and wildfires.

10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

The City of San Buenaventura is the lead agency for the project. No approvals from other agencies are required.
### Table 1
City of San Buenaventura Housing Element Land Inventory (HELI) Under Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant and Underutilized Sites by District, Neighborhood Center (NC), or Corridor</th>
<th>Total Developable Units</th>
<th>VL/L (very low/low income)</th>
<th>Mod (Moderate Income)</th>
<th>Above Mod (Above Moderate Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arundel District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol NC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Day NC</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown District</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimball NC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Dr Corridor</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Vista Corridor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St Corridor</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ave District</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bank District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierpont NC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV Mall District</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saticoy NC</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone &amp; Cachuma NC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Corridor</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Blvd Corridor</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Ave Corridor</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Ave Corridor</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Road Corridor</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Vacant and Underutilized Sites</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,026</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,605</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,265</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pending Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,256</strong></td>
<td><strong>528</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,664</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Res. Second Units</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total HELI</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,410</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,133</strong></td>
<td><strong>318</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,929</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RHNA (2014-2021)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,654</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,452</strong></td>
<td><strong>673</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,529</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>681</strong></td>
<td><strong>-355</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2
Comparison of HELI Under Adopted 2014 Housing Element to HELI Under Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Developable Units</th>
<th>VL/L</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant and Underutilized Sites</td>
<td>4,599</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>2,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending Projects</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Res. Second Units</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HELI</td>
<td>8,041</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>5,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA (2014-2021)</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>4,387</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>-414</td>
<td>4,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Developable Units</th>
<th>VL/L</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Vacant and Underutilized Sites</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>2,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending Projects</td>
<td>4,256</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Res. Second Units</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HELI</td>
<td>8,410</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>5,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA (2014-2021)</td>
<td>3,654</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>4,756</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>-355</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison of Total HELI Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Developable Units</th>
<th>VL/L</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Above Mod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total HELI Units Under Adopted</td>
<td>8,041</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>5,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HELI Units Under Proposed</td>
<td>8,410</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>5,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 Regional Location

Image provided by Esri and its licensors © 2018.
Figure 2 Project Location – Areas Affected by Proposed Project
Figure 3 Mixed Use General Plan and Zoning Code Modifications
Figure 4 Victoria Avenue Corridor Development Code (VACDC) and Montalvo Annexation Area Modifications
Figure 5 Inconsistencies

Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2017.
Additional data provided by City of San Buenaventura, 2015.
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is “Potentially Significant” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

| □  Aesthetics | □  Agriculture and Forest Resources | □  Air Quality |
| □  Biological Resources | □  Cultural Resources | □  Geology/Soils |
| □  Greenhouse Gas Emissions | □  Hazards & Hazardous Materials | □  Hydrology/Water Quality |
| □  Land Use/Planning | □  Mineral Resources | □  Noise |
| □  Population/Housing | □  Public Services | □  Recreation |
| ■  Transportation/Traffic | □  Utilities/Service Systems | □  Mandatory Findings of Significance |
Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant 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 could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potential significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature  

Date  

2/8/18
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. AESTHETICS

-- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
   - □
   - □
   - □
   - ■

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
   - □
   - □
   - □
   - ■

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
   - □
   - □
   - ■
   - □

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
   - □
   - □
   - □
   - ■

Existing Setting

The project encompasses the various areas across the City of San Buenaventura shown in Figure 2 as being affected by the proposed project. These areas are located throughout the City, which has a variety of landscapes and seascapes, including natural, agricultural, and urban areas. The City is framed by the Pacific Ocean and the Ventura River on the west, rolling hills on the north, agricultural land on the east, and the Santa Clara River on the south.

Areas of Potential Change

Areas with potential to experience aesthetic change as a result of the proposed project are areas where the project could lead to changes in the visual character, quality, or intensity of development compared to existing conditions. These do not include commercially-designated land uses where the option for developing residential uses would be restricted and in which the Mixed-use land use designation or the ORMU Overlay zone are not being applied. These include the areas shown in gray in Figure 3. Development in these areas is currently mostly commercial in nature and removing the option for developing residential uses in these areas would not lead to an aesthetic change compared to existing conditions. One exception is the Victoria Avenue Corridor Development Code and Montalvo Annexation Areas shown in Figure 4, where the residential option would be removed from the commercially-designated properties along the southern portion of the Victoria Avenue Corridor south of Ralston Street, but where other changes would be made as part of the proposed project that may have aesthetic effects. The remaining areas shown in Figure 3 may experience aesthetic changes as a result of the proposed project and their existing aesthetic setting is therefore described below.
Urban Corridors

The City’s General Plan (Ventura, City of, 2015a) identifies eight key urban corridors: Ventura Avenue, Main Street, Thompson Boulevard, Loma Vista Road, Telegraph Road, Victoria Avenue, Johnson Drive, and Wells Road. All of these corridors may experience aesthetic change as a result of the proposed project, and their existing aesthetic setting is therefore described below. These descriptions are consistent with those provided in Section 4.1, Aesthetics and Community Design of the 2005 Ventura General Plan EIR (Ventura, City of, 2005b).

The Ventura Avenue corridor is characterized by a mix of older, small-scale commercial, industrial, and residential uses, and retains a pedestrian scale. The corridor has been undergoing visual improvements over the past several years (newer developments, removal of overhead power lines), but a large number of buildings that are either vacant or lacking maintenance remain. Development along this corridor generally consists of one or two story commercial and light industrial buildings fronting Ventura Avenue. A few residential and institutional properties and three-story buildings also front Ventura Avenue, but these are a minority.

Main Street is primarily a commerce-oriented corridor with a limited amount of mixed residential/commercial development. Development consists of one- to two-story buildings at a relatively urban intensity. Buildings are generally well-maintained throughout the corridor, though landscaping is sparse in some areas.

Thompson Boulevard is primarily a commerce-oriented corridor with a limited amount of mixed residential/commercial development. Commercial uses are generally one story, while some residential uses are two stories. The intensity of development is lower than along Main Street, with a high number of auto dealerships and large parking areas.

The Loma Vista Road corridor is characterized by a mix of commercial and residential development at varying scales, with a high concentration of medical facilities, including two hospitals. The various sections of the two hospitals range in height from about four to seven stories. Other than the hospitals, development consists primarily of one- and two-story buildings.

The Telegraph Road corridor is characterized primarily by suburban-scale commercial development, with some single-family and multi-family residences, as well as a mobile home park located near Ashwood Avenue. Some portions of this corridor are characterized by “zero lot line” development with on-street parking, while other portions have large front setbacks occupied by surface parking lots between the street and commercial uses. Buildings vary from one to two stories in height with no common architectural theme, setback, or layout.

The Victoria Avenue corridor is an auto-oriented commercial corridor centered on a wide arterial roadway that accommodates large traffic volumes. Sporadic views of visual resources, such as the locally known “Two-trees” and Topa Topa Mountains to the north, and limited views of agricultural areas and the Pacific Ocean to the south, are available from this corridor. The Victoria Avenue corridor is characterized primarily by large-scale shopping centers and other retail development, though single-family residential development is also present. The
General Plan Refinement Project
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The majority of the commercial and professional development along the corridor is low-density and auto-oriented, with building heights typically of one to two stories, with a few three- to four-story buildings.

Architecture along the Victoria Avenue corridor is characteristic of typical urban strip-commercial development. Buildings are constructed out of concrete and steel, contain flat roofs, and there is little ornamentation. Many of the buildings in the Victoria Avenue Corridor area were constructed before 1980, with some newer structures developed during the 1990s, particularly residential and office buildings in the Thille neighborhood west of Victoria Avenue. More recent major developments include the Montalvo Square Shopping Center, which was completed in 2006; and an apartment complex project with buildings up to four stories in height, which is still under construction, located directly south of this shopping center. The Thille and Montalvo neighborhoods to the west and east of Victoria, respectively, are comprised of medium-density, mostly one- and two-story single-family residences and condominiums. The “Montalvo Annexation Area” shown in Figure 4 may have the potential to experience aesthetic change as a result of the proposed project.

The Johnson Drive corridor is a relatively high-speed travel corridor that connects East Ventura to U.S. 101. The corridor is characterized by suburban-scale retail development on either side of Johnson Drive, which in this area is a wide arterial roadway with a landscaped center median that includes several left turn pockets for access into the retail centers. A number of vacant parcels are present near the U.S. 101 interchange.

The Wells Road corridor is characterized by a mix of older industrial uses and newer suburban commercial and residential development. Over the past several years, this area has been undergoing a transition toward a mix of suburban-scale residential and retail uses.

Scenic Corridors

The City’s General Plan also identifies Scenic Corridors in the City from which views of scenic resources are available. Among the eight key urban corridors described above, the following are also identified as Scenic Corridors and could experience aesthetic change under the proposed project: Main Street, Victoria Avenue south of U.S. 101, and Wells Road. Main Street offers intermittent views of historic buildings, parks, and surrounding hillsides. Victoria Avenue south of U.S. 101 offers views of agricultural areas in the south and the foothills north of the City. Wells Road provides views of the hills and agriculture areas on the east side of the road at the base of the hills.

The City’s General Plan (Ventura, City of, 2015a) also identifies nine key urban districts: Upper North Avenue, North Avenue, Downtown, Pacific View Mall, Harbor, Arundell, North Bank, Montalvo, and Saticoy. The existing aesthetic setting of any of these corridors that may experience aesthetic change as a result of the proposed project is described below. These descriptions are consistent with those provided in Section 4.1, Aesthetics and Community Design of the 2005 Ventura General Plan EIR (Ventura, City of, 2005b).
Districts

The Pacific View Mall District encompasses an enclosed shopping mall and adjacent commercial uses along Telegraph Road and Mills Roads. The area is a focal point of commercial activity in the City as well as a transit hub. This district overlaps with the Telegraph Road corridor described above.

The North Bank District includes a mix of automobile retail and industrial/business park uses. The auto center and other uses within this area are highly visible from U.S. 101. The portions of this district that may be affected by the proposed project are located in the northern tip of this area at the Victoria Avenue/U.S. 101 interchange, including a few parcels on the west side of Victoria Avenue at this interchange that are within the neighboring Arundell District, but with the same aesthetic characteristics as the parcels on the east side of Victoria within the North Bank District.

Neighborhood Centers

The proposed project may also affect the aesthetic setting of three Neighborhood Centers identified in the City’s General Plan: College/Day, Bristol, and Saticoy. Neighborhood Centers are small commercial centers offering goods and services serving their local area. Each of the Neighborhood Centers listed above consists of one-story commercial buildings with on-site surface parking lots.

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a) As described above, Main Street, Victoria Avenue south of U.S. 101, and Wells Road are designated as Scenic Corridors in the City’s General Plan, and portions of these corridors could experience aesthetic change under the proposed project. General Plan Policy 4D is to protect views along scenic routes, and Action 4.36 requires that development along these corridors respects and preserves views of the community and its natural context. In these areas, the proposed project would facilitate buildings taller than the existing one-story buildings, but would not increase allowable building heights and would reduce allowed building heights in the Victoria Avenue Corridor, non-residential portions of the Montalvo Community Area, and the Bristol Neighborhood Center. The two-story buildings allowed under the proposed project within the Victoria Avenue Corridor Moon Drive Overlay, and the three-story buildings within the remaining portion of the Victoria Avenue Corridor and the Montalvo Neighborhood area allowed under the proposed project, would not substantially block views from any identified view locations. Therefore, project implementation would not block scenic vistas. Additionally, these changes would occur in already-developed areas and the proposed project does not include any other elements that would potentially block or otherwise negatively affect scenic vistas. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas.

NO IMPACT

b) The City’s General Plan identifies several scenic resources in and around the City, including the seashore, the hillsides, and agricultural land. As discussed in Impact 1a), the proposed project would facilitate 2 story buildings in areas where height is currently limited to one story, but either not affect, or would in some cases reduce, allowed building heights in areas that
could experience aesthetic change under the proposed project. For example, some linear parks would be rezoned to make their zoning more consistent with their actual use as parks, but no physical changes to the parks would occur as a result of this action. The proposed project also would not involve development of any agricultural land, hillside land, or land located directly on the seashore. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources or impede views of scenic resources.

**NO IMPACT**

c) The areas affected by the proposed project are mostly built-out. An incremental addition of mixed use, in newer buildings in the areas where the ORMU Overlay Zone and the Mixed Use Land Use Designation would be applied, would not substantially change the visual character of those areas because many of these areas already contain a mix of residential and commercial buildings and therefore a mixed use visual character, although across multiple sites rather than on a single site.

Among the key urban corridors, scenic corridors, urban districts, and neighborhood centers identified in the City’s General Plan and discussed under *Existing Setting* above, the following do not currently contain any residential uses: the Johnson Drive corridor; the Victoria Avenue south of U.S. 101 Scenic Corridor; the Pacific View Mall District; the North Bank District; and the College/Day, Bristol, and Telephone/Cachuma Neighborhood Centers. In these areas, whose visual character is currently defined, in part, by their solely commercial and/or industrial nature, allowing or even requiring mixed use on some properties that are currently designated commercial would change this visual character. However, there is nothing to indicate that a change toward a more mixed-use environment would constitute a degradation of visual character in these areas.

In all areas where the ORMU Overlay Zone and the Mixed Use Land Use Designation would be applied, whether or not they currently contain any residential uses, individual development projects would be reviewed by the City according to its Design Review procedures (described in Chapter 24.545 of the Municipal Code) to ensure that they do not degrade the visual character and quality of their surroundings and the City as a whole.

Within the Victoria Avenue Corridor Development Code area (including the Montalvo Community Area and the Bristol Neighborhood Center), where the proposed project would amend the Victoria Avenue Corridor Development Code to address building height and massing (see Action 2 under *Description of Project* on page 2 of this Initial Study), the reduction in allowable building heights to two and three stories would mirror more closely the existing visual character of these areas. The building height reductions and amendment to the Victoria Avenue Corridor Development Code for a two story height limit within the Moon Drive Overlay and three-story height limit for the remaining T4.8 zones and amendment to the Municipal Code creating a Two Story Height Limit Overlay within the Montalvo Community Area, and the C-1 zone designation with a three story limit for the Bristol Neighborhood Center, would help new development blend in with existing development in terms of height and massing, thus helping to preserve existing neighborhood character and quality. Individual development projects would be reviewed by the City according to its Design Review
procedures to ensure that these project would not degrade the visual character and quality of their surroundings and the City as a whole.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

d) The areas affected by the proposed project are urbanized and include light sources such as streetlights, parking lot lighting, and lighting from residential and commercial establishments. As discussed above, the proposed project may lead to a different mix of uses in certain parts of the City compared to existing conditions. Any new construction, either with or without the proposed project, would potentially create new sources of light or glare, particularly at night. New mixed use development facilitated by the proposed project in areas that are currently commercial and/or industrial would not tend to produce higher levels of light and glare than these commercial and industrial uses and therefore would not significantly change lighting conditions in these areas. Additionally, lighting improvements for individual development projects would be reviewed by the City through its Design Review procedures (see Chapter 24.545 Section C.7 of the Municipal Code).

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Mitigation Measures

The project would not result in significant impacts to Aesthetics; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

-- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Board. -- Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, 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) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

Existing Setting

Agriculture plays an important role in the economy of the County of Ventura, with an annual agricultural production value of $2.2 billion in 2015 (Department of Food & Agriculture, State of California 2016). Agriculture in the County has access to high quality soils, adequate water supplies, favorable climate, long growing season, and level topography, which contribute to agricultural productivity; however, there is no productive agricultural land, land designated Agriculture, or other agricultural resources within the areas affected by the proposed project.

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-e) The project area is entirely within the urban boundaries set by the City’s General Plan. The areas affected by the proposed project contain no farmland, land designated for agricultural use, or forest land. Ventura contains pockets of land identified as “Prime Farmland” or “Farmland of Statewide Importance,” but they are outside the City’s urban boundaries (Department of Conservation, State of California 2016, Ventura, City of 2005a). There are no forest lands or timberlands identified in the General Plan and implementation of the proposed project would not result in any loss of such lands.

NO IMPACT
Mitigation Measures

The project would not result in significant impacts to Agricultural Resources; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.

### III. AIR QUALITY

-- Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☘</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☘</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☘</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☘</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☘</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Existing Setting

Existing conditions for air quality in Ventura County are described in detail in the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District’s (VCAPCD) 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).

### Regional Climate and Meteorology

Ventura County has a Mediterranean climate, with warm dry summers and cooler, mild winters. Inland areas typically experience a wider range of temperatures than on the coast, mainly due to their separation from the moderating influence of the ocean by distance and terrain such as the coastal mountain ranges. Maximum temperatures in the summer in coastal areas average about 70 degrees Fahrenheit (°F), while temperatures in the high 90’s are typical in the inland valleys. Average minimum winter temperatures range from the low 40s along the coast to the low 30s inland.
The County’s meteorology is largely controlled by a persistent high-pressure system over the eastern Pacific Ocean. The Pacific high-pressure system (Pacific High) remains generally fixed several hundred miles off-shore from May through September. Coastal fog and low clouds often form a marine layer along the coast, typically in the spring and early summer.

Approximately 90 percent of the total annual rainfall in the County occurs between November and April; however, rainfall amounts can vary considerably among different regions in the County. Annual rainfall averages 16 inches along the Coast. The speed and direction of local winds are influenced by the location and strength of the Pacific High, by topographical features, and by circulation patterns resulting from temperature differences between land and sea. In spring and summer, when the Pacific High is at its strongest, on-shore winds from the northwest generally prevail during the day. In the fall, on-shore surface winds decline and the marine layer grows shallow, allowing an occasional weak off-shore flow. Pollutants may accumulate more during this time of year, remaining over the ocean for a few days and then being carried back on-shore.

Inversions occur when a cooler, more stable parcel of air is located beneath a warmer parcel of air. An inversion essentially caps pollutants that are emitted below or within them, resulting in higher ozone concentrations, particularly at the interface between the two parcels of air. This inversion effect is intensified when the Pacific High weakens and moves inland to the east, therefore reducing wind speed along the California coast, which adds to air stagnation.

Santa Ana winds can occur in the County, primarily during the fall and winter. These winds transport warm air and pollutants from the high inland deserts into the Ventura County area. Sometimes, these winds transport pollutants off the coast, where a sea breeze then brings these pollutants back on-shore, where they combine with local emissions and can sometimes result in high pollutant concentrations.

Upper level winds are typically from the north or northwest, but occasionally southerly and easterly winds occur in the winter, particularly in the morning. These winds occur infrequently in the summer, but when they do occur, they are typically accompanied by periods of high ozone (O3), a precursor for smog. Upper level winds can transport pollutants that originate in other Counties into Ventura County.

Local Regulatory Framework

Both the federal and state governments have established ambient air quality standards for the protection of public health. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) is the federal agency designated to administer air quality regulation, while the California Air Resources Board (CARB) of the California Environmental Protection Agency is the state equivalent. Local control of air quality management is provided by the CARB through county-level Air Pollution Control Districts (APCDs). The CARB has established air quality standards and is responsible for the control of mobile emission sources, while the local APCDs are responsible for enforcing standards and regulating stationary sources. The CARB has established 14 air basins statewide. In addition, the City further regulates air quality through the City’s Air Quality Ordinance (Ordinance 93-37). This ordinance requires developers of projects that generate emissions exceeding Ventura County APCD (VCAPCD) significance thresholds to pay air quality impact
fees that are placed in a transportation demand management (TDM) fund that is used by the City to offset project emissions through implementation of regional air quality programs.

The USEPA has set primary national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), suspended particulates known as PM₁₀ (particulate matter with a diameter of 10 microns or less) and PM₂.₅ (particulates of less than 2.5 microns in diameter), and lead (Pb). Primary standards are those levels of air quality deemed necessary, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect public health. In addition, the State of California has established health-based ambient air quality standards for these and other pollutants, some of which are more stringent than the federal standards. Table 3 lists the current federal and state standards for regulated pollutants.

### Table 3: Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>Federal Primary Standards</th>
<th>California Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.09 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-Hour</td>
<td>0.075 ppm</td>
<td>0.07 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>8-Hour</td>
<td>9.0 ppm</td>
<td>9.0 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>35.0 ppm</td>
<td>20.0 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>0.053 ppm</td>
<td>0.03 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.18 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>0.03 ppm</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>0.14 ppm</td>
<td>0.04 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Hour</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.25 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₁₀</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>20 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>150 µg/m³</td>
<td>50 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM₂.₅</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>12 µg/m³</td>
<td>12 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-Hour</td>
<td>35 µg/m³</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>30-Day Average</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.5 µg/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Month Average</td>
<td>1.5 µg/m³</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ppm = parts per million

µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter

*Source: California Air Resources Board, www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf, October 1, 2015.*

Ventura is located in the Ventura County portion of the South Central Coast Air Basin. The VCAPCD is the designated air quality control agency in the Ventura County portion of the Basin. Ventura County is a state and federal non-attainment area for ozone (1-hour and 8-hour, respectively) and a state non-attainment area for suspended particulates (PM₁₀ & PM₂.₅). Ventura County has been listed as “serious nonattainment” for the eight-hour ozone standard. Ventura County is in attainment for the state and federal CO standards.
Current Ambient Air Quality

The Air Quality Monitoring Station in El Rio is the nearest to the City of Ventura and most representative of air quality in the City. The El Rio monitoring station measures ozone, NO₂, PM_{10}, and PM_{2.5}. The closest monitoring station reporting CO is the Goleta-Fairview station in Santa Barbara, but no carbon monoxide data from recent years is available for this station. There are no CO monitoring stations in Ventura County. Table 4 lists the ambient air quality data for the El Rio monitoring station.

Sensitive Receptors

National and state ambient air quality standards represent what is considered safe, within an adequate margin, to protect public health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect the segment of the population most susceptible to respiratory problems, such as children under 14, the elderly over 65, people engaged in strenuous work or exercise, and hospital patients. Most sensitive receptors are schools and hospitals.

As shown in Figure 2, areas affected by the proposed project occur throughout the City. For this reason, many sensitive receptors, including schools and hospitals, occur within or near areas affected by the proposed project. For example, Montalvo Elementary School is located adjacent to the Victoria Avenue Plan and Montalvo Annexation Areas, Anacapa Middle School is located adjacent to the Pacific View Mall District and the Telegraph Road corridor, and Mound Elementary School, Balboa Middle School, and Buena High School are located near the northern end of the Victoria Avenue corridor. Ventura County Medical Center is located within the Loma Vista Road corridor; and Community Memorial Hospital is located in the Loma Vista Road corridor, adjacent to the Main Street Corridor and the Telegraph Road corridor. Other medical facilities, such as urgent care facilities and assisted living facilities, occur either within or near areas affected by the proposed project.

Odors

Existing odors in areas affected by the proposed project are typical of those in an urban environment, and include sources such as car exhaust, smoke and odors from restaurants, and odors from other commercial and industrial uses. Agricultural activities and oil refinery operations near the City also may affect the City. According to California Air Resources Board (CARB)’s Community Health Air Pollution Information System (CHAPIS), stationary sources of air pollution in and near the City include uses in the Ventura Harbor area (including a wastewater treatment plant, a refinery, and the Ventura Port District).

Significance Criteria for Short-Term Emissions

The VCAPCD has not adopted quantitative thresholds for short-term construction emissions that would apply in Ventura County. The VCAPCD recommends thresholds for short-term (i.e., construction) and long-term (i.e., operational) emissions of 25 pounds per day (lbs/day) for ROG and 25 lbs/day for NOx. No quantitative thresholds have been set for PM_{10} (e.g., dust).
### Table 4
Ambient Air Quality Data Concentrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Air Pollution Data</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone, ppm - maximum hourly concentration (ppm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of state exceedances (&gt;0.09 ppm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of federal exceedances (&gt;0.12 ppm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone, ppm - maximum 8-hour concentration (ppm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of State exceedances (&gt;0.07 ppm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of federal exceedances (&gt;0.075 ppm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide, ppm - Worst 8 Hours(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of state 1-hour exceedances (&gt;20.0 ppm)(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of state 8-hour exceedances (&gt;9.0 ppm)(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide, ppm - Worst Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days of state exceedances (&gt;0.18 ppm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter &lt;10 microns, maximum concentration in (\mu g/m^3) (State/Fed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of samples of state exceedances (&gt;50 (\mu g/m^3)), 24-hour average concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of samples of federal exceedances (&gt;150 (\mu g/m^3)), 24-hour average concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter &lt;2.5 microns, maximum 24-hour average concentration in (\mu g/m^3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of days of federal 24-hour average exceedances (&gt;35 (\mu g/m^3))</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CARB, Air Quality Data Statistics; available at http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/topfour/topfour1.php

All data except for CO data is from the El Rio Monitoring Station

\(^a\) No CO monitoring is available in Ventura County; the closest point is the Goleta-Fairview site results.

NA= Not Available
Discussion of Checklist Answers

a) The VCAPCD’s Air Quality Management Plan, adopted in 2016, includes the County’s strategy for attaining ozone standards. Vehicle use, energy consumption, and associated air pollutant emissions are directly related to population growth. A project may be inconsistent with the AQMP if it would generate population exceeding the forecasts used in the development of the AQMP. As discussed in Section XIII, Population and Housing, the proposed amendments to the General Plan would not directly induce any population growth but, as shown in Table 2, would result in an increase in the City’s total Housing Element Land Inventory (HELI) of 331 housing units. As discussed in Section XIII, Population and Housing, this potential increase would be consistent with SCAG population forecasts and the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

b) The proposed project would not involve any specific development that would generate long-term increases in air pollutant emissions. As discussed below, neither construction activity nor long-term operation of new development facilitated by the proposed project would cause any violation of any air quality standards, or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Construction Impacts

Individual construction projects carried out under the proposed project would generate temporary air pollutant emissions, including fugitive dust (PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$) and exhaust emissions from heavy construction vehicles, and reactive organic gases (ROG) that would be released during the drying phase upon application of architectural coatings. Grading, excavation, hauling, and site preparation would involve the largest use of heavy equipment and generation of fugitive dust. Construction equipment would be required to comply with U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and CARB Tier 3 standards for off-road diesel engines.

The VCAPCD has not adopted quantitative thresholds of significance for construction emissions, since such emissions are temporary. Rather, the VCAPCD recommends implementation of emission and dust control requirements for all construction projects with ROG or NOx emissions over 25 pounds per day (VCAPCD, 2003). While it is possible that construction-related emissions of ROG and NOx associated with construction of individual projects could exceed 25 pounds per day, VCAPCD and City requirements pertaining to control of dust and emissions would apply to all construction activity.

Operational Impacts

National and state ambient air quality standards represent what is considered safe, within an adequate margin, to protect public health and welfare. These standards are designed to protect the segments of the population most susceptible to respiratory problems, such as children under 14, the elderly over 65, people engaged in strenuous work or exercise, and hospital patients. Sensitive receptors within or near the project area include elementary, junior high, and high schools and hospital/urgent care facilities.
While the proposed project would change the types of uses allowed in some areas, potentially leading to mixed-use development in some areas where it is not currently allowed, it would not substantially increase the total amount of development in these areas, especially since these areas are already developed and new development would therefore replace existing development in most cases. The proposed project would be consistent with the VCAPCD’s AQMP (see Impact IIIa) and applicable population forecasts (see Section XIII, Population and Housing). The County is in attainment for applicable CO standards and, based on low ambient CO levels, carbon monoxide hot spots are not anticipated. Therefore, potential emissions associated with the proposed project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

c) As discussed under items (a) and (b), the proposed project would be consistent with the VCAPCD’s AQMP. While construction-related emissions of ROG and NOx associated with construction of individual projects could exceed 25 pounds per day, standard City construction conditions and VCAPCD Rule 55 pertaining to control of fugitive dust would apply and would reduce construction-related emissions for individual construction projects to the maximum degree feasible.

Operational emissions from individual future developments could exceed the VCAPCD’s 25 pounds per day thresholds for ROG and NOx. However, the City’s Air Quality Ordinance (Ordinance 93-37) would address impacts from individual projects by requiring payment of air pollution buy down fees in accordance with VCAPCD guidelines. These fees would be used to fund air pollution control programs that would reduce any net increase in citywide air pollutant emissions to below VCAPCD thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is in non-attainment.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

d) Sensitive receptors include residential areas, schools, hospitals, and daycare centers. The sensitive receptors closest to areas that may experience changes in development patterns compared to existing conditions under the proposed project (the areas shown in orange and green on Figure 3, and the area shown in green on Figure 4) are the schools and medical facilities discussed in the Existing Setting – Sensitive Receptors section above. These changes in development patterns would generally lead to more mixed-use development in commercial areas. Mixed-use development would consist of a mix of commercial and residential uses, which would not tend to have higher emission levels per capita or per square foot than commercial or residential uses already existing in these areas. Additionally, as discussed in parts b-c, the project would not generate emissions exceeding VCAPCD significance thresholds. For these reasons, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
e) The proposed project would allow mixed-use developments in urban built-out areas. Mixed-use development would consist of a mix of commercial and residential uses, which would not tend to create objectionable odors to a greater extent than the commercial or residential uses already allowed or existing in these areas. Actions facilitated by the proposed project would generally not affect the type or amount of development compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**Mitigation Measures**

The project would not result in significant impacts to Agricultural Resources; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

-- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife 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, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. 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 wildlife nursery sites?
General Plan Refinement Project
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES
-- Would the project:

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? □ □ □ ■

Existing Setting
The City’s General Plan is predominantly focused on the intensification and reuse of previously developed areas, thereby limiting expansion into agricultural and/or relatively undisturbed areas. Policies and actions put forth in the General Plan are intended to decrease development pressure on more sensitive or biologically productive areas within the scope of the General Plan. The proposed actions to refine the City’s General Plan and Municipal Code are aligned with the intensification and reuse of previously developed areas and the development of currently vacant infill parcels in a manner compatible with existing development.

Existing development in areas that may experience changes in development compared to existing conditions under the proposed project (shown in Figure 3 and Figure 4) are in urbanized parts of the City. Sensitive habitats and sensitive species are therefore limited in these areas due to existing development or prior disturbance. Existing habitat consists largely of landscape trees, which can provide habitat to nesting birds. The monarch butterfly (Danaus plexippus), a CDFW Special Animal, can also roost in landscape trees that serve as wintering sites, in addition to sensitive bats such as the California Mastiff bat (Eumops perotis).

Some of the “Inconsistencies” parcels shown in Figure 5 are within less urbanized areas, such as the Olivas Park Golf Course and Arroyo Verde Park. Actions proposed on these parcels, however, would merely resolve inconsistencies between land use designations, zoning designations, and existing uses, and would encourage preservation of existing uses. Thus, they would not lead to any physical changes in the environment that could affect biological resources.

Discussion of Checklist Answers
a) The parcels that could experience physical change under the proposed project are completely developed and urbanized, and occupied by residential and commercial uses, with the exception of approximately 65 vacant parcels which are surrounded by development. As a result, these parcels maintain little to no native vegetation and wildlife resources, which have been virtually eliminated through urban development. They also provide no significant habitat for vertebrate
species with the potential to occur in commercial and residential areas in Ventura County due to the urbanized character of the site and vicinity, although there may be a variety of common wildlife species, including rodents (e.g., mice, rats, and squirrels), snakes, lizards, opossums, and birds. No candidate, sensitive, or special status species are known or suspected to be located on these parcels or in their immediate vicinity. The 2005 General Plan EIR (Ventura, City of, 2005b) concluded that all of the General Plan land use scenarios would largely avoid impacts to sensitive habitats and mature native trees by emphasizing intensification/reuse of urbanized areas, and that implementation of General Plan policies and actions that aim to protect sensitive habitats and mature trees would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Because the proposed project would not involve increased development in areas outside those already planned for development under the General Plan, implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse effects to species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

b-d) As explained under *Existing Setting*, the proposed project would only have potential physical effects to biological resources in the areas identified in Figure 3 and Figure 4. Development facilitated by the proposed project would occur within urbanized and previously developed areas with the exception of approximately 65 vacant parcels, all of which are also generally surrounded by existing development. No riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, federally protected wetlands, or wildlife corridors have been identified in these areas or their immediate vicinity. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on such resources.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

e, f) Because, as discussed above, the proposed project would have no significant adverse impacts on biological resources, it would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the State Natural Communities Conservation Plan or the conservation and open space element (*Our Natural Community*) of the City’s General Plan. Areas for which the proposed project would facilitate physical change are not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan Natural Community Conservation Plan or other habitat conservation plan area.

**NO IMPACT**

**Mitigation Measures**

The project would not result in significant impacts to Biological Resources; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Existing Setting

The City of San Buenaventura is rich in cultural and historic resources due to the long history of human settlement that spans from the Chumash civilization to Spanish settlements. Within the Ventura General Plan Planning Area, there are 25 recorded archaeological sites and 96 historic landmarks or points of interest, at least 43 of which may also contain subsurface cultural resources. Most of these historic sites are in the Downtown Specific Plan area (see Figure 6). For example, a number of historic sites are located in the Mission Historic District, including Mission San Buenaventura, the China Alley Historic District, and the John C. Fremont Camp; and the Selwyn Shaw Historic District, located one block west of Cemetery Memorial Park on Poli Street between Downtown and Midtown, contains several historic homes. Prehistoric sites generally involve at least one of the following resources: middens, milling stone sites, large villages, cemeteries, hilltop bead shrines, flake scatters and camp workshops (Ventura, City of 2005b).

There are about 111 properties that are considered local landmarks city-wide, but most are outside of areas that would be directly affected by the proposed project, as can be seen by comparing the locations of City-designated historic landmarks, historic points of interest, and historic districts (Figure 6) to the areas affected by the proposed project (Figure 2). Areas with historic properties in or near areas directly affected by the proposed project include the Simpson Tract Historic District in the Westside area, historic sites located in the Ashwood area, the Ivy Lawn Historic District, and the Rancho Attilio Site. For example, the Dudley House Historic Museum (197 N Ashwood Avenue) historic landmark is located in proximity to several inconsistent parcels and parcels in the proposed Mixed-Use Overlay Zone in the Ashwood area, the Ivy Lawn Cemetery Memorial Park and Funeral Home (5400 Valentine Road) historic district is located just south of the Victoria Avenue Corridor Development Code Area, and the
Figure 6 Historic Resources

Image provided by Esri and its licensors © 2018.
Additional data provided by City of San Buenaventura, 2017.
Rancho Attilio Site is located at the eastern end of the City near commercially- and industrially-designated properties in the unincorporated Saticoy community. There are no historic sites in the Victoria Avenue corridor or the Saticoy and Wells corridor (Ventura, City of 2016a). The Montalvo District, Midtown corridor, and Telegraph Road support a number of buildings that may have historic merit since they exceed 40 years in age (Ventura, City of 2009a).

**Discussion of Checklist Answers**

a-d) The proposed project would not alter the City’s requirements and procedures for development review and permitting that support the protection of cultural resources. The presence of known historic sites and resources could be a constraint to possible future development facilitated by the proposed project in some locations. In addition, there is the possibility that unknown archaeological resources could be discovered during any subsequent development project in the City.

General Plan Policy 9D calls for the proper treatment of archaeological and historic resources, and Action 9.15 calls for the suspension of development activity when archaeological resources are discovered in order for a qualified archaeologist to oversee handling of the resources in coordination with the Ventura County Archaeological Society and local Native American organizations as appropriate (Ventura, City of 2005b).

General Plan Action 9.19 contains provisions for historic assessment when new development or demolition is proposed for a structure 40 years or age or older. Chapter 24.545 of the Ventura Municipal Code includes major and minor design review requirements for structural renovations or new construction in the Historic District Overlay Zones or for designated historic landmarks or points of interest (Ventura, City of 2017).

Adherence to 2005 General Plan policies and actions, the provisions of the General Plan Action 9.19, and the requirements of the City’s Municipal Code, would reduce potential impacts to historic resources and unidentified prehistoric archaeological or paleontological resources or human remains to a less than significant level.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**Mitigation Measures**

The project would not result in significant impacts to Cultural Resources; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

-- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
   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? □ □ ■ □
   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? □ □ ■ □
   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? □ □ ■ □
   iv) Landslides? □ □ ■ □

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? □ □ ■ □

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? □ □ ■ □

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? □ □ ■ □

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? □ □ ■ □

**Existing Setting**

Similar to much of southern California, Ventura is located in a seismically active region, crossed by several potentially active fault systems. Major fault zones in the area include the Ventura-Foothill, Country Club, Oak Ridge, McGrath, and Red Mountain faults. Much of the City is on the relatively flat coastal plain, but steeply sloped hills abut the northern portion of the City. Drainage throughout the project area is generally from the hillsides to the southwest toward the Pacific Ocean.
Major faults in the project area that may produce damaging ground shaking include the Ventura-Foothill, Oak Ridge, McGrath, and Country Club Faults. The Ventura-Foothill Fault zone is considered active, and designated as an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone by the State Geologist in 1978 (Department of Conservation, State of California 1978). The Ventura-Foothill Fault runs along the foothills of the City, to the north of the Downtown Specific Plan area. The Oak Ridge and McGrath Faults run across the southern portion of the City, and are considered potentially active and probably active. The Oak Ridge Fault crosses through the Victoria Avenue corridor, and roughly parallels Highway 126 south of Telephone Road (Impact Sciences, Inc. 2011). The Country Club Fault runs across the eastern portion of the City between Kimball Road and Wells Road to the west and east, and between Telegraph and Telephone Roads to the north and south. The Country Club Fault is considered potentially active, but does not appear to cross the Saticoy and Wells corridor (Ventura, City of 2005b).

**Discussion of Checklist Answers**

a.i, ii) The project comprises six actions to refine the City’s General Plan and Zoning Code portion of the City’s Municipal Code to create mixed-use overlay zones in specific areas of the city for future optional residential capacities compatible with existing uses, and to resolve General Plan inconsistencies between land use and zoning designations and existing uses in select areas. Typical of areas across California, the areas affected by the proposed project are on or near active or potentially active fault traces and are therefore potentially subject to surface rupture. However, all aspects of the proposed project emphasize infill development in already developed areas. All new development is and would be subject to the City’s General Plan Policy 7B to minimize geologic and flood risks, and Action 7.7, which requires project proponents to perform geotechnical evaluations and implement mitigation prior to development of any site (Ventura, City of 2005a). New development would also be subject to the California Building Code (CBC) standards to protect people and structures from loss, injury or death due to rupture, ground shaking, ground failure and landslides (Ventura, City of 2005b). With continued compliance with the City’s General Plan policy and actions, and the CBC, implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects related to rupture or ground failure.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

a.iii) Liquefaction due to seismic activity is a potential geological hazard for much of the City due to shallow ground water and presence of liquefiable soils (Department of Conservation, State of California 2002). Areas affected by the proposed project with liquefaction potential are along Ventura Avenue on the Westside, throughout the Midtown corridors and Ashwood zone, the southern portion of the Victoria Avenue corridor just north of US 101, and along Wells Road, which follows parts of Brown Barranca (Ventura, County of 2015). All new development would conform to the CBC (as amended at the time of permit approval), as required by law. General Plan Action 7.7 requires geotechnical investigations in specified situations. Implementation of these codes and actions would ensure that future construction would resist damage from liquefaction or soil expansion. Implementation of the project would not impact the existing conditions or risk of liquefaction and future developments would continue to be subject to the laws and regulations currently in place.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
a.iv) Areas most susceptible to landslides are located on the hills north of the City. However, the areas that could experience changes in physical development due to the proposed project do not contain steep slopes and are not subject to landslide hazards (Ventura, City of 2005b).

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

b-d) Expansive soils, which exist in many areas affected by the proposed project, are susceptible to erosion. However, areas that could experience physical change due the proposed project consist of completely developed or previously developed land, with most surface soils being covered by existing buildings or pavement. CBC and City standards for building construction and review would ensure that future projects would be adequately protected from soil erosion, loss of top soil, lateral spreading, or expansion. Implementation of the proposed project would not itself cause soil disturbance or increase the risk of soil erosion, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Future development projects would continue to be subject to the laws and regulations currently in place.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

e) The project does not entail implementation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The entire City relies on a sewer system for wastewater disposal. Future development projects would continue to be connected to existing City wastewater conveyance and treatment systems.

**NO IMPACT**

**Mitigation Measures**

The project would not result in significant impacts to Geology and Soils; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

-- Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? □ □ ■ □

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? □ □ ■ □

City of San Buenaventura
Climate change is the observed increase in the average temperature of the Earth’s atmosphere and oceans along with other substantial changes in climate (such as wind patterns, precipitation, and storms) over an extended period of time. Climate change is the result of numerous, cumulative sources of greenhouse gases (GHGs). GHGs contribute to the “greenhouse effect,” which is a natural occurrence that helps regulate the temperature of the planet. The majority of radiation from the Sun hits the Earth’s surface and warms it. The surface in turn radiates heat back towards the atmosphere, known as infrared radiation. Gases and clouds in the atmosphere trap and prevent some of this heat from escaping back into space and re-radiate it in all directions. This process is essential to supporting life on Earth because it warms the planet by approximately 60° Fahrenheit. Emissions from human activities since the beginning of the industrial revolution (approximately 250 years ago) are adding to the natural greenhouse effect by increasing the gases in the atmosphere that trap heat, thereby contributing to an average increase in the Earth’s temperature.

GHGs occur from both human and non-human activities. Human activities that produce GHGs are the burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas for heating and electricity, gasoline and diesel for transportation); methane from landfill wastes and raising livestock, deforestation activities; and some agricultural practices. Greenhouse gases produced by human activities include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). Since 1750, it is estimated that the concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide in the atmosphere have increased over by 36%, 148%, and 18% respectively. Emissions of GHGs affect the atmosphere directly by changing its chemical composition while changes to the land surface indirectly affect the atmosphere by changing the way in which the Earth absorbs gases from the atmosphere. Potential impacts of global warming in California may include loss in snow pack, sea level rise, more extreme heat days per year, more high ozone days, more large forest fires, and more drought years (CEC, March 2009).

Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 was issued by the Governor in June 2005. EO S-3-05 sets a GHG emission reduction target of 1990 levels by 2020. Assembly Bill 32, the “California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006,” was signed into law in the fall of 2006. This bill also requires achievement of a statewide GHG emissions limit equivalent to 1990 emissions by 2020 (essentially a 25% reduction below 2005 emission levels) and the adoption of rules and regulations to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emissions reductions. In response to EO S-3-05, CalEPA created the Climate Action Team (CAT), which in March 2006, published the Climate Action Team Report (CAT Report) (CalEPA, 2006). The 2006 CAT Report identified a recommended list of strategies that the state could pursue to reduce GHG emissions. The strategies include a variety of techniques aimed at the reduction of passenger and light duty truck emissions, reduction of energy and water use and increased recycling. In addition, in 2008 the California Attorney General published The California Environmental Quality Act Addressing Global Warming Impacts at the Local Agency Level (Office of the California Attorney General, Global Warming Measures Updated May 21, 2008). This document provides information that may be helpful to local agencies in carrying out their duties under CEQA as they relate to global warming. Included in this document are various measures that may reduce the global warming related impacts of a project such as reducing water use and encouraging smart land use.
The adopted \textit{CEQA Guidelines} provide regulatory guidance on the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions in CEQA documents, while giving lead agencies the discretion to set quantitative or qualitative thresholds for the assessment and mitigation of GHGs and climate change impacts. Neither VCAPCD, the City of Ventura, nor the Ventura Port District have adopted GHG emissions thresholds, and no GHG emissions reduction plan with established GHG emissions reduction strategies has been adopted locally. The VCAPCD staff, though, has examined options for GHG thresholds for CEQA documents, and has developed Draft Thresholds, explained below.

\textbf{VCAPCD Draft Thresholds}

In November 2011, the VCAPCD staff prepared a report titled \textit{Greenhouse Gas Thresholds of Significance Options for Land Use Development Projects}. The report presents a number of options for setting GHG significance thresholds. Since 2008, the CARB and several larger local air districts (South Coast, Bay Area, and San Joaquin) have undertaken efforts to identify and adopt suitable GHG significance thresholds for land use development projects in their respective jurisdictions. Several other California air districts, including VCAPCD, are still looking into this complex matter as part of their CEQA implementing procedures (CEQA Guidelines §15022) or thresholds of significance development (CEQA Guidelines §15064.7). Such thresholds, however, would only be advisory and not regulatory directives. That is because, although California air districts have a vital role in the CEQA review process, and have authority to regulate emissions from indirect or area-wide sources (\textit{California Health & Safety Code} §40716(a)), they do not have authority over land use projects (\textit{California Health & Safety Code} §40716(b)), and have not adopted control measures, rules, or regulations governing GHG emissions from land use projects.

Given that Ventura County is adjacent to the area under the South Coast AQMD’s jurisdiction and is a part of the SCAG region, District staff believes it makes sense to set local GHG emission thresholds of significance for land use development projects at levels consistent with those set by the South Coast AQMD. While no conclusive threshold of significance has been adopted, the District staff will continue to evaluate and develop suitable interim GHG threshold options for Ventura County with preference for GHG threshold consistency with the South Coast AQMD and the SCAG region.

Based on VCAPCD staff recommendation summarized above, this analysis will rely in part on the draft thresholds of the SCAQMD. The SCAQMD released draft guidance regarding interim CEQA GHG significance thresholds in 2008. In December 2008, the SCAQMD adopted an interim 10,000 metric tons CO2e (MTCO2e) per year screening level threshold for stationary source/industrial projects for which the SCAQMD is the lead agency. The SCAQMD continues to consider adoption of significance thresholds for non-industrial development projects. The most recent proposal issued in September 2010 uses the following tiered approach to evaluate potential GHG impacts from various uses:

- Tier 1: Determine if CEQA categorical exemptions are applicable. If not, move to Tier 2.

\footnote{1 \url{http://www.vcapcd.org/pubs/Planning/GHGThresholdReportRevised.pdf} (accessed January 2018)}
• Tier 2: Consider whether or not the proposed project is consistent with a locally adopted GHG reduction plan (i.e., a Climate Action Plan) that has gone through public hearings and CEQA review, that has an approved inventory, includes monitoring, etc. If not, move to Tier 3.

• Tier 3: Consider whether the project generates GHG emissions in excess of screening thresholds for individual land uses. The 10,000 MTCO2e/year threshold for industrial uses would be recommended for use by all lead agencies. Under option 1, separate screening thresholds are proposed for residential projects (3,500 MTCO2e/year), commercial projects (1,400 MTCO2e/year), and mixed-use projects (3,000 MTCO2e/year). Under option 2 a single numerical screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO2e/year would be used for all non-industrial projects. If the project generates emissions in excess of the applicable screening threshold, move to Tier 4.

• Tier 4: Consider whether the project generates GHG emissions in excess of applicable performance standards for the project service population (population plus employment). The efficiency targets were established based on the goal of AB 32 to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The 2020 efficiency targets are 4.8 MTCO2e per service population for project level analyses and 6.6 MTCO2e per service population for plan level analyses. If the project generates emissions in excess of the applicable efficiency targets, move to Tier 5.

• Tier 5: Consider the implementation of CEQA mitigation (including the purchase of GHG offsets) to reduce the project efficiency target to Tier 4 levels.

The thresholds identified above are not adopted by the SCAQMD or VCAPCD, nor distributed for widespread public review and comment, and the working group tasked with developing the thresholds has not met since September 2010. The future schedule and likelihood of threshold adoption is uncertain.

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a) Construction activities facilitated by the proposed project would generate temporary GHG emissions, primarily due to the operation of construction equipment and truck trips. Operational emissions include emissions from energy use (electricity and natural gas production), area sources (consumer products and landscape maintenance), waste generation (emissions from waste decomposition at landfills), water sources (electricity to supply water to the project site), and mobile sources (vehicles traveling to and from the project sites).

The proposed amendments would allow new mixed-use development in currently developed urban areas under the ORMU Overlay zone and MU Land Use designation; slightly increase residential development potential on four parcels in the Saticoy & Wells Development Code Area; and change the land use designation of the site of an existing church from POS (Parks Open Space) to NM (Neighborhood Medium, 9-20 du/ac). These actions would promote concentrated residential development and infill development. As discussed in Section XVI, Transportation/Traffic, the proposed project would not change the overall intensity of development in these areas in a way that would increase overall trip generation or increase the calculated 2025 Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) at the intersections studied for the 2005 General Plan EIR, Scenario 1. In fact, mixed use development in these areas would likely reduce overall trip generation and traffic impacts compared to solely commercial development, due to
a shift from auto trips to active transportation (e.g. walking, bicycling) or transit trips shown to result from mixed use development.. The VCAPCD has no specific rules or regulations governing land developments and no authority over the permitting of mixed-use facilities.

Integration of residential uses with commercial uses would encourage alternative transportation and discourage motorized vehicle trips. Because the proposed project would encourage infill development and promote the establishment and practice of alternative transit through mixed-use development, it would contribute to long-term reductions in per capita GHG emissions as demonstrated in SCAG’s 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Therefore, the proposed project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

b) Neither the VCAPCD nor the City of Ventura has adopted a Climate Action Plan or any other plan, policy, or regulation for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Senate Bill 375, signed in August 2008, requires the inclusion of sustainable communities’ strategies (SCS) in regional transportation plans (RTPs) for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. In April 2016, the Southern California Association of Government (SCAG) adopted the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). SCAG’s RTP/SCS includes a commitment to reduce emissions from transportation sources by promoting compact and infill development to comply with SB 375. A goal of the SCS is to “promote the development of better places to live and work through measures that encourage more compact development in certain areas of the region, varied housing options, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and efficient transportation infrastructure.”

As stated in Item 9 in the list of Proposed Actions starting on page 1 of this Initial Study, the proposed project would add new policies and actions to the General Plan related to climate change and GHGs, as listed in the November 9, 2009 Administrative Report (Appendix B). These policies and actions call on the City to reduce GHG emissions and enhance the City’s resiliency (adaptation) to climate change.

The areas most likely to experience changes in development as a result of the proposed project are generally areas where mixed-use development would be allowed or required along existing commercial thoroughfares. As discussed under Item a), mixed-use development in these areas would reduce per capita vehicle miles travelled, and thus per capita GHG emissions, compared to conventional residential development. Additionally, the proposed project would add policies and actions to the City’s General Plan to reduce GHG emissions and enhance the City’s resiliency (adaptation) to climate change. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs and would be consistent with the objectives of the RTP/SCS, AB 32, SB 97 and SB 375.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
Mitigation Measure

The project would not result in significant impacts to Greenhouse Gas Emissions; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

-- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

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 ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material 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?
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

-- Would the project:

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact  ☐ Potentially Significant unless Mitigation Incorporated  ☐ Less than Significant Impact  ■ No Impact

Existing Setting

The City of Ventura is bounded to the west by State Route 33. US 101 runs along the southwestern portion of the City, and State Route 126 splits from US 101 outside the Midtown Corridor and runs east, north of the Victoria Street Corridor and south of the Saticoy and Wells Corridor, until it leaves the City. All three routes are identified by the General Plan as routes where transportation of hazardous materials are a concern. There are no superfund sites located within the City, though there are brownfield sites in the Westside and North Ventura Avenue Neighborhoods for which the City received grants between 1999 through 2006 to identify and remediate potential brownfield sites prior to redevelopment (Ventura, City of 2005b). The City has established a Brownfield Assessment Demonstration Pilot Program to fund site assessments and initiate remediation.

Within Ventura, the City Fire Department maintains a team specially trained and equipped to respond to hazardous materials emergencies. Additional equipment and personnel for large-scale hazardous materials incidents is available from the County Fire Protection District, the City of Oxnard, and the U.S. Naval Construction Battalion Center in Port Hueneme (Ventura, City of 2005a). The County of Ventura Environmental Health Division is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) to implement the unified hazardous waste and hazardous materials management regulatory program within the County. The City of Ventura Fire Department is a Participating Agency (PA) authorized by the County CUPA to enforce certain elements of the hazardous materials management regulatory program within its jurisdiction (Ventura, City of 2005b). While the County CUPA enforces the hazardous waste program element within the City, the Ventura Fire Department enforces the Hazardous Materials Business Plan, Underground Storage Tanks, Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tanks and the California Accidental Release Prevention program elements of the CUPA program. In addition to conducting periodic facility inspections, CUPA and PA programs include hazardous materials emergency response, investigation of the illegal disposal of hazardous waste, public complaints, and storm water illicit discharge inspections (Ventura, County of 2012). The City Fire Department compiles and maintains a list of businesses that meet the threshold criteria for use, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials, compressed gases and/or hazardous waste. The City of Ventura Fire Department responds to all hazardous materials calls within the City. The
City maintains a hazardous materials (HAZMAT) team at Fire Station 6, located at 10797 Darling Road in Ventura. The HAZMAT team is specially trained and equipped to respond to emergencies involving potentially hazardous materials (Ventura, City of 2005b).

a, b) The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because the allowance of mixed-use land use designations and zoning classifications, building height refinements for the Victoria Avenue Corridor, resolution of land use and zoning designation inconsistencies, and clarification of the City’s 2013-2018 Economic Strategy and incorporation of principles for infill development in the General Plan’s Our Prosperous Community and Our Well Planned Community chapters, respectively, would not significantly increase the public’s exposure to hazardous materials. In most areas where mixed use development would be allowed under the proposed project, some residential development already exists in proximity to these areas so the addition of more residential development in a mixed use setting would not significantly affect hazardous materials risks. In proposed mixed use areas that do not currently contain any residential uses (the Johnson Drive Corridor; the Pacific View Mall District; the North Bank District; and the College/Day, and Bristol Neighborhood Centers), there are no hazardous materials risks that would pose a significant risk to residents of new mixed use developments and mixed commercial-residential developments themselves would not produce or involve the transport of significant quantities of hazardous materials.

While some new mixed use developments allowed under the proposed project could be located along major transportation corridors, the Ventura County Hazardous Materials Program regulates hazardous materials that traverse the City, most frequently along State Routes 33 and 126, US 101, and the Union Pacific Railroad (Ventura, City of 2005b).

Compliance with the policies and actions set forth in the 2005 General Plan, in combination with existing regulations administered by the State of California and Ventura County HAZMAT Program, would ensure that the proposed project does not create significant hazards to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, disposal, or reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving hazardous materials.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

c) There are over 30 schools in the Ventura Unified School District, most of which are located within one-quarter mile of areas that would be affected by the proposed project. With the exception of the land use designation change from Residential Neighborhood High to Industry at 2325 Vista Del Mar Drive, the proposed project would not facilitate new development that would involve the transport, use, or disposal of large quantities of hazardous materials. The land use designation for the Vista Del Mar Drive property reflects the current use of the site as a citrus processing plant so is not expected to involve any increase in the use of or exposure to hazardous materials. Otherwise, the proposed project encourages mixed-use commercial and residential development in select areas of the City. Future development projects would be required to comply with uses permitted under land use and zoning designations for specific project sites to ensure proposed uses are compatible with existing uses in the vicinity. Therefore, hazards materials and emissions impacts to schools would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**
d) Areas that may experience new development under the proposed project are already developed, with the exception of the approximately 65 vacant parcels, which are surrounded by development. As explained in VIII a, b, above, the proposed project would not significantly increase the public’s exposure to hazardous emissions or materials. Moreover, either with or without the proposed project, development of any project requiring City approvals would be reviewed for its potential to be affected by a hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As necessary, existing soil or groundwater contamination would be remediated under the direction of an appropriate regulatory agency in conjunction with new development in order to avoid potential health and safety risks. As a result, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from its potential to be located on such a site.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

e, f) The City is not located within two miles of an airport or private airstrip, and not within an airport land use plan. The nearest airports are Camarillo Airport (approximately eight miles southeast of the City), Oxnard Airport (approximately five miles south of the City), and Santa Paula Airport (approximately 11 miles northeast of the City). Therefore, no impact related to airport safety hazards would occur.

NO IMPACT

g) The proposed project would not involve any alteration of street patterns associated with major emergency evacuation routes. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or otherwise interfere with adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. In the unlikely event that any future development projects would involve changes to emergency response or evacuation routes, they would be required to address such impacts at that time as part of the City’s standard project review.

NO IMPACT

h) Areas for which the proposed project would facilitate new development are located in developed and urban settings that are not generally subject to wildland fires, because they are not located directly adjacent to any hillside areas that would have wildfire risks. Most areas identified as being very high fire hazard severity zones under the City’s responsibility area are located along the northern boundary of the City in such hillside areas (Department of Forestry & Fire Protection, State of California 2010). Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

NO IMPACT

Mitigation Measures

The project would not result in significant impacts to Hazards and Hazardous Materials; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.
General Plan Refinement Project  
Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

-- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? □ □ ■ □

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)? □ □ ■ □

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? □ □ ■ □

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? □ □ ■ □

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? □ □ ■ □

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? □ □ ■ □

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? □ □ □ ■

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? □ □ □ ■
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

-- Would the project:

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? □ □ ■ □

j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? □ □ □ ■

Existing Setting

Rainfall in Ventura generally drains from the hills to the north and terminates in the Ventura River, Santa Clara River, or the Pacific Ocean (Ventura, City of 2005a). The Ventura County Watershed Protection District (VCWPD) has jurisdiction over and maintains approximately 20 natural barrancas and concrete channels that serve as major drainages in the City. Most areas affected by the proposed project are outside of Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplains, and would not be subject to major flood hazards, with the exception of areas around the Wells and Saticoy Corridor by Brown Barranca², Johnson Drive Corridor adjacent to Harmon Barranca³, and the Westside Corridor along the Ventura River⁴ (Department of Homeland Security, U.S. 2017).

The City owns and/or maintains local drainage facilities in the City. Most City drainage facilities are designed to convey runoff generated from a 10-year storm event within the storm drain, while city streets convey flows above the 10 year storm. The General Plan has adopted actions 5.14 and 5.15 to assess and replace failing and/or deficient storm drain systems in areas of new development or where deficiencies or failures exist (Ventura, City of 2005a).

The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Clean Water Act (CWA) 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments (LARWQCB, June 2007) lists the following areas within the City as areas where water quality is a concern: San Buenaventura Beach; Ventura Harbor; Ventura Keys; Ventura Marina Jetties; and the Ventura River. Water quality is subject to seasonal variation. Common sources of water quality degradation in the Ventura area include surface runoff from oil fields, agricultural areas, urban land uses, and natural sedimentation. Best Management Practices (BMPs) are typically employed during construction to maintain water quality and must be consistent with anticipated pollutant loads and water quality objectives.

If the Castaic and/or Pyramid dams were to fail, they would have the potential to flood the lower portion of the Victoria Avenue Corridor (Ventura, City of 2005b). Castaic Dam is approximately 47 miles to the northeast of Ventura and Pyramid Dam is an additional 15 miles north of Castaic. Both dams meet applicable safety requirements and are inspected by the Division of Dam Safety and the California Department of Water Resources twice per year to ensure compliance and that any necessary maintenance is performed (Ventura, City of 2005b).

**Discussion of Checklist Answers**

a) Changes to development compared to existing conditions resulting from the proposed project would not lead to any significant increase in impervious surfaces, since the areas that could experience these effects are in already-developed areas. Additionally, any new development, with or without the proposed project, would be subject to the General Plan policies and applicable rules, regulations, and BMPs discussed above. For these reasons, the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or wastewater discharge requirements.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

b) The proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan, which encourages intensification and reuse of developed land within City boundaries. Furthermore, the General Plan contains adopted policies and actions for water conservation, such as Action 5.1, which calls for the use of low-flow fixtures, leak repair, drought-tolerant landscaping, and reclamation. Other General Plan policies and actions for water conservation are Policy 5A, Actions 5.1, 5.4, and Policy 5B, Actions 5.7, 5.8, 5.9 and 5.11.

As stated in Item 8 in the list of Proposed Actions starting on page 1 of this Initial Study, the proposed project would replace the existing policies and actions in Chapter 5 of the General Plan with new policies and actions related to water conservation (with Policy 5B and Action 5.10 through Action 5.15 being most directly relevant), as listed in the June 2, 2008 Administrative Report (Appendix A). As stated in Item 9 in the list of Proposed Actions starting on page 1 of this Initial Study, the proposed project would also add new policies and actions to the General Plan related to stormwater quality, as listed in the November 9, 2009 Administrative Report (Appendix B). Among these policies and actions, Policy 5D, (“Low Impact Development (LID) is the preferred best management practice”) and the actions listed below it (Action 5.25 through Action 5.33) are the most directly relevant to water conservation because they promote practices, such as minimizing impervious surfaces and incorporating on-site retention and recharge of runoff, that would promote retention and recharge of runoff into the local groundwater system, rather than channeling this runoff through the stormwater system to the ocean.

Future development facilitated by the proposed project would be subject to these policies and actions, which would reduce water use (including groundwater use), and therefore help prevent groundwater depletion. Additionally, only City water supply sources, which do not include individual groundwater wells, would be allowed for future developments carried out under the proposed project. For these reasons, the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering or the local groundwater table level.
LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

c, d) The proposed actions do not entail alteration of existing drainage patterns. Any future development that would occur in areas that could experience new physical development as a result of the proposed project would be urban infill and not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface in a way that would substantially increase runoff or alter drainage patterns. Furthermore, the 2005 General Plan includes Actions 5.14 and 5.15 to ensure that any deficiencies in storm water drainage facilities would be repaired. The proposed project’s impact on drainage patterns would be less than significant.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

e) Areas for which the proposed project would facilitate new development are largely already developed, with the vast majority of land surface built-up or paved. Development facilitated by the proposed project would be urban infill and would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface area within the affected areas. Furthermore, the General Plan includes Actions 5.14 and 5.15 to ensure that any deficiencies in storm water drainage facilities would be repaired. The proposed project would therefore not 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.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

f) Regulations under the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) require compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general construction storm water permit for projects that would disturb an area greater than one acre. Compliance with the NPDES permit requires preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that contains BMPs to control discharge of pollutants including sediment into local surface water drainage. In addition, the Ventura County Stormwater Quality Urban Impact Mitigation Plan (SQUIMP) requires new development and redevelopment projects to implement various BMPs to minimize the amount of pollutants entering surface waters. Implementation of these standards and adherence to and implementation of adopted policies and actions would ensure that the proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

g, h) Most areas affected by the proposed project are outside of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplain and would not be subject to major flood hazards. Areas that would be affected by the proposed project around the Wells and Saticoy Corridor by Brown Barranca⁵, Johnson Drive Corridor adjacent to Harmon Barranca⁶, and the Westside Corridor along the Ventura River⁷ are adjacent to 100-year floodplains (Department of Homeland Security, U.S. 2017), but all parcels affected by the proposed project in these areas are located in Zone X (areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance

---

flood), and the 100-year floodplain boundaries are limited to the water bodies of the barrancas and the Ventura River. Furthermore, the 100-year flood hazard area for the Ventura River is relatively small due to the construction of a levee along the east bank of the river by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1948 (Ventura, City of 2005b). Therefore, all areas affected by the proposed project are outside the 100-year flood zone.

**NO IMPACT**

i) In the event of a dam failure, several areas affected by the proposed project would be inundated. According to Figure 4.8-5, *Dam Inundation Areas* in the General Plan EIR, failure of the Casitas Dam would impact the entirety of the North Avenue and Westside Corridors; failure of the Santa Felicia Dam would impact the entirety of the North Bank District and Johnson Drive Corridor, and southern portion of the Montalvo District; and failure of the Castaic and Pyramid Dams would impact the Arundell District and the southern portion of the Victoria Avenue Corridor (Ventura, City of 2005b). Areas that may potentially be inundated in the event of a dam failure and that could experience new development as a result of the proposed project are already fully developed, with the exception of the approximately 65 vacant parcels surrounded by development. Regular inspections of all dams reduce the risk of failure to a less than significant level, and the proposed actions would not increase exposure to inundation and dam failures.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

j) Areas for which the proposed project would facilitate new development are outside of the tsunami risk area identified by the California Geological Survey (California Geological Survey, California Emergency Management Agency and University of Southern California 2009). These areas are also outside of the City’s Hillside Management Program area. Though in some places in the vicinity of steep hills, these areas are not within a mudslide risk zone\(^8\) (Department of Conservation, State of California 1971). Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the potential for inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflows.

**NO IMPACT**

**Mitigation Measures**

The project would not result in significant impacts to Hydrology and Water Quality; no mitigation measures are proposed or required and no further analysis is necessary.

---

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

-- Would the project:

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 an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a) The proposed project would encourage infill development in select areas throughout the City, while maintaining existing neighborhood character, and resolve inconsistencies between existing uses and zoning designations. No neighborhoods or communities would be physically divided as a result of implementing the proposed actions.

NO IMPACT

b) The proposed project consists of nine actions intended to refine the City’s General Plan and zoning code in order to encourage infill development and/or resolve inconsistencies between land use and zoning designations in select areas throughout the City. These actions are analyzed below for their consistency with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. For actions 1 through 6, applicable policies from the City’s General Plan are listed subsequently in Table 5, and analyzed for consistency with these policies. Actions 7 through 9 are discussed without reference to Table 5 because they either do not directly relate to, or have no potential to conflict with, any existing General Plan policies (Action 7); or consist of policy revisions to the General Plan that are more appropriately discussed in a more narrative format (actions 8 and 9).

Action 1: Make City-wide General Plan designation and zoning code modifications relating to mixed-use land use designations, zoning classifications, and development standards.

Application of the proposed MU Land Use Designation and ORMU Overlay Zone in the areas shown in Figure 3 would be conducive to intensified infill development, but consistent with the character of existing communities, as explained in Section II, Aesthetics. Vacant and
underutilized parcels have been identified in the Housing Element Land Inventory, throughout the project area but within select corridors and districts of interest, that may be appropriate for mixed-use development following the implementation of the proposed Mixed-Use Overlay Zone. See Table 1 and Table 2 of this Initial Study for a summary of the total development residential potential of these areas. Therefore, Action 1 and its sub-actions would not conflict with existing General Plan policies noted in Table 5.

**Action 2:** Amend the zoning code for the Victoria Avenue Corridor to address issues of building height.

The building height reductions within certain zones, retaining the Height Limit Adjacent to Homes, implementation of a Two Story Height Limit Overlay for specific areas within the Montalvo Community Area, and the height reduction for the Bristol Neighborhood Center, would ensure the preservation of existing neighborhood character by changing development standards to better approximate existing conditions while providing guidance for compatible future development. Therefore, neither Action 2 nor its sub-actions would conflict with existing General Plan policies noted in Table 5.

**Action 3:** Amend the General Plan to resolve inconsistencies between land use designations, zoning designations, and existing use in the Montalvo Community Area and on five other properties throughout the City.

The resolution of land use and zoning designation inconsistencies under Action 3 would more appropriately reflect existing zoning designations and existing uses in these areas, with the majority of parcels affected by this action being located in the Montalvo Community Area, where implementation of Action 3 would change the General Plan land use designation of 202 parcels from higher to lower residential densities to better reflect existing zoning and uses. This action would also change the land use designation of three parcels in the Montalvo Community Area that are currently zoned for Commercial Planned Development (CPD) from a Residential Neighborhood Medium (NM) designation to a Commerce (C) designation, thereby better reflecting existing use and zoning. Similarly, Action 3 would resolve land use and zoning designation inconsistency for the property located at 2325 Vista Del Mar Drive, by changing its land use designation from Residential Neighborhood High (NH) to Industry (I), which would better reflect existing uses on site and in the vicinity. Action 3 would also change the land use designation of four other properties (three in the Ventura Avenue Corridor and one at 4440 Olivas Park Drive) to better reflect existing zoning and uses. Action 3 would ensure existing uses and zoning designations are reflected in land use designations, thereby maintaining community character according to the General Plan policies in Table 5.

**Action 4:** Amend the General Plan to resolve Citywide zoning and General Plan inconsistencies for the following types of parcels: [inconsistent parcels, County remnants, atypical parcels, specific changes for select parcels].

Similar to Action 3 in intent and purpose, Action 4 also entails the resolution of land use and zoning designation inconsistencies for the City. One sub-action would allow second units on four properties in the Saticoy and Wells Corridors, which is encouraged under Policy 2.12 from the City’s 2014-2021 Housing Element (City of Ventura, 2013). Therefore, Action 4 would ensure existing uses are reflected in land use and zoning designations and General Plan policies noted in Table 5.
Action 5: Amend the Our Prosperous Community Chapter of the General Plan to reflect the 2013-2018 Economic Strategy, reference partnering organizations, remove economic visions for the Westside, include the Wellness District concept, and revise the mixed-use development strategy.

The amendments to Our Prosperous Community would include several additions, such as a change to Policy 2A to implement the City’s Economic Development Strategy across six focus areas: government, tourism and quality of life, healthcare and biomedical, manufacturing, regional agriculture and food, and small business and entrepreneurship (Ventura, City of 2015); inclusion of a Wellness District in the Midtown Corridor focused on preventative health care and healthy lifestyles in proximity to residential areas; and the creation of mixed-use land use designations in areas suited for residential development. These sub-actions are aligned with General Plan policies specified in Table 5 due to the focus on creating economic growth and infill development opportunities within the City. Therefore, Action 5 would not conflict with existing General Plan policies.

Action 6: Incorporate the principles for infill as they relate to Ventura (developed by the ad hoc Committee to better define infill) into the Our Well Planned and Designed Community Chapter of the General Plan.

The amendment to Our Well Planned and Designed Community chapter would promote intensification and infill development in areas specified under Actions 1, 3, and 4 to ensure future compatible residential and commercial growth within City boundaries. Action 6 is closely aligned with General Plan policies pertaining to development within the City as well as the use of vacant and underutilized parcels, noted in Table 5. Therefore, Action 6 would not conflict with existing General Plan policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Applicable General Plan Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Plan Policies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Actions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our Prosperous Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A: Establish a clear economic strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B: Make the local economic climate more supportive of business investment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.6: Encourage intensification and diversification of uses and properties in districts, corridors, and neighborhood centers, including through assembly of vacant and underutilized parcels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C: Encourage niche industries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 2.11: Allow mixed-use development in commercial and industrial districts as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Our Well Planned and Designed Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A: Sustain and complement cherished community characteristics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B: Integrate uses in building forms that increase choice and encourage community vitality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C: Maximize use of land in the city before considering expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E: Ensure the appropriateness of urban form through modified development review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014-2021 Housing Element</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12: Facilitate the provision of second units as a means of providing affordable rental housing in existing neighborhoods. Ensure compatibility with the primary unit and surrounding neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1: Maintain an up-to-date inventory of vacant and underutilized parcels and provide to interested developers in conjunction with information on available development incentives. Within redevelopment project areas, provide assistance in land assembly in support of affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Policies</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8: Facilitate the development of mixed-use projects in appropriate commercial areas, including stand-alone residential developments (horizontal mixed-use) and housing above ground floor commercial uses (vertical mixed-use).</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9: Promote higher density housing as part of mixed-use developments along parts of Thompson Boulevard and Main Street in Midtown Ventura, as well as other areas such as Westside, Downtown and within designated neighborhood centers in East Ventura.</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10: Promote mixed-use developments on the Westside of Ventura.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from Ventura, City of, 2005a; Ventura, City of, 2013; Rincon Consultants, 2017*

**Action 7:** Make administrative changes to the General Plan Diagram to depict all General Plan Amendments in land use designations and Sphere of Influence (SOI) adjustments that have been previously approved since adoption of the 2005 General Plan. CEQA analysis was previously conducted as part of each of these changes to the General Plan.

Because this action would simply make the General Plan Diagram consistent with changes that have already been made to the General Plan and SOI, it would not create any new policy or change any existing policies of the General Plan, or have any other effect that would create a policy consistency impact. Action 7 therefore does not relate to, or have any potential to conflict with, any existing General Plan policies.

**Action 8:** Amend Chapter 5, Our Sustainable Infrastructure, and Chapter 1, Our Natural Community, of the General Plan to reflect the June 2, 2008 Administrative Council Report recommendations (Appendix A), which would replace existing policies and actions in Chapter 5 with new policies related to water, wastewater, and reclaimed water; and add one new policy related to urban forestry to Chapter 1.

As stated in the June 2008 Administrative Council Report (Appendix A), policies and actions related to water, wastewater, reclaimed water and urban forestry are addressed in the City’s current General Plan. This action would replace and/or update these policies to further reflect the importance of these issues to the sustainability of the community, and to more clearly establish and update a course of action for City Council and staff to follow in working to achieve community goals. The new policies (each accompanied by actions, listed in Appendix A, to help implement the policies) are the following:

- Policy 5A: Ensure an adequate, reliable and safe water supply
- Policy 5B: Meet water demands while ensuring conservation and sustainability
- Policy 5C: Maintain and operate adequate water system facilities
- Policy 5D: Ensure safe, healthy wastewater service
- Policy 5E: Provide fiscally responsible and environmentally sound wastewater treatment
- Policy 5F: maintain and operate adequate wastewater facilities
- Policy 5G: Pursue energy saving alternatives that are economically viable as well as environmentally sound, including a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, while meeting the wastewater needs of the community
- Policy 1E: Continue to expand our City’s urban forest
Because the new policies within Chapter 5 would replace existing policies, they would not conflict with these existing policies. These new policies would also be consistent with the goal of Chapter 5 of the General Plan, which is to safeguard public health, well-being and prosperity by providing and maintaining facilities that enable the community to live in balance with natural systems. These new policies would also be generally consistent with the other policies of the General Plan, which are designed to be consistent with the goals of each of the other General Plan chapters.

Policy 1E would not conflict with existing policies of Chapter 1, which are to reduce beach and hillside erosion and threats to coastal ecosystem health (1A), increase the area of open space protected from development impacts (1B), improve protection for native plants and animals (1C), and expand the use of green practices (1D). In fact, the actions under Policy 1E would support these other policies in several ways, such as increasing canopy cover and providing root stabilization of soil, which could reduce erosion and runoff; and by increasing habitat for native animals such as nesting birds. Policy 1E would also be consistent with the goal of Chapter 1 of the General Plan, which is to be a model for other communities of environmental responsibility, living in balance with our natural setting of coastline, rivers, and hillside ecosystems.

*Action 9: amend Chapter 5, Our Sustainable Infrastructure, of the General Plan to reflect the November 9, 2009 Administrative Council Report recommendations (Appendix B), which would add a section entitled “Stormwater Quality”, and a section entitled “Climate Action” to General Plan Chapter 1, Our Natural Community, with new policies and actions related to reducing greenhouse (GHG) emissions, and enhancing the City’s resiliency (adaptation) to climate change.*

As stated in the November 2009 Administrative Council Report (Appendix B), the existing General Plan contains stormwater quality protections that ensure development and flood protection improvements are carefully considered alongside their environmental impacts to our natural environment. The recommended additional text, policies, and actions are primarily focused on the benefits of low impact development (LID) and Smart Growth. The recommended policies and actions are derived from the Ahwahnee Water Principles that were prepared by the Local Government Commission, in conjunction with local municipal staff, and adopted by the City Council on April 5, 2004. These policies and actions also complement the Municipal Stormwater Permit that was issued May 7, 2009 by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. LID and Smart Growth principles have been carried forward into subsequent Municipal Stormwater Permits, and these policies and actions therefore remain consistent with the current Ventura County MS4 Permit (LARWQCB, July 2010). The proposed additional text, policies, and actions would therefore build upon, and not be in conflict with, existing City policies.

The City’s current General Plan contains a number of measures that improve air quality through Smart Growth, energy conservation, alternative energy sources, efficient bicycle and mass-transit systems, waste diversion, recycling, water conservation, and composting. All of these actions contribute to local and global sustainability, and benefit efforts to combat global climate change, which has the potential to impact Ventura with higher sea levels, storm surges, inland and upland flooding, erosion of beaches, extreme weather events, and saltwater intrusion into coastal aquifers. The recommended additional policies and actions will contribute
positively to efforts to combat global climate change, while reducing its local impacts. The proposed actions include enacting California’s Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and its subsequent implementing legislation; conducting a citywide greenhouse gas inventory; setting annual targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and coordinating the City’s efforts with emerging strategies identified in AB 32, the Local Government Protocols, and the California Climate Adaptation Strategy. The revisions are also recommended to more clearly establish and update a course of action for City Council and staff that could help the City acquire funding for additional climate action programs.

The proposed Climate Action section of Chapter 1 of the General Plan would be consistent with the goal of this chapter, which is to be a model for other communities of environmental responsibility, living in balance with our natural setting of coastline, rivers, and hillside ecosystems. It would also be consistent with the policies in Chapter 1, especially Policy 1D, which is to expand the use of green practices. The proposed policies and actions would complement, and not conflict with, existing General Plan policies to improve air quality and conserve resources.

All nine of the proposed actions would further refine and promote the City’s General Plan policies and associated objectives. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not cause any conflicts with existing plans or policies.

**NO IMPACT**

c) Areas that would experience physical change under the proposed project are not located within an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other habitat conservation plan area, as discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources. Therefore, the proposed actions would not conflict with any habitat or natural community conservation plan.

**NO IMPACT**

**Mitigation Measure**

The project would not result in significant impacts to Land Use and Planning; no mitigation measures are proposed or required and no further analysis is necessary.

---

### XI. 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? □ □ □ ■
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES
-- Would the project:

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?

[□] Potentially Significant Impact
[□] Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
[□] Less than Significant Impact
[■] No Impact

Existing Setting
Areas affected by the proposed project are not located in a locally important mineral resource recovery site or in a designated Mineral Resource Zone, since there are no known mineral resources delineated in the City of Ventura General Plan Area.

Discussion of Checklist Answers
a, b) The proposed project would not apply to areas known to contain any mineral resources, and areas that would experience physical change under the proposed project are almost completely developed with structures and impermeable surfaces (hardscape such as pavement, sidewalks, parking lots, and roads), with the exception of approximately 65 vacant parcels. There are no mineral extraction activities occurring within areas affected by the proposed project, and the project would not entail construction of structures or facilities for the purposes of extraction or exploration of mineral resources. Therefore, implementation of the project would result in no loss of mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites designated in any existing City planning documents.

NO IMPACT

Mitigation Measure
The project would not result in significant impacts to Mineral Resources; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.
### XII. NOISE

-- Would the project result in:

| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the project? |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☐ |

| 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? |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☑ |

| 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? |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| ☐ | ☒ | ☐ | ☑ |

### Existing Setting

The Ventura 2005 General Plan requires acoustical analyses for new residential developments within a 60dBA CNEL noise contour or higher, or within any area designated for commercial or industrial use where new residential uses could result in exterior noise exceeding 65 dBA CNEL and/or interior noise exceeding 45 dBA CNEL with windows closed (Action 7.32). The 60 dBA CNEL noise contours are located along the highways going through town (SR 33, US 101, SR 118, and SR 126), and local streets with an ADT over 5,000, including the State Routes mentioned above, Main Street, Victoria Avenue, Telegraph Road, and Ventura Avenue.
Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-d) The proposed project would facilitate development of residential units within mixed-use areas, which could potentially affect noise levels, or exposure of sensitive receptors to noise, in those areas. Noise levels generated by operation of residential units would result primarily from traffic associated with these units, and be similar to noise levels generated by traffic associated with existing land uses, which is already on the roadway network in these areas. Section 10.650.130 of the San Buenaventura Municipal Code, sets a daytime threshold of 60 dBA and nighttime threshold of 55 dBA for commercial areas. Because noise levels generated by residential units in these areas would be similar to noise levels generated by existing uses, the residential units would not cause an exceedance of these thresholds.

Noise-sensitive uses in areas affected by the proposed project include residences and schools. Various actions included in the proposed project would either allow new uses in certain areas (such as mixed use development in areas that are now exclusively commercial), or increase residential development on selected parcels, which would promote concentrated residential development. The introduction of additional residential units to these areas would generate noise compatible with existing residential uses in the area. Residential uses do not typically create higher noise levels than commercial development. Thus, in areas that are now exclusively commercial, mixed use development would not necessarily significantly increase ambient noise.

Noise levels generated by construction of mixed use development would be similar to construction noise from other residential or commercial projects. As shown in Table 6, noise levels associated with heavy equipment typically ranges from about 76 to 89 dBA at 50 feet from the source. Such noise levels can be disturbing, particularly to noise-sensitive uses such as residences, schools, and hospitals. The grading/excavation phase of construction tends to create the highest construction noise levels because of the operation of heavy equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Onsite</th>
<th>Average Noise Level at 50 Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Compressor</td>
<td>81 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>85 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw</td>
<td>76 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>89 dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Individual construction projects would be expected to generate noise levels similar to those shown in Table 6. Such levels would be temporary, but could potentially exceed the City’s daytime thresholds for commercial areas of 60 - 75 dBA.
Construction noise is regulated under Chapter 10.650 of the Noise Ordinance of the City’s Municipal Code, which forbids construction exceeding the noise level limits of Article 1, Noise Regulations Generally, between 8:00 p.m. of one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next, but allows them outside those hours. New construction facilitated by the proposed project would, like any new construction in the City, be subject to these requirements, which are meant to secure and promote the health, comfort, safety, and welfare of the City's residents by controlling unnecessary, excessive, and annoying noise.

New residential development meeting the criteria identified in General Plan Action 7.32 would be required to conduct an acoustical analysis and mitigate any noise and vibration impacts exceeding applicable thresholds. Therefore, because noise and vibration associated with construction and operation of development facilitated by the proposed project would be generally consistent with surrounding uses and City noise thresholds, and projects potentially affecting sensitive uses would be required to conduct an acoustical analysis, the proposed project would not expose persons to excessive noise or vibrations levels or result in a substantial permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise and vibration levels above levels existing without the project.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

e, f) Ventura is not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport or in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact relative to airport noise.

NO IMPACT

Mitigation Measures

The project would not result in significant impacts in regards to noise; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

-- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

   □    □    □    ■

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

   □    □    □    ■
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

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

Existing Setting
Ventura has 109,275 residents as of January 2017 (California Department of Finance, 2017b) and is projected to reach approximately 125,300 residents by 2040, nearly a 15% increase (Southern California Association of Governments 2012). The City is nearly built out, and has a limited supply of developable parcels to accommodate commercial, industrial, and residential growth within City boundaries (Ventura, City of 2005b). The City’s 2005 General Plan aims to minimize impacts of growth by emphasizing intensification and reuse of already developed areas to minimize development pressure on agricultural and undeveloped lands, notably in the hillsides above the City.

Discussion of Checklist Answers
a) The proposed actions would not directly induce substantial population growth. Proposed Actions 1 and 3, as described above in Section X, Land Use and Planning, would restrict residential use in existing Commerce and Industry designations, but allow and in some cases require mixed use development in select areas of the City. This would result in an increase in the City’s total Housing Element Land Inventory (HELI) of 331 housing units; however, no new homes or businesses or extension of any roads or other infrastructure are included as part of the proposed project. Based on the assumption that the project could add 331 housing units in the City, given the City’s average household size of 2.61 persons (California Department of Finance, 2017a), these 331 housing units could accommodate 864 people. Adding these 864 people to the City’s January 2017 population of 109,275 (California Department of Finance, 2017b) results in a population of 110,139, which falls well within the SCAG forecast of 125,300 residents by 2040, as well as the projected population of 126,153 for Scenario 1 (the adopted scenario) from the City’s General Plan EIR (Ventura, City of, 2005b). Therefore, the project would not, either directly or indirectly, induce substantial population growth, and no impact would occur.

NO IMPACT

b, c) Areas that could experience physical change as a result of the proposed project are developed with a mix of commercial and residential uses. Implementation of the proposed project does not directly involve demolition or construction of any buildings or roads. Rather, resolving inconsistent land use and zoning designations would encourage the preservation of existing uses, and allowing mixed use development in certain parts of the City allows for managed future infill development within City boundaries. While future development
(including the 331 additional housing units discussed under Impact XIIIa)) may include replacement of existing housing units with mixed use development (as in areas where residences already exist in commercially-designated areas where the Mixed Use Land Use Designation or ORMU Overlay Zone would be applied), such mixed use development would itself include housing. Therefore, although the proposed project could potentially displace people or housing in some instances, the overall effect of project implementation would be to increase housing in the City. Consequently, the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**Mitigation Measures**

The project would not result in significant impacts to Population and Housing; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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:

i) Fire protection? □ □ ■ □

ii) Police protection? □ □ ■ □

iii) Schools? □ □ ■ □

iv) Parks? □ □ ■ □

v) Other public facilities? □ □ ■ □
Discussion of Checklist Answers

a (i) The City of Ventura Fire Department (VFD) provides emergency and non-emergency fire, rescue, and protection services, including fire response, emergency medical response, hazardous materials response, and public assistance to the City (Ventura, City of 2005b). Non-emergency services include fire and life safety inspections, building inspections, fire code investigations, code compliance and public education. The proposed project would facilitate construction of new buildings and infrastructure in certain areas of the City, but would be within the population forecasts of SCAG and the City’s General Plan. The City’s currently adopted HELI contains a total of 8,041 developable units, as shown in Table 2. Table 2 also shows that the proposed project would increase this HELI total to 8,372 developable units, 331 more units than the current HELI, a roughly 4 percent increase in the number of residential units. Additional units could result in increased emergency response call volumes and required fire and life safety inspections.

Future development projects would continue to be required to comply with California Fire Code (CFC) and City standards related to water availability and demonstrate integration of fire safety features such as fire sprinklers, fire hydrants, and water service infrastructure capable of delivering required fire flow rates. Future development projects would also continue to be required to pay fire facility and equipment mitigation fees per City of Ventura Municipal Code Section 4.220.040. The General Plan EIR identifies a potential need for new fire stations in the Harbor area and the North Ventura Avenue area, but these areas would not be affected by the proposed project. For these reasons, no new or physically altered fire protection facilities would be needed as a result of the proposed actions, and substantial adverse physical or environmental impacts associated with the provision of such facilities would not occur.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

a (ii) The City of Ventura Police Department (VPD) provides a variety of law enforcement and community services within City jurisdictional limits (Ventura, City of 2005b). The proposed project would facilitate the construction of new buildings and infrastructure that could increase the City’s population and require police services. However, all future development would be in already developed areas of the City that are within the VPD’s current service area. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical or environmental impacts associated with the provision of such facilities.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

a (iii) The Ventura Unified School District (VUSD) provides public education services throughout the City (Ventura, City of 2005b). The VUSD manages 16 elementary schools, four middle schools, three high schools, one continuation high school, Opportunity and Independent Study programs, and an adult education program. Additional education facilities in the City include private schools and institutions of higher learning.

The potential increase of 331 units associated with the proposed project would generate approximately 144 new VUSD students, based on the student generation assumptions in the General Plan EIR, which assumed that the 8,300 new units anticipated to be added to the City through 2025 would generate an estimated 3,486 new students at VUSD. As discussed in Section
XIII, Population and Housing, The 331-unit increase associated with the proposed project is within General Plan and SCAG projections. Additionally, developers of future projects would be required to pay school impact fees to VUSD to offset potential impacts on schools, pursuant to Section 65995 (h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50). Pursuant to Section 65995(h) of the California Government Code, the payment of statutory fees “...is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization…on the provision of adequate school facilities.” Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical or environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

a (iv) The proposed amendments to the City’s General Plan and zoning code would have an indirect impact on parks and recreation due to the potential population increase of 893 people associated with the proposed project. However, applicants for future development projects would be required to pay park dedication in-lieu fees to offset the cost of replacing the City’s parks and recreational amenities per San Buenaventura Municipal Code Section 4.230.040. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse physical or environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks. Section XV, Recreation, contains additional analysis of potential impacts on parks and other recreational facilities from the proposed project.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

a (v) Impacts to other public facilities such as sewer and storm drains, and roadways are discussed in Sections XVI, Transportation/Traffic, and XVIII, Utilities and Public Services, of this Initial Study.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Mitigation Measures

The project would not result in significant impacts to Public Services; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.
XV. RECREATION

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?

[ ] Potentially Significant Impact
[ ] Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
[ ] Less than Significant Impact
[ ] No Impact

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?

[ ] Potentially Significant Impact
[ ] Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated
[ ] Less than Significant Impact
[ ] No Impact

Existing Setting

The City’s Parks, Recreation, and Community Partnership Department (Parks and Recreation Department) manages park facilities in the City and provides recreation programs for its residents. The City’s parks system is comprised of over 820 acres of parkland across 45 parks and recreation facilities (Ventura, City of 2016b). The City has adopted a park acreage standard of 10 acres per 1,000 residents, which is greater than the State’s standard of 3 acres per 1,000 residents (Ventura, City of 2005a). The City’s 865 acres of parkland, parks, and recreation facilities, compared to its 2017 population of 109,275 people, results in a ratio of 7.9 acres of parks per 1,000 residents. The City also has in place a park dedication in-lieu fee based on the number of new residential dwelling units, which covers the cost of replacing the City’s existing park and recreational amenities per San Buenaventura Municipal Code Section 4.230.040.

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a, b) Based on the City’s standard of 10 acres of parks per 1,000 residents, the potential population increase of 864 people (331 units) associated with the proposed project (described in Section XIII, Population and Housing) would generate demand for about 9 acres of parks. The 331-unit increase associated with the proposed project is within General Plan and SCAG projections.

The increased demand for parks of 9 acres may incrementally increase the rate at which existing parks physically deteriorate and would create the need for additional park space. However, applicants for future development projects would continue to be required to provide parks or other recreational facilities or pay park dedication in-lieu fees to the City to offset the cost of replacing the City’s parks and recreational amenities per San Buenaventura Municipal Code Chapter 4.230. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant environmental effects related to parks. The physical environmental effects associated with any new park facilities planned by the City would depend on the nature and location of the new parks and would be addressed as part of the CEQA review that would be required at such time as the new facilities are proposed.
NO IMPACT

Mitigation Measure

The project would not result in significant impacts to Recreation; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

-- Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways, and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

   Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact

   □ □ □ □

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

   Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact

   □ □ □ □

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?

   Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact

   □ □ □ □

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?

   Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact

   □ □ □ □

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

   Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact

   □ □ □ □

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

   Potentially Significant Impact | Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact

   □ □ □ □
Traffic impacts of the proposed project have been estimated qualitatively based on the traffic analysis conducted for Scenario 1 in the Ventura 2005 General Plan Update Final EIR, which identifies 13 intersections at LOS D and one intersection at LOS F in 2025 (FEIR Figure 4-12-6), and on the actions included in the proposed project.

Current traffic conditions, as identified in the Final EIR for the 2005 General Plan, show all identified intersections operating at LOS C or better, except for the intersection of Ventura Boulevard and North Bank Drive operating at LOS F.

**Discussion of Checklist Answers**

a-b) The City’s current Housing Element Land Inventory (HELI) estimates that, under current zoning, the City could accommodate a total of 8,041 developable housing units, as shown in Table 2. Table 2 also shows that the proposed project would allow a total HELI of 8,372 developable housing units, 331 more units than the current HELI, a roughly 4 percent increase in the number of units. This proposed update to the Housing Element, does not, however, change the conclusions of the analysis previously performed in the FEIR, because the proposed update to the Housing Element is consistent with the General Plan “Intensification/Reuse Only Scenario” and will not conflict with applicable analysis regarding necessary transportation facilities. As discussed in Section XIII, *Population and Housing*, the proposed project would not directly induce substantial population growth, and the 8,372 developable housing units included in the revised HELI are within the population projections contained in the FEIR.

The proposed project would restrict residential use in existing Commerce and Industry designations, but allow and in some cases require mixed use development in some of these areas. While these actions would change the mix of uses in certain areas, they would not change the overall intensity of development in these areas in a way that would increase overall trip generation or increase the calculated 2025 Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) at the intersections studied for the 2005 General Plan EIR, Scenario 1. In fact, mixed use development in these areas would likely reduce overall trip generation and traffic impacts compared to solely commercial development, due to a shift from auto trips to active transportation (e.g. walking, bicycling) or transit trips shown to result from mixed use development. A Federal Department of Transportation study estimates a 13 to 16 percent reduction in PM trips from mixed use development (FDOT, April 2014).

Additionally, although the programmatic changes to the HELI discussed above would positively influence the availability of affordable housing to City residents and meet compliance with state mandates to adopt a Housing Element, they would not directly result in General Plan land use designation or zoning changes, with the exception of the change to the General Plan land use designation of three parcels from Industry to Neighborhood Medium at 1250 and 1272 North Olive Street and 133 Sunnyway Drive. The update to the Housing Element is based on the same projected population numbers that were analyzed in the 2005 General Plan FEIR. Further, the Housing Element Update would not grant additional entitlements for anticipated development beyond that evaluated in the 2005 General Plan EIR. Accordingly, the amount of housing anticipated in the 2014-2021 5th RHNA cycle would remain consistent with the land use designations in the 2005 General Plan, which analyzed and forecasted future residential growth through 2025. Thus, this change to the General Plan does not increase or significantly change the traffic generation or impacts as previously analyzed.
The other actions under the proposed project would not affect traffic, such as changing allowed building heights or minimum floor height, changing the land use designation on built-out parcels, or amending the General Plan to resolve inconsistencies between land use designations, zoning designations, and existing uses. Although the use of the identified properties could potentially change in the future, these isolated changes would not have a significant effect on traffic.

Under the proposed project, growth and associated traffic increases would occur as outlined under Scenario 1 of the 2005 General Plan EIR. As described in the FEIR for the 2005 General Plan, Scenario 1 represents an 18.7% increase in average daily trips (ADT) over existing conditions, with the growth generally spread throughout the Planning Area. Scenario 1 was forecast to result in one location requiring additional (non-committed) improvements. This location is the Wells Road and Darling Road intersection.

Mitigation Measure TC-1 from the 2005 General Plan FEIR, listed below, requires that two actions be added to the 2005 General Plan: one to require project proponents to analyze traffic impacts and implement mitigation as appropriate prior to development; and another to update the traffic mitigation fee program to fund necessary citywide circulation and mobility system improvements needed in conjunction with new development. While these actions have been added to the City’s General Plan, implementation of the latter action is still required. Therefore, the applicable portions of Mitigation Measure TC-1, as shown below, are still required in order to reduce the proposed project’s potential traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure

TC-1 Circulation Actions. The following actions shall be carried out to ensure that traffic impacts of future developments are addressed and mitigated:

- Require project proponents to analyze traffic impacts and implement mitigation as appropriate prior to development. Depending upon the nature of the impacts and improvements needed, mitigation may either consist of implementing needed physical improvements, contributing “fair share” fees toward implementation of needed improvements, or some combination thereof.
- Update the traffic mitigation fee program to fund necessary citywide circulation and mobility system improvements needed in conjunction with new development.

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT UNLESS MITIGATION INCORPORATED

c-f) The proposed project would not result in any changes to air traffic patterns, substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, result in inadequate emergency access, or conflict with adopted policies promoting transit or active transportation. The project itself does not approve any development with any associated design feature that would cause any of the effects listed above, and future projects that may be facilitated by the proposed project would be reviewed by the City for such potential impacts. Mixed-use development would likely support or encourage the use of transit or active transportation modes such as walking and bicycling.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

-- Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public resources Code section 5020.1(k)? □ □ ■ □

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. □ □ ■ □

Discussion of Checklist Answers

a-b) Areas that could experience physical change as a result of the proposed project are developed and urbanized. As a result, it is unlikely that infill development would affect a tribal cultural resource listed or eligible for listing in the state or local register of historical resources, or determined by the lead agency to be significant to a California Native American tribe. Additionally, the City has initiated tribal consultation to solicit input on potential tribal cultural resources, and none that would be directly affected by the proposed project have been identified (see Appendix C). The project would therefore not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Mitigation Measures

The project would not result in significant impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.
XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

-- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
   □ □ ■ □

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?
   □ □ ■ □

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?
   □ □ ■ □

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
   □ □ ■ □

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?
   □ □ ■ □

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?
   □ □ ■ □

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?
   □ □ ■ □

Existing Setting

Water

As stated in the City’s 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (2015 UWMP), the City’s water system is a geographically complex system of 16 pressure zones, 10 active wells, 21 booster stations, approximately 380 miles of pipelines ranging from 4-inches to 36-inches in diameter, and a total storage capacity of approximately 52 million gallons (MG) in 32 tanks and reservoirs. The City operates three purification facilities, including one membrane filtration treatment plant for surface water sources on the west side of the City and two iron/manganese removal treatment plants for groundwater sources on the east side. The City also maintains and operates
the Ventura Water Reclamation Facility. Five distinct sources provide surface and groundwater to the City supply system.

- Casitas Municipal Water District
- Ventura River surface water intake, subsurface water and wells (Foster Park)
- Mound Groundwater Basin
- Oxnard Plain Groundwater Basin (Fox Canyon Aquifer)
- Santa Paula Groundwater Basin

The City also holds a State Water Project entitlement of 10,000 Acre-feet per year.

The UWMP is required by the California State Water code. The UWMP is a long-term planning tool that provides water purveyors and their customers a broad perspective on water supply issues over a 20 to 25 year period. The UWMP is a management tool, providing the framework for action, but does not function as a detailed project development plan.

In addition to the UWMP, in 2013 the City Council directed the Ventura Water Department and the Community Development Department to work together to develop a short term balance of water supply and estimated demands, the result of this collaboration is the annual Comprehensive Water Resource Report (CWRR) completed each year by Ventura Water. The CWRR focuses on a short timeframe and on near-term demand changes as well as long-term projection of demand and supply. The CWRR estimates demands from approved projects whereas the UWMP estimates demands from population projections.

The final 2017 CWRR prepared by Ventura Water and dated April 7, 2017 provides the most current information regarding the City’s water supply. That report indicates that 2017 and 2018 drought water supplies are less than the projected water demand. However, normal (non-drought) water supplies would meet forecast demand through 2030. Table 7 compares forecast citywide water demand through 2030 to anticipated supplies.

![Table 7](summary_of_water_supply_and_demand.csv)

*Table 7: Summary of Water Supply and Demand*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017 Drought (AFY)</th>
<th>2018 Drought (AFY)</th>
<th>2018 (AFY)</th>
<th>2020 (AFY)</th>
<th>2030 (AFY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>14,988 – 16,847</td>
<td>14,965 – 16,824</td>
<td>18,385 – 20,244</td>
<td>19,313 – 23,672</td>
<td>22,400 – 28,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand*</td>
<td>17,270</td>
<td>17,429</td>
<td>17,429</td>
<td>17,747</td>
<td>19,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Supply</td>
<td>(2,282) – (423)</td>
<td>(2,464) – (605)</td>
<td>956 – 2,815</td>
<td>1,566 – 5,925</td>
<td>3,366 – 9,242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Demand equals baseline 10 year average (17,111 AF) plus the estimated demand from 350 units built annually from the approved projects list for future years fully vested in 2025 and using a 0.55% growth rate to 2030 (Table 3-8 & 5-1). Assumes a new supply source (Direct Potable Reuse) in future years.

Wastewater

The Ventura Water Reclamation Facility (VWRF) is permitted to receive, and has a design capacity of, 14 million gallons per day (MGD), and discharges up to 9 MGD based on an annual average to the Santa Clara River Estuary. The VWRF is currently discharging less than an annual average of 9 MGD. The City’s NPDES permit, issued by the Regional Water Quality
Control Board for the VWRF, indicates that once the average daily dry-weather flow equals or exceeds 75 percent of the Plant’s design capacity (or 10.5 MGD, which is 75 percent of the design capacity of 14 MGD) then a report must be submitted outlining the steps needed to provide for additional capacity for water treatment. Plant flows are closely monitored due to the permit requirements to consider expansion when at 75 percent capacity.

The VWRF provides wastewater collection and treatment services for approximately 98 percent of City residences as well as McGrath State Beach Park and the North Coast Communities (County Service Area No. 29). In February 2016 the City took over sewer service for the formerly unincorporated Montalvo community serviced by Montalvo Community Services District. The VWRF produces recycled water that is treated to tertiary Title 22 standards through tertiary filtration and disinfection. Currently approximately 7 percent of the treated effluent is reused as recycled water; the rest is discharged to the Santa Clara River Estuary.

The City’s wastewater collection system consists of approximately 290 miles of gravity sewers ranging in size from 4 to 42 inches, approximately 10 miles of force mains, 11 wastewater lift station, and the VWRF, a tertiary treatment plant. In addition, the city has taken over 7.5 miles of sewer mains formerly owned by the Montalvo Community Services District. The collection system conveys flows generally form east to west and north to south, culminating at the VWRF for treatment.

*Stormwater*

The City of Ventura works collaboratively with the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, the County of Ventura, and other cities throughout the county to meet clean water regulations under the Countywide Stormwater Program. Each of these public entities operates separate municipal storm drain systems and discharge stormwater under the Ventura Countywide Stormwater NPDES permit.

*Solid Waste*

The Office of Environmental Sustainability within the City of Ventura Public Works Department manages the collection and disposal of solid waste within the City. Waste is sorted at the Gold Coast Material Recovery Facility and Transfer Station, and what cannot be recycled is then sent to landfills. The majority of waste sent to landfill is sent to the Toland Road Landfill, which is managed by the Ventura Regional Sanitation District. Toland Road Landfill has a maximum permitted throughput of 1,500 tons per day and a maximum capacity of 30 million cubic yards (CalRecycle 2017). Current throughput at this landfill is about 1,400-1,500 tons per day so the Ventura County Sanitation District is currently seeking to increase the permitted daily throughput to 1,800 tons per day. Waste can also be sent to the Simi Valley Landfill, managed by Waste Management. These are both permitted non-hazardous waste landfills and are able to handle increased waste capacities if needed (Ventura, City of 2005b).

**Discussion of Checklist Answers**

a, e) The VWRF is currently discharging less than 9 MGD. The City’s NPDES permit, issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the VWRF, indicates that once the average daily dry-weather flow equals or exceeds 75 percent of the Plant’s design capacity of 14 MGD then a report must be submitted outlining the steps needed to provide for additional capacity for
water treatment. Plant flows are closely monitored due to the permit requirements to consider expansion when at 75 percent capacity.

Adding the Project’s estimated wastewater flow of 0.06 MGD\(^9\) to the VWRF’s current 10-year average (2007-2017) influent flow of 8.26 MGD, the resulting 8.32 MGD would not exceed the existing VWRF design capacity of 14 MGD, 75 percent of its design capacity (10.5 MGD), or its current annual average of 9 MGD. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact on the City’s wastewater treatment requirements.

b) As indicated in the City’s 2005 General Plan and General Plan EIR, project proponents are required to conduct evaluations of the existing water distribution system, pump station and storage requirements for the proposed development in order to determine if there are any system deficiencies or needed improvements for the proposed development.

As indicated in the City’s 2005 General Plan and General Plan EIR, project proponents are required to conduct sewer collection system analysis to determine if downstream facilities are adequate to handle the proposed development.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

c) Areas that could experience changes in physical development under the proposed project are developed and urbanized, with the exception of 65 vacant parcels that are generally surrounded by development. Future development facilitated by the proposed project would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns or lead to increased stormwater runoff because the project area primarily encompasses already developed areas with a high proportion of impervious surfaces (see Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality). Moreover, all new development would be subject to current NPDES requirements, which limit post-project peak runoff to pre-project levels. Additionally, General Plan Actions 5.14 and 5.15 were developed to ensure that any deficiencies in the existing stormwater infrastructure are remedied through the development of a financing program for replacing failing storm drain pipes and establishing assessment districts or other mechanisms to address storm drain deficiencies in areas where new development is anticipated and deficiencies exist.

*Action 5.14 – Develop a financial program for the replacement of failing corrugated metal storm drain pipes in the City.*

*Action 5.15 – Establish assessment districts or other financial mechanisms to address storm drain system deficiencies in areas where new development is anticipated and deficiencies exist.*

For the reasons discussed above, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

\(^9\) Using a wastewater flow factor of 194 gpd/du for residential units, and conservatively estimating that the 331 new residential units that could result from the proposed project (see Table 2) would be beyond General Plan growth forecasts, this number was arrived at using the following equation: 331 units x 194 gpd/du = 64,214 gpd, or 0.06 MGD.
d) Water demand increases that may result from future development facilitated by the proposed project are explained as follows. In order to estimate the total water demand based on the General Plan Refinement Project the following calculation was completed. The estimated demands including approved projects per Table 3-8 of the 2017 CWRR is 18,519 AFY. The Summary of Predicted, Actual and Remaining Development based on the 2005 General Plan Prediction per Table 2-5 of the 2017 CWRR indicates that there are 3,065 residential units and 2,831,648 square feet of non-residential square feet available to be developed. The General Plan Refinement Project includes an additional 331 developable units (Table 2). Conservatively assuming that the 331 new residential units would be beyond growth forecasts, and utilizing the demand factors from the 2013 CWRR (assuming 30% single family dwelling units and 70% multi-family dwelling units), an additional 1,928 AFY of water demand would be added to the 18,519 AFY with a total estimated water demand of 20,447 AFY for the General Plan Refinement Project.

The total estimated demand is within the available normal supplies as shown in Table 7 for Years 2018, 2020, and 2030. Therefore, the proposed project would create the need for new or expanded water supplies. Additionally, The City of San Buenaventura is implementing a Water Rights Dedication and Water Resource Net Zero Policy per Municipal Code Chapter 22.180. The proposed project is subject to compliance with the policy, which includes implementation of conservation offsets, dedication of water rights, and/or payment of a Water Resource Net Zero Fee.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

f, g) As discussed above, Toland Road Landfill is currently accepting up to about its currently permitted daily solid waste throughput of 1,500 tons, but the Sanitation District is seeking to increase the permitted daily throughput to 1,800 tons per day. Development facilitated by the proposed project would not generate solid waste beyond the 84 tons per day that the 2005 General Plan EIR forecast would be sent to area landfills by 2025. Nevertheless, conservatively assuming that the 331 new residential units would be beyond growth forecasts, and based on a rate of 12.23 pounds of waste per residential units per day (CalRecycle 2017), project implementation would increase solid waste generation by an estimated 4,048 pounds (2.0 tons) per day. Because Toland Road Landfill is already operating near or at capacity, even this level of increase could require additional landfill capacity. However, as noted above, the Sanitation District is currently seeking an increase in the permitted daily throughput at Toland Road Landfill. The increase to 1,800 tons per day would be more than sufficient to meet any increase in solid waste associated with the proposed project. Moreover, Simi Valley Landfill will continue to be able to accommodate increases in solid waste in the event the Toland Road Landfill expansion is not approved.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Mitigation Measures

The project would not result in significant impacts to Utilities and Service Systems; no mitigation measures are proposed or required.
XVIV. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, 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?

☐ ☐ ■ ☐

a) Because the areas affected by the proposed project are almost entirely developed and urbanized, the proposed project amendments to the City’s General Plan and zoning code do not have the potential to substantially reduce habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a species 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. As discussed in Sections IV, Biological Resources and V, Cultural Resources, biological resources in the project area are limited and there are no known cultural sites. Implementation of General Plan policies and actions, and requirements of the Municipal Code would prevent impacts to biological resources and as yet undiscovered cultural resources.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

b) The proposed project would eliminate residential development on industrially-designated properties, and restrict residential development on commercially-designated properties to areas where the proposed Optional Residential Mixed Use (ORMU) Overlay Zone and Mixed Use Land Use Designation would be applied. The projected difference in overall residential development from this project is projected to be 342 units. This 342-unit increase, and the
associated potential population increase of 893 people (described in Section XIII, Population and Housing), is a hypothetical, conservative estimate; would be spread out across a wide area of the City as shown in figures 2, 3, and 4; and would fall within SCAG and General Plan growth forecasts for the City. It would represent a 4% increase in total units in the City’s HELI compared to the adopted HELI. This analysis is inherently cumulative in nature because it takes into account all potential development on vacant and underutilized sites, pending projects, and potential residential second units, as shown in Table 1 and Table 2. The 4% increase in total units would not result in substantial development opportunities above what is currently allowed by existing standards, especially since it would be within SCAG and General Plan growth forecasts. Even if these 893 people were added to the buildout assumptions in the General Plan EIR, which assumes that the City will reach a population of 126,153 by 2025, this 893-person increase would be an 0.7% increase over this buildout population. Therefore, the proposed project would not create significant cumulative impacts.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

c) The proposed project would not result in impacts that would directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, as discussed throughout this Initial Study, but particularly in the following sections: III, Air Quality; VIII, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; IX, Hydrology and Water Quality; and XII, Noise. Future development projects carried out subsequent to the proposed project could potentially have short-term adverse effects on human beings, especially during construction activities (i.e., noise, dust, etc.), but none of these impacts would be long term or significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**Conclusion**

The proposed project consists of nine actions that would implement a Mixed-Use Overlay Zone and Mixed Use Land Use Designation in select districts and corridors to encourage commercial development compatible with existing residential uses; limit building heights and height transitions to ensure preservation of neighborhood character in the Victoria Avenue Corridor and Montalvo Neighborhood Area; make existing land uses and zoning designations consistent throughout the City; amend General Plan sections Our Prosperous Community, Our Well Planned and Designed Community, and Our Sustainable Infrastructure to reflect the City’s encouragement of mixed-use and infill development within City boundaries and to reflect the June 2, 2008 Administrative Council Report recommendations (Appendix A); and amend the Our Sustainable Infrastructure and the Our Natural Community chapters of the General Plan to reflect the November 9, 2009 Administrative Council Report recommendations (Appendix B), which would add a section entitled “Stormwater Quality” to Our Sustainable Infrastructure, and a section entitled “Climate Action” to Our Natural Community. As demonstrated throughout this Initial Study, the General Plan amendments encompassed by these nine actions are consistent with the 2005 General Plan. Any development carried out as a result of the proposed project would have less than significant impacts, or impacts that could be mitigated to a less than significant level (see Mitigation Measure TC-1).
REFERENCES


Conservation, Department of, State of California. "Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the Oxnard 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Ventura County, California." 2002.


Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB), November 20, 2013, Adopted Waste Discharge Requirements and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit – City of Ventura, Ventura Water Reclamation Facility.


Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District. Air Quality Impacts of Drive-through Facilities vs. Non-Drive-through Facilities. Santa Barbara: Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, 2008.


--. City of Ventura General Plan EIR. Ventura, City of, 2005b.

--. Final IS-MND for the City of Ventura Victoria Avenue Corridor Plan and Development Code. Ventura, City of, 2009a.


--. Victoria Avenue Corridor Development Code. Ventura, City of, 2009b.


This page is intentionally left blank.