

January 22, 2020

Lisa Woodburn
Jensen Design and Survey
1672 Donlon Street
Ventura, CA 93003

Subject: Second Determination of Application Incompleteness
Conditional Use Permit, Planned Development Permit, and
Tentative Parcel Map
Case No. PL19-0046
2789 Somis Road, Somis
Assessor's Parcel Number 156-0-180-285

Dear Ms. Woodburn,

Ventura County agencies have reviewed your application as submitted on March 20, 2019, October 25, 2019, November 1, 2019 and December 17, 2019 and find that it is incomplete as of January 22, 2020. The date of this determination reflects a voluntary time extension to the 30-day review granted on January 16, 2020.

The information required to complete the application is as follows:

Incompleteness Items

Ventura County Public Works – Transportation Division – Glenn Derossett, Engineering Manager, (805) 654-2087, Glenn.Derossett@ventura.org

1. The Transportation Study (TS) shall provide any and all data, maps, calculations, tables, etc. that are needed to prove the impacts that the proposed project could have on the regional, local, and private road networks. The TS that was submitted was missing the following:
 - a. For the necessity of a left-turn and right-turn lane the TS states that it used NCHRP Report 279 warrant, but this is not included in the Technical Appendix. Please provide these documents.
 - b. The intersection Turning Movement Counts broken down in 15 minutes intervals for all of the intersection, the only one that was provided was for Balcom Canyon Road and SR 118.
 - c. The documentation from Caltrans and PWATD on existing ADT.
 - d. Table 11 only provides T values of the approved/pending development projects in the area of the Somis Ranch Farmworker Dwelling project. You need to provide the calculations of these values, the land use codes used,



and if you choose to use the fitted curve or average rate with explanations as to why you choose to use that method of calculation. In addition, for some projects from the City of Camarillo, the trip generation is available on the City website. If available, please use this published trip generation instead of the trip generation in the manual calculation.

- e. All calculations for Table 8 and Table 12. If you sum the difference between the existing and existing + project for Table 8, the total additional trips do not add up to the total project trip generation, the same goes for Table 12. Please provide explanation and calculations of how each value for each table were derived, and clearly show how each trip is being added and taken into consideration with proposer distribution.
 - f. Table 8 and 12 do not represent all of the roadways required to be analyzed in accordance with the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines, include all the road segments and how they are all affected by the project and the cumulative projects, not just part of the state highways.
 - g. In the TS Technical Appendix, under Engineering Roadway Design Capacity, you have two tables: "Standard Engineering Roadway Design Capacities" and Figure 4.2.2. You do not identify which you are using and why. Please identify in the report which you are using and for what purpose.
 - h. When you use Figure 4.2.2 in the TS Technical Appendix, please explain which class each roadway segment analyzed falls under, keep in mind the classification is not the same classification used by Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Each class has their own definition explained in the document that Figure 4.2.2 resides in.
2. The values used for the Signal Warrants must be updated with the additional requested information. The traffic counts used for the signal warrants shall include trips generated by the City of Camarillo groundwater treatment facility and desalter, since this facility will be using the same access road. In addition, the speed on Highway 34 in front of the project is 50 MPH.
- a. The TS did not include the trips generated by the City of Camarillo groundwater treatment facility and desalter.
 - b. The TS incorrectly states that the speed on Highway 34 is 40 MPH. However, the Signal Warrant was evaluated assuming the speed is 50 MPH. Please correct the TS for the correct speed of 50 MPH.
 - c. The Signal Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume worksheet was missing from the Technical Appendix. Please provide this document with explanations and calculations of how these values used for the warrant were derived, for both the southern and northern driveways.
 - d. There are values given for Warrant 1, Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume, the minor street at both the southern and northern driveways to SR 34, but

there is nothing identifying where these values came from. Provide how these numbers and the time of day were derived with detailed explanations and calculations. The highest PM volume that was given was during the time of 7:00 pm to 8:00 pm, how was this established?

3. The TS states that a right-turn and left-turn lane is warranted for both entrances, however it does not specify the length of the lanes. Please provide the required length of the lanes and calculations justifying these lengths.
 - a. In the TS it states that the City of Camarillo is responsible for construction of the southern access, including the requirement for a right-turn lane. The City of Camarillo Groundwater Treatment and Desalter project has been approved and construction began on September 11, 2019. The plans, CEQA documents, and scope of work do not show installation of a right-turn lane. If the data for this project requires this lane, it needs to be included in the project.
4. Lisa Woodburn's letter dated November 25, 2019, provided a breakdown of the trip distribution percentages of the trips associated with this project, detailing the distribution from trips existing the site, and then how the trips will be distributed as they go west and east on SR 118 and South on SR 34.
 - a. The exhibits A-D mentioned in the letter are not included in the TS, please provide these exhibits.
 - b. The trip distribution percentage was not fully distributed to 5%, PWATD is particularly interested in the additional distribution of the 16.4% of Highway 118 West Travel Area, Subarea 3 (Heritage Valley – West). Please distribute the trips to at least 5% in accordance with the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.
5. The Trip distribution explained on page 12 of the TS is different than what is explained in the November 25th letter.
6. The TS did not analyze all the trips distributed to 5%. As mentioned in the last incompleteness memo, comment number 4, Per the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines, "Trip distribution shall be provided for all transportation corridors anticipated carrying five percent or more of site generated traffic but in no case, less than one trip." Although not required for completeness, this will be required for the final CEQA document.
7. The cumulative traffic analysis must include traffic generated from all proposed projects in the area. Table 11 in the previously submitted TS has 17 projects in the cumulative analysis. The current TS duplicated this table without making the correction noted in the previous incompleteness memo.
 - a. Provide the project name used by the governing agency
 - b. Provide the address (or location described by the governing agency) for all the project

- c. Provide the Parcel Number for all the projects
 - d. Provide the trip distribution for each project
 - e. Project 1 on table 11, is a project where ATE is the traffic engineering consultants for the project, thus ATE already has direction on the trip generation for that project.
 - f. Project number 2 on Table 11, has the correct ADT of 40, 10% of that would be 4 AM and 4 PM peak hour trips
 - g. Project number 3 on table 11, has a pending approval for only 26 ADT, 10% of that would be 3 AM and 3 PM peak hour trips.
8. As mentioned in the previous incompleteness memo, the LOS for signalized and potentially signalized intersection shall be performed in accordance with methods previously approved by the Federal Highway Administration under the Signalized Intersection Information Guide and the most current edition of those methods.
- a. Transportation Research Board Circular 212
 - b. The Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) Method
 - c. The HCM Planning Method
 - d. The Quick-Estimation Method
- Please identify which method is used and, if applicable (ICU in particular), which version was used. Include all the traffic counts needed to verify the calculations of the intersections and include all the calculations needed to derive the result of the LOS of the intersections.
9. The intersection of Balcom Canyon Road and SR 118 is a signalized intersection. The TS analyzes this intersection as unsignalized. Please reanalyze the intersection of Balcom Canyon Road and SR 118 as a signalized intersection. Provide documentation that the traffic counts conducted were based on the signalized intersection, not as an unsignalized intersection.
10. The TS shall be stamped and signed by a Registered Civil Engineer and/or Traffic Engineer Licensed in the State of California.

When you have gathered all of the information requested above, please submit the information to Justin Bertoline, the case planner, to begin the next 30-day review period. Submittal directly to another department or agency may not start the second 30-day review period, resulting in processing delays for your permit application.

This determination of incompleteness may be appealed to the Ventura County Planning Commission provided the appeal is filed with the Planning Division by January 31, 2020 (i.e., within 10 calendar days from the date of this letter) and is accompanied by the appropriate fee and appeal form. Appeal forms are available at the Planning Division public counter and on-line at <http://www.ventura.org/rma/planning/Permits/appeals.html>.

Ventura County Agencies Comments

Attached to this letter is a copy of the agency comments available at this time. However, please be aware that although some agencies have provided comments for the project, County staff has not formulated a recommendation as to whether or not the decision-maker should grant the requested Conditional Use Permit, Planned Development Permit and Parcel Map.

If you have any questions about this letter, please contact Justin Bertoline at (805) 654-2466 or justin.bertoline@ventura.org.

Sincerely,



Mindy Fogg, Manager
Commercial & Industrial Permits Section
Ventura County Planning Division

Encl.: Agency Comments

c: Meyerstein Trust, 2350 Long Valley Road, Hidden Hills, CA 91302
Michelle Glueckert D'Anna, Community Relations Officer, 601 Carmen Drive, Camarillo, CA 93011
Case File