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The City of Camarillo has independently reviewed and approved the information presented in this document.
RESOLUTION NO. 2016-105

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CAMARILLO CERTIFYING FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 2014-2 FOR THE CAMARILLO VILLAGE HOMES, LLC, PROJECT AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LEWIS AND PLEASANT VALLEY ROADS

The City Council of the City of Camarillo resolves as follows:

SECTION 1. General Findings. The City Council finds as follows:

A. An Initial Study of Environmental Impact and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) 2014-2 has been prepared for the proposed development of an approximately 23-acre parcel, which will include 399 dwelling units and approximately 12,000 square feet of commercial lease space (Project), in accordance with the provisions of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and City of Camarillo Environmental Guidelines, so as to evaluate the potential for adverse environmental impact.

B. A duly-noticed public hearing was held by the Planning Commission for the City of Camarillo on July 19, 2016, and after such hearing, the Planning Commissioner recommended that the City Council certify EIR 2014-2.

C. A duly-noticed public hearing was held by the City Council for on August 24, 2016, during which additional evidence was heard on the proposed Project and EIR 2014-2. The City Council of the City of Camarillo considered the Initial Study of Environmental Impact and the Environmental Impact Report, together with any comments received during the public review process.

D. The City Council members have reviewed the Environmental Impact Report and the document reflects the independent judgment of the City of Camarillo.

E. The City Council finds and determines that on the basis of the Initial Study and EIR 2014-2, including the mitigation measures identified therein and on the basis of any comments received in the public review process, there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant adverse effect upon the environment, other than the permanent loss of agricultural lands.


SECTION 3. Mitigation Measures. All proposed mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are adopted by reference.

SECTION 5. Filing Notice of Determination. The Director of Community Development is directed to file a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk of the County of Ventura. The record of proceedings upon which this decision is based is located in the office of the City Clerk, who is the custodian of records for the same.

PASSED AND ADOPTED August 24, 2016.

[Signature]
Mayor

ATTEST: 8/25/16
[Signature]
City Clerk

I, Jeffrie Madland, City Clerk of the City of Camarillo, certify Resolution No. 2016-105 was adopted by the City Council of the City of Camarillo at a regular meeting held on August 24, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: Craven, Little, Mayor Morgan
NOES: Councilmembers: Kildee, McDonald
ABSENT: Councilmembers: None

[Signature]
City Clerk

c: Department of Community Development
General Services Department/Information Systems Division
Public Works Department
Camarillo Village Homes, LLC
EJM Arizona Commerceplex / Hawkeye Dev. II, LLC
STATEMENT OF FACTS AND FINDINGS
AND
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
FOR THE
CAMARILLO VILLAGE HOMES PROJECT

August 2016

EXHIBIT A
# Table of Contents

Introduction .................................................................................................................. 1

Project Summary ........................................................................................................... 3
  Project Location .......................................................................................................... 3
  Description of the Project Proposed for Approval ....................................................... 3
  Project Objectives ...................................................................................................... 3
  Required Discretionary Actions and Approvals ........................................................ 4

Environmental Review / Public Participation ............................................................... 5

Independent Judgement and Findings .......................................................................... 6

Environmental Effects and Findings ............................................................................ 7
  Effects Determined to be Less Than Significant Level with Mitigation .................... 7
    Water Supply ........................................................................................................... 7
    Aesthetics ................................................................................................................ 8
    Air Quality .............................................................................................................. 8
    Biological Resources ............................................................................................ 9
    Cultural Resources ............................................................................................... 10
    Hazards and Hazardous Materials ...................................................................... 10
    Hydrology and Water Quality ........................................................................... 10
    Noise ..................................................................................................................... 11
    Transportation / Traffic ....................................................................................... 11
  Effects Determined to be Significant and Unavoidable ......................................... 11
    Agricultural Resources ......................................................................................... 11

Alternatives to the Project ............................................................................................ 14
  No Project Alternative ............................................................................................ 14
  Industrial Development Alternative ...................................................................... 15
  Alternative Site ....................................................................................................... 15

Certification of the Final EIR ...................................................................................... 16

Statement of Overriding Considerations ...................................................................... 16
  Introduction ............................................................................................................. 16
  Significant Unavoidable Impacts .......................................................................... 17
  Overriding Considerations .................................................................................... 17

Camarillo Village Homes
STATEMENT OF FACTS AND FINDINGS
AND
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
FOR THE
CAMARILLO VILLAGE HOMES PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a Lead Agency issue two sets of findings prior to approving a project that will generate a significant impact on the environment. The Statement of Facts and Findings is the first set of findings where the Lead Agency for the project identifies the significant environmental impacts as identified in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), presents facts supporting the conclusions reached in the analysis, makes one or more of three findings for each impact, and explains the reasoning behind the agency’s findings.

The following Statement of Facts and Findings has been prepared in accordance with Section 15091 of the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines) and California Public Resources Code, Section 21081 (collectively, CEQA). Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines provides that:

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can or should be adopted by such other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

(b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives.
The finding in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.

(d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

(e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.

(f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines further provides:

(a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposal project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”

(b) Where the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. This statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

(c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

The Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) is the second set of findings. Where a project will cause unavoidable significant environmental impacts, the Lead Agency may still approve a project where its benefits outweigh the adverse impacts. Further, as provided in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Lead Agency sets forth specific reasoning by which benefits are balanced against effects, and approves the project.

The City of Camarillo (City), the CEQA Lead Agency, finds and declares that the Environmental Impact Report for Camarillo Village Homes (EIR, State Clearinghouse [SCH] No. 2015091025) has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City finds and certifies that the EIR was reviewed and that information contained in the EIR was considered prior to approving the proposed Camarillo Village Homes project, herein referred to as the “project.”
Having received, reviewed and considered the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) and the Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Report (Preliminary Final EIR) for the Camarillo Village Homes project (SCH No. 2015091025, collectively, “the EIR”), as well as all other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the Findings and Facts in Support of Findings (Findings) and SOC included in this document are hereby adopted by the City of Camarillo in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency.

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Location

The proposed project site is located within the Dawson Drive Industrial Area, which is a 180-acre area located to the east of Old Town Camarillo, sandwiched between Lewis Road and the residential neighborhoods of Calleguas Gardens and Village at the Park. The proposed project site is located at the northeastern corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road.

The proposed project site consists of one parcel of land totaling approximately 23 acres that has been used for active agricultural production since at least 1938 and is presently used year-round for the production of irrigated row crops.

Description of the Project Proposed for Approval

The project co-applicants are requesting approval from the City of Camarillo to change the land use designation of the site to approximately 19.5 acres of Medium Density Residential and approximately 3.2 acres of Commercial Mixed Use. The proposed project would involve the development of up to 309 multi-family units throughout the site along with up to 12,000 square feet of commercial uses. The homes would be developed within six neighborhoods. Neighborhoods 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 would consist of multi-unit townhouse buildings totaling 285 residential units. The mixed-use Neighborhood 4 would provide 24 residential flats above ground-level commercial space.

Direct vehicular access to the project site would be provided by two new connections along Lewis Road and one new connection along Pleasant Valley Road. An additional connection in the northeastern part of the site would connect to Mike Loza Drive (formerly 3M Drive) within the Village Gateway development. The internal roadways would consist of three primary drives, one central spine, and a series of alleys within the residential-only neighborhoods.

Project Objectives

The objectives for the project, as set forth by the project co-applicants, are to:

- Beautify the southern entry to the City of Camarillo by converting industrial land to a mixed-use residential/commercial community, under grounding existing power poles, and providing landscaped
setbacks. The project also includes a “Welcome to Camarillo” monument sign for the corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road.

- Provide retail services to the community including the Fairfield community to the north of the project site and for the California State University, Channel Islands campus.

- Provide rental housing and for sale housing to young families and professionals with various styles of flats and two bedroom and three bedroom townhomes. There is a shortage of three bedroom townhomes due to the extra 250 square feet of common area space needed to provide the third bedroom. Seventy percent of the townhouse at the project site will be three bedroom units to help fulfill this underserved portion of the housing market.

- Provide each townhome with 200 square feet of private open space to create more of a luxury style community.

- Provide a 40- to 86-foot setback along Lewis Road and provide a Class One bicycling and jogging trail which will connect with the Fairfield community to the north and tie into the meeting and eating area of the plaza within the retail center.

- Provide the public roads roads necessary to connect to the adjacent Fairfield community so that residents of that project can access the proposed retail center without going onto Lewis Road. This road will also provide a safe signalized entry/exit onto Lewis Road for both communities.

- Provide greater property tax and sales revenue to the City of Camarillo.

**Required Discretionary Actions and Approvals**

The following discretionary actions and approvals are anticipated to be undertaken by the City of Camarillo in order to implement for the Camarillo Village Homes project:

- **Certification of Environmental Impact Report 2014-2** with the determination that the EIR has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA.

- **General Plan Amendment 2014-3** to change the existing land use designation of the project site from Industrial to Medium Density Residential and Commercial Mixed Use.

- **Change of Zone CZ-321** to change the zoning designation of the project site from M-1 to RPD 15U (Residential Planned Development, 15 Units per Acre Max) and CMU (Village Commercial Mixed Use).

- **Specific Plan Amendment** to amended the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines to identify residential and commercial mixed use as the preferred land use for the project site within the Specific Plan area.
- **Residential Planned Development RPD-196** to permit development of medium density residential development totaling a maximum of 285 units at the project site.

- **Conditional Use Permit CUP-369** to permit development of up to 12,000 square feet of commercial uses and 24 residential units at the project site.

Development Allotment Applications will require approval by the City Council for the new residential units, with the exception of any residential units that are reserved exclusively for affordability.

Project implementation would also require approval by the City of a tract map to divide the site into separate parcels and a condominium map for designated condominium properties.

Other non-discretionary actions anticipated to be taken by the city at the staff level as part of the project implementation include:

- Review and approval of building permits by the Camarillo Building and Safety Department;

- Review and approval of grading permits, encroachment permits, and on- and off-site infrastructure improvements by the Camarillo Public Works Department and Community Development Department;

- Review and approval of water supply impact report related to water supply availability for the project; and

- Approval by the Camarillo Public Works Department of a Post Construction Storm Water Management Plan (PCSMP) to mitigate post-construction stormwater flows produced by the projects.

- Permit coverage will be required under the California State Water Resources Control Board General Construction NPDES Permit CAS000002, Order 2009-0009-DWQ as amended by Orders 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ for construction-related stormwater quality discharges.

Approvals and permits that may be required by other agencies include:

- Approval of encroachment permits from the Ventura County Watershed Protection District.

- Approval of encroachment permits from the California Department of Transportation for all encroachments within the Caltrans right-of-way.

- Approval from the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency for groundwater pumping allocation transfers to the City of Camarillo Water Division.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The City of Camarillo conducted an extensive review of the Camarillo Village Homes project, which included technical reports, an Initial Study, a Draft EIR, and a Preliminary Final EIR, along with public
review and comment periods. The following is a summary of the City’s environmental review of this project:

- Pursuant to the provision of Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, as amended, the City of Camarillo prepared an Initial Study and circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to the State Clearinghouse, responsible agencies, and other interested parties for a 30-day period. The NOP and Initial Study were circulated for a 30-day review period beginning on September 11, 2015 and ending on October 12, 2015. In addition, a scoping meeting was conducted by the City of Camarillo Department of Community Development on September 16, 2010 at Camarillo City Hall, pursuant to the requirements of Section 15082(c)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines.

- The City of Camarillo circulated the Draft EIR for the Camarillo Village Homes project for 45 days from February 17, 2016 through April 1, 2016.

- The City received a total of seven comment letters from responsible agencies and other interested parties. The City prepared responses to all written comments. The comments and responses are contained in the Preliminary Final EIR.

- In accordance with the provisions of Section 21092.5 of the California Public Resources Code, the City of Camarillo has provided a written response to each commenting public agency no less than ten days prior to the proposed certification date of the Final EIR.

- Opportunities for public agencies and other interested parties to comment of the EIR have been provided during the public hearings held for the project before the City of Camarillo Planning Commission and City Council.

INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT AND FINDINGS

The City of Camarillo is the Lead Agency for the preparation of the EIR, as defined by CEQA (California Public Resources Code, Section 21067 as amended). The City of Camarillo retained the independent consulting firm of Cadence Environmental Consultants to prepare the EIR for the Camarillo Village Homes project. Cadence Environmental Consultants has prepared the EIR under the supervision, direction, and review of the City. The City Council has received and reviewed the EIR prior to its certification and prior to making any decision to approve or disapprove the Camarillo Village Homes project. All findings set forth herein are based on substantial evidence in the record as indicated with respect to each specific finding.

Findings

The EIR for the Camarillo Village Homes project reflects the independent judgment of the City of Camarillo. The City has exercised independent judgment in accordance with Section 21082.1(c)(3) of the California Public Resources Code in retaining its own environmental consultant to prepare the EIR, and directing the consultant in the preparation of the EIR. The City has independently reviewed and analyzed the EIR and accompanying studies and finds that the report reflects the City’s independent judgment.
The City Council has considered all the evidence presented in its consideration of the project and the EIR, including, but not limited to, the Preliminary Final EIR and its supporting studies; written and oral evidence presented at hearings on the project; and written evidence submitted to the City by individuals, organizations, regulatory agencies, and other entities. On the basis of such evidence, the City Council finds that, with respect to each environmental impact identified in the review process (except those described in the following paragraph), the impact (1) is less than significant and would not require mitigation; or (2) is potentially significant but would be avoided or reduced to a less than a significant level by implementation of identified mitigation measures; or (3) would be significant and not able to be avoided or substantially lessened. Prior to approving this project, the City Council also adopts a Statement of Overriding Considerations which finds, based on specific reasons and substantial evidence in the record, that certain identified economic, social, or other benefits of the project outweigh such unavoidable adverse environmental effects.

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND FINDINGS

Effects Determined to be Less Than Significant Level with Mitigation

Water Supply

Project Water Demand: The project is expected to demand approximately 39.29 acre-feet of water from the City of Camarillo Water Division. The City previously received about two acre-feet per year of increased groundwater allocation for each acre that is converted from agricultural uses, but this amount was further reduced by 25 percent pursuant to the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA) Ordinance Code. The City of Camarillo has requested and received from the FCGMA a conditional approval of an agricultural to municipal and industrial allocation transfer in the amount of 34.98 acre-feet per year based on 23.32 acres and 1.5 acre-feet per acre. However, the City understands that the conditional approval has been rescinded in light of FCGMA Emergency Ordinance E and the new allocation system that is being developed by the FCGMA. In light of these conditions, the City of Camarillo is now requiring the project developer to obtain all of the water necessary to serve the demand of the project without any increase in groundwater use. The project developer would be required to enter into written contract or contracts with public and/or private entities that are existing water customers of the Camarillo Water Division to implement water conservation measures (WCMs) that would reduce existing water use by these entities in an amount that would cover all of the water demand of the project. Examples of WCMs that the city would allow include, but not be limited to, permanent turf removal and replacement with materials other than artificial turf, landscape irrigation control and sensor systems that are proven to reduce water consumption, high-efficiency irrigation nozzles, high-efficiency plumbing fixtures. Examples of WCMs which are not permissible by the city include, but are limited to, artificial turf, soil amendments and conditioners, specialty products that have not been verified to permanently improve water efficiency. The WCMs must be implemented, 100% operational, and providing the specified water reductions at a minimum subject to confirmation by the city prior to the issuance of any building permits for the projects. These requirements are reflected as mitigation measures WS-1 and WS-2, which would enable the City of Camarillo Water Division to provide water to the project site with
no reduction of existing water supplies and reduce the potential impact of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

Findings: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.

Facts in Support of Findings: The potential significant impacts associated with water supply have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measures WS-1 and WS-2 identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).

Aesthetics

Construction-Related Nighttime Lighting

Construction of the project could create a new source of substantial light or glare which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Findings: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.

Facts in Support of Findings: The potential significant impacts associated with construction-related nighttime lighting have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measure A-1 identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).

Air Quality

Construction-Related Emissions

Implementation of the project would generate new sources of air pollutants during project construction activities. These emissions would cause a significant impact if all appropriate emissions control measures recommended by the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) are not implemented.

Findings: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.

Facts in Support of Findings: The potential significant impacts associated with construction-related emissions have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).
Operational Emissions

The daily operational emissions generated by the project would exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the VCAPCD.

**Findings:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.

**Facts in Support of Findings:** The potential significant impacts associated with operational emissions have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measures AQ-3 and AQ-4 identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).

Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

The daily operational emissions generated by the project would exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the VCAPCD and, therefore, would generate a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants.

**Findings:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.

**Facts in Support of Findings:** The potential significant impacts associated with operational emissions have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measures AQ-3 and AQ-4 identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).

Biological Resources

**Construction-Related Disturbance**

Construction of the project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

**Findings:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.

**Facts in Support of Findings:** The potential significant impacts to biological resources associated with construction-related activities have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measure BR-1 in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).
Cultural Resources

Construction-Related Disturbance

There is a remote possibility that archeological resources may exist below the ground surface and that these resources could be encountered during site grading and trenching. There is also a very remote possibility that paleontological resources may exist below the ground surface, and that these resources could be encountered during site grading and trenching.

Findings: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.

Facts in Support of Findings: The potential significant impacts to cultural resources associated with construction-related activities have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measures CR-1 and CR-2 in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Construction-Related Disturbance

Construction-related impacts could occur if the soils at the site have levels of toxaphene that exceed California Human Health Screening Levels and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regional Screening Levels for soil at residential sites.

Findings: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.

Facts in Support of Findings: The potential significant impacts associated with construction-related activities have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measure HHM-1 in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).

Hydrology and Water Quality

Site Flooding

Areas of the project site could be placed within the 100-year flood zone if these areas were to be lowered from their current elevation as a part of project development.

Findings: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.
Facts in Support of Findings: The potential significant impacts associated with site flooding have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measure HWC-1 in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).

Noise

Noise Levels at the Project Site

Residents of the project site could be exposed to roadway noise levels that exceed city standards.

Findings: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.

Facts in Support of Findings: The potential significant impacts associated with noise levels at the project site have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measure N-1 in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).

Transportation/Traffic

Traffic Hazards

Implementation of the project could increase hazards due to site access design features.

Findings: Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Camarillo Village Homes project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR. The effects identified in the EIR have been determined not to be significant.

Facts in Support of Findings: The potential significant traffic impacts associated with project design features at the project site have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less that significant levels by virtue of mitigation measures T-1, T-2, T-3, and T-4 in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Appendix H of the Final EIR).

Effects Determined to be Significant and Unavoidable

Agricultural Resources

Conversion of Prime Farmland to Non-agricultural Uses

Implementation of the project would convert approximately 23 acres of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact under the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Model scoring thresholds.

Findings: No mitigation is available to reduce or eliminate the conversion of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of housing and commercial opportunities for residents, students, and local workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures considered by the City in the Draft EIR.
Facts in Support of Findings: The impact associated with the conversion of the project site to non-agricultural uses was evaluated using the California Agricultural LESA Model developed by the California Department of Conservation. The California Agricultural LESA Model is a point-based approach that is generally used for rating the relative value of agricultural land resources. The California Agricultural LESA Model defines and measures two separate sets of factors. The first set, Land Evaluation (LE), includes factors that measure the inherent soil-based qualities of land as they relate to agricultural suitability. The second set, Site Assessment (SA), includes factors that are intended to measure social, economic, and geographic attributes that also contribute to the overall value of agricultural land.

A single LESA score is generated for a given site after all of the individual LE and SA factors have been scored and weighted as detailed in the system. The final score is based on a scale of 100 points, with a given site being capable of deriving a maximum of 50 points from the LE factors and 50 points from the SA factors. Scoring thresholds are based upon both the total LESA score as well as the component LE and SA subscores. In this manner the scoring thresholds are dependent upon the attainment of a minimum score for the LE and SA subscores so that a single threshold is not the result of heavily skewed subscores (i.e., a site with a very high LE score, but a very low SA score, or vice versa.

The total LESA Model score for the project site is 70.75 with an LE subscore of 38.4 and an SA subscore of 32.25. Because the total LESA Model score for the project site is between 60 and 79 points, and neither the Land Evaluation (LE) nor SA subscores are less than 20 points, the impact of the project would be considered significant under the California Agricultural LESA Model scoring thresholds. Therefore, the EIR concludes that the project would result in a significant impact to Farmland related to the loss of Prime Farmland and the associated conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Potential methods to mitigate impacts to Farmland primarily involve avoidance, preservation/conservation of off-site Farmland, or payment of mitigation or in-lieu fees for conservation purposes. The applicability of these mitigation methods to the project is discussed below.

The entire project site is designated as Prime Farmland and there is no area at the site that would be preferred for non-development/avoidance. Avoiding development of a portion of the project site would reduce the amount of Prime Farmland that is converted to non-agricultural uses. However, as agricultural parcels become smaller, they become less viable. This is reflected in the LESA Model which assigned higher scores to larger sites. Avoiding development within a portion of the project site is not an option to mitigate the impact from the proposed project since this would make any remaining agricultural portion more difficult to farm and remain viable.

The city’s General Plan and zoning designations do not demonstrate a long-term commitment to the preservation of agricultural activity at the project site. The City of Camarillo has planned for conversion of the site from agriculture to urban uses since at least 1986. The current General Plan land use designation for the site is Industrial and the underlying zoning is M-1 (Light Manufacturing). On September 11, 1991, Tentative Tract 4698 was approved by the City Council (CC Resolution No. 99-176)
for the project site. AKT Development received approval of a tentative tract map to create 15 parcels for industrial development ranging in size from 1.0 to 2.9 acres. While multiple time extensions were requested and approved, the final time extension expired on September 23, 1999, with the final tract map remaining unrecorded. The Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines also plan for the conversion of the site to non-agricultural uses. Preserving agricultural areas elsewhere in Camarillo is not an option to mitigate the impact of the proposed project because the General Plan already identifies several parcels within the city boundary that are designated for agriculture. Several large areas are located in the southern part of the city while a few others are in the northern part of the city. One of the southern areas is located to the west of the Dawson Drive Industrial Area and is within the project site Zone of Influence. As such, development of the project would not reduce the amount of agricultural land envisioned under the General Plan.

The establishment of a conservation easement off site is another potential mitigation option. To effectively mitigate for the conversion of Farmland in the City of Camarillo, any conservation should occur in the city or in Ventura County, specifically southwestern Ventura County. However, the agricultural areas outside the boundary of the City of Camarillo are already protected from development under the CURB and SOAR Ordinance.

The payment of a mitigation fee or in-lieu fee is used as an option for mitigating various types of impacts from development projects. For purposes of mitigating agricultural resources, this would involve the payment of mitigation or in-lieu fees to a local, regional, or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural conservation easements. Currently, there are no mitigation fee programs pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act (California Government Code, Sections 66000 et seq.) that have been established for the purpose of developing agricultural conservation easements or other agricultural conservation programs in Ventura County, specifically southwestern Ventura County. Payment of a mitigation fee is not an option to mitigate the impact from the proposed project because: 1) there are currently no existing mitigation fee programs in place for the establishment of agricultural conservation easements or mitigation banks in southwestern Ventura County; 2) it is unknown when such programs will be developed; and 3) it is unknown how successful these programs will be due to the existing preservation ordinances already in place throughout this area of the county. Further, the payment of any mitigation or in-lieu fee outside an established mitigation fee program is not required because the determination of an appropriate fee amount would be speculative, and such fee would not ensure that project impacts to Farmland are mitigated.

An additional potential mitigation measure considered by the city was having the project co-applicants make the surface soils available for purchase and transportation to an agricultural site of lower quality. In theory, this could improve the soils and agricultural productivity at a farm site that does not presently have the quality of soils that occur at the project site. However, implementation of this measure would result in secondary impacts that would not occur with the project as proposed. The soil to a level of
around 18 inches would have to be scraped and transported from the project site to another presently unknown site. Then new soils necessary to replace the excavated soils to a level that is above the 100-year flood zone would have to be obtained from another presently unknown site and transported to the project site. This would result in greater construction-related air quality and noise impacts than would occur with the proposed project. It is also not known where the project site soils would be transported to since nearly all of the soils in the flat areas within and around Camarillo quality as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

Because avoidance or preservation of Farmland on or off the site are not viable options to mitigate the impact of the project related to the conversion of Prime Farmland to nonagricultural uses, the project impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Alternatives to the Project**

The Draft EIR addresses the environmental effects of alternatives to the proposed project. A description of these alternatives, a comparison of their environmental impacts to the proposed project, and the City's findings are listed below. These alternatives are compared against the project relative to the identified project impacts and to the project objectives.

In making the following alternatives findings, the City of Camarillo certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Draft EIR, including the information provided in the comments on the Draft EIR and the responses thereto.

**No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed and the site would temporarily remain in its undeveloped state.

**Findings:** The findings of the project set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic and other issues set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations provide support for the proposed project and the elimination of this alternative from further consideration.

**Facts in Support of Findings:** Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed and the site would temporarily remain as an agricultural site. However, it is reasonably foreseeable that another application would be submitted to the City of Camarillo in the near future requesting approval to develop the site with light industrial uses to the extent permitted by the M-1 zone. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not preclude development of the project site; it would instead temporarily delay to a later date the development of the site with uses similar to the proposed project.

The environmental impacts associated with this alternative would be the same as those caused by the proposed project. The entire project site that is designated as Prime Farmland would be converted to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would delay, but not eliminate or reduce, the
significant and unavoidable environmental impact associated with the proposed project. This alternative would also not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project.

**Industrial Development Alternative**

The industrial Development Alternative assumes the development of the project site with light industrial uses consistent with the existing land use and zoning designations for the site. This alternative assumes that the entire site would be utilized and no area would be left undeveloped and available for additional future development.

**Findings:** The findings of the project set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic and other issues set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations provide support for the proposed project and the elimination of this alternative from further consideration.

**Facts in Support of Findings:** The environmental impacts associated with this alternative would be the same as those caused by the proposed project. The entire project site that is designated as Prime Farmland would be converted to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the Industrial Development Alternative would also delay, but not eliminate or reduce, the significant and unavoidable environmental impact associated with the proposed project. This alternative would also not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project.

**Alternative Site**

This alternative involves the potential development of the proposed project at another site.

**Findings:** The findings of the project set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic and other issues set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations provide support for the proposed project and the elimination of this alternative from further consideration.

**Facts in Support of Findings:** The evaluation of an alternative site is generally practical for new infrastructure projects or other projects that do not need to be developed at a site that is owned by a particular project developer. It is generally less applicable to new infill general development projects such as the proposed project. In the case of this project, the project co-applicants could, in theory, purchase another property within Camarillo that is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. However, development at an alternative site would not meet the applicant's objectives to provide new residential and commercial uses within the Dawson Drive Industrial Area and in close proximity to the California State University, Channel Islands campus. The project co-applicants do not own another property in the area that is not already being developed with residential uses. This alternative would also not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project.
CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

The City Council declares that no new significant information as defined by the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5, has been received by the City Council after circulation of the EIR that would require recirculation. The City Council certifies the EIR based on the findings and conclusions discussed below.

Findings

The project would have the potential for creating significant adverse impacts. These significant adverse environmental impacts have been identified in the EIR and will require mitigation as set forth in the Findings. Significant adverse impacts which cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level are limited to the conversion of approximately 23 acres of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Conclusions

1. Except as to the impact stated above relating to the conversion of approximately 23 acres of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses, all other potentially significant environmental impacts from the implementation of the project have been identified in the EIR and, with implementation of the mitigation measures identified, will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

2. Alternatives to the proposed project, which could potentially achieve the basic objectives of the proposed project, have been considered and rejected in favor of the proposed project.

3. Environmental, economic, social, and other considerations and benefits derived from the development of the project override and make infeasible any alternatives to the project or further mitigation measures beyond those incorporated into the project.

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Introduction

CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines provide in part the following:

a) CEQA requires that the decision maker balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”

b) Where the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant effects that are identified in the Final EIR but are not mitigated, the agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. This statement may be necessary if the agency also makes the finding under Section 15091(a)(2) or 15091(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.
Statement of Facts and Findings and
Statement of Overriding Considerations

c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the Notice of Determination (Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines).

The City Council, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR for the project, responses to comments and the public record, adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations that have been balanced against the unavoidable adverse impacts in reaching a decision on this project.

**Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

Although all potential project impacts have been substantially avoided or mitigated as described in the preceding findings, there is no feasible mitigation for the conversion of approximately 23 acres of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses.

**Overriding Considerations**

To the extent that the significant effect of the project on agricultural resources can not be avoided or substantially lessened to below a level of significance, the City Council, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Camarillo Village Homes EIR and the public record, and having balanced the benefits of the project against the unavoidable effects which remain, finds that such significant and unavoidable effects to be acceptable in view of the following overriding considerations:

1. The significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the conversion of approximately 23 acres of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses is not based specifically on the uses proposed for the project. Any development at the project site would result in the conversion of Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. The City of Camarillo has planned for conversion of the site from agriculture to urban uses since at least 1986. The current General Plan land use designation for the site is Industrial and the underlying zoning is M-1 (Light Manufacturing). On September 11, 1991, Tentative Tract 4698 was approved by the City Council (CC Resolution No. 99-176) for the project site. AKT Development received approval of a tentative tract map to create 15 parcels for industrial development ranging in size from 1.0 to 2.9 acres. While multiple time extensions were requested and approved, the final time extension expired on September 23, 1999, with the final tract map remaining unrecorded. The Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines also plan for the conversion of the site to non-agricultural uses.

2. The project site is positioned at a primary entry to the city from the south along Lewis Road (State Highway 34), and would provide an attractive gateway feature on the corner of Lewis and Pleasant Valley Roads, at the southerly terminus of a landscaped Class One bike path. The medium-density land use designation requested would be an appropriate transition from the higher density residential project to the north, into the county agricultural uses to the south and to California State University - Channel Islands (CSUCI) beyond.
3. The project would add to the diverse housing opportunities currently available by allowing consideration of 285 townhomes as well as 24 mixed-use residential units to the City’s potential housing stock, including, two- and three-bedroom units, including affordable housing.

4. The project would provide rental housing and for-sale housing to young families and professionals with various styles of flats and two- and three-bedroom townhomes. There is a shortage of three-bedroom townhomes due to the extra 250 square feet of common area space needed to provide the third bedroom. Seventy percent of the townhomes at the project site would be three-bedroom units to help fulfill this underserved portion of the housing market.

5. The project site is within four miles of the CSUCI campus and will be the first available housing and commercial opportunities in Camarillo in support of the campus.

6. The project would provide retail services to the community, including the Fairfield community to the north of the project site, for nearby workers, and for the CSUCI campus.

7. The project would provide the public roads necessary to connect to the adjacent Fairfield community so that residents of that project can access the proposed retail center without going onto Lewis Road. This road will also provide a safe signalized entry/exit onto Lewis Road for both communities.

8. The project would provide greater property tax and sales revenue to the City of Camarillo.

In its decision to approve the project, the City Council has considered the benefits of the project to outweigh the significant and unavoidable environmental impact.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Setting</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Analysis</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Resources</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Impact Categories</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives to the Proposed Project</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparers of the EIR</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices (provided on CD)

Appendix A - Initial Study
Appendix B - Notice of Preparation
Appendix C - NOP Responses
Appendix D - September 2015 Monthly Report
Appendix E - Agricultural Resources Data
Appendix F - Water Use and Supply Study
Appendix G - Responses Received on the Draft EIR
Appendix H - Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1</td>
<td>Regional Location Map</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2</td>
<td>Dawson Drive Industrial Area</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3</td>
<td>Local Vicinity Map</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4</td>
<td>Surrounding Land Uses</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>Illustrative Site Plan</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6</td>
<td>Site Circulation Plan</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7</td>
<td>Conceptual Townhouse Building Elevations</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 8</td>
<td>Conceptual Mixed-Use Building Elevations</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 9</td>
<td>Agricultural Land Zone of Influence</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LIST OF TABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1 - Issues of Known Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2 - Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3 - Five Year Comparison of Ventura County Crop Values</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4 - NRCS Storie Index Ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5 - Soils at the Project Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6 - California LESA Model Thresholds of Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7 - Land Use Compatibility Classification and Storie Index Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8 - Project Size Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9 - LESA Model Scores for the Project Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10 - Water Purveyors Within Camarillo</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11 - Historic Water Use at the Project Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 12 - Estimated Daily Operational Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 13 - Estimated Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

This introduction is intended to provide the reader with general information regarding the subject of this Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the purpose for an EIR, standards for EIR adequacy, an introduction to the scope and content of this EIR, and the opportunities that will be provided for public participation in the project and EIR review process.

SUBJECT OF THIS EIR

Project Site History

The proposed project site consists of one parcel of land totaling approximately 23 acres that has been used for active agricultural production since at least 1938 and is presently used year-round for the production of irrigated row crops.

The current land use designation for the project site is Industrial (Research and Development) and the underlying zoning designation is LM (Limited Manufacturing).

The project site is also located within the Dawson Drive Industrial Area, which is a 180-acre area located to the east of Old Town Camarillo, sandwiched between Lewis Road and the residential neighborhoods of Calleguas Gardens and Village at the Park. This area houses many of the city’s industrial businesses, in addition to large parcels of vacant and underutilized land, such as the former Imation and EJM (the proposed project site) properties. When it was adopted in 2010, the Dawson Drive Industrial Area Concepts & Design Guidelines only identified industrial uses for the Dawson Drive Area. The Concepts & Design Guidelines were amended in 2013 to include residential uses as part of mixed-use development.

Proposed Project

EJM-Arizona Commerceplex and Hawkeye Investments II, LLC are requesting approval from the City of Camarillo to change the land use designation of the site to approximately 19.5 acres of Medium Density Residential and approximately 3.2 acres of Commercial Mixed Use. The proposed project would involve the development of up to 309 multi-family residential units throughout the site along with up to 12,000 square feet of commercial uses. The requested changes in land use designations would also necessitate a zone change as well as an amendment to the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines.

PURPOSE OF AN EIR

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted in 1970 with the objective to inform the public and decision-makers of the potential environmental impacts of a proposed project. CEQA requires
Introduction

agencies to consider the significant effects of a project and to reduce the significant environmental effects of a project by implementing feasible mitigation measures or alternatives to the project as proposed. The public agencies shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information which may be presented to the agency when deciding whether to approve or deny a project. An EIR is also intended to be the primary reference document in the formulation and implementation of a mitigation monitoring and reporting program for an approved project.

CEQA applies to all discretionary actions proposed to be carried out or approved by California public agencies, including state, regional, county, and local agencies. The proposed project requires discretionary approval for the City of Camarillo and is, therefore, subject to CEQA. For the purpose of CEQA compliance, the City of Camarillo is the “Lead Agency” for the proposed project. The Lead Agency is responsible for preparing the EIR in accordance with CEQA and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines). As mandated by the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR has been subject to the city’s internal review process and reflects the city’s independent judgement and objectivity with regard to the scope, content, and adequacy of analysis.

Although the City of Camarillo is the Lead Agency for the proposed project and the city has sole authority to approve or deny the project, development and operation of the proposed land uses may also be subject to permit approval by other federal, state, or regional agencies. Such responsible and trustee agencies may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Ventura County Watershed Protection District
- Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency

EIR ADEQUACY

The principle use of an EIR is to enable the Lead Agency and other responsible agencies to examine the overall effects of projects that could have one or more significant effects on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines require no particular level of detail for such a document; instead, Section 15151 of the CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR, regardless of the type:

...should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision makers with information that enables them to make a decision that intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of a proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in the light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the
experts. The courts have looked not for perfection but for adequacy, completeness, and good faith effort at full disclosure.

The critical factor is that an environmental analysis discloses all environmental consequences associated with the project implementation, while avoiding unnecessary, redundant environmental analysis.

EIR SCOPE AND CONTENT

Before beginning the preparation of a Draft EIR, the Lead Agency must decide which specific issues should be evaluated in the document. CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines identify various steps that lead agencies must take to define the scope and contents of an EIR, and also give lead agencies discretion to use additional “scoping” methods.

To determine the environmental issues that should be addressed in this Draft EIR, City of Camarillo Department of Community Development conducted a preliminary evaluation in an Initial Study of the potential environmental impacts that could occur with implementation of the proposed project. Based on this review, the city concluded that the project could have potentially significant impacts associated with the following environmental issues:

• Agricultural Resources

• Water Supply

The Initial Study is provided as Appendix A to this Draft EIR. A summary of the analyses and conclusions of the Initial Study are provided in the Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant section of this Draft EIR.

Input as to the scope of the Draft EIR was then obtained from interested public agencies and private parties through a Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR (NOP) review process and public Draft EIR scoping meeting. The NOP was circulated for a 30-day review period beginning on September 11, 2015 and ending on October 12, 2015. The NOP is included as Appendix B to this Draft EIR and the letters received by the City of Camarillo in response to the NOP are included as Appendix C.

A public scoping meeting was conducted by the City of Camarillo Department of Community Development on September 16, 2010 at Camarillo City Hall. City staff and the EIR consultant presented a description of the proposed project and the proposed scope of the Draft EIR, and solicited input from the attendees of the meeting.

The input provided through the NOP review period and the public scoping meeting did not change the city’s proposed scope of the Draft EIR.
TOPICS OF KNOWN CONCERN

A summary of the concerns identified in the letters submitted to the Department of Community Development in response to the NOP is provided in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenting Agency</th>
<th>Issues of Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
<td>The EIR should evaluate the impacts of the project on the State transportation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Developments should use drought tolerant native landscaping and install rooftop solar energy panels. Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to biological resources should be evaluated. Avoid impacts to nesting birds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Base Ventura County</td>
<td>Project site is within the Military Influence Area and may experience noise impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>The air quality section of the EIR should be prepared in accordance with the 2003 Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only attendee of the public scoping meeting other than city staff and the EIR consultant was a representative of the project co-applicants. The only issues of concern that were identified pertained to the expected schedule for the Draft EIR preparation.

ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

This Draft EIR has been formatted for ease of use and reference. To help the reader locate information of particular interest, a brief summary of the contents of each section of the EIR is provided. The following sections are contained within the EIR:

**Introduction** — This section introduces the subject of this Draft EIR, the purpose for an EIR, standards for EIR adequacy, an introduction to the scope and content of this Draft EIR, and the opportunities that will be provided for public participation in the project and EIR review process.

**Summary** — This section provides a summary of the analyses and conclusions presented in the body of this Draft EIR, including the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, the recommended mitigation measures, the level of significance after mitigation, and the unavoidable impacts of the project. Also contained within this section is a summary of alternatives to the proposed and their ability to reduce the significant impacts of the project.
Environmental Setting — This section describes the physical environment that currently exists at, and in the vicinity of, the project site. This section also summarizes the approach for addressing cumulative impacts in this Draft EIR.

Project Description — This section defines the project location, describes the physical characteristics of the project site, describes the project as proposed by the project applicant, outlines the objectives for the project, and identifies the approvals required by the City of Camarillo and other agencies for project implementation.

Environmental Impact Analysis — The Environmental Impact Analysis is the primary focus of the Draft EIR. Separate discussions are provided to address the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. Each section provides a discussion of existing conditions (environmental setting), identification of the thresholds of significance for that topic, an assessment of the impacts of the project in relation to the thresholds of significance, recommended mitigation measures, cumulative impacts, and a residual impact statement as to the effectiveness of the recommended mitigation measures.

Alternatives to the Proposed Project — This section identifies alternatives to the proposed project that have been considered by the city to reduce and/or minimize potential project impacts, including a “no project” alternative.

Long-Term Implications — This section provides a summary of the proposed project’s potential to lead to population growth and the indirect implications of that growth on the city provides a list of proposed project impacts that are significant and unavoidable by issue area; identifies the irreversible changes to the natural environment resulting from the proposed project, and discusses the beneficial impacts of the proposed project.

Preparers of the EIR — This section identifies the individuals responsible for the preparation of this EIR.

References — This section identifies all references used and cited in the preparation of this EIR.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation is an essential part of the CEQA process. To provide full public disclosure of the potential environmental impacts that may occur as a result of the proposed project, CEQA requires that the Draft EIR be circulated for a 45-day public review period. During this review period, public agencies and interested organizations and individuals are encouraged to provide written comments addressing their concerns regarding the adequacy and completeness of the Draft EIR. When providing written comments on the subject matter of the Draft EIR, the readers are referred to Section 15204(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, which states:
In reviewing draft EIRs, persons and public agencies should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant environmental effects. At the same time, reviewers should be aware that the adequacy of an EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably feasible, in light of factors such as the magnitude of the project at issue, the severity of its likely environmental impacts, and the geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR.

All comments or questions regarding the Draft EIR were addressed to:

Steve Mitchell, Principal Planner
City of Camarillo Department of Community Development
601 Carmen Drive
Camarillo, CA 93010-0248
Telephone: (805) 383-5370
Fax: (805) 388-5388
Email: smitchell@cityofcamarillo.org

A copy of the Draft EIR was made available for public review by the general public at the City of Camarillo Department of Community Development at the address listed above.

Following the Draft EIR public review period and receipt of all written comments, the City of Camarillo prepared a Final EIR. The Final EIR provides additions and revisions to the Draft EIR as applicable, written responses to the written comments received by the city during the Draft EIR review period, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Members of the public also had additional opportunities to participate in the review of the proposed project through attendance at the public hearings before the City of Camarillo Planning Commission and City Council.

**ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

Issues to be resolved by the City of Camarillo include the determination that the EIR adequately evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, the determination that the recommended mitigation measures reduce the significant impacts of the project to a less than significant
level or to the maximum extent feasible, and the determination as to whether to approve or deny the project as proposed or one of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This summary is intended to highlight the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis of the proposed project. This summary includes a discussion of the location of the project site, project objectives, and the project description. A summary of the potential impacts that could occur as a result of the proposed project, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance after mitigation is included in this section. A summary of project alternatives is also provided.

PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed project site is located within the City of Camarillo in Ventura County. It is located within the Dawson Drive Industrial Area, which is a 180-acre area located to the east of Old Town Camarillo, sandwiched between Lewis Road and the residential neighborhoods of Calleguas Gardens and Village at the Park. This area houses many of the city's industrial businesses, in addition to large parcels of vacant and underutilized land, such as the former Imation and EJM (the proposed project site) properties. The proposed project site is located at the northeastern corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road.

The proposed project site consists of one parcel of land totaling approximately 23 acres that has been used for active agricultural production since at least 1938 and is presently used year-round for the production of irrigated row crops. Water for the agricultural use is provided by the City of Camarillo Water Division as an agricultural customer.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives for the project, as set forth by the project co-applicants, are to:

• Beautify the southern entry to the City of Camarillo by converting industrial land to a mixed-use residential/commercial community, under grounding existing power poles, and providing landscaped setbacks. The project also includes a “Welcome to Camarillo” monument sign for the corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road.

• Provide retail services to the community including the Fairfield community to the north of the project site and for the California State University, Channel Islands campus.

• Provide rental housing and for sale housing to young families and professionals with various styles of flats and two bedroom and three bedroom townhomes. There is a shortage of three bedroom townhomes due to the extra 250 square feet of common area space needed to provide the third bedroom. Seventy percent of the townhouse at the project site will be three bedroom units to help fulfill this underserved portion of the housing market.
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- Provide each townhome with 200 square feet of private open space to create more of a luxury style community.

- Provide a 40- to 86-foot setback along Lewis Road and provide a Class One bicycling and jogging trail which will connect with the Fairfield community to the north and tie into the meeting and eating area of the plaza within the retail center.

- Provide the public roads necessary to connect to the adjacent Fairfield community so that residents of that project can access the proposed retail center without going onto Lewis Road. This road will also provide a safe signalized entry/exit onto Lewis Road for both communities.

- Provide greater property tax and sales revenue to the City of Camarillo.

PROPOSED PROJECT

The project co-applicants are requesting approval from the City of Camarillo to change the land use designation of the site to approximately 19.5 acres of Medium Density Residential and approximately 3.2 acres of Commercial Mixed Use. The proposed project would involve the development of up to 309 multi-family residential units throughout the site along with up to 12,000 square feet of commercial uses. The homes would be developed within six neighborhoods of which two neighborhoods may also provide pool facilities. Neighborhoods 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 would consist of multi-unit townhouse buildings totaling 285 residential units. The mixed-use Neighborhood 4 would provide 24 residential flats above ground-level commercial space.

The townhouse units would range in size from 1,400 square feet for two-bedroom units to 1,650 and 1,900 square feet for three-bedroom units. In all, the 285 townhouse units would provide approximately 476,500 square feet of building space. The density of the townhouse units would be 14.62 units per gross acre. The allowable building coverage for these units is 50% of the land area while the proposed coverage is 28%.

The 24 residential flats would average 1,100 square feet for a total of approximately 26,400 square feet of building space. The density of the these units would be 7.5 units per gross acre. The allowable building coverage for mixed-use buildings is 50% of the land area while the proposed coverage is 17%.

Direct vehicular access to the project site would be provided by two new connections along Lewis Road and one new connection along Pleasant Valley Road. An additional connection in the northeastern part of the site would connect to Mike Loza Drive (formerly 3M Drive) within the Village Gateway development. As shown in the site circulation plan (Figure 6), the internal roadways would consist of three primary

---

1 Pool facilities are shown within the current illustrative site plan. Under the city’s Water Conservation Ordinance, new pool facilities may not be filled during drought conditions. Construction of pools within the project site may need to be delayed until permitted during non-drought conditions.
drives, one central spine, and a series of alleys within the residential-only neighborhoods. Vehicular access to the residential-only neighborhoods would be controlled via gated entrances.

**TOPICS OF KNOWN CONCERN**

To determine the environmental issues that should be addressed in this EIR, City of Camarillo Department of Community Development conducted a preliminary evaluation in an Initial Study of the potential environmental impacts that could occur with implementation of the proposed project. Based on this review, the city concluded that the project could have potentially significant impacts associated with the following environmental issues:

- Agricultural Resources
- Water Supply

A summary of the potential significant environmental impacts of the project is provided in Table 2. As shown, the proposed project would result in one significant and unavoidable impact: the conversion of Prime Farmland to nonagricultural uses. Any development that occurs at the project site would result in this significant and unavoidable impact.

**PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

This EIR also considers a range of alternatives to the proposed project to provide informed decision-making in accordance with Section 151216(f) of the CEQA guidelines. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR are as follows:

**No Project Alternative**

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed and the site would temporarily remain in its undeveloped state. However, it is reasonably foreseeable that another application would be submitted to the City of Camarillo in the near future requesting approval to develop the site with light industrial uses to the extent permitted by the L-M zone. The level is approximately 700,000 square feet of building space. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not preclude development of the project site; it would instead temporarily delay to a later date the development of the site with uses similar to the proposed project. This alternative would also not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project.

**Industrial Development Alternative**

The industrial Development Alternative assumes the development of the project site with light industrial uses consistent with the existing land use and zoning designations for the site. This alternative assumes
that the entire site would be utilized and no area would be left undeveloped and available for additional future development. The environmental impacts associated with this alternative would also be the same as those caused by the proposed project. The entire project site that is designated as Prime Farmland would be converted to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the Industrial Development Alternative would also delay, but not eliminate or reduce, the significant and unavoidable environmental impact associated with the proposed project. This alternative would also not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project.

**Alternative Site**

The evaluation of an alternative site is generally practical for new infrastructure projects or other projects that do not need to be developed at a site that is owned by a particular project developer. It is generally less applicable to new infill general development projects such as the proposed project. In the case of this proposed project, the project co-applicants could, in theory, purchase another property within Camarillo that is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. However, development at an alternative site would not meet the applicant’s objectives to provide new residential and commercial uses within the Dawson Drive Industrial Area and in close proximity to the California State University, Channel Islands campus. The project co-applicants do not own another property in the area that is not already being developed with residential uses. This alternative would also not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agricultural Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the proposed project would convert Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact under the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Model scoring thresholds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any zoning for forest use or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Implementation of the proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. No mitigation is required or recommended. No impact.

Water Supply

The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental effect. No mitigation is required or recommended. No impact.

The project co-applicants would be required to either wait to provide 100% of the water demand for the uses approved and entitled by the city. This will enable the City of Camarillo Water Division to provide water to the project site with no reduction of existing water or groundwater supplies.

WS-1 Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, and prior to issuance of any will serve letter, the project developer shall submit to the City of Camarillo a Water Supply Study (WSS) that identifies the amount of water required for the uses approved and entitled by the City and the sources that will provide 100% of the identified water demand. The WSS must include a description of the entitled project, the estimated water demand for the entitled uses, and the sources and quantities of the water that will be obtained to supply the entitled uses. The following requirements shall apply to the WSS:

A. The water demand estimates for the entitled uses must use water demand rates approved in writing by the City.

B. The water demand for this project is estimated to be 39.29 acre-feet per year, but this estimate must be updated based on the entitled uses and the WSS.

Less than significant impact.

---

**TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project co-applicants would be required to either wait to provide 100% of the water demand for the uses approved and entitled by the city. This will enable the City of Camarillo Water Division to provide water to the project site with no reduction of existing water or groundwater supplies.</td>
<td>WS-1 Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, and prior to issuance of any will serve letter, the project developer shall submit to the City of Camarillo a Water Supply Study (WSS) that identifies the amount of water required for the uses approved and entitled by the City and the sources that will provide 100% of the identified water demand. The WSS must include a description of the entitled project, the estimated water demand for the entitled uses, and the sources and quantities of the water that will be obtained to supply the entitled uses. The following requirements shall apply to the WSS: A. The water demand estimates for the entitled uses must use water demand rates approved in writing by the City. B. The water demand for this project is estimated to be 39.29 acre-feet per year, but this estimate must be updated based on the entitled uses and the WSS.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Contracts
   a) The project developer shall enter into written contract or contracts (Contract) with public and/or private entities that are existing water customers of the City of Camarillo (Entity or Entities) to offset 100% of the water demand of the project.
   b) The project developer shall enter into written contract or contracts (Contract) with public and/or private entities that are existing water customers of the City of Camarillo (Entity or Entities) to offset 100% of the water demand of the project.

D. Contents of Contract
   The Contract must include, but not be limited to, the following provisions:
   1) Identification of specific water conservation measures (WCMs)
   2) The Entity and the successors in interest of that Entity will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance, and replacement when necessary, of the WCMs.
   3) A statement that reads:
      The Camarillo Village Homes developer and ___________ (insert name of Entity) agree that the City of Camarillo is expressly made a third party beneficiary of this Contract and the City may, at its sole discretion, enforce the terms of this Contract by all lawful means. If and when the City initiates legal action

---

### TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to enforce the terms of this Contract, then the prevailing party will be entitled to recover reasonable attorney’s fees and costs.

A. Requirements for WCMs

1) The WCMs must be permanent and measurable.

2) The WCMS must be implemented within the City of Camarillo water service area.

3) WCMs must be approved in writing by the City. The City will consider the following measures as possibly permissible: permanent turf removal and replacement with materials other than artificial turf, landscape irrigation control and sensor systems that are proven to reduce water consumption, high-efficiency irrigation nozzles, high-efficiency plumbing fixtures, and such other WCMs as the City may approve in writing.

4) WCMs which are not permissible include: artificial turf, soil amendments and conditioners, specialty products that have not been verified to permanently improve water efficiency, and other such WCMs as the City may disapprove in writing.

F. The WSS must include engineering reports or other information or documentation acceptable to the City that describe the WCMs in detail, the amount of water savings by each WCM, and the

---

**TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to enforce the terms of this Contract, then the prevailing party will be entitled to recover reasonable attorney’s fees and costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Requirements for WCMs

1) The WCMs must be permanent and measurable.

2) The WCMS must be implemented within the City of Camarillo water service area.

3) WCMs must be approved in writing by the City. The City will consider the following measures as possibly permissible: permanent turf removal and replacement with materials other than artificial turf, landscape irrigation control and sensor systems that are proven to reduce water consumption, high-efficiency irrigation nozzles, high-efficiency plumbing fixtures, and such other WCMs as the City may approve in writing.

4) WCMs which are not permissible include: artificial turf, soil amendments and conditioners, specialty products that have not been verified to permanently improve water efficiency, and other such WCMs as the City may disapprove in writing.

F. The WSS must include engineering reports or other information or documentation acceptable to the City that describe the WCMs in detail, the amount of water savings by each WCM, and the
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methods of measuring the water savings for each WCM. The engineering reports, other information, or documentation must be referenced in and made part of the Contract.

A. The WSS must be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the City of Camarillo Public Works Department and Community Development Department prior to the issuance of any grading permit and water-will serve letter.

B. Mitigation measure WS-1 will be completed prior to starting mitigation measure WS-2.

WS-2 Prior to the issuance of any building permits, and a water will-serve letter, the project developer shall submit to the City of Camarillo an update to the WSS, and water will-serve letter required under mitigation measure WS-1 that demonstrates that approved water conservation measures (WCMs) are implemented, 100% operational, and providing the specified water reductions at a minimum subject to confirmation by the City of Camarillo Public Works Department and Community Development Department. All terms and conditions required for the WSS under mitigation measure WS-1 apply to the WSS update under this mitigation measure.

Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant

| Aesthetics: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. | No mitigation is required or recommended. | Less than significant impact. |

TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Camarillo Village Homes
**TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics:</strong> The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics:</strong> The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics:</strong> Construction of the proposed project could create a new source of substantial light or glare which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.</td>
<td>A-1 To avoid potential significant impacts to adjacent residential properties and roadways, the project developers shall include in contract specifications that temporary construction lighting within 200 feet of adjoining residential properties and roadways with direct lines of sight to the lighting source shall be shielded from the affected residential properties and roadways. This shall include permanent and temporary lighting provided within the new residential and mixed-use buildings.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality:</strong> Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Air Quality:** Implementation of the proposed project would generate new sources of air pollutants during project construction activities. These emissions would cause a significant impact if all appropriate emissions control measures recommended by the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) are not implemented. The daily operational emissions generated by the project would exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the VCAPCD. | AQ-1 All developers of new buildings at the project site shall implement fugitive dust control measures throughout all phases of construction. The project developers shall include in construction contracts the control measures required and recommended by the VCAPCD at the time of development. Examples of the types of measures currently required and recommended include the following:  
- Minimize the area disturbed on a daily basis by clearing, grading, earthmoving, and/or excavation operations. | Less than significant impact. |
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- Pre-grading/excavation activities shall include watering the area to be graded or excavated before the commencement of grading or excavation operations. Application of water should penetrate sufficiently to minimize fugitive dust during these activities.
- All trucks shall be required to cover their loads as required by California Vehicle Code §23114.
- All graded and excavated material, exposed soil areas, and active portions of the construction site, including unpaved on-site roadways, shall be treated to prevent fugitive dust. Treatment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, periodic watering, application of environmentally-safe soil stabilization materials, and/or roll-compaction as appropriate. Watering shall be done as often as necessary.
- Material stockpiles shall be enclosed, covered, stabilized, or otherwise treated, to prevent blowing fugitive dust offsite.
- Graded and/or excavated inactive areas of the construction site shall be monitored by a city-designated monitor at least weekly for dust stabilization. Soil stabilization methods, such as water and roll-compaction, and environmentally-safe control materials, shall be periodically applied to portions of the construction site that are inactive for over four days. If no further grading or excavation operations are planned for the area, the area should be seeded and watered until grass growth is evident, or periodically treated with environmentally-safe dust suppressants, to prevent excessive fugitive dust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-grading/excavation activities shall include watering the area to be graded or excavated before the commencement of grading or excavation operations. Application of water should penetrate sufficiently to minimize fugitive dust during these activities.</td>
<td>All trucks shall be required to cover their loads as required by California Vehicle Code §23114.</td>
<td>All graded and excavated material, exposed soil areas, and active portions of the construction site, including unpaved on-site roadways, shall be treated to prevent fugitive dust. Treatment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, periodic watering, application of environmentally-safe soil stabilization materials, and/or roll-compaction as appropriate. Watering shall be done as often as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material stockpiles shall be enclosed, covered, stabilized, or otherwise treated, to prevent blowing fugitive dust offsite.</td>
<td>Graded and/or excavated inactive areas of the construction site shall be monitored by a city-designated monitor at least weekly for dust stabilization. Soil stabilization methods, such as water and roll-compaction, and environmentally-safe control materials, shall be periodically applied to portions of the construction site that are inactive for over four days. If no further grading or excavation operations are planned for the area, the area should be seeded and watered until grass growth is evident, or periodically treated with environmentally-safe dust suppressants, to prevent excessive fugitive dust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Signs shall be posted on-site limiting on-site traffic to 15 miles per hour or less.

• During periods of high winds (i.e., wind speed sufficient to cause fugitive dust to impact adjacent properties), all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations shall be curtailed to the degree necessary to prevent fugitive dust created by on-site activities and operations from being a nuisance or hazard, either off-site or on-site. The site superintendent/supervisor shall use his/her discretion in conjunction with the VCAPCD is determining when winds are excessive.

• Adjacent streets and roads shall be swept at least once per day, preferably at the end of the day, if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent streets and roads.

• Personnel involved in grading operations, including contractors and subcontractors should be advised to wear respiratory protection in accordance with California Division of Occupational Safety and Health regulations.

AQ-2 All developers of new buildings at the project site shall implement and agree to enforce measures to reduce the emissions of pollutants generated by heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment operating at the Project site throughout the project construction phases. The project developer shall include in construction contracts the control measures required and recommended by the VCAPCD at the time of development. Examples of the types of measures currently required and recommended include the following:

### TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Signs shall be posted on-site limiting on-site traffic to 15 miles per hour or less.</td>
<td>• During periods of high winds (i.e., wind speed sufficient to cause fugitive dust to impact adjacent properties), all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations shall be curtailed to the degree necessary to prevent fugitive dust created by on-site activities and operations from being a nuisance or hazard, either off-site or on-site. The site superintendent/supervisor shall use his/her discretion in conjunction with the VCAPCD is determining when winds are excessive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjacent streets and roads shall be swept at least once per day, preferably at the end of the day, if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent streets and roads.</td>
<td>• Personnel involved in grading operations, including contractors and subcontractors should be advised to wear respiratory protection in accordance with California Division of Occupational Safety and Health regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ-2 All developers of new buildings at the project site shall implement and agree to enforce measures to reduce the emissions of pollutants generated by heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment operating at the Project site throughout the project construction phases. The project developer shall include in construction contracts the control measures required and recommended by the VCAPCD at the time of development. Examples of the types of measures currently required and recommended include the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Air Quality: The daily operational emissions generated by the proposed project would exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the VCAPCD. | • Maintain all construction equipment in good condition and in proper tune in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications.  
• Limit truck and equipment idling time to five minutes or less.  
• Minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating at the same time during the smog season (May through October).  
• Use alternatively fueled construction equipment, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), or electric, to the extent feasible. | Less than significant impact. |
| AQ-3 All developers of new buildings at the project site shall include in construction and building management contracts the following requirements or measures shown to be equally effective:  
• Use solar or low-emission water heaters in new buildings.  
• Require that commercial landscapers providing services at the common areas of project site use electric or battery-powered equipment, or other internal combustion equipment that is either certified by the California Air Resources Board or is three years old or less at the time of use, to the extent that such equipment is reasonably available and competitively priced in Ventura County (meaning that the equipment can be easily purchased at stores in Ventura County and the cost of the equipment is not more than 20 percent greater than the cost of standard equipment). |
TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQ-4 Prior to the issuance of a zoning clearance, the developers of new buildings at the project site shall pay a total of $21,167 to the city TDM fund to reduce vehicle trips and associated air pollutant emissions.</td>
<td>Mitigation measures AQ-3 and AQ-4 would be applicable to this impact.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong>: The daily operational emissions generated by the proposed project would exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the VCAPCD and, therefore, would generate a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong>: The proposed project would not Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong>: The proposed project would not Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Biological Resources**: Construction of the proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. | BR-1 To avoid potential significant impacts to nesting birds, including migratory birds and raptors, one of the following shall be implemented by the developers of the proposed project:  
  - Conduct tree removal associated with construction from September 1st through January 31st, when birds are not nesting.  
  OR…  
  - Conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting birds if tree removal is initiated during the nesting season with results of the survey provided to the Department of Community Development. A qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct weekly pre-removal bird surveys no more than 30 days prior to tree removal to provide confirmation on the presence or absence of active nests in the affected trees. The last survey should be conducted no more than three days prior to the tree removal. | Less than significant impact. |
Executive Summary

removal. If active nests are encountered, removal of the affected trees shall be deferred until the young birds have fledged and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. A minimum buffer of 300 feet (500 feet for raptor nests) or as determined by a qualified biologist shall be maintained during construction depending on the species and location. A copy of the buffer plan shall be provided to the Department of Community Development prior to fencing. The perimeter of the nest-setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with staked flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel and activities restricted from the area. Construction personnel should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. A survey report by the qualified biologist documenting and verifying compliance with the mitigation and with applicable state and federal regulations protecting birds shall be submitted to the Department of Community Development prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The qualified biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities would occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests would occur.

Biological Resources: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camarillo Village Homes</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
**TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong>: The proposed project would not 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.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong>: The proposed project would not 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.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong>: The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong>: The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, Natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong>: The proposed project would not Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong>: There is a remote possibility that archeological resources may exist below the ground surface and that these resources could be encountered during site grading and trenching.</td>
<td>CR-1 The project developers shall include in construction contracts the requirement that construction activities be halted if any archaeological materials are encountered during the course of project development. The services of a professional archaeologist shall be secured by contacting the Center for Public Archaeology – California State University Fullerton, or a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) or a SOPA-qualified archaeologist to assess the resources and evaluate the impact.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the event that cultural resources are discovered, the handling will differ depending on the nature of the artifacts. However, it is understood that all artifacts with the exception of human remains and related grave goods or sacred objects belong to the property owner. All artifacts discovered at the development site shall be inventoried and analyzed by the professional archaeologist. In the event that the archaeologist identifies resources of a prehistoric or Native American origin, a Native American observer of Chumash origin shall be retained to accompany the archaeologist for the duration of the grading phase to help analyze the Native American artifacts for identification as everyday life and/or religious or sacred items, cultural affiliation, temporal placement, and function, as deemed possible. All items found in association with Native American human remains will be considered grave goods or sacred in origin and subject to special handling pursuant to State law. The remainder of the Native American artifact assemblage will be inventoried, analyzed, and prepared in a manner for reburial at the project site and/or curation, and the archaeological consultant will deliver the materials to an accredited curation facility approved by the City of Camarillo within a reasonable amount of time.

Nonnative American artifacts will be inventoried, assessed, and analyzed for cultural affiliation, personal affiliation (prior ownership), function, and temporal placement. Subsequent to analysis and reporting, these artifacts will be subjected to curation or returned to the property owner, as deemed appropriate.
A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of recovered artifacts, shall be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above. The report shall include a discussion of the significance of all recovered artifacts. The report and inventory, when submitted to the City of Camarillo Department of Community Development and the UCLA Archaeological Information Center, will signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to archaeological and/or cultural resources.

**Cultural Resources**: There is a very remote possibility that paleontological resources may exist below the ground surface, and that these resources could be encountered during site grading and trenching.

| **Cultural Resources**: The proposed project would have no impact on known human remains. | **CR-2** The project developer shall include in construction contracts the requirement that the project be halted if any paleontological materials are encountered during the course of project development. The services of a paleontologist shall be secured by contacting the Center for Public Paleontology, which can be found at the following universities; USC, UCLA, California State University at Los Angeles, or California State University at Long Beach, to assess the resources and evaluate the impact. Copies of the paleontological survey, study, or report shall be submitted to the Department of Community Development. | Less than significant impact. | No mitigation is required or recommended. | Less than significant impact. |
Executive Summary

Geology and Soils: The technical report prepared for the project demonstrates that the development of the site with residential and commercial uses is feasible from a geotechnical perspective with no unusual risk or geotechnical hazard. Standard engineering practices as specified in the technical report would ensure that the project developments would not pose a significant risk to people or structures in the event of a seismic activity. These types of measures are required of all new development in Camarillo.

No mitigation is required or recommended. Less than significant impact.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, but these emissions would not have a significant effect on the environment.

No mitigation is required or recommended. Less than significant impact.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs

No mitigation is required or recommended. Less than significant impact.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Construction-related impacts could occur if the soils at the site have levels of toxaphene that exceed California Human Health Screening Levels and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regional Screening Levels for soil at residential sites.

HHM-1 The project developers shall contact the Ventura County Environmental Health Department (VCEHD) or the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to enroll in their voluntary oversight program for the mitigation of the toxaphene by general grading and site preparation with conformation sampling or risk analysis.

OR

If mitigation is not permissible by the VCEHD or the DTSC, the project developers shall perform remedial excavation and disposal to remediate the toxaphene concentrations exceeding applicable screening levels.

Less than significant impact.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school.

No mitigation is required or recommended. Less than significant impact.
### TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials:</strong> The proposed project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.</td>
<td>Mitigation measure HHM-1 would be applicable to this impact.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials:</strong> The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard from airport operations for people residing or working in the project area.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials:</strong> The proposed project would not result in a safety hazard from private airport operations for people residing or working in the project area.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials:</strong> The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials:</strong> The proposed project would not 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.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology and Water Quality:</strong> Construction and operation of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology and Water Quality:</strong> The proposed project would not 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, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Hydrology and Water Quality: The proposed project would 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. No mitigation is required or recommended. Less than significant impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality: The proposed project would not otherwise degrade water quality. No mitigation is required or recommended. No impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Areas of the project site could be placed within the 100-year flood zone if these areas were to be lowered from their current elevation as a part of project development. HWC-1 All portions of the project site shall be maintained at the current elevation or higher as part of project development and all new residential structures shall be constructed a minimum of 12 inches above the 100 year flood levels. Less than significant impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Development of the proposed project would not expose residents of the project site to a significant risk associated with dam failure. No mitigation is required or recommended. Less than significant impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality: There would be no impacts related to loss, injury or death involving inundation at the project site by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. No mitigation is required or recommended. No impact.

Land Use and Planning: The proposed project would not divide any existing residential neighborhoods. No mitigation is required or recommended. No impact.

Land Use and Planning: The proposed project would be consistent with each of the City of Camarillo General Plan policies and goals that are applicable to the project. No mitigation is required or recommended. Less than significant impact.

Land Use and Planning: The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No mitigation is required or recommended. No impact.

Mineral Resources: Implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly result in the loss of availability of important mineral resources at the project site or in the general vicinity. No mitigation is required or recommended. No impact.

TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology and Water Quality:</strong> The proposed project would 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.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology and Water Quality:</strong> The proposed project would not otherwise degrade water quality.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology and Water Quality:</strong> Areas of the project site could be placed within the 100-year flood zone if these areas were to be lowered from their current elevation as a part of project development.</td>
<td>HWC-1 All portions of the project site shall be maintained at the current elevation or higher as part of project development and all new residential structures shall be constructed a minimum of 12 inches above the 100 year flood levels.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology and Water Quality:</strong> Development of the proposed project would not expose residents of the project site to a significant risk associated with dam failure.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology and Water Quality:</strong> There would be no impacts related to loss, injury or death involving inundation at the project site by seiche, tsunami or mudflow</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Planning:</strong> The proposed project would not divide any existing residential neighborhoods.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Planning:</strong> The proposed project would be consistent with each of the City of Camarillo General Plan policies and goals that are applicable to the project.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Planning:</strong> The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mineral Resources:</strong> Implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly result in the loss of availability of important mineral resources at the project site or in the general vicinity.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise:</strong> Construction of the proposed project would not expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Residents of the project site could be exposed to roadway noise levels that exceed city standards.</td>
<td>N-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits for residential buildings located along Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road, the developers of these units shall submit an exterior noise study that demonstrates that walls along the western and southern townhouse yards have been designed to ensure that future exterior noise levels within the private back yard/patio areas of these units will not exceed 65 dBA CNEL.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise:</strong> Construction and operation of the proposed project would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise:</strong> Operation of the proposed project would not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise:</strong> Construction of the proposed project would not generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise:</strong> The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels if the project is located within an area covered by an airport land use plan.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise:</strong> The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels if the project is located in the vicinity of a private airstrip.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and Housing:</strong> The proposed project would not indirectly induce population growth at a location where growth is currently not possible</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and Housing:</strong> the proposed project would not result in the demolition of any existing residential units or the displacement of any residents.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services:</strong> Project development would not require the development of new or physically altered fire protection facilities which would cause significant environmental impacts.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services:</strong> The proposed project would not create the need for the construction of new or physically-altered police facilities.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services:</strong> The new students living at the project site could create the need for new or expanded school facilities. Payment of the required school impact fees would reduce the potential impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services:</strong> The new residents of the proposed project would create an additional demand for park and recreation areas. Payment of the required in-lieu fees would reduce the potential impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Services:</strong> No new public facilities would need to be constructed to accommodate the needs of project residents.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation:</strong> The new residents of the proposed project would create an additional demand for park and recreation areas. Payment of the required in-lieu fees would reduce the potential impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation/Traffic:</strong> The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation/Traffic:</strong> The proposed project would not 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.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation/Traffic:</strong> Development of the proposed project would not force any changes to the air traffic patterns of these airports.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>No impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation/Traffic:</strong> Implementation of the proposed project could increase hazards due to site access design features.</td>
<td>T-1 The volumes and delays at the new main northern driveway shall be monitored and, if warranted and approved by Caltrans, a traffic signal installed by the project developer as conditions warrant in the future.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T-2 Prior to approval of the final site design, the applicant shall provide a sight distance analysis for the new main northern driveway on Lewis Road that demonstrates that sufficient sight distance is provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T-3 The southbound left-turn pocket to the new main northern driveway on Lewis Road shall provide a minimum depth of 285 feet including taper if permitted by Caltrans. It is understood that the layout is subject to Caltrans review and that additional length may be required by Caltrans staff before an encroachment permit is issued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T-4 Prior to approval of the final site design, the applicant shall provide a truck turning analysis that confirms that adequate space is provided for garbage trucks, moving trucks, and emergency vehicles within the residential parcel, and for delivery trucks and emergency vehicles within the mix-use parcel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation/Traffic:</strong> Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities and Service Systems:</strong> Implementation of the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities and Service Systems:</strong> The proposed project would not require the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater facilities.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Utilities and Service Systems: The proposed project would not require the construction of new or expanded storm water facilities. No mitigation is required or recommended. Less than significant impact.

Utilities and Service Systems: The Camarillo Wastewater Treatment Plant has adequate capacity to treat the wastewater that would be generated by the proposed project. No mitigation is required or recommended. Less than significant impact.

Utilities and Service Systems: The landfills serving the City of Camarillo have adequate capacity to accommodate the total solid waste generation of the project. No mitigation is required or recommended. Less than significant impact.

TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Residual Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities and Service Systems</strong>: The proposed project would not require the construction of new or expanded storm water facilities.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities and Service Systems</strong>: The Camarillo Wastewater Treatment Plant has adequate capacity to treat the wastewater that would be generated by the proposed project.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities and Service Systems</strong>: The landfills serving the City of Camarillo have adequate capacity to accommodate the total solid waste generation of the project.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required or recommended.</td>
<td>Less than significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

CEQA requires that an EIR include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project site, as they exist at the time the NOP is published, or if no NOP is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective. This environmental setting will normally constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant. The description of the environmental setting shall be no longer than is necessary to an understanding of the significant effects of the proposed project and its alternatives. Additional descriptions of the environmental setting as it relates to each of the environmental topics analyzed in this Final EIR are included in the environmental setting discussions provided within the technical sections of this Final EIR.

As part of the environmental setting, this section also identifies the amount of cumulative development currently envisioned for the vicinity of the project site. This is important since, in many cases, the impact of a single project may not be significant, but when combined with other projects, the “cumulative” impact may be significant. Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to assess not only an individual project’s potential impacts, but also the cumulative impacts when combined with other projects.

Section 15125(d) requires that an EIR discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans. While this requirement is listed in the Environmental Setting section of the CEQA Guidelines, it does not make much sense to discuss the effects of a project in a section of the EIR that is merely describing the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project site. Instead, consistency of the proposed project with all applicable policies from applicable local and regional plans is discussed in the Land Use and Planning section of the Initial Study that was prepared for the proposed project. The Initial Study is included as Appendix A to this Final EIR.

REGIONAL SETTING

The proposed project site is located within the City of Camarillo in Ventura County. As shown in Figure 1, the City of Camarillo is located in southern Ventura County along the U.S. Highway 101 (Ventura Freeway) corridor. U.S. Highway 101 bisects the city along an east-west alignment. The city is surrounded by unincorporated county land. The City of Thousand Oaks is located to the east and the cities of Oxnard and San Buenaventura (Ventura) are located to the west.

Camarillo lies in the Pleasant Valley at the eastern edge of the Oxnard Plain, a fertile plain which is characterized in part by flat lands and rich soils. However, Camarillo is also distinguished by hills along its northern perimeter and the Santa Monica Mountains along its eastern perimeter. The majority of the city is approximately 150 feet above mean sea level while the northern foothill regions are as high as 360
feet above mean sea level. The topographic relief in Camarillo’s planning area\(^1\) is more diverse, however, with slopes ranging from approximately 30 feet above mean sea level in the relatively flat lands of the Oxnard Plain to approximately 1,814 feet above mean sea level along the extremely steep rise of the Santa Monica Mountains.

Camarillo has a mild Mediterranean-type climate with year round temperatures averaging in the low 70 degree range (Fahrenheit). Typically, precipitation averages approximately 16 inches per year. Fog and damp air frequently occur due to the proximity to the Pacific Ocean approximately nine miles to the southwest of the city, although “Santa Ana” conditions bring dry warm winds during the fall and winter. Air pollution levels in southern Ventura County are affected by a temperature inversion\(^2\) and low average wind speeds.

A variety of land uses, such as agricultural, residential, commercial, office, and industrial, occur within the city, which covers approximately 12,186 acres within its incorporated boundary. Agricultural uses are typically found in the southern part of the city and are composed primarily of row crops including a variety of vegetables and fruits. Residential uses are located throughout the city, but mostly north of the

---

\(^1\) An area that extends not less than 1.5 miles beyond the existing city limits.

\(^2\) Warm, dry air above cool marine air which creates a lid that keeps the marine air from rising.
Ventura Freeway. Commercial and office uses generally occur in business districts and shopping centers along the Ventura Freeway and major arterials, such as Ventura Boulevard, Carmen Drive and Arneill Road. Industrial uses are primarily located along the railroad right-of-way in the central and eastern portions of the city and consist of manufacturing, research and development, and agriculturally-oriented industries.

Regional vehicular access to the city is obtained primarily from U.S. Highway 101 and State Route 34 (Lewis Road). Other regional access routes located close to Camarillo include State Route 1 (Pacific Coast Highway) and State Route 118.

LOCAL SETTING

The project site is located within the Dawson Drive Industrial Area, which is a 180-acre area located to the east of Old Town Camarillo, sandwiched between Lewis Road and the residential neighborhoods of Calleguas Gardens and Village at the Park. This area houses many of the city’s industrial businesses, in addition to large parcels of vacant and underutilized land, such as the former Imation and EJM (the proposed project site) properties. The Dawson Drive Industrial Area is illustrated in Figure 2.

FIGURE 2 - DAWSON DRIVE INDUSTRIAL AREA
The proposed project site is located at the northeastern corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road as illustrated in Figure 3.

FIGURE 3 - LOCAL VICINITY MAP

The land uses surrounding the project site are illustrated in Figure 4. The property to the immediate north of the site is a former industrial site (3M/Imation) that was approved for multi-family residential development (Village Gateway) by the City of Camarillo City Council in 2013. The area to the immediate east of the site is developed with light industrial uses along Constitution Avenue. The area to the west of the site and Lewis Road is also developed with light industrial uses. The areas to the south of the site and Pleasant Valley Road are agricultural properties located within the unincorporated area of Ventura County. The Camarillo Sanitary District Pumping Station No. 2 is located at the southeastern corner of the project site.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT SITE

The proposed project site consists of one parcel of land totaling approximately 23 acres that has been used for active agricultural production since at least 1938 and is presently used year-round for the production of irrigated row crops. Water for the agricultural use is provided by the City of Camarillo Water Division as an agricultural customer.
The project site is relatively flat and drains to the south. An existing storm drain is located at the southwestern corner of the site and connects to the existing storm drains located within Lewis Road.

CURRENT LAND USE AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

The current General Plan land use designation for the site is Industrial and the underlying zoning is M-1 (Light Manufacturing).

Development within the Dawson Drive Industrial Area is subject to the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines (Specific Plan). The purpose of the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines is to articulate a vision for the revitalization of the Dawson Drive area and establish a set of design standards and improvements that will guide its redevelopment into a vibrant district. A key component of the plan is to enhance signage, circulation and access so that this area becomes better integrated into central Camarillo. As implemented over time, the Concepts and Design Guidelines will encourage property owners, residents and businesses to improve existing properties and create new infill development that will help unify the area and connect central Camarillo.

When it was adopted in 2010, the Dawson Drive Industrial Area Concepts & Design Guidelines primarily identified industrial uses for the Dawson Drive area although residential uses were allowed as part of mixed-use development. The Concepts & Design Guidelines were amended in 2013 to identify high
density multi-family residential uses as the preferred use for a portion of the former Imation site. The amended Concepts & Design Guidelines states that:

Introducing residential uses will not only diversify the mix of uses within the Plan area, it will support transportation oriented development efforts as well as the continued revitalization of Camarillo’s downtown and downtown-adjacent areas.

The project site is planned for industrial park/university serving uses in the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines. Specifically, the Concepts & Design Guidelines states that:

The EJM property will, because of highway access and future market forces, undergo a significant transformation into a thriving business park through a major private development/reno
development effort. While not precluding development with uses permitted by M-1 zoning, or a possible re-
zonning to SC (service/commercial, a transitional flex zone), this property will have the ability to act in concert with the City and [California State] University [Channel Islands], to recruit business that relate to the assets of being near a University campus. Lewis Road will be improved to include a parkway with a greenbelt incorporating an off-road pedestrian and bicycle trail and a gateway element will be located in the intersection of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road.

As to the desired uses for the project site, the Concepts & Design Guidelines states that:

As with the Imation site, quality use and composition of development are important factors. While the M-1 zoning will allow for this area to be developed with high quality industrial uses, future development opportunities allowed by the re-zoning of the property to SC (service/commercial) could also be encouraged that would take advantage of the potential spin off from the University as it matures. It is preferred that the EJM site, when developed, provides a home for uses that support the California State University Channel Islands in a quality business or industrial park setting. Uses such as offices, banks, restaurants, and support commercial would be encouraged. No unique design style is suggested.

UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The proposed project site is located within the Calleguas Municipal Water District and is served by the Camarillo Water Division. Water is provided via a 16-inch water main located within Lewis Road and a 12-inch water main located in Pleasant Valley Road.

Wastewater from the Dawson Drive Industrial Area is treated by the Camarillo Sanitary District, which operates and maintains the Camarillo Sanitary District Water Reclamation Plant located on Howard Road near Conejo Creek.
RELATED PROJECTS

In addition to the potential environmental impacts that would be associated with the proposed project, this EIR also evaluates “cumulative impacts.” Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines defines cumulative impacts as two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or that compound or increase other environmental impacts. In general, these impacts occur in conjunction with other related development that may have impacts that might compound or interrelate with those of the project under review.

In order to analyze the cumulative impacts of the proposed project in combination with other expected future development, the amount and location of growth expected to occur in addition to the proposed project must be considered. Section 15130(b) of the CEQA Guidelines allows the following two methods of prediction:

A) A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or

B) A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or areawide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

This Final EIR utilizes the City of Camarillo’s Monthly Report from September 2015 to identify the projects that have been recently completed, are under construction, approved, or pending as a list of related projects throughout Camarillo. This date was selected since that was the timeframe that the NOP was prepared and the baseline traffic conditions were evaluated for the project. The September 2015 Monthly Report is included as Appendix D to this Final EIR. The actual list of related projects utilized to evaluate cumulative projects in this Final EIR will vary, however, by the issue being evaluated. For example, potable water is provided to the city by two separate agencies. Only the related projects within the service area of the Camarillo Municipal Water Division will be evaluated, since the proposed project would not utilize potable water provided by another other agency.
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PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this project description is to describe the project in a way that will be meaningful to the public, reviewing agencies, and decision-makers. According to CEQA, an adequate project description need not be exhaustive, but should supply the detail that is necessary for project evaluation.¹

PROJECT APPLICANTS

The co-applicants for the proposed project are EJM-Arizona Commerceplex and Hawkeye Investments II, LLC.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives for the project, as set forth by the project co-applicants, are to:

- Beautify the southern entry to the City of Camarillo by converting industrial land to a mixed-use residential/commercial community, under grounding existing power poles, and providing landscaped setbacks. The project also includes a “Welcome to Camarillo” monument sign for the corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road.

- Provide retail services to the community including the Fairfield community to the north of the project site and for the California State University, Channel Islands campus.

- Provide rental housing and for sale housing to young families and professionals with various styles of flats and two bedroom and three bedroom townhomes. There is a shortage of three bedroom townhomes due to the extra 250 square feet of common area space needed to provide the third bedroom. Seventy percent of the townhouse at the project site will be three bedroom units to help fulfill this underserved portion of the housing market.

- Provide each townhome with 200 square feet of private open space to create more of a luxury style community.

- Provide a 40- to 86-foot setback along Lewis Road and provide a Class One bicycling and jogging trail which will connect with the Fairfield community to the north and tie into the meeting and eating area of the plaza within the retail center.

¹ Although required by CEQA for a project description, this Final EIR provides a list of the agencies that are expected to use the EIR in their decision-making process in the Introduction section and the location of the project site is provided in the Environmental Setting section.
• Provide the public roads necessary to connect to the adjacent Fairfield community so that residents of that project can access the proposed retail center without going onto Lewis Road. This road will also provide a safe signalized entry/exit onto Lewis Road for both communities.

• Provide greater property tax and sales revenue to the City of Camarillo.

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

Proposed General Plan Amendment, Changes of Zone, and Specific Plan Amendments

The project co-applicants are requesting approval from the City of Camarillo to change the land use designation of the site to approximately 19.5 acres of Medium Density Residential and approximately 3.2 acres of Commercial Mixed Use. The requested changes in land use designations would also necessitate a zone change as well as an amendment to the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines.

Development Concept

The proposed project would involve the development of up to 309 multi-family residential units throughout the site along with up to 12,000 square feet of commercial uses. As shown in the illustrative site plan (Figure 5), the homes would be developed within six neighborhoods of which two neighborhoods may also provide pool facilities. Neighborhoods 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 would consist of multi-unit townhouse buildings totaling 285 residential units. The mixed-use Neighborhood 4 would provide 24 residential flats above ground-level commercial space.

The townhouse units would range in size from 1,400 square feet for two-bedroom units to 1,650 and 1,900 square feet for three-bedroom units. In all, the 285 townhouse units would provide approximately 476,500 square feet of building space. The density of the townhouse units would be 14.62 units per gross acre. The allowable building coverage for these units is 50% of the land area while the proposed coverage is 28%.

The 24 residential flats would average 1,100 square feet for a total of approximately 26,400 square feet of building space. The density of the these units would be 7.5 units per gross acre. The allowable building coverage for mixed-use buildings is 50% of the land area while the proposed coverage is 17%.

---

2 Pool facilities are shown within the current illustrative site plan. Under the city’s Water Conservation Ordinance, new pool facilities may not be filled during drought conditions. Construction of pools within the project site may need to be delayed until permitted during non-drought conditions.
Roadways and Site Access

Direct vehicular access to the project site would be provided by two new connections along Lewis Road and one new connection along Pleasant Valley Road. An additional connection in the northeastern part of the site would connect to Mike Loza Drive (formerly 3M Drive) within the Village Gateway development. As shown in the site circulation plan (Figure 6), the internal roadways would consist of three primary drives, one central spine, and a series of alleys within the residential-only neighborhoods. Vehicular access to the residential-only neighborhoods would be controlled via gated entrances.

Pedestrian access would be available at each of the vehicular access points to the project site. A meandering sidewalk and Class A bike path would be provided along the western edge of the project site. A pedestrian plaza would be provided at the southwestern corner of the site within the mixed-use neighborhood (Neighborhood 4).

Parking

Each townhouse unit is required to provide two resident parking spaces. Guest parking at a ratio of 0.60 spaces per unit is also required for these uses. This equates to a required total of 741 spaces. The residential spaces would be provided in enclosed garages at the lowest level of each residential unit. The guest spaces would be provided in open spaces throughout each residential-only neighborhood.

Within the mixed-use neighborhood, each residential flat is also required to provide two resident parking spaces and guest parking at a ratio of 0.60 spaces per unit. This equates to a required total of 63 spaces.
Project Description

The 48 residential spaces would be provided in subterranean garages below the mixed-use buildings. The 15 guest parking spaces would co-mingle with the 133 required commercial parking spaces in two open lots.

FIGURE 6 - SITE CIRCULATION PLAN

Building Design

Conceptual elevations for the proposed townhouse buildings are illustrated in Figure 7. Conceptual elevations for the proposed mixed-use buildings are illustrated in Figure 8.

Utilities and Infrastructure

The proposed project site is located within the Calleguas Municipal Water District and is served by the Camarillo Water Division. The project development would connect to a 16-inch water main located within Lewis Road and a 12-inch water main located in Pleasant Valley Road for potable water use.

Wastewater from the project development would be treated by the Camarillo Sanitary District, which operates and maintains the Camarillo Sanitary District Water Reclamation Plant located on Howard Road near Conejo Creek. The project development would connect to an 18-inch sewer main located along the east side of Lewis Road. The 18-inch sewer line is currently being installed as part of the Village Gateway project. These lines connect to the Camarillo Sanitary District Pumping Station No. 2 located at the southeastern corner of the project site.
The project site is relatively flat and drains to the south. The existing storm drain is located at the southwestern corner of the site and connects to the existing storm drains located within Lewis Road. A subsurface detention facility consisting of eight rows of 48-inch diameter pipe, with each pipe run at a length of about 250 feet (total pipe length of approximately 2,000 feet) would be used to meet City of Camarillo 50-year design storm standards for all storm drain systems and to reduce all storm flows up to the 100-year peak storm to the level of the 10-year pre-developed peak storm flow. The project development would also be designed to meet the requirements of the Ventura County Municipal Stormwater Permit (CAS004002, Order R4-2010-0108) and related requirements of the Ventura County Technical Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Measures (TGM) that are in effect at the time of building development. The current version of the TGM is dated May 29, 2015 and includes site design, site-specific source control, retention measures, and treatment control measures. The post-development best management practices (BMPs) proposed for the project include proprietary infiltration (treatment) along with one or more features such as vegetated swales, cartridge media filters, and hydrodynamic separation devices, which are identified in the project’s Post Construction Stormwater Management Plan dated April 23, 2015.

The six power poles currently located along the project site frontage with Lewis Road would be removed and the existing power lines would be underground. The three existing power poles located along the southern perimeter of the site (including the power pole at the corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road) would remain in place.
The Camarillo Sanitary District Pumping Station No. 2 is located at the southeastern corner of the project site. Odors are emitted from vents within the pumping system. These odors would typically not be objectionable to industrial uses such as those that could develop at the site under the current land use and zoning designations for the site. They could, however, be offensive to residents of the project site, particularly at night when gentle winds may blow the odors towards the residential units. The project has been designed to place parking in close proximity to the pumping station and extend the distance to the nearest residential units. However, city staff have been concerned that residents of the nearest residential units could notice objectionable odors and have requested that an air scrubber be installed on the pump station to substantially reduce any odors. In response, the project applicant is proposing the installation of a Purafil Parallel Bed Scrubber or equal to address the city’s concerns.

The total water demand for the proposed project would be greater than the historic water use at the project site. In response, the project co-applicants and the Pleasant Valley School District (PVSD) in Camarillo have agreed to enter into a partnership in which the co-applicants provide a monetary investment to the school district to facilitate the improvement of current irrigation standards and, thereby, provide water savings to the City of Camarillo Water Division. Turf irrigation needs are proposed to be decreased by utilizing a Weathermatic on-site weather monitoring and irrigation control. The estimated cost for the PVSD to implement and use a Weathermatic on-site weather monitoring and irrigation control system is approximately $58,300. This cost would be provided by the project co-applicants to the PVSD prior to connection to the city’s water system.

**DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS AND APPROVALS**

The City of Camarillo is the lead agency for the proposed project. The Initial Study will be provided to address all discretionary and ministerial actions associated with the development of the project including, but not limited to, the following:

- **General Plan Amendment 2014-3**: The project co-applicants are requesting approval of GPA 2014-3 to change the existing land use designation of the project site from Industrial to Medium Density Residential and Commercial Mixed Use.

- **Change of Zone CZ-321**: The project co-applicants are requesting approval of CZ-321 to change the zoning designation of the project site from M-1 to RPD 15U (Residential Planned Development, 15 Units per Acre Max) and CMU (Village Commercial Mixed Use).

- **Specific Plan Amendment**: The project co-applicants are requesting approval of the amended Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines to identify residential and commercial mixed use as the preferred land use for the project site within the Specific Plan area.
• **Residential Planned Development RPD-196**: The project co-applicants are requesting approval of RPD-196 to permit development of medium density residential development totaling a maximum of 285 units at the project site.

• **Conditional Use Permit CUP-369**: The project co-applicants are requesting approval of CUP-369 to permit development of up to 12,000 square feet of commercial uses and 24 residential units at the project site.

Development Allotment Applications will require approval by the City Council for the new residential units, with the exception of any residential units that are reserved exclusively for affordability.

Project implementation would also require approval by the city of a tract map to divide the site into separate parcels and a condominium map for designated condominium properties.

Other non-discretionary actions anticipated to be taken by the city at the staff level as part of the proposed project include:

• Review and approval of building permits by the Camarillo Building and Safety Department;

• Review and approval of grading permits, encroachment permits, and on- and off-site infrastructure improvements by the Camarillo Public Works Department and Community Development Department;

• Review and approval of water supply impact report related to water supply availability for the project; and

• Approval by the Camarillo Public Works Department of a Post Construction Storm Water Management Plan (PCSMP) to mitigate post-construction stormwater flows produced by the projects.

• Permit coverage will be required under the California State Water Resources Control Board General Construction NPDES Permit CAS000002, Order 2009-0009-DWQ as amended by Orders 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ for construction-related stormwater quality discharges.

Approvals and permits that may be required by other agencies include:

• Approval of encroachment permits from the Ventura County Watershed Protection District.

• Approval of encroachment permits from the California Department of Transportation for all encroachments within the Caltrans right-of-way.

• Approval from the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency for groundwater pumping allocation transfers to the City of Camarillo Water Division.
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ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

This section is the primary component of the Final EIR as it provides a forecast of the probable future environment following the development of the proposed project. The purpose of this section is to inform readers about the type and magnitude of the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, how such impacts would affect the existing environment, to identify mitigation measures which would reduce the magnitude of significant environmental impacts, and to identify cumulative impacts associated with development of the proposed project as well as other related projects.

SECTION FORMAT

This overall section is actually divided into two technical sections based on the environmental issues identified by the City in the NOP and the comments received in response to the NOP. The two technical sections are as follows:

• Agricultural Resources

• Water Supply

Each of these sections is organized into the six discussions, as follows:

• Summary

• Introduction

• Environmental Setting

• Thresholds of Significance

• Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

• Cumulative Impacts

• Unavoidable Significant Impacts

These two sections are followed by the Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant section, which summarizes the analyses and conclusions of the Initial Study for the environmental issues that were determined to be less than significant with or without mitigation and, as such, not requiring further analysis in the Final EIR.
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AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

SUMMARY

Implementation of the proposed project would convert Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact under the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Model scoring thresholds.

Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any zoning for forest use or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Implementation of the proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.

The conversion of Prime Farmland to nonagricultural uses is considered to be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the contribution of the project to the countywide conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural uses would also be considerable.

INTRODUCTION

This section of the Final EIR evaluates the potential impacts associated with the conversion of the project site from historic agricultural operations to urban land uses. Although the evaluation is based on the change from the existing operations at the site, the actual impact associated with the conversion of agricultural-designated land at the project site to urban uses has previously been evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Dawson Drive Area Concepts and Design Guidelines. The zoning and land use designations of the project site were not affected by the adoption of the Dawson Drive Area Concepts and Design Guidelines and the MND concluded that impacts associated with the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use would be less than significant.
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Agricultural Production and Crop Value

Ventura County has a long history of agricultural production. Table 3 identifies 2010 through 2014 data on agricultural crop values in Ventura County. As shown, crop values have increased over this time period. Throughout this period, strawberries have been the leading agricultural commodity in Ventura County. In 2014, strawberries had crop value $627,964,000, which provided approximately 29 percent of the total crop value for Ventura County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop Grouping</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fruit and Nut Crops</td>
<td>$1,085,677,000</td>
<td>$1,124,860,000</td>
<td>$1,254,592,000</td>
<td>$1,280,274,000</td>
<td>$1,338,004,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Crops</td>
<td>$533,473,000</td>
<td>$490,233,000</td>
<td>$460,280,000</td>
<td>$568,722,000</td>
<td>$557,614,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock &amp; Poultry Products</td>
<td>$6,161,000</td>
<td>$6,075,000</td>
<td>$6,872,000</td>
<td>$6,517,000</td>
<td>$7,887,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apiary Products</td>
<td>$1,505,000</td>
<td>$2,385,000</td>
<td>$3,326,000</td>
<td>$1,392,000</td>
<td>$554,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery Stock</td>
<td>$180,057,000</td>
<td>$163,793,000</td>
<td>$186,351,000</td>
<td>$190,889,000</td>
<td>$180,499,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut Flowers</td>
<td>$47,348,000</td>
<td>$52,217,000</td>
<td>$46,829,000</td>
<td>$43,079,000</td>
<td>$47,615,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Crops</td>
<td>$2,463,000</td>
<td>$1,684,000</td>
<td>$2,491,000</td>
<td>$474,000</td>
<td>$1,417,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture</td>
<td>$2,453,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$3,045,000</td>
<td>$3,557,000</td>
<td>$3,443,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1,859,151,000</td>
<td>$1,844,260,000</td>
<td>$1,963,798,000</td>
<td>$2,094,915,000</td>
<td>$2,137,033,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of table data: County of Ventura, Office of the Agricultural Commissioner, November 5, 2015.

Camarillo Agriculture

The City of Camarillo lies on the eastern edge of the Oxnard Plain, a fertile plain which is characterized in part by flat lands and rich soils. A variety of land uses, such as agricultural, residential, commercial, office, and industrial, occur within the city. Agricultural uses are typically found in the southern part of the city and are composed primarily of row crops including a variety of vegetables and fruits.

Project Site Agriculture

The proposed project site consists of one parcel of land totaling approximately 23 acres that has been used for active agricultural production since at least 1938 and is presently used year-round for the production of irrigated row crops. There are no forest resources located at, or in the vicinity of, the project site.
Farmland and Soil Classification

The U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has identified, mapped, and classified the various soil types in Ventura County. The existing soil types, water availability, and quality are some of the predominant factors that determine where agricultural cultivation will occur and what types of crops will be grown. Soil units are classified according to their characteristics with an emphasis on those features that influence their suitability for the growing of crop plants, grasses, and trees. In many places throughout the county, soil units form a mixed pattern so that they have been grouped based on similar characteristics and are represented as an association. An association is made up of two or more soil units that are represented as one unit on the map. Within these soil types, minor soil differences, such as the variations in effective rooting depth, slope, erosion, drainage, and salt content or alkali content may be an important factor for agricultural production.

One method the NRCS uses to rate the suitability of soils for agriculture is the Land Compatibility Classification (LCC). The LCC indicates the suitability of soils for most kinds of crops. Groupings are made according to the limitations of the soils when used to grow crops and the risk of damage to soils when they are used in agriculture. Soils are rated from Class I to Class VIII, with soils having the fewest limitations receive the highest rating (Class I). Specific subclasses are also utilized to further characterize soils.

A second method the NRCS uses to rate the suitability of soils for agriculture is the Storie Index. This index expresses numerically the relative degree of suitability of a soil for general intensive agriculture as it exists at the time of evaluation. The rating is based on soil characteristics only and is obtained by evaluating such factors as soil depth, surface texture, subsoil characteristics, drainage, salts and alkali, and relief. The six grades and their range in index ratings are shown in Table 4. A rating of 100 percent expresses the most favorable, or ideal soil, while a lower rating indicates that the soil is less favorable for crop production.
According to the Ventura County Soil Survey, the project site is underlain by three types of soil. The amount of each soil type at the project site and its associated LCC and storie index ratings are shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>LCC</th>
<th>Storie Index Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metz loamy sand (MeA)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>IIIs</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocho loam (MoA)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pico sandy loam (PcA)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>IIIs</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


California Department of Conservation Farmland Classifications

The California Department of Conservation has developed a Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program that classifies the different agricultural soil types related to their ability to sustain agricultural crops. The soil type classifications are Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, Grazing Land, Urban and Built-up Land, and Other Land.

Based on data published by the California Department of Conservation, in 2010 Ventura County had 45,420 acres of Prime Farmland, 33,482 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, 28,793 acres of Unique Farmland, and 14,988 acres of Farmland of Local Importance.\(^1\)

\(^1\) California Department of Conservation, February 2012.
The proposed project site is classified as Prime Farmland.\(^2\) Prime Farmland is defined as land that has the best combination of physical and chemical features able to best sustain long-term agricultural production. This land has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce sustained high yields. Land must have been used for irrigated agriculture production at some time during the four years prior to the California Department of Conservation mapping date.

**Irrigation Water**

The Dawson Drive Industrial Area is located within the service area of the City of Camarillo Water Division, which provides potable water for urban and agricultural uses. Water for the agricultural use is provided by the City of Camarillo Water Division as an agricultural customer. The use of potable water for irrigation can be revoked by the city at any time, although the City has not had to do so for this property.

**Williamson Act Contracts**

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (the “Williamson Act” – California Government Code Section 51200) recognizes the importance of agricultural land as an economic resource that is vital to the general welfare of society. The enacting legislation declares that the preservation of a maximum amount of the limited supply of agricultural land is necessary to the conservation of the state’s economic resources, and is necessary not only to the maintenance of the agricultural economy of the state, but also for the assurance of adequate, healthful, and nutritious food for future residents of the state and the nation.

Intended to assist the long-term preservation of prime agricultural land in the state, Williamson Act contracts provide the agricultural landowner with a substantial property tax break for keeping land in agricultural use. When under contract, the landowner no longer pays property tax for an assessed valuation based upon the property’s urban development potential. The Williamson Act stipulates that for properties under contract, “the highest and best use of such land during the life of the contract is for agricultural uses.” Therefore, property under contract is assessed and taxed based upon its agricultural value. Williamson Act contracts remain in effect for ten to twenty years unless the property owner files for a notice of non-renewal with the county.

The proposed project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. As discussed in the Environmental Setting section of this Final EIR, the project site is also zoned and designated for non-agricultural uses.

---

\(^2\) California Department of Conservation, February 2012.
Regulatory Setting

City of Camarillo General Plan

As discussed in the City of Camarillo General Plan, agriculture has, and continues to play, an important role in the life of the City of Camarillo. The General Plan encourages agricultural uses to continue both as a source of economic substance to the community and the county, and as a physical definition to the urban area of the city. In doing so, the General Plan includes an Agricultural land use category on the General Plan Land Use Map and in the text of the General Plan itself.

As discussed previously in the Environmental Setting section of this Final EIR, the current General Plan land use designation for the project site is Industrial and the underlying zoning designation is M-1 (Light Manufacturing). Therefore, the City has already planned for the eventual conversion of the site from agriculture to urban uses.

Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines and Mitigation Measures

There are no guidelines or mitigation measures related to agriculture and forestry resources included in the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines or its associated Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Camarillo Urban Restriction Boundary

In 1998, the voters of the City of Camarillo adopted the SOAR (Save Open Space and Agricultural Resources) initiative establishing the Camarillo Urban Restriction Boundary (CURB). The purpose of the SOAR ordinance is to ensure that agricultural, open space, and rural lands located beyond the CURB are not prematurely or unnecessarily converted to other more intensive development uses unless approved by a majority of voters within the SOAR area. SOAR intends to direct development to locations within the existing boundaries of the city. The existing CURB defines the urban development boundary for the City of Camarillo until December 31, 2020 at which time the voters can determine whether the program should be extended, modified, or expired.

The proposed project site is located within the CURB and, as such, is not subject to any restrictions under the SOAR ordinance.

Ventura County Agricultural/Urban Buffer Policy

In an effort to protect public health, safety, and the welfare of the citizens of Ventura County as well as protect the economic viability and long-term sustainability of the county’s agricultural industry, the Ventura County Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee (APAC) has adopted an agricultural/urban buffer policy (July 19, 2006). This policy provides guidelines to prevent and/or mitigate potential conflicts that may arise at the agricultural/urban interface. These conflicts generally include public and animal

---

3 City of Camarillo, November 3, 1998.
exposure to agricultural chemicals, dust, noise, and odors, as well as potential vandalism, pilferage, trespassing, and complaints against standard legal agricultural practices. The policy applies where urban structures or ongoing non-farming activities are permitted adjacent to land 1) in crop or orchard production; or 2) classified by the California Department of Conservation Important Farmland Inventory as prime, statewide importance, unique, or local importance. Specifically, the APAC recommends that a reinforced 8-foot chain link fence with top bar be provided between the urban and agricultural uses to deter pilferage and vandalism of crops, and setbacks between the urban and agricultural uses. The APAC recommends that a 300-foot setback to new structures and sensitive uses be provided on the non-agricultural property unless a vegetative screen is installed, in which case a 150-foot buffer may be provided. It should be noted that this policy is a recommendation of the APAC and the Ventura County Agriculture Commissioner and, although it is recommended for all agriculture/urban interfaces, it is not required by the City of Camarillo.

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact on agriculture and forestry resources if any of the following were to occur:

(a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use;

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

(c) 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; or

(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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

In order to determine whether the conversion of specific agricultural land to non-agricultural uses is significant, the California Department of Conservation developed quantifiable thresholds and the California Agricultural LESA Model.\(^4\) The California Agricultural LESA Model is a point-based approach that is generally used for rating the relative value of agricultural land resources. The California Agricultural LESA Model defines and measures two separate sets of factors. The first set, Land Evaluation (LE), includes factors that measure the inherent soil-based qualities of land as they relate to agricultural

\(^4\) California Department of Conservation, 1997.
suitability. The second set, Site Assessment (SA), includes factors that are intended to measure social, economic, and geographic attributes that also contribute to the overall value of agricultural land.

A single LESA score is generated for a given project after all of the individual LE and SA factors have been scored and weighted as detailed in the system. The final score is based on a scale of 100 points, with a given project being capable of deriving a maximum of 50 points from the LE factors and 50 points from the SA factors. Scoring thresholds are based upon both the total LESA score as well as the component LE and SA subscores. In this manner the scoring thresholds are dependent upon the attainment of a minimum score for the LE and SA subscores so that a single threshold is not the result of heavily skewed subscores (i.e., a site with a very high LE score, but a very low SA score, or vice versa.

The thresholds of significance recommended under the system by the Department of Conservation are identified in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total LESA Score</th>
<th>Scoring Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 39 Points</td>
<td>Not Considered Significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 59 Points</td>
<td>Considered Significant only if LE and SA subscores are each greater than or equal to 20 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 79 Points</td>
<td>Considered Significant unless either LE or SA subscore is less than 20 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 100 Points</td>
<td>Considered Significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Conversion of Farmland of Statewide Importance

**Threshold:** Would the proposed project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

**Impact:** Implementation of the proposed project would convert Prime Farmland to non-agricultural uses. This would be a and unavoidable significant impact under the California Agricultural LESA Model scoring thresholds.

**Impact Analysis**

As discussed previously in this Final EIR section, the soils at the project site are classified as Prime Farmland. Therefore, the California Agricultural LESA Model has been used to determine whether the
conversion of the site’s agricultural land to non-agricultural uses is significant. The complete LESA Model calculations for the proposed project are provided in Appendix E to this Final EIR.

**Land Evaluation (LE) Factors**

The first step of the LESA Model in determining the LE score is the calculation of the LCC and storie index scores. The amount of each soil type at the project site and its associated LCC and storie index ratings were shown previously in Table 4. Under the LESA Model, the LCC class I Mocho loam soil has an LCC rating of 100, the LCC class II Pico sandy loam soil has an LCC rating of 80, and the LCC class III Metz loamy sand has an LCC rating of 60. Multiplying the proportion of each soil type within the project site by the applicable LCC rating yields the LCC score for each soil type. These are then added together to identify the LCC total score. Similarly, multiplying the proportion of each soil type within the project site by the applicable storie rating yields the storie index score for each soil type. These are also added together to identify the total storie index score for the project site. The LCC and storie index scores for the proposed project site are identified in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Map Unit</th>
<th>Project Acres</th>
<th>Proportion of Project Area</th>
<th>LCC</th>
<th>LCC Rating</th>
<th>LCC Score</th>
<th>Storie Index Rating</th>
<th>Storie Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MeA</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoA</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PcA</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LESA Model calculation sheets are provided in Appendix E.

**Site Assessment (SA) Factors**

The LESA Model includes four SA factors that are rated separately as follows:

1. The Project Size Rating
2. The Water Resources Availability Rating
3. The Surrounding Agricultural Land Rating
4. The Surrounding Protected Resource Land Rating

The project size rating relies upon the acreage figures that were tabulated under the LCC Rating in Table 7. The project size rating is based upon identifying acreage figures for three separate groupings of soil
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classes within the project site, and then determining which grouping generates the highest project size score. The project site score for the proposed project site is identified in Table 8. Because the project site includes between 10 and 19 acres of LCC class I and II soils, these areas are assigned a score of 30. Fewer than 10 acres would result in a score of 0 while 80 or more acres of LCC class I and II soils would be required to obtain a score of 100. The project site also includes between 10 and 19 acres of LCC class II soils, which is assigned a score of 10. The LESA Model uses the highest score of the soil classes to determine the overall project site score which, as identified in Table 8, is 30 for this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Map Unit</th>
<th>Project Acres</th>
<th>LCC</th>
<th>LCC Class I - II</th>
<th>LCC Class III</th>
<th>LCC Class IV-VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MeA</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>IIIs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoA</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PcA</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>IIIs</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Size Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Project Size Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LESA Model calculation sheets are provided in Appendix E.

The water resources availability rating is based upon identifying the various water sources that may supply a given property, and then determining whether different restrictions in supply are likely to take place in years that are characterized as being periods of drought and non-drought. In the case of the proposed project, water for the existing agricultural use is provided by the City of Camarillo Water Division as an agricultural customer. The use of potable water for irrigation can be revoked by the city at any time, although the city has not had to do so for this property. Under the LESA Model water resources availability scoring table, sites with no physical or economic water availability restrictions during non-drought years, but with physical restrictions (e.g., potential revocation) during drought years are given a water resource availability rating of 85.

The surrounding agricultural land rating is designed to provide a measurement of the level of agricultural land use for lands in close proximity to a subject project. The LESA Model rates the potential significance of the conversion of an agricultural parcel that has a large proportion of surrounding land in agricultural production more highly than one that has a relatively small percentage of surrounding land in agricultural production. The definition of a “Zone of Influence” (ZOI) that accounts for surrounding lands up to a minimum of one quarter mile from the project boundary is the result of several iterations during model development for assessing an area that will generally be a representative sample of surrounding land use. The ZOI for the proposed project site is illustrated in Figure 9.
Related to the surrounding agricultural land rating is the surrounding protected resource land rating. Protected resource lands are those lands with long term use restrictions that are compatible with or supportive of agricultural uses of land. Included among them are the following:

- Williamson Act contracted lands
- Publicly owned lands maintained as park, forest, or watershed resources
- Lands with agricultural, wildlife habitat, open space, or other natural resource easements that restrict the conversion of such land to urban or industrial uses

In the case of the proposed project site, there are 604.9 acres of land within the ZOI. Of this total, 431.8 acres are in agriculture and 326.3 acres of agricultural land are protected by the CURB and SOAR Ordinance. The agricultural land represents 71 percent of the ZOI and the surrounding protected resource land represents 54 percent of the ZOI. Under the LESA Model, a range of 70 to 74 percent of agriculture within the ZOI is assigned a surrounding agricultural land score of 70. Likewise, a range of 50 to 54 percent of protected land within the ZOI is assigned a protected resource land score of 30.

Final LESA Score

The total LESA Model scores for the proposed project site are calculated and identified in Table 9. Because the total LESA score is between 60 and 79 points, and neither the LE nor SA subscores are less than 20 points, the impact of the proposed project would be considered significant under the California Agricultural LESA Model scoring thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a significant impact to Farmland related to the loss of Prime Farmland and the associated conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Potential methods to mitigate impacts to Farmland primarily involve avoidance, preservation/conservation of off-site Farmland, or payment of mitigation or in-lieu fees for conservation purposes. The applicability of these mitigation methods to the proposed project is discussed below.

The entire project site is designated as Prime Farmland and there is no area at the site that would be preferred for non-development/avoidance. Avoiding development of a portion of the project site would reduce the amount of Prime Farmland that is converted to non-agricultural uses. However, as agricultural parcels become smaller, they become less viable. This is reflected in the LESA Model which assigned higher scores to larger sites. Avoiding development within a portion of the project site is not an option to mitigate the impact from the proposed project since this would make any remaining agricultural portion more difficult to farm and remain viable.

---

5 The agricultural land within the boundary of the City of Camarillo are not protected by the CURB or SOAR Ordinance.
The city’s General Plan and zoning designations do not demonstrate a long-term commitment to the preservation of agricultural activity at the project site. The City of Camarillo has planned for conversion of the site from agriculture to urban uses since at least 1986. The current General Plan land use designation for the site is Industrial and the underlying zoning is M-1 (Light Manufacturing). The Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines also plan for the conversion of the site to non-agricultural uses. Preserving agricultural areas elsewhere in Camarillo is not an option to mitigate the impact of the proposed project because the General Plan already identifies several parcels within the city boundary that are designated for agriculture. Several large areas are located in the southern part of the city while a few others are in the northern part of the city. One of the southern areas is located to the west of the Dawson Drive Industrial Area and is within the project site ZOI. As such, development of the proposed project would not reduce the amount of agricultural land envisioned under the General Plan.

The establishment of a conservation easement off site is another potential mitigation option. To effectively mitigate for the conversion of Farmland in the City of Camarillo, any conservation should occur in the city or in Ventura County, specifically southwestern Ventura County. However, the agricultural areas outside the boundary of the City of Camarillo are already protected from development under the CURB and SOAR Ordinance.

### TABLE 9 - LESA MODEL SCORES FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESA Factors</th>
<th>Factor Scores</th>
<th>Factor Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Factor Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Evaluation (LE) Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Capability Classification</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storie Index</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Assessment (SA) Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Size</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resource Availability</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounded Agricultural Land</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Resource Land</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final LESA Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LESAModel calculation sheets are provided in Appendix E.
The payment of a mitigation fee or in-lieu fee is used as an option for mitigating various types of impacts from development projects. For purposes of mitigating agricultural resources, this would involve the payment of mitigation or in-lieu fees to a local, regional, or statewide organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural conservation easements. Currently, there are no mitigation fee programs pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act (California Government Code, Sections 66000 et seq.) that have been established for the purpose of developing agricultural conservation easements or other agricultural conservation programs in Ventura County, specifically southwestern Ventura County. Payment of a mitigation fee is not an option to mitigate the impact from the proposed project because: 1) there are currently no existing mitigation fee programs in place for the establishment of agricultural conservation easements or mitigation banks in southwestern Ventura County; 2) it is unknown when such programs will be developed; and 3) it is unknown how successful these programs will be due to the existing preservation ordinances already in place throughout this area of the county. Further, the payment of any mitigation or in-lieu fee outside an established mitigation fee program is not required because the determination of an appropriate fee amount would be speculative, and such fee would not ensure that project impacts to Farmland are mitigated.

Because avoidance or preservation of Farmland on or off the site are not viable options to mitigate the impact of the proposed project related to the conversion of Prime Farmland to nonagricultural uses, the project impact would be significant and unavoidable.

**Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or Williamson Act**

**Threshold:** Would the proposed project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

**Impact:** Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Impact Analysis**

As discussed previously, the current zoning designation for the project site is M-1 (Light Manufacturing) and the project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impacts associated with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act conflicts would occur.

**Forest Land**

**Thresholds:** Would the proposed project 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)); or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.
Impact: Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any zoning for forest use or result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Impact Analysis

As discussed previously, the current zoning designation for the project site is M-1 (Light Manufacturing) and the project site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract. Also, there are no forest resources located at, or in the vicinity of, the project site. Therefore, no impacts to forest land would occur.

Other Changes Resulting in the Conversion of Farmland or Forestland

Threshold: Would the proposed project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Impact: Implementation of the proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Analysis

The proposed project would be constructed on a site within the City of Camarillo that has been planned for conversion from agriculture to urban uses since 1986. Therefore, there would be no unanticipated actions that could cause other land in the vicinity of the project site to convert from agriculture to non-agricultural uses. Also, there are no forest resources located at, or in the vicinity of, the project site.

A potential impact could occur, however, if a substantial conflict between new non-agricultural uses and adjacent agricultural properties occurs to the point that some of the agricultural land must be permanently taken out of production. The nearest agricultural area to the project site is the located to the south and is separated from the project site by Pleasant Valley Road. As such, the project site is not adjacent to any existing and active agricultural lands where conflicts such as substantial vandalism, pilferage, or trespassing on the part of residents, employees, or visitors of the project site could occur. Therefore, no impact would occur.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

As discussed above, the impact of the proposed project related to the conversion of Prime Farmland to nonagricultural uses is considered to be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the contribution of the project to the countywide conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural uses would also be considerable.
UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

The impact of the proposed project related to the conversion of Prime Farmland to nonagricultural uses is considered to be significant and unavoidable.
WATER SUPPLY

SUMMARY

The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental effect.

The project co-applicants would be required to either wait to develop and connect the project to the city’s water service until Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency Emergency Ordinance E is no longer in effect or make a payment to the city’s water conservation credit program. Either strategy will enable the City of Camarillo Water Division to provide water to the project site with no reduction of existing water or groundwater supplies.

INTRODUCTION

The following analysis is based in part upon the Revised Water Use and Supply Study for Camarillo Village Homes, APN 229-0-070-240 prepared by Stantec, September 8, 2015. The proposed project site is located within the Service area of the City of Camarillo Water Division. Therefore, the Water Use and Supply Study and this EIR section address the ability of the Camarillo Water Division to provide the proposed project with adequate potable water supplies. The City of Camarillo has independently reviewed and approved the information presented in the Water Use and Supply Study. A copy of the Water Use and Supply Study is provided as Appendix F to this Final EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The City of Camarillo is served by a total of six water purveyors. These purveyors are listed in Table 10. The majority of the city, however, is served by the Camarillo Water Division, which operates within the City of Camarillo Department of Public Works, and the Camrosa Water District. The Camarillo Water Division supplies nearly 60 percent of the city with potable water while the Camrosa Water District supplies nearly 40 percent of the city.

The Dawson Drive Industrial Area is located within the service area of the Camarillo Water Division, which provides potable water for urban and agricultural uses.
Water Supply

City of Camarillo Urban Water Management Plan

State Water Code Sections 10610-10657 require every urban water supplier providing water for municipal purposes for more than 3,000 customers, or providing more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually, to prepare and adopt and Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The Water Code also requires urban water suppliers to update their UWMP in years ending in five and zero using a 25 to 30-year planning horizon. The original City of Camarillo UWMP was prepared in 1985 and updates prepared every five years through 2010. The city is now in the process of preparing the 2015 update to its UWMP.

The purpose of the City of Camarillo 2010 UWMP is to maintain efficient use of urban water supplies, continue to promote conservation programs and policies, ensure that sufficient water supplies are available for future beneficial use, and provide a mechanism for response during water drought conditions.

Camarillo Water Division Water Sources

The Camarillo Water Division serves its customers a blend of groundwater and imported water. Historically, the blended water has consisted of approximately 42% groundwater and 58% imported water and has been necessary to manage the concentration of dissolved solids in the groundwater. The groundwater is obtained from the Fox Canyon Aquifer while the imported water is obtained from the Calleguas Municipal Water District (CMWD), which in turn receives its deliveries from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) of Southern California. These sources of water are described below.

Imported Water from the Calleguas Municipal Water District

The City of Camarillo has imported water from the Calleguas Municipal Water District (CMWD) since April, 1996. The CMWD receives treated water from the State Water Project via the Saint Joseph Jensen Treatment Plant in Granada Hills and supplies the Cities of Camarillo and Oxnard and the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Purveyor</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camarillo Water Division</td>
<td>City of Camarillo, west of Calleguas Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camrosa Water District</td>
<td>City of Camarillo, east of Calleguas Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Mutual Water Company</td>
<td>Las Posas Estates, northwest section of City of Camarillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal-American Water Company</td>
<td>City of Camarillo, northwest portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Valley Mutual Water Company</td>
<td>City of Camarillo, northern area, north of Las Posas Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Valley County Water District</td>
<td>Agricultural uses only, Camarillo and Oxnard Plain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of table data: Carollo Engineers, May 2011.
unincorporated area of Somis through its Santa Rosa feeder. Each of Camarillo’s eight turnouts has a rated capacity of 2,000 gallons per minute. These are generally operated at around 85% of their maximum capacity. The amount of imported water available to the city at Tier 1 rates is capped at 5,300 acre-feet of imported water per year. This means that any additions to the city’s water supplies must be obtained from increases in groundwater extraction, through water use conservation, or through the purchase of additional imported water at Tier 2 rates.

On January 17, 2014, Governor Brown officially proclaimed a State of Emergency to exist due to drought conditions and called on Californians to reduce their water usage and directed state officials to take all necessary actions to alleviate drought impacts throughout the state. On April 25, 2014 Governor Brown issued a second Executive Order asking Californians to redouble their efforts to reduce statewide water use by at least 20 percent. The MWD has responded to these Executive Orders by adopting Resolution No. 1845 on July 2, 2014, which declares that a State 3 Shortage exists within its service area and urges area water users to 1) implement extraordinary water conservation measures in an effort to reduce water consumption by a minimum of 20 percent and extend available water resources, and 2) vigorously explore and participate in the numerous water saving tips and rebate programs offered through www.bewaterwise.com.

**Groundwater from the Fox Canyon Aquifer**

The following information regarding the groundwater basin and water quality is excerpted from the Water Sources chapter of the City of Camarillo 2010 UWMP.

The city and the surrounding area rest on a alluvial deposit approximately 1,000 feet thick, which is comprised of several aquifers inter-bedded with gravel, sand, and clay lenses. The clay lenses preclude any significant groundwater movement from one aquifer to the next. The service area of the City of Camarillo lies entirely in the Pleasant Valley Basin, but there are also several separate groundwater basins in the area, separated by a series of faults or folds, which reduce groundwater movement from one basin to another. Groundwater generally flows southeast.

The Pleasant Valley Basin historically has been replenished by subsurface inflows from the Oxnard Plain Basin, East and West Las Posas Basins, and the Santa Rosa Basin. Subsurface inflow over the past several years has been limited to only the Oxnard Plain and the East Las Posas Basins. Over-pumping in the other basins has lowered their water tables and prevented subsurface inflows into the Pleasant Valley Basin.

Most of the groundwater within the basin is contained within alluvial deposits and the Fox and Grimes Canyon aquifers. The upper strata of the basin are alluvial deposits, which average 400 feet in thickness and consist of water bearing sands and gravels separated by clay lenses. The Fox Canyon aquifer is within the bottom of the San Pedro
formation, which underlies the alluvial deposits. It varies in thickness from 400 to 1,500 feet and is effectively sealed from percolation of water from above by impervious materials located at the bottom of the alluvial deposits. Beneath the San Pedro formation lies the Santa Barbara formation containing the Grimes Canyon aquifer.

The Camarillo Water Division obtains its groundwater from the Fox Canyon Aquifer via a series of four wells. Pumping from this source, as well as the other confined and unconfined aquifers within several groundwater basins underlying the southern portion of Ventura County, is managed by the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA), which is an independent special district separate from the County of Ventura or any city government. The FCGMA was created by the California Legislature in 1983 to manage the groundwater in both overdrafted and potentially seawater-intruded areas within Ventura County. The primary objectives and purpose of the FCGMA are to preserve groundwater resources for agricultural, municipal, and industrial uses in the best interests of the public and for the common benefit of all water users.¹

One of the earliest programs produced by the FCGMWA was its initial Groundwater Management Plan, which was published in 1985. The main focus of the initial Groundwater Management Plan was to contain seawater intrusion in the South Oxnard Plain Basin. One of the strategies established by the FCGMA was a historical groundwater pumping allocation program in 1991 for those stakeholders (municipal and agricultural users) that were pumping groundwater during the mid-1980s, and allowed groundwater credit accumulation for future use if those allocations were not pumped in a particular year. For the City of Camarillo in 1991, the historical groundwater allocation was about 4,082 acre-feet. The FCGMA program also allowed the transfer of historical groundwater allocations in those instances when agricultural uses were converted to municipal uses and the city has obtained about 696 acre-feet through this scenario. For those instances when the agricultural uses were not pumping groundwater during the mid-1980s but the lands were being used for agricultural purposes, the FCGMA would allow groundwater pumping transfers between agriculture and municipal through a “baseline” which was to be used annually without the ability to accumulate groundwater credits. The city has obtained about 576 acre-feet through this scenario. In response to the condition of the overdrafted groundwater basins, the FCGMA has required a 25 percent reduction of pumping for those users which own historical groundwater pumping allocations. This has reduced the city’s overall municipal pumping entitlements to 4,279.1 acre-feet per year during normal (non-drought) years. The Groundwater Management Plan has since been updated and additional information regarding current groundwater management strategies may be reviewed in the 2007 Update to the FCGMA Groundwater Management Plan that is available on the agency’s website (www.fcgma.org).

The city obtains its groundwater from four wells; A, B, D (well C was abandoned), and Airport 3. Wells A and B are located in the northeastern area of the service area near Antonio Avenue and Las Posas Road.

Well D is located north of U.S. Highway 101 and west of Las Posas Road and Airport 3 is located at Camarillo Airport. The four wells are capable of pumping up to 8.6 million gallons of groundwater per day. Wells B and D operate year-round while well A and Airport 3 are used as standby sources.

Saline intrusion from surrounding sediments and salinity associated with high groundwater levels are the primary water quality concern in the Pleasant Valley Basin. Within the northern part of Camarillo, groundwater levels have increased more than 250 feet to historic highs from levels in the early 1990. Coincident with this rise in groundwater levels has been a degradation in water quality, especially for the constituents sulfate, chloride, iron, and manganese. This is evident in wells A and B, which also have high concentrations of total dissolved solids. The city is, therefore, required to blend the groundwater with imported water in order to meet California Department of Public Health Drinking Water Standards.

In addition to using imported water to meet applicable standards, the city has also been purchasing imported water to accumulate additional groundwater credits which would be used in the case of prolonged drought conditions or natural disaster emergency conditions where imported water deliveries would be severely reduced over a long period of time.

Groundwater supply allocations to the city will generally increase as agricultural sites within the service area are converted to municipal and industrial uses. This will generally be the primary source of additional water supplies available to the city. In recent years, the city has received about two acre-feet per year of increased groundwater allocation for each acre that is converted from agricultural uses, but this amount was further reduced by 25 percent pursuant to the FCGMA Ordinance Code. The actual allocation transfer does not occur until the new development is ready to connect to the city’s water system.

The FCGMA has responded to the current drought conditions affecting California by adopting Emergency Ordinance E, which temporarily reduces groundwater extraction allocations for all municipal and industrial operators within southern Ventura County. During the time that Emergency Ordinance E is in effect, conservation credits may not be obtained and may not be used to avoid paying surcharges for groundwater extractions. The FCGMA has also suspended all agricultural groundwater allocation transfers as part of Emergency Ordinance E.

In late 2014, the California Legislature enacted the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) which requires that groundwater basins within California be managed sustainably. The FCGMA was designated the groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) for the Fox Canyon management area. The SGMA requires that GSAs prepare groundwater sustainability plans (GSPs) for groundwater basins that do not meet objectives related to groundwater levels and quality, subsidence, and sea water intrusion. The FCGMA is currently preparing a GSP which will include strategies for allocating groundwater

---

Water Supply

The GSP adopted will replace Ordinance E. It is unknown whether groundwater allocation transfers from agricultural operations would resume once a GSP is adopted.

Camarillo Water Demand Management

The City of Camarillo has implemented water conservation measures for more than two decades. In 1991, the city became a signatory to the Memorandum of Understanding regarding Urban Water Conservation in California and is, therefore, a member of the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC). The city currently implements all of the required Best Management Practices (BMPs) of the CUWCC, which are as follows:

**BMP 1  Water Survey Programs for Residential Customers.** The City of Camarillo conducts interior and exterior water audits for residential customers. These audits include the installation of low-flow shower heads, aerators on kitchen and bathroom faucets, and water displacement bags where needed. Exterior audits are also performed for residences with landscape irrigation systems. Interior and exterior audits are available to all governmental and institutional customers as well.

**BMP 2  Residential Plumbing Retrofit.** The low-flow shower head exchange programs provides customers the opportunity to exchange their high-flow shower heads for low-flow shower heads at no cost.

**BMP 3  System Water Audits, Leak Detection, and Repair.** Due to an extremely low unaccounted-for water loss of 2.4 percent, the city does not provide a comprehensive system leak detection program. However, the city is conscientious about locating and repairing main and service connection leaks when they occur. The city also provides assistance in locating leaks on private property and the Camarillo Municipal Code (discussed below) prohibits leak durations of more than 72 hours.

**BMP 4  Metering with Commodity Rates.** All service connections are metered for tiered rate billing.

**BMP 5  Large Landscape Conservation Programs and Incentives.** Large landscape water audits have been conducted at all schools and parks, and monthly irrigation schedules have been provided. Temporary rate reductions have been implemented as an incentive for customer retrofits. Audits are available to new commercial and industrial landscape partners.

**BMP 6  High-Efficiency Washing Machine Rebate Programs.** CMWD have provided rebates for city customers.

**BMP 7  Public Information Programs.** The City of Camarillo newsletter (CityScene) is distributed quarterly and periodically discusses water issues. The city has distributed water information in its monthly bills, at special events, and on its internet homepage.
BMP 8  **School Education Programs.** Brochures are distributed on various water issues and the city participates in programs to promote student water awareness. A number of teachers have included water conservation discussions as part of their curriculum.

BMP 9  **Commercial, Industrial, and Institutional Water Conservation Programs.** The city targets commercial, industrial, and industrial water accounts with large monthly consumption levels for water audits.

BMP 10  **Wholesale Agency Programs.** This BMP does not apply to the City of Camarillo.

BMP 11  **Conservation Pricing.** The city implements a tiered rate structure which applies a uniform standby rate on most of the fixed costs of supplying water, which does not vary with the amount of water used. Most of the variable costs are applied as the commodity portion of the rate, which is proportional to the amount of water used and purchased from the more expensive importer.

BMP 12  **Water Conservation Coordinator.** The city employs one full time water conservation technician, a water conservation coordinator, and budgets for an annual water conservation program.

BMP 13  **Wastewater Prohibition.** The Camarillo Municipal Code (discussed below) prohibits wasteful water practices.

BMP 14  **Residential Ultra-Low Flush Toilet (“ULFT) Replacement Program.** The city has distributed several thousand ULFTs through rebate and direct distribution programs.

As a result of the six year drought from 1987 through 1992, the City of Camarillo adopted the No Waste Ordinance No. 715, which has since been superseded by the City’s Water Conservation Ordinance (City Municipal Code Chapter 14.12) to prohibit wasteful water practices such as:

- The watering of turf or landscape in a manner that is allowed to run to waste;
- Allowing leaks or breaks to continue for more than 72 hours;
- The use of a hose without a workable positive shutoff nozzle for the washing of automobiles, trucks, boats, or other mobile equipment;
- The washing of sidewalks, driveways, patios, decks, building exteriors, or other hard surface by hose;
- The watering of lawns between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m.; or
- The serving of water in any area where food is sold without the customer initiating the request.

On July 22, 2009, the Camarillo City Council amended the Water Conservation Ordinance to provide additional water use regulations in response to the statewide drought emergency condition and declared
Water Supply

a Stage 1 Water Supply Alert. The following additional water conservation requirements apply during a declared Stage 1 water supply condition, which has a 10% reduction goal:

- Watering is restricted to Monday, Wednesday, Friday, and Sunday.

- Applicants for new potable water service must prepare a water impact study. In order for new such service to be approved, the water impact study must demonstrate that the proposed project will not create additional demand on the city’s water system. An example of such non-impact would be if the proposed project does not require an increase in water usage from that historically used on the same site.

As of March 31, 2010, city customers had reduced their overall water consumption by 20 percent.

On January 13, 2010, the Camarillo City Council adopted Ordinance No. 1050 to amend the city’s Water Conservation Ordinance to require water efficient landscaping in new landscape installations or landscape rehabilitation projects over a minimum size. For new residential and non-residential projects, these standards apply to new landscape installations or landscape rehabilitation projects with a landscaped area including water features, but excluding hardscape, equal to or greater than 2,500 square feet and which are subject to a discretionary approval of a landscape plan, or which otherwise require a ministerial permit for a landscape or water feature.

New development projects constructed within Camarillo after January 1, 2014 are also subject to the mandatory water efficiency and conservation measures of the California Green Building Standards (CALGreen) Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11). The outdoor water use standards of the CALGreen Code are already addressed by the city’s Water Conservation Ordinance. With regard to indoor water use, new residential developments must use water closets (toilets) that do not exceed 1.28 gallons per flush, shower heads that have a maximum flow rate of not more than 2.0 gallons per minute, lavatory faucets that have a maximum flow rate of not more than 1.5 gallons per minute, and kitchen faucets that have a maximum flow rate of not more than 1.8 gallons per minute.

In response the ongoing drought conditions affecting the city’s water supplies, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2014-71, which declared the existence of a Stage 2 water supply condition and imposed additional water conservation measures in order to reduce customer demand by at least 20%. The City Council recently adopted Resolution No. 2015-126 on November 4, 2015, which re-declared the State 2 water supply condition and continued the imposition of additional water conservation measures. The City Council also adopted Ordinance No. 1116, which amended sections of the City of Camarillo Municipal Code pertaining to the city’s water conservation measures under its water shortage conservation plan. The following additional water conservation requirements now apply during a declared Stage 2 water supply condition:

- Watering is limited to three days per week.
• Leaks in distribution, irrigation, or plumbing systems must be promptly corrected after discovery and in no event more than 48 hours after receiving notice from the city.

• Filling or refilling of ornamental lakes is prohibited except to the extent needed to sustain aquatic life provided that such aquatic life is of significant value and has been actively managed within the water feature prior to declaration of the stage 2 condition.

• Refilling of more than one foot and initial filling of residential swimming pools is prohibited unless the applicant makes a payment to the city’s water conservation credit program in an amount necessary to offset the proposed water demand.

• Reclaimed water must be used for construction activities if available.

• No new potable water service connections will be provided, no new temporary meters or permanent meters will be provided, and no statements of immediate ability to serve or provide potable water service (such as will-serve letters or letters of water verification) will be issued except under the following circumstances:
  • A valid will-serve letter has already been issued;
  • A valid, unexpired building permit has been issued for the project;
  • The project is a city capital project;
  • The project is necessary to protect the public health, safety, and welfare;
  • The project is a temporary use that will not cumulatively use more than one-quarter acre-foot of water; or
  • The applicant provides to the satisfaction of the city and in accordance with the city’s water conservation credit program substantial evidence of an enforceable commitment that water demands for the project will be offset prior to the provision of a will-serve letter. The applicant may satisfy this requirement through any one or combination of the following methods: (i) modifications to the project to provide non-required water saving features; (ii) agreements with existing water users to retrofit existing improvements and facilities with water saving features; (iii) by making a payment to the city’s water conservation credit program; or (iv) by transferring groundwater rights that are immediately available for use by the city in an amount necessary to offset the project’s water demand.

• The city will withhold the issuance of any grading permit subject to a city-issued will-serve letter.

• The city will suspend consideration of annexations to its service area unless the annexation will not result in any increased use of water.
Historic Project Site Water Demand

The existing agricultural uses at the project site are provided potable water by the Camarillo Water Division. The use of potable water for irrigation can be revoked by the city at any time, although the city has not had to do so for this property.

The amount of potable water supplied to the site during the ten years preceding 2014 is presented in Table 11. As shown, the agricultural operations at the site utilized an average of about 37 acre-feet per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acre-Feet Per Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>35.78</td>
<td>36.58</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>29.62</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>34.92</td>
<td>38.19</td>
<td>35.84</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of table data: Stantec, September 8, 2015.

Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a potentially significant impact on water supply could occur if a project would:

(a) Require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental effect; or

(b) Not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources.

In addition, a potentially significant impact on groundwater could occur if a project would:

(c) 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).
PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Water Supply Facilities

**Threshold:** Would the proposed project require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental effect.

**Impact:** The proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental effect. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Impact Analysis**

As discussed previously in this EIR section, the existing agricultural uses at the project site are provided potable water by the Camarillo Water Division. Water is provided via a 16-inch water main located within Lewis Road and a 12-inch water main located in Pleasant Valley Road. The proposed residential and commercial uses would obtain their potable water supplies from these same pipelines. Therefore, the infrastructure needed to serve the proposed project is already in place. As such, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental effect. No impact would occur.

Project Water Demand

**Threshold:** Would the proposed project not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources.

**Impact:** The project co-applicants would be required to provide 100% of the water demand for the uses approved and entitled by the city. This will enable the City of Camarillo Water Division to provide water to the project site with no reduction of existing water supplies. This would reduce the impact of the project to a less than significant level.

**Impact Analysis**

As discussed previously, the city previously received about two acre-feet per year of increased groundwater allocation for each acre that is converted from agricultural uses, but this amount was further reduced by 25 percent pursuant to the FCGMA Ordinance Code. The City of Camarillo has requested and received from the FCGMA a conditional approval of an agricultural to municipal and industrial allocation transfer in the amount of 34.98 acre-feet per year based on 23.32 acres and 1.5 acre-feet per acre. However, the city understands that the conditional approval has been rescinded in light of Emergency Ordinance E and the new allocation system that is being developed by the FCGMA. In light of these conditions, the City of Camarillo is now requiring the project developer to obtain all of the water necessary to serve the demand of the project without any increase in groundwater use. The project
developer would be required to enter into written contract or contracts with public and/or private entities that are existing water customers of the Camarillo Water Division to implement water conservation measures (WCMs) that would reduce existing water use by these entities in an amount that would cover all of the water demand of the project. Examples of WCMs that the city would allow include, but not be limited to, permanent turf removal and replacement with materials other than artificial turf, landscape irrigation control and sensor systems that are proven to reduce water consumption, high-efficiency irrigation nozzles, high-efficiency plumbing fixtures. Examples of WCMs which are not permissible by the city include, but limited to, artificial turf, soil amendments and conditioners, specialty products that have not been verified to permanently improve water efficiency. The WCMs must be implemented, 100% operational, and providing the specified water reductions at a minimum subject to confirmation by the city prior to the issuance of any building permits for the projects. These requirements are reflected as mitigation measures WS-1 and WS-2, which would enable the City of Camarillo Water Division to provide water to the project site with no reduction of existing water supplies and reduce the potential impact of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation**

The following mitigation measures are recommended to enable the City of Camarillo Water Division to provide water to the project site with no reduction of existing water supplies:

**WS-1** Prior to the issuance of any grading permits, and prior to issuance of any will serve letter, the project developer shall submit to the City of Camarillo a Water Supply Study (WSS) that identifies the amount of water required for the uses approved and entitled by the City and the sources that will provide 100% of the identified water demand. The WSS must include a description of the entitled project, the estimated water demand for the entitled uses, and the sources and quantities of the water that will be obtained to supply the entitled uses. The following requirements shall apply to the WSS:

A. The water demand estimates for the entitled uses must use water demand rates approved in writing by the City.

B. The water demand for this project is estimated to be 39.29 acre-feet per year, but this estimate must be updated based on the entitled uses and the WSS.

C. Contracts

   a) The project developer shall enter into written contract or contracts (Contract) with public and/or private entities that are existing water customers of the City of Camarillo (Entity or Entities) to offset 100% of the water demand of the project.

   b) The Entities must be located within City of Camarillo water service area.

D. Contents of Contract
The Contract must include, but not be limited to, the following provisions:

1) Identification of specific water conservation measures (WCMs)

2) The Entity and the successors in interest of that Entity will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance, and replacement when necessary, of the WCMs.

3) A statement that reads:

The Camarillo Village Homes developer and ____________ (insert name of Entity) agree that the City of Camarillo is expressly made a third party beneficiary of this Contract and the City may, at its sole discretion, enforce the terms of this Contract by all lawful means. If and when the City initiates legal action to enforce the terms of this Contract, then the prevailing party will be entitled to recover reasonable attorney’s fees and costs.

E. Requirements for WCMs

1) The WCMs must be permanent and measurable.

2) The WCMs must be implemented within the City of Camarillo water service area.

3) WCMs must be approved in writing by the City. The City will consider the following measures as possibly permissible: permanent turf removal and replacement with materials other than artificial turf, landscape irrigation control and sensor systems that are proven to reduce water consumption, high-efficiency irrigation nozzles, high-efficiency plumbing fixtures, and such other WCMs as the City may approve in writing.

4) WCMs which are not permissible include: artificial turf, soil amendments and conditioners, specialty products that have not been verified to permanently improve water efficiency, and other such WCMs as the City may disapprove in writing.

F. The WSS must include engineering reports or other information or documentation acceptable to the City that describe the WCMs in detail, the amount of water savings by each WCM, and the methods of measuring the water savings for each WCM. The engineering reports, other information, or documentation must be referenced in and made part of the Contract.

G. The WSS must be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the City of Camarillo Public Works Department and Community Development Department prior to the issuance of any grading permit and water will serve letter.

H. Mitigation measure WS-1 will be completed prior to starting mitigation measure WS-2.

WS-2 Prior to the issuance of any building permits, and a water will-serve letter, the project developer shall submit to the City of Camarillo an update to the WSS, and water will-serve letter required under mitigation measure WS-1 that demonstrates that approved water conservation measures (WCMs) are implemented, 100% operational, and providing the specified water reductions at a minimum subject to confirmation by the City of Camarillo Public Works Department and
Groundwater Supplies

**Threshold:** Would the proposed project 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).

**Impact:** The project co-applicants would be required to provide 100% of the water demand for the uses approved and entitled by the city. This will enable the City of Camarillo Water Division to provide water to the project site with no decrease of existing groundwater supplies. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

**Impact Analysis**

As discussed previously, the City of Camarillo currently will not be able to obtain the agricultural groundwater allocation transfers associated with the conversion of the project site from agricultural to municipal. In response, the City of Camarillo is now requiring the project developer to obtain all of the water necessary to serve the demand of the project without any increase in groundwater use. This requirement is reflected as mitigation measures WS-1 and WS-2, which would enable the City of Camarillo Water Division to provide water to the project site with no reduction of existing water supplies and reduce the potential impact of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

As discussed previously, the City of Camarillo currently requires the applicants for new potable water service to prepare water impact studies that demonstrate that the proposed project will not create additional demand on the city’s water system. Implementation of this requirement ensures that cumulative development does not increase the demand for potable water beyond existing water supplies. Based on this program, the City of Camarillo Water Division would have adequate water supplies to serve related projects and the potential cumulative impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

**UNAVOIDABLE SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS**

The proposed project would not create any unavoidable significant water supply impacts.
IMPACTS FOUND TO BE
LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

INTRODUCTION

In addition to the environmental impact categories analyzed in detail in this Final EIR, the City of Camarillo has determined that the development and operation of the proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts to the environmental impact topics listed below. Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines states:

“An EIR shall contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the EIR. Such a statement may be contained in an attached copy of an Initial Study.”

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project is provided as Appendix A to this Final EIR. The following discussions provide a summary of the analyses and conclusions of the Initial Study for the environmental impact categories that are not analyzed in detail in this Final EIR. It has been determined that there is no evidence that the proposed proposed project would cause significant environmental effects in the following areas and that no further environmental review of these issues is necessary for the reasons described below.

AESTHETICS

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a potentially significant impact on aesthetics or visual resources could to occur if a project would:

(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; or

(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.
Impact Analysis

Scenic Vistas

Development of the proposed project would result in the construction of new residential buildings that are mostly two stories in height. The mixed-use buildings at the corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road would be three stories in height. New trees would also be planted throughout the project site that could obtain substantial height. Views of the Santa Monica and Guadalasca Mountains could be slightly blocked for people traveling along Lewis Road when they are adjacent to the project site, but much less so when these people are on the Lewis Road bridge over the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks. Therefore, views of the nearby scenic vistas would continue to be intermittent from nearby vantage points and potential impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

Scenic Resources

Neither Lewis Road nor Pleasant Valley Road are designated as state scenic highways. Although several ornamental/landscaping trees are located in the northern portion of the site and some palm trees are located near the corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road, all of which would be removed and replaced as part of the project, these are generally internal to the project site and are not scenic resources to areas beyond the boundaries of the project site. No other potential scenic resources such as rock outcroppings or historic buildings are located at the project site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

Visual Character

The majority of residential buildings envisioned for the site would be two stories in height and would be similar to other multi-family developments recently constructed in Camarillo such as those located along Flynn Road north of Adolfo Road. The mixed-use buildings at the corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road would be three stories in height and would be similar to other mixed-use developments along Ventura Boulevard in Old Town Camarillo. The new residential and mixed uses would be developed consistently with the applicable design guidelines of the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines and would result in visual conditions that are similar to other recent residential and mixed-use developments within Village at the Park and elsewhere in Camarillo, and would not result in a visual degradation of the project site.

The project also includes a meandering sidewalk and Class A bike path along the western edge of the project site. This feature is consistent with the improvements envisioned under the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines for the eastern side of Lewis Road from Pleasant Valley Road to the Lewis Road bridge.
Based on this information, the potential impacts associated with changes to the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings would be less than significant.

**Light and Glare**

Temporary sources of lighting would be employed throughout the construction phases of development. Exterior lighting would be provided for nighttime security and interior lighting would be provided for workplace illumination and nighttime security. Unlike permanent lighting installations, temporary construction illumination is often unshielded. Lighting within the residential and mixed-use structures may be exposed to outside areas until the exterior walls are installed. Both of these conditions could cause nighttime construction lights to shine directly into the eyes of motorists driving along Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road. Therefore, to ensure that no significant impacts associated with temporary construction lighting would occur as a result of project implementation, mitigation measure A-1 is required. With implementation of this measure, potential impacts related to construction-related lighting would be less than significant.

When operational, nighttime sources of light would include vehicle headlights, street lights, interior and exterior security building lights, parking area and other security lighting. These sources of light would be very similar to the existing lighting within the adjacent industrial areas and throughout the Village at the Park area. Compliance with Camarillo Zoning Ordinance standards would ensure that there will not be excessive nighttime lighting beyond that necessary for function and safety. Exterior lighting would be located and designed to minimize direct spill beyond the site property. In accordance with Title 24 as implemented through City codes and standard conditions of approval, all lighting would be shielded and focused on the project features, and directed away from the adjacent properties and roadways. Blinking, flashing, or unusually high intensity lighting would be prohibited in accordance with Camarillo Zoning Ordinance standards. As such, lighting at the project site would not adversely affect aircraft flights into or out of Camarillo Airport and Naval Base Ventura County.

Sources of glare that typically cause daytime glare include exterior building materials such as glass walls and highly reflective façade materials and finishes. These types of materials are typically utilized for office building projects. As shown in Figures 7 and 8 of the Project Description to this Final EIR, these types of materials are not proposed to be utilized for the proposed residential and mixed-use buildings. The building design guidelines of the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines also do not involve design styles with highly reflective materials. Therefore, highly reflective exterior building materials would already be prohibited from use at the project site.

Based on this information, potential operational impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant.
Mitigation

To ensure that the proposed project does not result in significant impacts related to construction-related nighttime lighting, the following mitigation measure is required:

A-1 To avoid potential significant impacts to adjacent residential properties and roadways, the project developers shall include in contract specifications that temporary construction lighting within 200 feet of adjoining residential properties and roadways with direct lines of sight to the lighting source shall be shielded from the affected residential properties and roadways. This shall include permanent and temporary lighting provided within the new residential and mixed-use buildings.

AIR QUALITY

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact on agriculture and forestry resources if any of the following were to occur:

(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan;

(b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;

(c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors);

(d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; or

(e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Impact Analysis

Consistency With the Air Quality Management Plan

The City of Camarillo is located within the South Central Coast Air Basin (Basin), which includes all of Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo Counties. The Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) is the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in the Ventura County portion of the Basin. To that end, the VCAPCD, develops rules and regulations, establishes permitting requirements, inspects emissions sources, and enforces such measures though educational programs or fines, when necessary.

The VCAPCD is directly responsible for reducing emissions from stationary (area and point), mobile, and indirect sources. It has responded to this requirement by preparing a series of Air Quality Management Plans (AQMPs). The most recent of these was adopted by the Governing Board of the VCAPCD in 2008.
This AQMP, referred to as the 2007 AQMP, was prepared to comply with the federal and State Clean Air Acts and amendments, to accommodate growth, to reduce the high pollutant levels of pollutants in the Basin, to meet federal and State air quality standards, and to minimize the fiscal impact that pollution control measures have on the local economy. It identifies the control measures that will be implemented to reduce major sources of pollutants. These planning efforts have substantially decreased the population’s exposure to unhealthful levels of pollutants, even while substantial population growth has occurred within the County.

For general development projects, the VCAPCD recommends that consistency with the current AQMP be determined by comparing the population generated by the project to the population projections used in the development of the AQMP. Inconsistency with these projections could jeopardize attainment of the air quality conditions projected in the AQMP and is considered a significant impact.

Chapter 20.01 of the City of Camarillo Municipal Code restricts the number of new residential units that can be constructed on an annual basis in order to ensure that population growth remains within adopted limits. Developers have to apply for the annual development allocations and characteristics of the projects such as energy efficiency are taken into consideration in the decision as to the projects that receive the limited allocations. The proposed project would be constructed over several years based upon the limited development allocations that would be split amongst several projects. By restricting the number of annual development allocations, the City of Camarillo would ensure that the proposed project along with other developments does not exceed the populations growth projections assumed in the 2007 AQMP. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan and the potential impact would be less than significant.

Violation of Air Quality Standards or Substantial Contribution to Air Quality Violations

Construction-Related Impacts

Construction-related activities are generally short-term in duration, and the VCAPCD does not recommend any thresholds of significance for their associated emissions. Instead, the VCAPCD bases the determination of significance on a consideration of the control measures to be implemented. If all appropriate emissions control measures recommended by the Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines are implemented for a project, then construction emissions are not considered significant. Therefore, to ensure that no significant impacts associated with temporary construction-related emissions would occur as a result of project implementation, mitigation measures 3-1 and 3-2 are required. These mitigation measures would reduce construction-related air quality impacts to a less than significant level.
Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant

**Operational Impacts**

The VCAPCD currently recommends that projects located everywhere in Ventura County outside of the Ojai Planning Area with operational emissions that exceed any of the following emissions thresholds should be considered significant:

- 25.0 pounds per day of reactive organic compounds (ROC)
- 25.0 pounds per day of nitrogen oxides (NOx)

The emissions associated with the proposed project has been calculated based on the conservative assumption that the project would be completed and fully operational by 2020 (development in years later than 2020 may result in lower emissions). The results of these calculations are presented in Table 12. As shown, the proposed project would generate average daily operational emissions that exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the VCAPCD. This would be a significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 12 - ESTIMATED DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emissions Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCD Thresholds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Impact?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NT = No threshold of significance.

CalEEMod result sheets are provided in Appendix A of the Initial Study.

Mitigation measure AQ-3 is recommended to reduce area source and energy source emissions generated at the project site. As shown in Table 12, mobile sources are the primary source of emissions associated with the proposed project and area and energy sources are a small component of these emissions. As such, mitigation measure AQ-3 would result in a very small reduction of operational emissions. The only remaining measure recommended by the VCAPCD that would reduce the operational impacts of the proposed project to less than significant levels is the contribution to a City-managed off-site TDM fund as required by mitigation measure AQ-4. The City of Camarillo utilizes this program to mitigate the significant air quality impacts of projects within its jurisdiction. Therefore, mitigation measure 3-4 has been added to identify the TDM contribution that would be required for the proposed project.
Implementation of mitigation measures AQ-3 and AQ-4 would reduce the operational air quality impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

**Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Pollutants**

The VCAPCD recommends that any operational emissions from individual projects that exceed the project-specific thresholds of significance identified above be considered cumulatively considerable. As discussed in the preceding impact analysis, the proposed project would generate average daily operational emissions that exceed the thresholds of significance recommended by the VCAPCD. As such, the project would generate a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants. This would be a significant cumulative impact. Implementation of mitigation measures AQ-3 and AQ-4 would reduce the cumulative air quality impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

**Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations**

Traffic-congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized concentrations levels of CO. Localized areas where ambient concentrations exceed national and/or state standards for CO are termed CO “hotspots.” CO hotspots used to be a concern in Ventura County when this area was designated as a nonattainment area for State and national CO standards. The county is now in attainment of all applicable State and national standards for CO and CO concentrations are no longer monitored in the county. This is due to substantial reductions in CO emissions from motor vehicles. The greatest potential for a CO hotspot to occur in Ventura County today is at the roadway edge of a very congested intersection.

All of the study-area intersections are projected to operate at Level of Service (LOS) E or better in the future with the traffic generated by other development projects in the area and the proposed project. LOS E would only occur at the E. 5th Street & Pleasant Valley Road intersection during the PM peak traffic hour. During the AM peak traffic hour, this intersection would operate at LOS D. There are no sensitive receptors at the edge of this intersection. All of the other study area roadway intersections would operate at LOS C or better during the AM and PM peak hours. As such, no sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the study-area intersections would be exposed to CO hotspots in the future with traffic generated by the proposed project.

**Odors**

Odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products, and other strong-smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. The proposed project consists of the development of new residential and retail buildings. Residential and retail uses are not typically associated with odor complaints. As the proposed uses involve no elements related to industrial projects, no objectionable odors are anticipated to be generated by the proposed project.
Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant

However, the Camarillo Sanitary District Pumping Station No. 2 is located at the southeastern corner of the project site. Odors are emitted from vents within the pumping system. These odors would typically not be objectionable to industrial uses such as those allowed under the current land use and zoning designations for the site. They could, however, be offensive to residents of the project site, particularly at night when gentle winds may blow the odors towards the residential units.

The project has been designed to place parking in close proximity to the pumping station and extend the distance to the nearest residential units. However, City staff have been concerned that residents of the nearest residential units could notice objectionable odors and have requested that an air scrubber be installed on the pumping system to substantially reduce any odors. In response, the project applicant is proposing the installation of a Purafil Parallel Bed Scrubber or equal to address the City’s concerns. Installation of the scrubbing system would reduce the potential impacts associated with objectionable odors to a less than significant level.

Mitigation

The following measures are recommended to reduce the potential emissions associated with construction activities to the maximum extent feasible:

AQ-1 All developers of new buildings at the project site shall implement fugitive dust control measures throughout all phases of construction. The project developers shall include in construction contracts the control measures required and recommended by the VCAPCD at the time of development. Examples of the types of measures currently required and recommended include the following:

- Minimize the area disturbed on a daily basis by clearing, grading, earthmoving, and/or excavation operations.

- Pre-grading/excavation activities shall include watering the area to be graded or excavated before the commencement of grading or excavation operations. Application of water should penetrate sufficiently to minimize fugitive dust during these activities.

- All trucks shall be required to cover their loads as required by California Vehicle Code §23114.

- All graded and excavated material, exposed soil areas, and active portions of the construction site, including unpaved on-site roadways, shall be treated to prevent fugitive dust. Treatment shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, periodic watering, application of environmentally-safe soil stabilization materials, and/or roll-compaction as appropriate. Watering shall be done as often as necessary.

- Material stockpiles shall be enclosed, covered, stabilized, or otherwise treated, to prevent blowing fugitive dust offsite.
• Graded and/or excavated inactive areas of the construction site shall be monitored by a City-designated monitor at least weekly for dust stabilization. Soil stabilization methods, such as water and roll-compaction, and environmentally-safe control materials, shall be periodically applied to portions of the construction site that are inactive for over four days. If no further grading or excavation operations are planned for the area, the area should be seeded and watered until grass growth is evident, or periodically treated with environmentally-safe dust suppressants, to prevent excessive fugitive dust.

• Signs shall be posted on-site limiting on-site traffic to 15 miles per hour or less.

• During periods of high winds (i.e., wind speed sufficient to cause fugitive dust to impact adjacent properties), all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations shall be curtailed to the degree necessary to prevent fugitive dust created by on-site activities and operations from being a nuisance or hazard, either off-site or on-site. The site superintendent/supervisor shall use his/her discretion in conjunction with the VCAPCD in determining when winds are excessive.

• Adjacent streets and roads shall be swept at least once per day, preferably at the end of the day, if visible soil material is carried over to adjacent streets and roads.

• Personnel involved in grading operations, including contractors and subcontractors should be advised to wear respiratory protection in accordance with California Division of Occupational Safety and Health regulations.

AQ-2 All developers of new buildings at the project site shall implement and agree to enforce measures to reduce the emissions of pollutants generated by heavy-duty diesel-powered equipment operating at the Project site throughout the project construction phases. The project developer shall include in construction contracts the control measures required and recommended by the VCAPCD at the time of development. Examples of the types of measures currently required and recommended include the following:

• Maintain all construction equipment in good condition and in proper tune in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications.

• Limit truck and equipment idling time to five minutes or less.

• Minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating at the same time during the smog season (May through October).

• Use alternatively fueled construction equipment, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), or electric, to the extent feasible.
The following measures are recommended to reduce the potential emissions associated with operational activities to a less than significant level:

**AQ-3** All developers of new buildings at the project site shall include in construction and building management contracts the following requirements or measures shown to be equally effective:

- Use solar or low-emission water heaters in new buildings.
- Require that commercial landscapers providing services at the common areas of project site use electric or battery-powered equipment, or other internal combustion equipment that is either certified by the California Air Resources Board or is three years old or less at the time of use, to the extent that such equipment is reasonably available and competitively priced in Ventura County (meaning that the equipment can be easily purchased at stores in Ventura County and the cost of the equipment is not more than 20 percent greater than the cost of standard equipment).

**AQ-4** Prior to the issuance of a zoning clearance, the developers of new buildings at the project site shall pay a total of $21,167 to the City TDM fund to reduce vehicle trips and associated air pollutant emissions.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact on biological resources if any of the following were to occur:

(a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;

(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service;

(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means;

(d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites;
(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or

(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.

**Impact Analysis**

**Impacts to Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Species**

The proposed project site has been used for agriculture since 1938 and is presently used year-round for the production of irrigated row crops. The properties to the east and west of the site are developed with industrial uses and the property to the north of the site is being developed with new multi-family residential buildings. The project site does not include any habitat that would support sensitive plant or animal species. However, several ornamental/landscaping trees are located along the northern portion of the project site that would be removed and replaced as part of the project. The industrial properties to the east also have large ornamental trees along their perimeter with the project site. All nesting birds are protected under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (Title 33, United States Code, Section 703 et seq., see also Title 50, Code of Federal Regulation, Part 10) and Section 3503 of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) Code. Thus, to ensure that no significant impacts to nesting birds would occur as a result of project implementation, mitigation measure BR-1 is required. With implementation of this measure, potential impacts related to sensitive species would be less than significant.

**Riparian Habitat, Other Sensitive Natural Habitat, and Federally Protected Wetlands**

The project site has been utilized for agricultural operations for several decades. No riparian habitat, wetlands, or other sensitive habitat areas are located at or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, no impacts associated with riparian habitat, wetlands, or other sensitive natural community resources would occur.

**Wildlife Movement**

The property to the immediate north of the site is a former industrial site (3M/Imation) that is currently being developed with multi-family buildings. The area to the immediate east of the site is developed with light industrial uses along Constitution Avenue. The area to the west of the site and Lewis Road is also developed with light industrial uses. The proposed project site and surrounding area are not part of any wildlife corridors. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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.
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Consistency with Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources

The City of Camarillo has not adopted any policies or ordinances protecting biological resources that would be applicable to the proposed project. The ornamental/landscaping trees located along the northern portion of the project site are not subject to protection by any local or regional protection ordinances. Therefore, no impacts associated with local biological resource protection policies or ordinances would occur.

Consistency with Adopted Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Community Conservation Plans

The project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other adopted local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any such conservation plan.

Mitigation

The following mitigation measure is required to ensure that the proposed project does not result in significant impacts related to nesting birds:

BR-1 To avoid potential significant impacts to nesting birds, including migratory birds and raptors, one of the following shall be implemented by the developers of the proposed project:

- Conduct tree removal associated with construction from September 1st through January 31st, when birds are not nesting.

OR...

- Conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting birds if tree removal is initiated during the nesting season with results of the survey provided to the Department of Community Development. A qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct weekly pre-removal bird surveys no more than 30 days prior to tree removal to provide confirmation on the presence or absence of active nests in the affected trees. The last survey should be conducted no more than three days prior to the tree removal. If active nests are encountered, removal of the affected trees shall be deferred until the young birds have fledged and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. A minimum buffer of 300 feet (500 feet for raptor nests) or as determined by a qualified biologist shall be maintained during construction depending on the species and location. A copy of the buffer plan shall be provided to the Department of Community Development prior to fencing. The perimeter of the nest-setback zone shall be fenced or adequately demarcated with staked flagging at 20-foot intervals, and construction personnel and activities restricted from the area. Construction personnel should be instructed on the sensitivity of the area. A survey report by the qualified biologist documenting and verifying compliance with the mitigation and with applicable state and federal regulations protecting birds shall be submitted.
to the Department of Community Development prior to the issuance of a grading permit. The qualified biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities would occur near active nest areas to ensure that no inadvertent impacts on these nests would occur.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact on cultural resources if any of the following were to occur:

(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines;

(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines;

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

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

Impact Analysis

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a historical resource as: (1) a resource listed in or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources; (2) a resource listed in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting certain state guidelines; or (3) an object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military or cultural annals of California, provided that the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines defines significant archaeological resources as resources which meet the criteria for historical resources, as discussed above, or resources which constitute unique archaeological resources.

The project site has been modified and used for agricultural purposes for several decades and no structures exist at the site. Therefore, no impacts to historical resources would occur. There are also no known prehistoric archeological or paleontological resources within the project site. It is likely that any surface and subsurface archeological and paleontological remains that might have once occurred at the project site would have long since been eliminated by past agricultural activities. However, there is a possibility that archeological and/or paleontological resources may still exist below the surface, and that these remains could be encountered during site excavation activities. There is also the possibility that unsuspected human remains could be discovered during project site excavation activities. While no further evaluation of this issue is recommended, the following measures, consistent with standard City of
Camarillo Conditions of Approval, would be applicable to the proposed project to ensure that any previously unidentified archeological, paleontological, and human resources uncovered by project construction activity are not adversely impacted. This would ensure that any potential project impacts would remain less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

CR-1 The project developers shall include in construction contracts the requirement that construction activities be halted if any archaeological materials are encountered during the course of project development. The services of a professional archaeologist shall be secured by contacting the Center for Public Archaeology – California State University Fullerton, or a member of the Society of Professional Archaeologists (SOPA) or a SOPA-qualified archaeologist to assess the resources and evaluate the impact.

In the event that cultural resources are discovered, the handling will differ depending on the nature of the artifacts. However, it is understood that all artifacts with the exception of human remains and related grave goods or sacred objects belong to the property owner. All artifacts discovered at the development site shall be inventoried and analyzed by the professional archaeologist. In the event that the archaeologist identifies resources of a prehistoric or Native American origin, a Native American observer of Chumash origin shall be retained to accompany the archaeologist for the duration of the grading phase to help analyze the Native American artifacts for identification as everyday life and/or religious or sacred items, cultural affiliation, temporal placement, and function, as deemed possible. All items found in association with Native American human remains will be considered grave goods or sacred in origin and subject to special handling pursuant to State law. The remainder of the Native American artifact assemblage will be inventoried, analyzed, and prepared in a manner for reburial at the project site and/or curation, and the archaeological consultant will deliver the materials to an accredited curation facility approved by the City of Camarillo within a reasonable amount of time.

Nonnative American artifacts will be inventoried, assessed, and analyzed for cultural affiliation, personal affiliation (prior ownership), function, and temporal placement. Subsequent to analysis and reporting, these artifacts will be subjected to curation or returned to the property owner, as deemed appropriate.

A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of recovered artifacts, shall be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above. The report shall include a discussion of the significance of all recovered artifacts. The report and inventory, when submitted to the City of Camarillo Department of Community Development and the UCLA Archaeological Information Center, will signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to archaeological and/or cultural resources.
CR-2 The project developer shall include in construction contracts the requirement that the project be halted if any paleontological materials are encountered during the course of project development. The services of a paleontologist shall be secured by contacting the Center for Public Paleontology, which can be found at the following universities; USC, UCLA, California State University at Los Angeles, or California State University at Long Beach, to assess the resources and evaluate the impact. Copies of the paleontological survey, study, or report shall be submitted to the Department of Community Development.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact on geology and soils if any of the following were to occur:

(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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42;

   (ii) Strong seismic ground shaking;

   (iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or

   (iv) Landslides; or

(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;

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

(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property; or

(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water.

Impact Analysis

The proposed project site and surrounding properties are relatively flat. According to the City of Camarillo Safety Element 2013, the project site is not underlain by an active fault, not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Hazard zone, not located within a landslide/mudslide hazard zone, and
not located within an area of high liquefaction potential. Wastewater from the project developments would be conveyed by sewer lines and treated by the Camarillo Sanitary District.

The suitability of the project site to support residential development has been evaluated in the Supplemental Engineering Geology and Geotechnical Engineering Feasibility Report for Proposed Mixed-Use Development, Northeast Corner of Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road, APN 229-0-070-245, Camarillo, California, prepared by Earth Systems Southern California. The City of Camarillo has independently reviewed and approved the information presented in this report.

The report demonstrates that the development of the site with residential uses is feasible from a geotechnical perspective with no unusual risk or geotechnical hazard. Standard engineering practices as specified in the technical report would ensure that the project development would not pose a significant risk to people or structures in the event of a seismic activity. These types of measures are required of all new development in Camarillo. Therefore, the potential impacts associated with geology and soils would be less than significant.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact associated with greenhouse gas emissions if either of the following were to occur:

(a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or

(b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Impact Analysis

Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions refer to a group of emissions that are believed to affect global climate conditions. These gases trap heat in the atmosphere and the major concern is that increases in GHG emissions are causing global climate change. The principal GHGs are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and water vapor (H₂O). CO₂ is the reference gas for climate change because it is the predominant greenhouse gas emitted. To account for the varying warming potential of different GHGs, GHG emissions are often quantified and reported as CO₂ equivalents (CO₂e).

This analysis utilizes the draft thresholds of significance that are being considered by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and the VCAPCD. These thresholds are as follows:
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Tier 1 Determine if CEQA categorical exemptions are applicable. If not, move to Tier 2.

Tier 2 Consider whether or not the proposed project is consistent with a locally adopted GHG reduction 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 metric tons CO$_2$e (MTCO$_2$e)/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 MTCO$_2$e/year), commercial projects (1,400 MTCO$_2$e/year), and mixed-use projects (3,000 MTCO$_2$e/year). Under option 2 a single numerical screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO$_2$e/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 MTCO$_2$e per service population for project level analyses and 6.6 MTCO$_2$e 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 SCAQMD’s draft thresholds have also been utilized for other projects in Ventura County and the City of Camarillo.

The proposed project is subject to CEQA, but no categorical exemptions are applicable to the project. Therefore, the analysis moves to Tier 2.

Neither the VCAPCD nor the City of Camarillo have adopted a GHG reduction plan that has gone through public hearings and CEQA review, that has an approved inventory, includes monitoring, etc. Therefore, the analysis moves to Tier 3.

The estimated annual operational GHG emissions associated with the proposed project have been calculated and are shown in Table 13. As shown, the annual emissions would exceed the draft 3,000 MTCO$_2$e threshold for mixed-use projects. Therefore, the analysis moves to Tier 4.
The 309 units of the proposed project are expected to generate approximately 723 new residents to the City of Camarillo based on a rate of 2.5 persons per unit, which is the City’s estimated average for multi-family residential units. The proposed commercial uses are conservatively expected to generate a commercial service population of approximately 2,460 employees, customers, and vendors. Together, the project would have a total service population of 3,192 residences, employees, customers, and vendors.

Dividing the 4,756.96 MTCO₂e annual GHG emissions shown in Table 13 by the 3,192 service population yields an efficiency of 1.49 MTCO₂e of GHGs per service population member. This would be substantially less than the SCAQMD’s draft threshold of 4.8 MTCO₂e per service population. Therefore, the City of Camarillo, as lead agency, may conclude that the GHG emissions generated in association with the proposed project would not have a significant impact on the environment.

### Consistency with GHG Reduction Plans

The SCAQMD’s Tier 4 draft 4.8 MTCO₂e per service population efficiency target was established based on the goal of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill No. 32; California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, Sections 38500, et seq., or AB 32) to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. As shown in the previous analysis, the proposed project would have an efficiency of 1.49 MTCO₂e of GHGs per service population member. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the goals of AB 32. The proposed project would also be subject to the energy efficiency requirements of the new Title 24 CalGreen Code and the City’s Water Conservation Ordinance. Based on this information, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.

### TABLE 13 - ESTIMATED PROJECT GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Source</th>
<th>CO₂e in Metric Tons per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area Sources</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sources</td>
<td>810.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Sources</td>
<td>3,867.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal</td>
<td>20.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>54.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions</td>
<td>4,756.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCAQMD Draft Tier 3 Threshold

| Exceeds Draft Threshold? | Yes |

Note: CalEEMod result sheets are provided in Appendix B of the Initial Study.
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact associated with hazards and hazardous materials if any of the following were to occur:

(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 one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school;

(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment:

(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;

(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area;

(g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or

(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.

Impact Analysis

Hazardous Materials

Construction-Related Impacts

The project applicant has complied with a mitigation measure from the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Dawson Drive Area Concepts and Design Guidelines by having a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment conducted for the project site. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment evaluated the potential for the site and/or surrounding properties to be a source of hazardous materials. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment determined that the proposed project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, the Phase I
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Environmental Site Assessment concluded that the existing and historic agricultural activities at the site have created the potential for the soils at the site to be affected by pesticides or other chemicals that are used routinely in agricultural production. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment also identified the potential for contaminated groundwater from the former 3M/Imation property to migrate beneath the project site. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment concluded that there were no other potential hazardous materials affecting the project site.

A Phase II Environmental Site Assessment was subsequently prepared to evaluate the levels of pesticides and other potential hazardous materials in the soil. A total of 22 samples were collected from 11 locations within the site. The elected concentrations of pesticides in the soil were compared to the California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLs) and the United State Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Regional Screening Levels (RSLs) established for residential and industrial sites. The CHHSLs and RSLs are concentrations of hazardous materials in soil that the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) and USEPA consider to be below thresholds of concern for risk to human health. The detected concentrations of the pesticide toxaphene were above the applicable screening in seven of the surface samples. The concentrations of toxaphene in these seven samples ranged from 510 micrograms per kilogram (µg/kg) to 1,900 µg/kg and are above both the CHHSL (460 µg/kg) and RSL (480 µg/kg) for toxaphene in soil at a residential site. Four of the subsurface samples taken from these same seven locations also showed detectable levels of toxaphene ranging from 22 to 350 µg/kg, which fall below the applicable screening levels. All other detected concentrations of pesticides in the soil samples were below the applicable screening levels for pesticides in soil at residential sites.

Arsenic was detected in 12 soil samples with concentrations ranging from 3.2 milligram per kilogram (mg/kg) to 4.0 mg/kg. The detected concentrations of arsenic in all of the surface samples exceeded the CHHSLs for arsenic in residential and industrial soil. However, for arsenic, normal background concentrations found in California soils are typically CHHSLs for both residential and commercial/industrial settings. Background concentrations of arsenic range from 0.6 mg/kg to 11 mg/kg. The USEPA states that they generally do not require cleanup if the concentrations are within or less than natural background levels. The detected concentrations of arsenic from the site fall within the range of normal background concentrations in California soils.

No other hazardous material were discovered in the soil samples obtained for the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment. The former 3M/Imation site is also no longer a source of contaminated groundwater. The CalEPA Department of Toxic Substances Control (CalEPA-DTSC or DTSC) conducted a Resource Conservation Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Assessment (RFA) of the Imation facility in April 1998. The RFA included a review of regulatory agency files and a site reconnaissance. Following the DTSC review, Imation entered into a Consent Agreement with DTSC in April 1999. Twenty-five Solid Waste Management Units (SWMUs) were identified at the subject property. On October 25, 1999, DTSC approved a Phase I RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) which was submitted on July 22, 1999. The RFI
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recommended no further action for twenty-three of the SWMUs. The SWMUs that required additional evaluation were SWMU 2 (nine Hazmat USTs) and SWMU 25 (Fuel USTs). Imation entered into a Corrective Action Consent Agreement with DTSC, which required assessment/mitigation be conducted at SWMU’s 2 and 25 to the satisfaction of DTSC. DTSC concluded that no further action was required following the review of the 2001 RFI prepared for the SWMU’s. On October 25, 2002 DTSC issued a letter of termination for the corrective action consent decree.

Based on this information, construction-related impacts could occur if the soils at the site have levels of toxaphene that exceed CHHSLs and RSLs for soil at residential sites. The Phase II Environmental Site Assessment identifies two programs to mitigate the levels of toxaphene at the site and these programs are reflected in mitigation measure HHM-I. This measure would ensure that construction-related impacts associated with the potential exposure of hazardous pesticides would be less than significant.

**Operational Impacts**

As a residential and commercial mixed-use project, the only potentially hazardous materials that would be used on a regular basis at the project site would be cleaning and landscaping products that are common to typical residential and commercial development. The proper use of these products would not create a significant hazard to the public living at or near the project site and the potential impact would be less than significant.

St. Mary Magdalen School is located approximately one-half mile to the northwest of the project site. As discussed above, no off site impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials are anticipated with construction and operation of the proposed project. The types of cleaning and landscaping products used at the project site would be similar to those used at these schools. Therefore, the proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school and the impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant.

**Airport Hazards**

The proposed project site is located within the general flight paths of Camarillo Airport and Naval Base Ventura County. It is, however, located outside of the airport land use plan areas and outer safety zones for these airports. As discussed in the City of Camarillo Safety Element 2013, all development, land use, and operational FAA Regulations in place at Camarillo Airport are intended to protect residents from potential aircraft crash incidents. Compliance with all applicable FAA regulations severely reduces the potential for aircraft crash incidents. The various protection zones and height restriction zones are in place so that current and future development is not subjected to potential aircraft crash incidents. FAA Operational procedures must also be adhered to for arriving and departing aircraft. Therefore, the potential safety risk of project residents to aircraft hazards would be no greater than most areas within Camarillo. This would be a less than significant impact.
Emergency Response/Evacuation Plans

According to the City of Camarillo Safety Element 2013, evacuation routes in Camarillo are dependent upon the event and need for evacuation. During a breach of the Bard Reservoir, the only required evacuation route would be the movement onto high ground out of the flood plain, which is generally north of Ponderosa Road, westerly of Ponderosa and Las Posas Roads and easterly of Calleguas Creek northerly of the Ventura Freeway (U.S. 101). In the event of a major chemical spill or other significant disaster, the City would be evacuated using U.S. 101 for east and westerly traffic or Lewis Road for evacuating the residents to the north or south. The proposed project would not alter vehicular circulation routes external to the project site, or impede public access or travel upon public rights-of-way. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Wildland Fires

According to the City of Camarillo Safety Element 2013, the undeveloped hillside areas in and adjacent to the City present a potentially serious hazard due to the high potential for large-scale wildland fires. The proposed project site is located in the flat area of the City and is largely surrounded by other urban development. It is not located in the area designated in the City of Camarillo Safety Element 2013 as a very high or high fire hazard zone. Therefore, no impact associated with wildland fires would occur.

Mitigation

The following mitigation measure is required to ensure that the potential construction-related impacts associated with the potential use of hazardous materials would be less than significant:

HHM-1 The project developers shall contact the Ventura County Environmental Health Department (VCEHD) or the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) to enroll in their voluntary oversight program for the mitigation of the toxaphene by general grading and site preparation with conformation sampling or risk analysis.

OR

If mitigation is not permissible by the VCEHD or the DTSC, the project developers shall perform remedial excavation and disposal to remediate the toxaphene concentrations exceeding applicable screening levels.
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact on hydrology and water quality if any of the following were to occur:

(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 through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

(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;

(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; or

(j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Impact Analysis

The issue of groundwater supplies and recharge (item b) is addressed in the Water Supply section of this Final EIR.
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Stormwater Quality

Construction-Related Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would involve site preparation and construction of the proposed buildings and associated infrastructure. Since development of the proposed project would include grading of more than one acre, it would require a General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) prior to the start of construction. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requires that a Notice of Intent (NOI) be filed with the SWRCB. By filing an NOI, the project developers agree to the conditions outlined in the General Permit. One of the conditions of the General Permit is the development and the implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP identifies which structural and nonstructural Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented, such as sandbag barriers, temporary desilting basins near inlets, gravel driveways, dust controls, employee training, and general good housekeeping practices. With implementation of the applicable grading and building permit requirements and the application of BMPs specifically designed to minimize construction-related water quality impacts, the construction of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, impacts from construction activities would be less than significant.

Operational Impacts

The proposed project would be designed to meet the requirements of the Ventura County Municipal Stormwater Permit (CAS004002, Order R4-2010-0108) and related requirements of the Ventura County Technical Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Measures (TGM) that are in effect at the time of building development. The current version of the TGM is dated May 2015 and includes site design, site-specific source control retention measures, and treatment control measures. Order R4-2010-0108 and the May 2015 TGM promote land development and redevelopment strategies that consider water quality and water management benefits associated with smart growth techniques. A key requirement is that all new development and redevelopment projects shall reduce the Effective Impervious Area (EIA) to five percent or less of the total project area by retaining the water quality volume of the design storm (e.g., 0.75” storm depth) using infiltration, reuse or evapotranspiration, or retention BMPs. In addition, treatment must be provided for the five percent EIA and developed pervious areas. If it is technically infeasible to reduce the EIA to five percent, then the project must biofilter 1.5 times the remaining volume. Alternative compliance measures are allowed when strict compliance is demonstrated to be technically infeasible. Per City requirements, the developers of this proposed project submitted a Post Construction Stormwater Quality Management Plan (PCSMP) dated April 23, 2015 which was approved by the Public Works Department on May 27, 2015. The project developers will be required to implement the approved PCSMP.
Compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations, Code requirements, and permit provisions would ensure that the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and the impact of the project would be less than significant.

**Drainage Patterns**

There are no natural watercourses at the project site and the project site does not drain towards any natural watercourse. The existing stormwater runoff from the project site sheet flows to the south where an existing storm drain located at the southwestern corner of the site connects to the existing storm drains located within Lewis Road. The potential for the proposed project to cause erosion or siltation onsite or offsite would occur during site construction activities.

As discussed above, the SWPPP required for project construction activities identifies which structural and nonstructural BMPs will be implemented, such as sandbag barriers, temporary desilting basins near inlets, gravel driveways, dust controls, employee training, and general good housekeeping practices. With implementation of the applicable grading and building permit requirements and the application of BMPs specifically designed to minimize construction-related water quality impacts, the construction of the proposed project would not cause substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite. Therefore, potential erosion and/or siltation impacts would be less than significant.

**Storm Drain System Capacity**

As discussed above, there are no natural watercourses at the project site and the project site does not drain towards any natural watercourse. The existing stormwater runoff from the project site sheet flows to the south where an existing storm drain located at the southwestern corner of the site connects to the existing storm drains located within Lewis Road. The existing peak stormwater flows from the site are calculated as 24.0 cubic feet per second (cfs) during the 10-year storm, 29.0 cfs during the 15-year storm, 37.0 cfs during the 50-year storm, and 42.0 cfs during the 100-year storm.

The storm water from the developed site would sheet flow via landscape or drive aisles into a private subsurface detention facility consisting of eight rows of 48-inch diameter pipe, with each pipe run at a length of about 250 feet (total pipe length of approximately 2,000 feet). The outflow of the facility would be controlled by an orifice plate with a 1.75-foot diameter opening housed within the discharge structure. The restriction would limit the discharge to 24.0 cfs for all storm events up to the 100-year storm. The weir wall will be set at an elevation of 119.0 feet (approximately five feet of ponding) that will only allow a maximum orifice discharge of 23.5 cfs, at which point the water will start spilling over the weir and into the detention pipes. The weir wall will have a six-inch flap gate set at the bottom to allow the basin to drain once the water level has receded.

Based on this information, development of the proposed project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or
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substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding onsite or offsite. The impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Residential Flooding and Flood Flows

According to the City of Camarillo Safety Element 2013 and the Preliminary Drainage Report, the proposed project site is located within the 500-year flood zone, but not within the 100-year flood zone. Areas of the project site could, however, be placed within the 100-year flood zone if these areas were to be lowered from their current elevation as a part of project development. The City will require the project developers to ensure that no areas of the project site are lower than their current elevations and that all new residential structures would be constructed a minimum of 12 inches above the 100-year flood levels. This requirement is reflected in mitigation measure HWC-1. Compliance with this requirement would reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level.

Failure of a Levee or Dam

According to the City of Camarillo Safety Element 2013, the proposed project site along with much of Camarillo is located within the inundation area of Bard Reservoir, which holds approximately 11,000 acre-feet of water under normal conditions. The City has responded to this potential hazard by developing a dam failure evacuation plan in cooperation with the Ventura County Fire Protection District and the Ventura County Office of Emergency Services. The evacuation plans seek to get people located within the inundation area to higher elevations in the event that a dam failure was to occur. However, the risk of the Bard Reservoir dam failing is considered to be very low and development of the proposed project would not expose residents of the projected project to a significant risk associated with dam failure. The impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Seiche or Tsunami

Topographically, the project site and surrounding area are flat and not susceptible to mudflows. The site is also not located near any inland bodies of water or water storage facilities that would be considered susceptible to seiche. In low-lying areas such as the Oxnard Plain, the hazard zone for tsunamis can extend up to approximately one mile inland from the Pacific Ocean. However, the City of Camarillo and the project site are located approximately ten miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. Therefore, there would be no impacts related to loss, injury or death involving inundation at the project site by seiche, tsunami or mudflow.

Mitigation

The following mitigation measure is recommended to ensure that the proposed project does not result in changes to the 100-year flood hazard zone:
HWC-1 All portions of the project site shall be maintained at the current elevation or higher as part of project development and all new residential structures shall be constructed a minimum of 12 inches above the 100 year flood levels.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a potentially significant impact on land use and planning could occur if a project would:

(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; or

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

Impact Analysis

Physically Divide an Established Community

The property to the immediate north of the site is a former industrial site (3M/Imation) that was approved for multi-family residential development (Village Gateway) by the City of Camarillo City Council in 2013. The area to the immediate east of the site is developed with light industrial uses along Constitution Avenue. The area to the west of the site and Lewis Road is also developed with light industrial uses. The areas to the south of the site and Pleasant Valley Road are agricultural properties located within the unincorporated area of Ventura County.

Development of the proposed project would result in infill development of a site that has previously used for agricultural uses, and has been planned for urban development. The proposed project would not divide any existing residential neighborhoods. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Land Use Plan Consistency

The project co-applicants are requesting approval from the City of Camarillo to change the land use designation of the site to approximately 19.5 acres of Medium Density Residential and approximately 3.2 acres of Commercial Mixed Use. The requested changes in land use designations would also necessitate a zone change as well as an amendment to the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines.

The evaluation of this potential impact is based on the consistency of the proposed project with the policies and goals from the City of Camarillo General Plan adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect that are applicable to the proposed project. This comparison is provided in Table 3 of the Initial Study, which concludes that the proposed project would be consistent
Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant

with each of the applicable policies and goals. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Habitat Conservation Plan

As discussed previously under the Biological Resources topic, the project site and its vicinity are not part of any draft or adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other adopted local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with any such conservation plan.

MINERAL RESOURCES

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact to mineral resources if either of the following were to occur:

(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; or

(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.

Impact Analysis

No mineral extraction activities have occurred at the project site and no sites within the City of Camarillo have been designated as locally important mineral resource recovery sites. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly result in the loss of availability of important mineral resources at the project site or in the general vicinity.

NOISE

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact associated with noise if any of the following were to occur:

(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;

(b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels;

(c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;
(d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project;

(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; or

(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Impact Analysis

Applicable Noise Standards

Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations codifies sound transmission control requirements and establishes uniform minimum noise insulation performance standards for new hotels, motels, dormitories, apartment houses, and dwellings other than single-family dwellings. Specifically, Title 24 states that interior noise levels attributable to exterior sources shall not exceed 45 decibels (dBA) CNEL in any habitable room of a new building. Dwellings are to be designed so that interior noise levels will meet this standard for at least 10 years from the time of building permit application. This standard applies to all new multi-family units developed at the project site.

Figure 4 of the Noise Element of the City of Camarillo General Plan provides the State of California matrix on recommended land use compatibility with community noise environments. These suggested noise standards are utilized by the City of Camarillo for community planning purposes. The standards suggest that exterior noise levels of up to 65 dBA CNEL are acceptable for multi-family residential uses based upon the assumption that any buildings are of normal conventional construction without any special noise insulation requirements. The exterior noise standard applies to the outdoor activity areas of new residential units; they are not applied to all areas of residential developments. Exterior activity areas for multi-family uses are typically private patios greater than six feet deep and common areas for congregating. Balconies that are six feet or less in depth are not considered to be exterior living environments that are subject to exterior noise standards. The exterior noise standard for commercial uses is 70 dBA CNEL. New development in areas with noise levels greater than these should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirement (if any) is made and the necessary noise insulation features are included in the building design. Neither the state nor the city have adopted interior noise standards for commercial uses, but conventional construction with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning will normally suffice to provide an acceptable interior noise environment.

The City of Camarillo has also adopted a Noise Ordinance (Section 10.34 of the Camarillo Municipal Code), which identifies noise standards for various sources, specific noise restrictions, exemptions, and
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variances for sources of noise within the city. The Noise Ordinance applies to all noise sources with the exception of any vehicle that is operated upon any public highway, street or right-of-way, or to the operation of any off-highway vehicle, to the extent that it is regulated in the State Vehicle Code, and all other sources of noise that are specifically exempted.

Section 10.34.120 of the City of Camarillo Municipal Code regulates noise from the construction of buildings and structures adjacent to or within any residential zone. Exterior construction or repair work that could generate noise levels that exceed the Noise Ordinance exterior or interior noise standards at residential properties is prohibited between the hours of 7:00 p.m. of one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or at any time on Sunday, or at any time on any public holiday.

Construction-Related Impacts

The area to the north of the project site is being developed with the multi-family residential uses. Project construction activities could generate noise levels at this new residential area to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance. Therefore, construction activities would be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and prohibited at anytime on Sunday or any public holiday pursuant to Section 10.34.120 of the City of Camarillo Municipal Code. This would reduce the impact of the project to a less than significant level.

Operational Impacts

Noise levels at the project site are and would continue to be dominated by vehicular traffic on adjacent roadways along with ambient noise levels from Lewis Road, Pleasant Valley Road, and aircraft overflights. The proposed project site is located within the general flight paths of Camarillo Airport and Naval Base Ventura County. It is, however, located outside of the 60 dBA CNEL noise contours for these airports. Therefore, the aircraft flying over Camarillo would not expose residents of the project site to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL.

The Project Site Noise Report calculates that the future (year 2030) 65 dBA CNEL roadway noise level contours at the project site would extend to approximately 142 feet from the centerline of Lewis Road and 180 feet from the centerline of Pleasant Valley Road. Residential uses are proposed within these distances and, as such, could expose residents to noise levels that exceed adopted standards. The residential flats proposed above the commercial uses would have balconies less than six feet in depth and, as discussed previously, are not subject to the 65 dBA CNEL exterior noise standard. The central park area and other residential congregation areas are located beyond these distances and would be shielded from roadway noise by the residential buildings. However, the back yard/patio areas of ground level townhouse units would be greater than six feet in depth and these areas of the units proposed along Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road could be exposed to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL. This is a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measure N-1 is recommended to ensure that exterior noise levels within the
private back yard/patio areas of ground level townhouse units along Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road would not be exposed to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL.

The exterior-to-interior reduction of newer residential and commercial buildings is generally more than 30 dBA. This is based on the situation in which new buildings must comply with CCR Title 24 Part 6: California’s Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, which requires substantial building insulation and also reduces exterior to interior noise levels. Assuming a 30 dBA exterior to interior noise reduction for new residential and commercial uses would provide an interior noise level of less than 45 dBA CNEL, which is the state’s interior standard for residential uses. The proposed project would also be subject to all applicable standards of the City’s Noise Ordinance for operational noise sources.

**Ground-borne Vibration**

*Construction-Related Impacts*

Grading and construction activities that would occur at the project site may have the potential to generate low levels of ground-borne vibration. However, the maximum vibration levels would be below the thresholds for both potential building damage and human annoyance at the nearest developed land uses. Therefore, the potential impacts associated with construction-related vibration would be less than significant.

*Operational Impacts*

The proposed project does not include uses that are expected to generate measurable levels of ground-borne vibration during operation of the proposed project. Therefore, the greatest regular source of project-related ground-borne vibration would be from smaller trucks bringing in deliveries for the project residents and commercial uses, and larger moving trucks and garbage trucks picking-up project-related refuse material generated by the project residents and commercial uses. The vibration levels associated with these trucks would be less than the levels associated with large construction equipment. Therefore, the operational impacts associated with ground-borne vibration would be less than significant at nearby sensitive uses.

**Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels**

The proposed project is expected to generate approximately 4,090 vehicle trips per day external to the project site. The traffic generated by the proposed project would increase existing local noise levels by a maximum of 0.4 dBA CNEL, which is inaudible/imperceptible to most people and would not exceed the applicable thresholds of significance.

Noise would also be generated by activities within the new mixed-use community. These noise levels would be associated with resident vehicles, people communicating, and landscape maintenance. These
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Sources and levels of noise would be similar to those within existing residential neighborhoods within the Village at the Park community.

Based on this information, the proposed project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above the levels existing without the project. The permanent increase in noise levels would be less than significant.

Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels

As discussed above, project construction activities could generate noise levels at the new residential areas adjacent to the project site to exceed the standards of the City’s Noise Ordinance. Therefore, construction activities would be restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and prohibited at anytime on Sunday or any public holiday pursuant to Section 10.34.120 of the City of Camarillo Municipal Code. Pursuant to standard City practice in which construction activities are a regular source of noise at time throughout Camarillo, restricting construction activities to daylight hours when residents are less sensitive to noise would reduce the potential impacts of typical construction noise to less than significant levels.

Airport Noise

There are no private airstrips located within the vicinity of Camarillo. However, the proposed project site is located within the general flight paths of Camarillo Airport and Naval Base Ventura County and is located outside of the airport land use plan areas and 60 dBA CNEL noise contours for these airports. That is not to say that there will not be times when noise levels from civilian and military aircraft do not cause a disturbance at the proposed project site or elsewhere in Camarillo. The majority of aircraft overflights to Camarillo Airport and Naval Base Ventura County do not cause disruptive noise levels in Camarillo. However, there are occasions when jet fighter aircraft fly over the eastern part of the City and generate high noise levels that can be heard throughout the City. There are also times when jet operations occur at Naval Base Ventura County that can be heard throughout Camarillo. These situations do not occur on a regular basis and they are not unique to the proposed project site. Therefore, it is acknowledged that occasional jet aircraft operations may disturb residents of the proposed project. However, this is not an environmental impact of the proposed proposed project that requires a specialized analysis or special mitigation that is not required elsewhere in Camarillo. This would be a less than significant impact.

Mitigation

The following mitigation measure is recommended to to ensure that exterior noise levels within the private back yard/patio areas of ground level townhouse units along Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road would not be exposed to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL:
N-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits for residential buildings located along Lewis Road and Pleasant Valley Road, the developers of these units shall submit an exterior noise study that demonstrates that walls along the western and southern townhouse yards have been designed to ensure that future exterior noise levels within the private back yard/patio areas of these units will not exceed 65 dBA CNEL.

**POPULATION AND HOUSING**

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact to population and housing if any of the following were to occur:

(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; or  

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

**Impact Analysis**

**Population Growth**

The City of Camarillo has an estimated population of approximately 67,154 persons as of October 31, 2015. Based on a rate of 2.5 persons per unit, which is the City’s estimated average for multifamily rental units, the 309 units under the proposed project are expected to generate approximately 723 new residents to the City of Camarillo. The addition of these new residents would not exceed the Southern California Association of Government’s (SCAG’s) 2020 growth forecast of 72,200 persons for the City of Camarillo. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly induce substantial population growth within the City of Camarillo that has not already been anticipated by the City and SCAG.

The proposed project is an infill development that would largely utilize the existing infrastructure already located at and in the immediate vicinity of the project site. It would not extend infrastructure to an area lacking such services. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly induce population growth at a location where growth is currently not possible.

Based on this analysis, the population growth impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.
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Displacement of Housing or People

No existing residential uses are located at the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the demolition of any existing residential units or the displacement of any residents. No impact would occur.

PUBLIC SERVICES

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact if it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

(a) Fire protection

(b) Police protection

(c) Schools;

(d) Parks; or

(e) Other public facilities.

Impact Analysis

Fire Protection

The City of Camarillo receives fire protection and emergency services from the Ventura County Fire Department. While the proposed project may increase the demand for fire protection services through the development of new residential and commercial buildings, these demands would be met by the existing Fire Department facilities in Camarillo. As such, project development would not require the development of new or physically altered fire protection facilities which would cause significant environmental impacts. In accordance with standard City practice, the project development and building plans would be subject to review by the Fire Department to ensure that the site design and building plans comply with all applicable fire codes. The proposed project would also be subject to the Fire Protection Facilities Fee that would be used to help fund new fire facilities and equipment. Compliance with the applicable Fire Code requirements and payment of the Fire Protection Facilities Fee would ensure that the potential impacts to fire protection services associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.
**Police Protection**

Police Protection Services for the City of Camarillo have been provided on a contract basis by the Ventura County Sheriff's Department since the City’s incorporation in 1964. Since police protection to the project site is provided via officers driving in Police Department vehicles, the proposed project would not create the need for the construction of new or physically-altered police facilities. As such, the proposed project would not create a significant impact under CEQA. In accordance with standard City practice, the project development and building plans would be subject to review by the Camarillo Police Department to reduce opportunities for the commission of crimes at the project site.

**Schools**

Public education is provided to the residents of Camarillo by the Pleasant Valley School District (PVSD) for grades K-8 and the Oxnard Union High School District (OUHSD) for grades 9-12. In addition, there are several public charter and private schools operating within Camarillo. The Project site is located within the attendance boundaries of Rancho Rosal Elementary School, which is located within Village at the Park, Las Colinas Middle School, and Camarillo High School.

Attendance at area schools is dependent upon the boundaries drawn by the local school districts and students often do not attend the school that is physically closest to their homes. The attendance boundaries of individual schools are adjusted by the school districts periodically on an as-needed basis.

Development of the proposed project would increase the number of students attending local public schools. Using the local school district student generations rates of 0.5 student per multi-family unit within the PVSD and 0.0925 student per multi-family unit within the OUHSD, the 309 proposed residential units would generate an average of 155 elementary/middle school students and 29 high school students. The new students could create the need for new or expanded school facilities.

Operating revenue for school districts is provided by local property taxes accrued at the state and allocated to each school district based on the average daily student attendance. Funds for facility improvements to accommodate new students comes primarily from fees charged to new development projects. The project developers would be required to pay the required State-mandated school impact fees under the provisions of SB 50. Pursuant to Section 65995 (3)(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), 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. Therefore, payment of the required school impact fees to both the PVSD and the OUHSD would reduce the potential impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.
Parks

Public parks are provided to the residents of Camarillo by the Pleasant Valley Recreation and Park District (PVRPD). The new residents of the proposed project would create an additional demand for park and recreation areas. Much of this demand would be met by private recreation areas within the project site. Project residents would also live within walking and cycling distance of the Pleasant Valley Fields sports park and other parks in Camarillo. Because the project would not include any new public park land, the project developers would be required to pay in-lieu fees to assist the PVRPD with the purchase and development of new community park facilities. Payment of the required in-lieu fees would reduce the potential impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

Other Public Facilities

Residents of the proposed project would have the opportunity to utilize other public facilities within Camarillo, such as the Camarillo Library. The project development would also be subject to review throughout the development process by City staff at Camarillo City Hall. However, no new public facilities would need to be constructed to accommodate the needs of project residents. The majority of services to the project residents could be provided by local businesses such as those already located along Ventura Boulevard in Old Town Camarillo. Therefore, the potential impact of the project on other public facilities would be less than significant.

RECREATION

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact to recreation facilities and/or services if it would:

(a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or

(b) Require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Impact Analysis

As discussed under the topic of Public Services, the new residents of the proposed project would create an additional demand for park and recreation areas. Much of this demand would be met by private recreation areas including pools and play areas within the project site. Project residents would also live within walking and cycling distance of the Pleasant Valley Fields sports park and other parks in Camarillo. Because the project would not include any new public park land, the project developers would be required to pay in-lieu fees to assist the PVRPD with the purchase and development of new
community park facilities. Payment of the required in-lieu fees would reduce the potential impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant traffic impact if it would:

(a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures 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;

(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;

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

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

(e) Result in inadequate emergency access; or

(f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Impact Analysis

Intersection Levels of Service

The Traffic and Circulation Study prepared for the proposed project evaluated the potential impacts to the following 15 study-area intersections, which were determined through consultations with the City of Camarillo Department of Public Works:

1. Daily Drive/U.S. 101 Northbound Ramps
2. Lewis Road/Daily Drive
3. Ventura Boulevard/U.S. 101 Southbound Ramps
4. Lewis Road/Ventura Boulevard
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5. Mission Oaks Blvd./U.S. 101 Northbound Ramps
6. Dawson Drive/Petit Street
7. U.S. 101 Southbound Ramps/Petit Street
8. Village at the Park Drive/Westpark Court
9. Lewis Road/Dawson Place
10. Lewis Road/Mike Loza Drive
11. Pleasant Valley Road/5th Street
12. Pleasant Valley Road/Dawson Drive
13. Pleasant Valley Road/Lewis Road
14. Pleasant Valley Road/Village Commons Boulevard
15. Pleasant Valley Road/Rancho Road

The intersection of Pleasant Valley Road with E. 5th Street operates in the level of service (LOS E) range during the PM peak hour, which exceeds the City’s level of service C standard. All other study-area intersections currently operate within the City’s acceptable level of service range during both peak hours.

The proposed project is expected to generate 5,834 average daily trips, with 314 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 354 trips occurring during the PM peak hour. Of these, 4,090 average daily trips, 247 AM peak hour trips, and 251 PM peak hour trips would be primary trips or trips that are new to the area.

All intersections would operate at LOS C or better under future plus project conditions in the AM peak hour, except the Pleasant Valley Road/E. 5th Street intersection, which would operate at the cusp of LOS C/D under future plus project conditions. The project would add one AM peak hour trip to the critical movements, which would not exceed the City’s traffic impact threshold of 30 per lane peak hour critical movement trips for LOS D. The proposed project would, therefore, not generate any significant project-specific impacts during the AM peak hour. It is noted that the City allows for LOS D operations for short periods of time during peak hour periods.

All intersections would also operate at LOS C or better under future plus project conditions in the PM peak hour, except the intersection of Pleasant Valley Road/E. 5th Street, which would continue to operate in the LOS E range during the PM peak hour. The project would add four critical movement trips at E. 5th Street, which would not exceed the City’s traffic impact threshold of 20 per lane peak hour critical movement trips for LOS E. The proposed project would, therefore, not generate any significant project-specific impacts during the PM peak hour.
Based on this analysis, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.

**Consistency with Congestion Management Program**

U.S. Highway 101, Lewis Road, Pleasant Valley Road and E. 5th Street are included in the congestion management plan (CMP) network. According to the 2009 CMP, all facilities operate at LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hour periods, except the following segments of U.S. 101:

- Southbound U.S. Highway 101 south of Lewis Road operates in the LOS F range during the AM peak hour. The proposed project would add 21 AM peak hour trips to southbound U.S. Highway 101. These traffic additions would not result in a CMP impact based on the criteria outlined above.

- Northbound U.S. Highway 101 operates in the LOS F range during the PM peak hour. The proposed project would add 13 PM peak hour trips to northbound U.S. Highway 101. These additions would not result in a CMP impact based on the criteria outlined above.

Caltrans and the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) have previously documented that the segment of U.S. Highway 101 in the Camarillo area should be upgraded by adding one lane in each direction to provide a continuous eight-lane facility. The need for widening this facility is generated by regional traffic growth to the year 2030, not isolated to traffic generated by the proposed project. Improvements for mainline freeway segments are programmed through VCTC and are funded through various state and federal funding sources, local sales tax and gas taxes. No formal funding for widening the freeway has been committed at this time. The City of Camarillo has contributed a fair-share contribution towards mainline freeway improvements by reconstructing freeway interchange bridges with longer spans to accommodate future mainline widening projects. Furthermore, the project developer would pay Traffic Mitigation Fees to the City that would partially finance off-site projects that accommodate future widening on the mainline freeway, e.g., interchange reconstruction, ramp improvements, and intersection improvements adjacent to freeway ramps.

Within the study area, the Lewis Road/Pleasant Valley Road intersection and the Pleasant Valley Road/E. 5th Street intersection are included in the CMP network. Both intersections are included in the traffic analysis and programs to provide levels of service consistent with the CMP program have been developed. No additional analysis is required.

Based on this analysis, the proposed project would not 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. The impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.
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Air Traffic Patterns

The proposed project does not include any aviation-related uses and would not generate any new air traffic patterns. As discussed previously under the topic of Hazards and Harrods Materials, the proposed project site is located within the general flight paths of Camarillo Airport and Naval Base Ventura County. It is, however, located outside of the airport land use plan areas and outer safety zones for these airports. Development of the proposed project would not force any changes to the air traffic patterns of these airports. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Hazards and Emergency Access

The circulation system for the proposed project is conceptual at this design stage. The residential circulation system is comprised of 26-foot wide driveways. All driveways that provide access to residential parking would be gated. Signage should be provided at the driveway entrance on Lewis Road to direct traffic to the retail and restaurant uses. The final design should also incorporate a truck turning analysis to confirm adequate space is provided for garbage trucks, moving trucks and emergency vehicles.

The commercial circulation system consists of several parking aisles that are connected via 26-foot wide driveways. The final design should incorporate a truck turning analysis to confirm adequate space is provided to accommodate delivery trucks and emergency vehicles.

Access to the project site is proposed via a full access driveway on Lewis Road approximately 500 feet south of the Lewis Road/Mike Loza Drive intersection, a right-turn in-and-out only driveway on Lewis Road north of Pleasant Valley Road, and a right-turn in-and-out only driveway on Pleasant Valley Road. A discussion of each project access is provided below.

- **Lewis Road/Northern Driveway**: Southbound residential and commercial traffic on Lewis Road would access the site via this full-access driveway. The intersection is located approximately 500 feet south of Mike Loza Drive and approximately 1,000 feet south of the signalized Lewis Road/Dawson Place intersection. Delays and queues were calculated for the driveway intersection for both project-specific and buildout conditions and a stop sign on the westbound (driveway) approach.

Calculations indicate that under project-specific conditions, the westbound approach would operate acceptably, however the left-turns would experience increased delay (LOS E) during the PM peak hour. The delay further increases under buildout conditions (LOS F). The low number of vehicles (37 AM peak hour trips and 27 PM peak hour trips) would not satisfy Warrant 3 – Peak Hour contained in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, indicating that a traffic signal is not warranted.

The data also indicates that the 95th percentile queues would potentially exceed the proposed westbound left-turn storage of two vehicles under buildout conditions, thereby blocking vehicles turning right from the driveway. It is recommended that either the driveway be realigned to provide additional left-turn
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storage, or volumes and delays be monitored and a traffic signal be installed as conditions warrant in the future. In addition, the final driveway design should include a sight distance analysis to show sufficient sight distance is provided.

95th percentile queues on the southbound left-turn approach on Lewis Road are shown to be one vehicle. The recommended minimum length of the left-turn bay should be 50 feet of storage and 235 feet of deceleration length (including bay taper) for 30 mph entry speed (40 mph speed limit minus 10 mph deceleration in through lane). It is noted that the layout is subject to Caltrans review and that additional length may be required by Caltrans staff before an encroachment permit is issued. The minimum length of the left-turn pocket should be 285 feet.

• Lewis Road/Southern Driveway: The southern driveway is proposed to be right-turn in-and-out only, and is expected to operate acceptably. Similarly to the northern driveway, the final driveway design should include a sight distance analysis to show sufficient sight distance is provided.

• Pleasant Valley Road/Project Driveway: This driveway is also proposed to be right-turn in- and-out only, and is expected to operate acceptably. The final driveway design should include a sight distance analysis to show sufficient sight distance is provided.

The recommendations identified above are recommended as mitigation measures T-1 through T-4 for the proposed project. In accordance with standard City practice, the project development and building plans would also be subject to review by the Ventura County Fire Department to ensure that the site design and building plans comply with all applicable fire codes for emergency access. Given the low traffic volumes, the proposed circulation system is expected to operate acceptably with the implementation of mitigation measures T-1 through T-4. With the implementation of these mitigation measures, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections), incompatible uses, or emergency access, and the impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Public Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Access

At the present time, the City of Camarillo operates an intra-city public transit system consisting of 12 buses. The City owns the buses and has a contract with a private bus company to provide drivers and maintain the buses. The Camarillo Area Transit (CAT) intra-city transit system has one fixed route bus. Dial-a-ride service providing curb-to-curb transportation is also available for all persons. The proposed project site area is not located along the current CAT fixed route.

The City also supports the Ventura Intercity Service Transit Authority (VISTA) bus system and participates with other agencies in coordination as well as financial aid. The VISTA system connects Camarillo with surrounding cities and, thereby, provides access to major employment, commercial, governmental, and recreation centers, as well as California State University, Channel Islands. The nearest
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VISTA stop is located at the Camarillo Metrolink Station located north of the project site. Metrolink provides train service to Oxnard and Los Angeles Union Station. Residents of the proposed project would be within walking distance of these public transit services.

The on-site pedestrian circulation system and meandering sidewalk proposed along Lewis Road would connect to the sidewalks along Lewis Road and Mike Loza Drive, which will be constructed by the Village Gateway development. These improvements will result in a continuous sidewalk and Class A bicycle path along Lewis Road, pursuant the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines. This multimodal path will provide a direct link between North Dawson Drive and points to the south, including the project site, and to bicycle lanes on Lewis Road that lead to the CSUCI campus.

Mitigation

The following mitigation measures are recommended to ensure that safe and adequate vehicular access is provided through the project site:

T-1 The volumes and delays at the new main northern driveway shall be monitored and, if warranted and approved by Caltrans, a traffic signal installed by the developer as conditions warrant in the future.

T-2 Prior to approval of the final site design, the applicant shall provide a sight distance analysis for the new main northern driveway on Lewis Road that demonstrates that sufficient sight distance is provided.

T-3 The southbound left-turn pocket to the new main northern driveway on Lewis Road shall provide a minimum depth of 285 feet including taper if permitted by Caltrans. It is understood that the layout is subject to Caltrans review and that additional length may be required by Caltrans staff before an encroachment permit is issued.

T-4 Prior to approval of the final site design, the applicant shall provide a truck turning analysis that confirms that adequate space is provided for garbage trucks, moving trucks, and emergency vehicles within the residential parcel, and for delivery trucks and emergency vehicles within the mix-use parcel.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a project could have a potentially significant impact to utilities and service systems if it would:

(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) 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;

(e) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs; or

(f) Not comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**Impact Analysis**

The issue of water supplies is addressed in the Water Supply section of this Final EIR.

**Wastewater Treatment**

The Camarillo Sanitary District provides sewer service to the project area. Sewage from the project site vicinity is conveyed via sewer infrastructure to the Camarillo Wastewater Treatment Plant (CWTP). Wastewater at the CWTP is treated in accordance with the treatment requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The residential wastewater discharged into the Sanitary District’s sewer lines and treated at the CWTP would not impede the CWTP from meeting RWQCB requirements. Therefore, the potential impact of the project on wastewater standards would be less than significant.

Approximately 137 of the residential units and the commercial uses within the project site are proposed to connect at one location to an existing 24-inch sewer main located just to the south of the project site within Pleasant valley Road. The remaining 172 residential units would connect at two locations to a new 18-inch sewer main that is being installed along the western boundary of the project site as part of the approved Village Gateway project. The Sewer Impact Study concludes that the proposed project would add 0.134 cubic feet per second of wastewater at its dry weather peak to the City’s collector system. This amount of wastewater would not cause the existing or future sewer flows to exceed the design requirement of 62 percent of the sewer main capacities during peak dry flow conditions.

Sewage from the project site vicinity is conveyed via sewer infrastructure to the CWTP. The CWTP has a current capacity of 7.25 million gallons per day and average flows are currently 3.5 million gallons per day. In addition to the treatment plant, the district maintains nearly 158 miles of underground sewer lines and four pump stations.
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The Sewer Impact Study prepared for the proposed project calculates that the proposed residential uses are expected to generate 29,956 gallons per day of wastewater. The proposed commercial uses are estimated to generate approximately 1,426 gallons of wastewater per day and the proposed restaurant uses are estimated to generate approximately 2,430 gallons per day. This equates to a total of approximately 29,812 gallons of wastewater per day for the proposed project. The remaining capacity of the CWTP is approximately 3.75 million gallons per day. As such, the CWTP has adequate capacity to treat the wastewater that would be generated by the proposed project.

Based on this information, the proposed project would not require the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater facilities. The potential impact of the project would be less than significant.

Storm Drain Facilities

As discussed above under the topic of Hydrology and Water Quality, the development within the proposed project site would continue to drain towards the existing storm drain system along Lewis Road. The runoff from the project site would be reduced to volumes that are less than current conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the construction of new or expanded storm water facilities and the impact of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Solid Waste

The City of Camarillo has an Exclusive Agreement with E.J. Harrison & Sons trash company for regular day-to-day refuse service. Refuse from the project would also be subject to this agreement as the project site is within the City of Camarillo. Trash from the City is taken to the following landfills and transfer stations:

- Chiquita Canyon Sanitary Landfill, 29201 Henry Mayo Drive, Valencia, CA.
- Simi Valley Landfill & Recycling Center, 2801 Madera Road, Simi Valley, CA.
- Toland Road Landfill, 3500 North Toland Road, Santa Paula, CA.
- Gold Coast Recycling and Transfer Station, 5275 Colt Street, Ventura, CA.

All solid-waste-generating activities within the City of Camarillo is subject to the requirements set forth in California Assembly Bill (AB) 939, which requires each city and county to divert 50 percent of its solid waste from landfill disposal through source reduction, recycling, and composting. As of January 2014, the City of Camarillo is diverting approximately 76% of its total solid waste from landfills.

Using a generation rate of 0.46 tons per year of solid waste per multi-family residential unit, the 309 proposed residential units would generate approximately 142.14 tons per year of solid waste. The 6,000 square feet of commercial uses would generate approximately 6.3 tons per year of solid waste based on a generation rate of 1.05 tons per year per 1,000 square feet. The 6,000 square feet of fast food restaurant
uses would generate approximately 69.1 tons per year of solid waste based on a generation rate of 11.52 tons per year per 1,000 square feet. The overall proposed project would generate a total of approximately 217.55 tons per year of solid waste. This equates to about 0.60 ton per day. The landfills serving the City of Camarillo have adequate capacity to accommodate the total solid waste generation of the project.

Much of the solid waste that would be generated by the project is expected to be recyclable materials. The materials would be diverted from landfills as part of the City’s existing solid waste diversion program. Therefore, the actual amount of solid waste actually disposed of in landfills is expected to be substantially less than the 0.60 tons per day identified above.

Based on this information, the impacts of the proposed project on solid waste disposal is expected to be less than significant.
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GENERAL IMPACT CATEGORIES

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts which cannot be avoided. Specifically, Section 15126.2(b) states:

Describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications and the reasons why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, should be described.

Based on the analysis contained in the Environmental Impact Analysis section of this Final EIR, the proposed project would only result in one significant and unavoidable impact: the conversion of Prime Farmland to nonagricultural uses. Any development that occurs at the project site would result in this significant and unavoidable impact. However, the City of Camarillo has planned for conversion of the site from agriculture to urban uses since 1986. The current General Plan land use designation for the site is Industrial and the underlying zoning is M-1 (Light Manufacturing). The Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines also plan for the conversion of the site to non-agricultural uses. Preserving agricultural areas elsewhere in Camarillo is not an option to mitigate the impact of the proposed project because the General Plan already identifies several parcels within the city boundary that are designated for agriculture. Several large areas are located in the southern part of the city while a few others are in the northern part of the city. As such, development of the proposed project would not reduce the amount of agricultural land envisioned under the General Plan. All other potentially significant impacts of the proposed project would be reduced to less than significant levels with the mitigation measures recommended in the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project.

SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the “uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely.” Section 15126.2(c) further states that “irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.”

The types and level of development associated with the proposed project would consume limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable resources. This consumption would occur during construction of the proposed project and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. The development of the proposed project would require a commitment of resources that would include (1) building materials,
fuel and operational materials/resources and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the project site.

Construction of the proposed project would require consumption of resources that are not replenishable or which may renew so slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include certain types of lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt (e.g., sand, gravel and stone), metals (e.g., steel, copper and lead), petrochemical construction materials (e.g., plastics) and water. Fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil, also would be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment.

The commitment of resources required for the type and level of proposed development would limit the availability of these resources for future generations for other uses during the operation of the proposed project. However, this resource consumption would be consistent with growth in the Southern California region and that expected to occur under the City of Camarillo General Plan and the Dawson Drive Industrial Area.

**GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the ways in which a proposed project could induce growth. This includes ways in which a project would foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Section 12126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

> Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the metropolitan planning organization responsible for the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. As the designated metropolitan planning organization for this region, SCAG is mandated by federal and state law to research and draw up plans for transportation, growth management, hazardous waste management, and air quality.
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As part of its comprehensive planning process, SCAG has divided its jurisdiction into 15 subregions. The City of Camarillo is a SCAG member city and is located within the Ventura County Subregion.

SCAG works with its member cities and subregional organizations to develop population projections, which form the basis of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), and other regional planning efforts. The most recent regional planning effort is the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, which was adopted by SCAG’s Regional Council on April 4, 2012. The Growth Forecast Appendix for the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS identifies population projections for the City of Camarillo of 72,200 persons in 2020 and 76,700 in 2035.

The City of Camarillo has an estimated population of approximately 67,154 persons as of October 31, 2015. Based on a rate of 2.5 persons per unit, which is the city’s estimated average for multifamily rental units, the 309 units under the proposed project are expected to generate approximately 723 new residents to the City of Camarillo. The addition of these new residents would not exceed SCAG’s 2020 growth forecast for the City of Camarillo. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly induce substantial population growth within the City of Camarillo that has not already been anticipated by the city and SCAG.

The proposed project is an infill development that would largely utilize the existing infrastructure already located at and in the immediate vicinity of the project site. It would not extend infrastructure to an area lacking such services. Therefore, the proposed project would not indirectly induce population growth at a location where growth is currently not possible.

Based on this analysis, the population impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

---

1 Steve Mitchell, November 9, 2015.
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ALTERNATIVES
TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

INTRODUCTION TO THE ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

As stipulated in Section 21002.1(a) of the CEQA Statutes (Public Resources Code):

The purpose of an environmental impact report is to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to a project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided.

More specifically, the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6) require an EIR to describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. The discussion of alternatives, however, need not be exhaustive, but rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that are deemed “infeasible.”

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparable merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. The lead agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. There is no ironclad rule governing the nature or scope of the alternatives to be discussed other than the rule of reason.

Purpose

Section 15126.6(b) of the CEQA Guidelines states:
Because an EIR must identify ways to mitigate or avoid the significant effects that a project may have on the environment, the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or would be more costly.

Selection of a Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

The range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency’s determination. Additional information explaining the choice of alternatives may be included in the administrative record. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

Level of Detail

The CEQA Guidelines do not require the same level of detail in the alternatives analysis as in the analysis of the proposed project. Section 15126.6(d) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. A matrix displaying the major characteristics and significant environmental effects of each alternative may be used to summarize the comparison. If an alternative would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the significant effects of the alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Development of the proposed project would result in the urban infill of a site that has been planned for non-agricultural uses for several decades. The current General Plan land use designation for the site is Industrial and the underlying zoning is M-1 (Light Manufacturing). The site has also been planned for development of industrial uses since the Dawson Drive Industrial Area Concepts & Design Guidelines
Alternatives to the Proposed Project

were adopted in 2010. As such, the proposed residential and commercial project represents a specific alternative to the general land use envisioned in the General Plan and the Dawson Drive Industrial Area Concepts & Design Guidelines. As discussed in the Environmental Impact Analysis section of this Final EIR, the proposed project would only result in one significant and unavoidable impact: the conversion of Prime Farmland to nonagricultural uses. Any development that occurs at the project site would result in this significant and unavoidable impact. As such, the only alternatives capable of reducing or eliminating the significant and unavoidable impact of the proposed project is either no development (no project) or development at an alternative project site.

The alternatives to the proposed project that were considered for this Final EIR are described and evaluated in the following discussions.

No Project Alternative

As required by CEQA, a no project/no new development alternative is analyzed in this EIR section. Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the no project alternative “…analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published…as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” Furthermore, Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

If approval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this ‘no project’ consequence should be discussed. In certain instances, the no project alternative means ‘no build/ wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the project will not result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the project’s non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment.

As discussed previously in this Final EIR, the current land use designation for the project site is Industrial and the underlying zoning designation is M-1 (Light Manufacturing). The project site is planned for industrial park/university serving uses in the Dawson Drive Area Concepts & Design Guidelines.

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed and the site would temporarily remain as an agricultural site. However, it is reasonably foreseeable that another application would be submitted to the City of Camarillo in the near future requesting approval to develop the site with light industrial uses to the extent permitted by the M-1 zone. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not preclude development of the project site; it would instead temporarily delay to a later date the development of the site with uses similar to the proposed project.
Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The environmental impacts associated with this alternative would be the same as those caused by the proposed project. The entire project site that is designated as Prime Farmland would be converted to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would delay, but not eliminate or reduce, the significant and unavoidable environmental impact associated with the proposed project. This alternative would also not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project.

Industrial Development Alternative

As discussed above, the current land use designation for the project site is Industrial and the underlying zoning designation is M-1 (Light Manufacturing). This alternative assumes the development of the project site with light industrial uses consistent with the existing land use and zoning designations for the site. This alternative assumes that the entire site would be utilized and no area would be left undeveloped and available for additional future development.

The environmental impacts associated with this alternative would also be the same as those caused by the proposed project. The entire project site that is designated as Prime Farmland would be converted to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, the Industrial Development Alternative would also delay, but not eliminate or reduce, the significant and unavoidable environmental impact associated with the proposed project. This alternative would also not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project.

Alternative Site

The evaluation of an alternative site is generally practical for new infrastructure projects or other projects that do not need to be developed at a site that is owned by a particular project developer. It is generally less applicable to new infill general development projects such as the proposed project. In the case of this proposed project, the project co-applicants could, in theory, purchase another property within Camarillo that is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. However, development at an alternative site would not meet the applicant’s objectives to provide new residential and commercial uses within the Dawson Drive Industrial Area and in close proximity to the California State University, Channel Islands campus. The project co-applicants do not own another property in the area that is not already being developed with residential uses. This alternative would also not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

In addition to the discussion and comparison of impacts of a proposed project and the alternatives, Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an “environmentally superior” alternative be selected and the reasons for such a selection disclosed. In general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would be expected to generate the least amount of adverse impacts. In this case, No Project Alternative would result in the least impacts on the existing environment. However,
this alternative would also simply delay, but not eliminate or reduce, the significant and unavoidable environmental impact associated with the proposed project. This alternative would also not meet any of the objectives for the proposed project.
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