

APPENDIX B - NOP RESPONSES



Gavin Newsom
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Kate Gordon
Director

Notice of Preparation

March 22, 2019

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: Camino Ruiz Apartment Community
SCH# 2019039127

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Camino Ruiz Apartment Community draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

**Michelle Glueckert D'Anna
Camarillo, City of
601 Carmen Drive
Camarillo, CA 93010**

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research at state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project on our website: <https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2019039127/2>.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

cc: Lead Agency

NOP Distribution List

Resources Agency

Resources Agency
Nadell Gayou

☐ Dept. of Boating & Waterways
Denise Peterson

☐ California Coastal Commission
Allyson Hitt

☐ Colorado River Board
Elsa Contreras

☒ Dept. of Conservation
Crina Chan

☐ Cal Fire
Dan Foster

☐ Central Valley Flood Protection Board
James Herota

☐ Office of Historic Preservation
Ron Parsons

Dept of Parks & Recreation
Environmental Stewardship Section

☐ S.F. Bay Conservation & Dev't. Comm.
Steve Goldbeck

☒ Dept. of Water Resources
Resources Agency
Nadell Gayou

Fish and Game

☐ Depart. of Fish & Wildlife
Scott Flint
Environmental Services Division

☐ Fish & Wildlife Region 1
Curt Babcock

☐ Fish & Wildlife Region 1E
Laurie Harnsberger

☐ Fish & Wildlife Region 2
Jeff Drongesen

☐ Fish & Wildlife Region 3
Craig Weightman

☐ Fish & Wildlife Region 4
Julie Vance

☒ Fish & Wildlife Region 5
Leslie Newton-Reed
Habitat Conservation Program

☐ Fish & Wildlife Region 6
Tiffany Ellis
Habitat Conservation Program

☐ Fish & Wildlife Region 6 I/M
Heidi Calvert
Inyo/Mono, Habitat Conservation Program

☐ Dept. of Fish & Wildlife M
William Paznokas
Marine Region

Other Departments

☐ California Department of Education
Lesley Taylor

☐ OES (Office of Emergency Services)
Monique Wilber

☐ Food & Agriculture
Sandra Schubert
Dept. of Food and Agriculture

☐ Dept. of General Services
Cathy Buck
Environmental Services Section

☐ Housing & Comm. Dev.
CEQA Coordinator
Housing Policy Division

Independent Commissions, Boards

☐ Delta Protection Commission
Erik Vink

☐ Delta Stewardship Council
Anthony Navasero

☐ California Energy Commission
Eric Knight

County:

Ventura

af

☒ Native American Heritage Comm.
Debbie Treadway

☐ Public Utilities Commission
Supervisor

☐ Santa Monica Bay Restoration
Guangyu Wang

☐ State Lands Commission
Jennifer Deleong

☐ Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)
Cherry Jacques

Cal State Transportation Agency CalSTA

☐ Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics
Philip Crimmins

☐ Caltrans - Planning
HQ LD-IGR
Christian Bushong

☒ California Highway Patrol
Suzann Ikeuchi
Office of Special Projects

Dept. of Transportation

☐ Caltrans, District 1
Rex Jackman

☐ Caltrans, District 2
Marcelino Gonzalez

☐ Caltrans, District 3
Susan Zanchi

☐ Caltrans, District 4
Patricia Maurice

☐ Caltrans, District 5
Larry Newland

☐ Caltrans, District 6
Michael Navarro

☒ Caltrans, District 7
Dianna Watson

☐ Caltrans, District 8
Mark Roberts

☐ Caltrans, District 9
Gayle Rosander

☐ Caltrans, District 10
Tom Dumas

☐ Caltrans, District 11
Jacob Armstrong

☐ Caltrans, District 12
Maureen El Harake

Cal EPA

Air Resources Board

☐ Airport & Freight
Jack Wursten

☐ Transportation Projects
Nesamani Kalandiyur

☒ Industrial/Energy Projects
Mike Tollstrup

☐ California Department of Resources, Recycling & Recovery
Kevin Taylor/Jeff Esquivel

☐ State Water Resources Control Board
Regional Programs Unit
Division of Financial Assistance

☒ State Water Resources Control Board
Cindy Forbes - Asst Deputy
Division of Drinking Water

☐ State Water Resources Control Board
Div. Drinking Water # _____

☐ State Water Resources Control Board
Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit
Division of Water Quality

☐ State Water Resources Control Board
Phil Crader
Division of Water Rights

☒ Dept. of Toxic Substances Control Reg. # _____
CEQA Tracking Center

☐ Department of Pesticide Regulation
CEQA Coordinator

SCH#

2019039127

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

☐ RWQCB 1
Cathleen Hudson
North Coast Region (1)

☐ RWQCB 2
Environmental Document Coordinator
San Francisco Bay Region (2)

☐ RWQCB 3
Central Coast Region (3)

☒ RWQCB 4
Teresa Rodgers
Los Angeles Region (4)

☐ RWQCB 5S
Central Valley Region (5)

☐ RWQCB 5F
Central Valley Region (5)
Fresno Branch Office

☐ RWQCB 5R
Central Valley Region (5)
Redding Branch Office

☐ RWQCB 6
Lahontan Region (6)

☐ RWQCB 6V
Lahontan Region (6)
Victorville Branch Office

☐ RWQCB 7
Colorado River Basin Region (7)

☐ RWQCB 8
Santa Ana Region (8)

☐ RWQCB 9
San Diego Region (9)

☐ Other _____

☐ _____
Conservancy

Last Updated 5/22/18

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 7 – Office of Regional Planning
100 S. MAIN STREET, MS 16
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE (213) 897-9140
FAX (213) 897-1337
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov



Making Conservation
a California Way of Life.

Governor's Office of Planning & Research

APR 29 2019

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

April 22, 2019

Mr. David Moe
City of Camarillo,
Department of Community Development
601 Carmen Drive
Camarillo, CA 93010

RE: Camino Ruiz Apartment Community Project
– Notice of Preparation (NOP)
SCH# 2019039127
GTS # 07-VEN-2019-00253
Vic. VEN-101/PM: 11.981

Dear Mr. David Moe:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project's NOP. The project applicant is requesting approval from City of Camarillo to develop the site with 386 apartment units in 17 buildings. The development would consist of approximately 97 studio units, 153 one-bedroom units, and 136 two-bedroom units.

After reviewing this project's NOP Caltrans has the following comments:

1. In Table 11 of the "Revised Traffic and Circulation Study", intersections 2 (Santa Rosa Rd/Los Pueblos Dr) and 6 (Pleasant Valley Rd/U.S. 101 SB Ramps) have improved LOS in the "Buildout + Project". Please explain how the project will improve LOS in these areas.

Further information included for your consideration:

Caltrans seeks to promote safe, accessible multimodal transportation. Methods to reduce pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to vehicles improve safety by lessening the time that the user is in the likely path of a motor vehicle. These methods include the construction of physically separated facilities such as sidewalks, raised medians, refuge islands, and off-road paths and trails, or a reduction in crossing distances through roadway narrowing.

Caltrans recommends the project to consider the use of methods such as, but not limited to, pedestrian and bicyclist warning signage, flashing beacons, crosswalks, signage and striping, be used to indicate to motorists that they should expect to see and yield to pedestrians and bicyclists. Visual indication from signage can be reinforced by road design features such as lane widths, landscaping, street furniture, and other design elements.

An encroachment permit will be required for any project on, or in the vicinity of, the Caltrans right of way. Please note that any modifications to the State facility (US-101) will be subject to additional review by the Office of Permits prior to issuance of the permit.

Mr. David Moe
April 22, 2019
Page 2 of 2

Any transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials which requires use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will need a Caltrans transportation permit. We recommend large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute periods

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact project coordinator Reece Allen, at reece.allen@dot.ca.gov and refer to GTS# 07-VEN-2019-00253.

Sincerely,



MIYA EDMONSON
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse



STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.

AB 52

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

1. Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project: Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:
 - a. A brief description of the project.
 - b. The lead agency contact information.
 - c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d)).
 - d. A "California Native American tribe" is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21073).
2. Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe's Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report: A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or Environmental Impact Report. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1(b)).
 - a. For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code §65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.1 (b)).
3. Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe: The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:
 - a. Alternatives to the project.
 - b. Recommended mitigation measures.
 - c. Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).
4. Discretionary Topics of Consultation: The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:
 - a. Type of environmental review necessary.
 - b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
 - c. Significance of the project's impacts on tribal cultural resources.
 - d. If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (a)).
5. Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process: With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code §6254 (r) and §6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (c)(1)).
6. Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document: If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency's environmental document shall discuss both of the following:
 - a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
 - b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (b)).

7. Conclusion of Consultation: Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
 - a. The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
 - b. A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code §21080.3.2 (b)).
8. Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document: Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code §21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (a)).
9. Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation: If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (e)).
10. Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:
 - a. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
 - i. Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
 - ii. Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
 - b. Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
 - i. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
 - ii. Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
 - iii. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
 - c. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
 - d. Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code §21084.3 (b)).
 - e. Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a non-federally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code §815.3 (c)).
 - f. Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code §5097.991).
11. Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource: An Environmental Impact Report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
 - a. The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 and §21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.2.
 - b. The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
 - c. The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code §21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code §21082.3 (d)).

The NAHC's PowerPoint presentation titled, "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices" may be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf

SB 18

SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code §65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf

Some of SB 18's provisions include:

1. **Tribal Consultation:** If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. **A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe.** (Gov. Code §65352.3 (a)(2)).
2. **No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation.** There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.
3. **Confidentiality:** Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code §65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code §5097.9 and §5097.993 that are within the city's or county's jurisdiction. (Gov. Code §65352.3 (b)).
4. **Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation:** Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
 - a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
 - b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and "Sacred Lands File" searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at: <http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/>

NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
 - a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
 - b. If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
 - c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
 - d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
2. If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
 - a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
 - b. The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.

3. Contact the NAHC for:
 - a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project's APE.
 - b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.
4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.
 - a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
 - b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
 - c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines §15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at my email

address: Steven.Quinn@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



for

Steven Quinn

Associate Governmental Program Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse



**VENTURA COUNTY
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT**
Memorandum

TO: David Moe, Assistant Director, Community Development

DATE: April 22, 2019

FROM: Nicole Collazo, Planning Division

SUBJECT: Comments on Initial Study for Camino Ruiz Apartment Community Project via Notice of Preparation (NOP) of Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Air Pollution Control District (APCD) staff has reviewed the Initial Study for the project referenced above. The proposed project consists of developing the site with 386 apartment units in 17 buildings. There are several existing office and light industrial buildings on-site that will be demolished and are part of a separate project approval submitted to the City of Camarillo. The project location is at the southeastern corner of Verdugo Way and Camino Ruiz within the City of Camarillo. The Lead Agency for the project is the City of Camarillo.

GENERAL COMMENTS

As a recommending agency for the CEQA review of the subject project, APCD has the following comments regarding the Initial Study prepared:

Air Quality Section

Item 1- Page 24, Construction-Related Impacts. Although the construction emissions are temporary and not included as part of the air quality significance determination per the Air Quality Assessment Guidelines, 2003, (AQAG) the emissions still need to be quantified in order to compare them against a recommended (unadopted) threshold of 25 lbs./day ROG and NOx so that the correct mitigation measures can be determined. The AQAG states “construction-related emissions should be mitigated if estimates of ROG and NOx emissions from the heavy-duty construction equipment anticipated to be used for a particular project exceed the 5 pounds per day threshold in the Ojai Planning Area, or the 25 pounds per day threshold in the remainder of the county” (Page 5-3, AQAG, emphasis mine). The discussion in Section 3b of the Initial Study makes no mention of the amount of construction emissions estimated. The air quality model attached to Appendix A does include maximum annual construction emissions estimated at 65.80 lbs./day ROG and 54.57 lbs./day NOx. We note these maximum ozone precursor amounts are primarily from painting operations (ROG in paints) and grading operations (NOx from heavy duty equipment). If the model used default settings for architectural coatings for the Ventura County APCD basin, it will have default settings of 250 g/L ROG for the VOC content of

paints used. We recommend running the model again with 100 g/L ROC, as this is the general maximum compliant VOC content for architectural flat coatings, per VCACPD Rule 74.2. This may decrease the construction ROC emissions substantially. In addition, it does not appear the Construction Mitigation Feature was used in estimating construction emissions. If selected, the user can select all off-road mobile construction equipment to have a minimum diesel rating of Tier 3 or Tier 4. This will also substantially reduce the estimated NOx emissions from off-road diesel construction equipment. If the model is changed, please include the update model results to Appendix A and state assumptions and/or quantified construction emissions into the discussion in Section 3b of the Initial Study.

Item 2- Page 26, toxic exposure to sensitive receptors. The Initial Study failed to review potential toxic exposure to nearby sensitive receptors from any existing source of toxic air contaminants (TAC), per AQAG Section 6.5.3 "Projects Near Existing Sources of Toxic Air Contaminants". A major TAC source is the 101 freeway just 300 feet south of the project (Initial Study, Page 7), which emits diesel particulate matter (DPM). DPM is a primary component of exhaust emissions from heavy duty diesel construction equipment (on-road and off-road). The CARB and EPA have designated DPM as a TAC, which has been found to account for 70-80% of the overall cancer risk from mobile source emissions (CARB 2005 Land Use Handbook, MATES IV Study, respectively) and recommend a screening buffer distance of 500 feet between sensitive receptors and major source of TACs. At the very least, we recommend a toxics screening analyses or Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to assess whether the project's residences will be exposed to toxic levels exceeding the HRA thresholds.

The Mission Oaks Townhomes Project approved by the City of Camarillo (Project No. PBC/GPA 2013-3) which has now been completed is a project immediately adjacent to the current project proposed. The Initial Study and certified Mitigated Negative Declaration included an HRA that concluded a potential health risk for several sensitive receptors and the 101 freeway and the following mitigation measures were determined 1) Ventilation Filter Screens on outside air intake ducts, 2) Resident Notification notifying the future residents of the property owners' responsibility for maintaining the filter screens, and 3) Weatherproofing the windows and doors with caulking and weather-stripping that is rated to last at least 20 years. In addition, nearby sensitive receptors like Courtyard Hotel and Adolfo Camarillo High School were also identified and additional construction mitigation measures were added in addition to what is recommended in the AQAG that included 1) Tier 4 diesel engine rating, wherever feasible, for all heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment, 2) Number of pieces of equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized, and 3) engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size. We recommend similar mitigation measures upon comparison of estimated toxic exposure against adopted thresholds and possibly changing the determination for Air Quality Item d to LS-M if needed.

Another possible mitigation measure is requiring all on-road construction vehicles to be model year 2010 or greater. More information on this is found in the On-Road regulation found in the embedded link [here](#). The CARB On-Road regulation requires a phasing out of pre-2010 diesel truck engines with full compliance for applicable trucks and buses by January 1, 2023. Newer models will have PM filters installed on them. which can effectively reduce DPM emissions by 85% or more, according to CARB.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this project's air quality impacts. If you have any questions, please call me at (805) 645-1426 or email nicole@vcapcd.org.

From: slarriaga63@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 9:04 AM
To: David Moe
Subject: The 300 apartments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I think it's a terrible idea to put apartments in the old Anthem building. I live across the street in the colony homes and have enjoyed this neighborhood for over 30 years. I work in the San Fernando Valley most of the time and I see how they're tearing down homes and build the apartment buildings and you can't even Park in the front of your own home there's cars on the road 24 hours a day traffic everywhere it's just so ridiculous to get home and coming down the grade already is such a hassle it's backed up from Westlake. I just don't see how we can handle this. Seems large family homes Maybe, but Apartments please no. Plus the crime unfortunately that it brings. We are already seeing that on the West End of Camarillo. I'm starting to see it in

my neighborhood too. Someone thought because I have a Volkswagen parked in my front yard that it's open for them to take whatever they want off of it they just the windshield wipers and my

both rear view mirrors off of it it's an old 69 Volkswagen and they just help themselves. And I'm

hearing different things from different people and Camarillo about the crime and is just so sad.

Please reconsider putting apartments in that area. I think it's a terrible idea for our beautiful town.

Thank you for listening.

Sherri Arriaga. 805. 746. 2004.

I miss the April 9th meeting because I had to work my second job. I raised two kids by myself as a single mother and I have to have a second job just to support just me. It's getting very bad in

California. My daughter is at the point that she would like to buy a home she can't even move near me because it is too expensive she has to look out of state this is happening to so many people

From: judy.spector <judy.spector@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 4:33 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Proposed 386 apartments on Verdugo Way

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

I've been a resident of Camarillo for over 20 years and the traffic has gotten so bad. Adding all these apartments will be horrible to the area, will create more traffic on the streets, more traffic on the 101, and more congestion at our local stores, especially Vons. Crime will go up, there is already a problem at Trader Joe's and Sprouts that purses and wallets are being stolen as it is. My friend had her wallet stolen at Trader Joe's two weeks ago and made a police report. More people will put a strain on our police and fire dept. I object to these apartments.
Alice Beumkas
Vlg 34
Camarillo

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S10+, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone

From: Jeff Biggs <jeffandsandibiggs@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 4:14 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Camino Ruiz Apartment Community project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Mr. Moe,

I am writing in regards to the Camino Ruiz Apartment Community project. Please do not do this project. Traffic on the 101 in Camarillo is already horrible. This would only add to the problem. I had thought that our City was striving for slow growth, but it appears we are giving away any land we have as quickly as we can for development and increased congestion. When do we reach the point when the quality of life that attracts people to Camarillo becomes so diminished by traffic and congestion that Camarillo becomes "just another bedroom community with horrible traffic" and little feeling of community? I fear that we are rapidly approaching this point. Of course, the 101 problem should have been fixed long ago, but until it is fixed, I see little logic in building more huge units near the freeway without an adequate transit system. Sure, the developers do well in this. I am sure there are other winners, also. The current citizens of Camarillo lose once again as our quality of life continues to be diminished.

Respectfully,
Jeffrey Biggs
22 Deloz Drive
Camarillo, Ca 93012

From: Janet Chamberlain <janetc1952@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 13, 2019 7:18 AM
To: David Moe
Subject: Fwd:

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Janet Chamberlain <janetc1952@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Apr 12, 2019, 5:54 PM
Subject:
To: <dmoe@cityofcamarrillo.org>

Please... no more building.. we don't need any more people in camarillo. We have lost so much of our fertile land already to buildings. There is so much traffic on the 101 thru camarillo it is stopped everyday. From las posas to springville are new homes, condos, townhomes. The new Teso Robles townhomes are now selling off the 101 and Verdugo. The LAST thing Camarillo needs is more people and more building... there are already buildings sitting empty.... Camarillo USED to be quaint, still a small city feel, hardly any traffic after 8:00.... It doesn't feel like that anymore.... its on its way to be another LA. Sad news for Camarillo ??

From: brian conley <b-conley@live.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2019 4:16 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: New development Mission Oaks, disagree

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To whom it may concern,

I STRONGLY DISAGREED WITH THE NEW DEVELOPMENT FOR MISSION OAKS!!!!!!!

Sent from my iPhone

From: Dawn Witlin <dwitlin@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2019 7:55 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Camino Ruiz Apartment Community

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

As residents of a neighborhood very near to this project, we oppose the development of the Camino Ruiz apartments.

This project will increase traffic congestion, and there is no plan we know of to relieve it. There are upcoming meetings to address carpool lanes on the 101 Freeway. Until we know the outcome of these plans, the project will be a nuisance and a problem for the community.

Building and growth should come after accommodation for additional residents. Not before.

Thank you for your consideration,
Donelle Conley

From: Crofts, Debbie <DCrofts@lockton.com>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 1:43 PM
To: David Moe
Cc: Crofts, Debbie; 'Monte Crofts'
Subject: RE: Proposed Construction Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi David,

I received your notifications about the new proposed construction project in Camarillo a couple of weeks ago and have now had time to review.

I am not behind this project and don't see anything positive except that the city will obtain additional tax dollars. Since my family lives right across the street from the construction site, my issues are as follows:

1. Where is the additional infrastructure to take on so many people (this will be an apartment and numerous apartment complex)
 - a. you have not yet widened the streets, and the existing intersection is very dangerous and not to safety code with signs blocking view of oncoming traffic as well, and crosswalk and corner dimensions are wrong. When the businesses let their people off work (shifts) which are all hours of day and night till 2am in the morning, the noise of trucks and motorcycle is sooo loud, with major congestion to the point that it can sometimes take 5-10 minutes to get through the intersections nearby, including the freeway noise that it is unbearable in conjunction and ALREADY needs noise abatement. And this is as it is currently!!!! Noise levels need to be measured and abated with noise walls along existing section of frontage road of 101; the Springville development has this; why not here, as it is sorely need here as well. Add traffic of 300 families, hell no!
 - b. I don't see where the additional sewer or drains were ever put in place, note commercial construction doesn't contemplate personal usage.
 - c. What about the additional pollution?
 - d. The School system is already taxed enough ñ are you building more, hiring additional teachers, etc.
 - e. Property Values decreasing; potential safety and theft issues.
 - f. People already park their cars on the posted "no parking" and "private property" areas, semi rigs park at night, and brake shift at ALL hours. Non residents in and park and let their dogs roam, and race their cars like a race track. I've seen local police drive by and do nothing to enforce traffic laws in this area. Pedestrians on work breaks from commercial areas already jaywalk and roam, and park cars anywhere the seem to want. Please provide any feedback would be appreciated or you can call me, my contact information is below.
Thank you.

Debbie T. Crofts
AVP – Account Executive
Commercial & Entertainment Group
Lockton Insurance Brokers, LLC
16633 Ventura Blvd., Ste 1300
Encino CA 91436
License #0F15767
Tel: 818.836.5820 | Cell: 805.612.5507 | Fax: 818.721.5820
E-mail: Dcrofts@lockton.com

Disclaimer

This email together with any attachments is for the exclusive and confidential use of the addressee(s) and may contain legally privileged information. Any other distribution, use of, or reproduction without the sender's prior consent is unauthorized and strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender by e-mail immediately and delete the message from

your computer without making any copies. While attachments are virus checked, the recipient should check this e-mail and any attachments for the presence of viruses. We accept no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by the e-mail. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secured or error-free, as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses.

From: Linda Galtress <misspurser@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 7:41 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Construction in Camarillo

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

When we moved to Camarillo in 1979, there was a moratorium on building. We had one stop light on Santa Rosa Rd and neither Adolfo or Upland went through to Old Camarillo. What is happening to our tiny city? We are building everywhere you look. Having the additional traffic getting off at Santa Rosa will cause even worse traffic jams than we already have. Coming down the Conejo Grade in the evenings as well as the off ramp from the north, are already backed up onto the fwy. When will the building stop? It would be different if our children could afford to buy some of these homes but, our son had to move up to Chico to afford to buy. Please help stop the madness.
Thank you for listening,
Linda Galtress

Sent from my iPad

From: James Graf <grafjimruth@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 12:29 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Camino Ruiz Apartment Community Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To: David Moe, Assistant Director, Community Development
From: Jim and Ruth Graf, 5185 Mariposa Place, Camarillo, Ca. 93012; 805-482-9385
Re: Camino Ruiz Apartment Community Development

Our concern: TRAFFIC! 386 units with mostly 2 cars per unit puts another 700 cars onto already impacted surface streets in our area. This would be in addition to the amount of car traffic being generated by the high density Teso Robles development already built on Camino Ruiz. There is only ONE on-ramp and one off-ramp each direction that feeds this area at Santa Rosa Road and the 101, which is already inching through Camarillo every afternoon. Talk to the CHP and CalTrans about how traffic dangerously backs up onto the 101 at the southbound exit daily, and the number of accidents happening at the tight curve on that ramp.

So much for our iPleasant Valleyi!!

Sent from my iPad

From: Daniel Graham <nexus76@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2019 7:15 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Santa Rosa/Pleasant Valley Exit

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello there,
My name is Daniel Graham and I live in the Birchview Park area of Mission Oaks here in Camarillo. I want to go on record in protest of the city of Camarillo's consideration for the 386 apartment spaces behind the New York Bagel/Subway restaurants. During the Cavalia performances, it became readily apparent that our small town could not support such an influx of additional traffic without a significant impact to commuter traffic that is already at unacceptable levels, particularly when traveling the 101 northbound through the heart of Camarillo.

As a homeowner and subsequent taxpayer, I do not want to see Camarillo turn into the next Oxnard or LA. We have a quality of life here that I believe is worth protecting and I urge you to consider this and not allow additional low cost housing. I moved here 4 years ago from Oklahoma City, OK where we suffered from the results of cheaper housing being built by way of apartment construction and all of the resultant traffic, crime, and negative impact to local schools. Please don't ruin Camarillo and push your most productive folks away by succumbing to pressures to house apartment dwellers and the problems that they invite.

Kindest Regards,
Daniel Graham
5420 Cherry Ridge Dr.
Camarillo, CA 93012
(405) 822-9609 - mobile

From: Sheila Hendrickson <shehen45@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 13, 2019 6:28 AM
To: David Moe
Subject: Camarillo Ruiz Apartment Community

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am writing this letter to oppose this proposed planned apartment community. I am a resident in the neighborhood of Leisure Village.

We have the new condominium development finishing up that already has an impact on local traffic and shopping. Added housing of apartment buildings will be too much for this small area off of Pleasant Valley Road to handle.

Please keep our beautiful Camarillo what it has been. A safe place for families that has a home town atmosphere.

Thank you,

Sheila Hendrickson
5202 Village 5
Camarillo, CA 93012

Sent from my iPhone

From: Alyce Jones <rosie492@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 10:34 AM
To: David Moe
Subject: Camino Ruiz Apartment Community

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

April 19, 2019

Dear Mr. Moe,

My husband and I are requesting that the proposed apartment complex on the corner of Verdugo Way and Camino Ruiz not be approved for construction. Increasing the area will double, if not more, of people and cars from the 386 apartments proposed to be built would severely impact our community. The town houses across the street have not even been completed so we have not seen the full impact that increase in cars and population will cause, not to mention the impact of the 300 homes being built on Upland.

The infrastructure is not updated to handle this increase in population. There will be increase congestion on the 101 and Santa Rosa offramp. There is only one grocery store in the vicinity that is already crowded during peak days and hours. Adding another 800+ people and cars to that store may make it difficult to shop there on Saturday, Sundays and after work on weekdays. What will be the impact on the parking at the small strip mall where Wells Fargo is located on the corner of Santa Rosa and Adolpfo Rd. or the CVS shopping mall next to Leisure Village. Will there be a place to park during peak hours.

My husband and I watched this happen in the Magnolia Park area of Burbank in the late 1980s. Single family homes were torn down and large apartment complexes were built in their place. This absolutely impacted the area. We couldn't even shop at our local grocery store in the middle of the day. We couldn't even find a place to park, and this was a large strip mall where this store was located just like the Vons on Mission Oaks Blvd. The increase in street congestion also impacted the community. That area was not designed to handle the increase in cars and congestion that eventually occurred. Our area around the proposed apartment complex is also not designed to handle the increase in population.

Another point that is concerning us is what is to keep more homes from being built in the same location designated for commercial buildings? If one is approved more developers will surfaced to try to develop those areas into residential homes.

There are so many building projects in the City of Camarillo currently occurring that will eventually impact the congestion on roads and shopping areas, do we really need to increase that.

Thank you for providing us for an opportunity to express our concerns regarding this proposed project.

Sincerely,

Alyce and Eric Jones

Leisure Village

From: Jennifer Jones <jenjonesms@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 10:36 AM
To: David Moe
Subject: Camino Ruiz Apartment Community Project - OPPOSED

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Moe,

I recently was informed about the proposed, 386-unit, apartment complex being considered for the site located along Verdugo Way in Camarillo. Upon hearing of this proposal, I was shocked that this would be considered as our little city of Camarillo has barely had time to recover from the brand new (and LARGE) residential development that is near completion just adjacent to the proposed site of Camino Ruiz.

If you have ever driven down the Conejo Grade between 4:30 and 6pm on the weekdays, you know that it's highly congested. Adding 386 apartment units will add at least 400 more cars, clogging up the 101 and its Pleasant Valley on ramp and off ramp.

More cars also means more dangerous traffic around Camarillo high school which is less than a mile away. Nearly every day I witness the existing drivers in that area break crosswalk laws, turning into roads when a high schooler (or other pedestrian) is attempting to cross the street.

Walking should not be dangerous! Adding 400 more cars near a high school where teens are walking is just a bad idea. An accident is inevitable.

We have many other new developments in the area, including the one near the Camarillo YMCA and Village At the Park. We also have all the new homes being built along the 101 near the Springville exit.

With all of this "development," our open spaces are disappearing. Where will our kids go exploring? Where can we go to get away from the business and instead, look at trees and blue sky? Where will our insects go to pollinate when all the flowers and bushes are cut down? Where will our rodents hide when the shrubbery is mowed down? And in turn, how will our birds of prey find food when the rodents disappear?

It's not just people that are at risk when the open spaces disappear. Whole ecosystems suffer and numerous organisms die off when their habitats are replaced by more homes.

I grew up in the Mission Oaks area of Camarillo. My mother still lives here and now my husband and I are raising our two daughters here. I miss the small-town feel of Camarillo. I miss the safety of the city and I wish it were more bike and pedestrian-friendly.

We don't need another apartment complex here. Please reject this proposal. We don't need more cars on the road. Our high schoolers should be able to walk to school safely. We need more open space for our kids to play and for our wildlife to flourish. I ask you to consider these reasons and reject the Camino Ruiz Apartment Community Project.

Thank you for reading this. I appreciate your time. Please help protect our dear city of Camarillo.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Susan Jones

mixed media artist/arts writer
805-816-0054 cell
jenjonesms@gmail.com
www.jennifersusanjones.com
IG @jenjonesms

From: Simon Liversidge <simonliversidge@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 11:29 AM
To: David Moe
Subject: concerns over proposed apartments at Verdugo Way

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To Whom it may concern.

I am a resident of Camarillo - residing at 149 Cottage Grove Ave. Camarillo, with my family.
That is the same exit as the new proposed apartments.

Traffic is already crazy at that exit going both ways off the 101 freeway. in the morning,
coming

south on the 101 and exiting on Pleasant Valley, traffic is backed up onto the freeway!

i am very concerned about further development of high density apartments in that area as
there is already so much traffic, foot traffic and it seems continual petty crimes.

i just wanted to share.

Simon Liversidge

From: Suzi Lonsway <rickyandsuzi@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 11:03 AM
To: David Moe
Subject: Apts at Verdugo & Camino Ruiz

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

368 new units probably means close to 700 vehicles added to the traffic on Verdugo, Adolpho, and our Santa Rosa/Pleasant Valley freeway off-ramp. This is unacceptable for our community. Not to mention all the water that such a large development will use. We are always one rainy season away from a drought!

Just because they can build it, doesn't mean that they should.
Definite NO!!!

Lonsway Family

From: Laura Martyniuk <lauramartyniuk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 5:32 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Verdugo apartments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To whom it may concern,

I am concerned about the nearly 400 apartments proposed for Verdugo way and Camino Ruiz. My concern is that this area already has a lot of traffic, and therefore noise, and that this increase in housing will make these streets and freeway impossible to navigate. I am also concerned because the Conejo grade on the 101 is often times so congested and there are many accidents. The proposed increase in nearby residents will only increase the traffic and multiply the accidents.

Thank you for your time,
Laura Martyniuk

From: Mark Nuhfer <zipfly@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2019 4:02 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Planned development in mission oaks

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I strongly oppose the planned development of apartments in the Mission Oaks area off Santa Rosa Road and Verdugo way.

Those of us that live here have already seen an increase in traffic due to other developments in the area.

Crime will be the next to follow.

If you really care about the standard of living and property values in the area we do not need additional apartments.

Have you traveled the freeway lately. starting at about 2:30pm it starts to back up.

The sirens from accidents on neighboring intersections is almost a daily occurrence.

We cannot afford to add to the situation.

Sincerely

Mark Nuhfer
5350 Heather st.
Camarillo Ca 93012
805 509-1000
Zipfly805@gmail.com

From: Jerry Price <jwp6670@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2019 2:50 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Please Reject Proposal

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Moe:

We are contacting you to voice our concern about the proposal to develop property at the SE corner of Verdugo Way and Camarillo Ruiz with 17 buildings that will house 386 apartments. We Urge you, and the City Council, to Reject this proposal. Adding 600+ people in this location, and all of the additional traffic they will bring, will create far too much traffic for the roads and routes to absorb. Too much congestion will spoil the beauty and rural feel of the very special City of Camarillo, especially in this location. Santa Rosa is already a busy and highly used road connecting the 101 Freeway to the 23 Freeway to Simi Valley and the surrounding area.

Please REJECT this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jerry & Sharon Price
Camarillo, California

From: Joel Rosen <joelsrosen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 7:28 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Against building the Camino Ruiz in Mission Oaks

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am against the possibility of building the 386 units called CAMINO RUIZ . Mission Oaks would suffer tremendously from the onset of more traffic and congestion.

Lela Rosen
Camarillo Ca.

From: judy.spector <judy.spector@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 4:02 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: 300+ apartments on Verdugo Way

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

My name is Sandra Rosenthal and I have lived in Camarillo for over 18 years and have seen this beautiful city grow so fast and get so congested. I drive the surface streets and oppose the 386 apartments project on Verdugo Way. That area will be so dense and make the streets so crowded and grocery shopping difficult in Mission Oaks.
Thank you
Village 31
Camarillo 93012

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S10+, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone

From: judy.spector <judy.spector@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 4:09 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Apartment project proposed on Verdugo Way

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Mr Moe

I have lived in Camarillo for almost 19 years and have seen this city grow too fast and the traffic is so congested. Adding 386 apartments on Verdugo Way will add so much more traffic and congestion. It will be so crowded on Verdugo Way, trying to get on the freeway on Santa Rosa, shopping in Mission Oaks, esp Vons.

Charlene Spector
Village 20
Camarillo CA

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S10+, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable

From: judy.spector <judy.spector@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 4:24 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: 386 apartments project on Verdugo Way

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Mr Moe

I am concerned about the proposed 386 apartments because of the additional traffic it will create in the area. Also, if there is an emergency, for example, a toxic spill on the 101, there will be a serious problem when they all have to evacuate. When the 101 was closed due to the fire in Nov 2018, Camarillo Springs offramp was closed and the residents of Camarillo Springs all had to evacuate via Pancho and it took a slow long time. This project is too dense and will create havoc for our surface streets: Santa Rosa Rd, trying to get on the freeway, and the general area will suffer.

Mr J Spector
Vlg 34
Camarillo CA

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S10+, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone

From: Wrightwood Racing <wrightwoodracing@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 11:02 AM
To: David Moe; City Hall Internet EMAIL Group
Subject: Notice of Preparation & Scoping Meeting feedback

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello Mr. Moe, RE: New development across from Teso Robles
We recently bought 2 units at the new development at Teso Robles.
When we saw this new proposal of another very dense development
right across the street from Teso Robles- we were very upset & dismayed.

We are already very concerned with the inherent traffic issues at Teso Robles.
There is only one exit from these townhomes- on the east side of the property.
You can not exit to the north (Verdugo), to the west (strip mall) or to the south
(freeway). Of 4 possible directions to go, the planners only gave homeowners
one way out. The only exit for the entire development is on the east side. So,
this is already a dangerous situation in an emergency- that Camarillo "planning"
allowed- why would you then put an extremely dense development right across the
street & make it worse? It is already very difficult to turn onto Verdugo Way from
Camino Ruiz when it is busy.

Another issue: Parking. It is very limited & not sufficient in the Teso Robles develop-
ment for the number of units built. There is very little extra parking besides the 2
car private garages. Many families are finding housing so expensive that sharing with
more than 2 adults is not unusual for a household. We have also invested in the
new Springville community where parking has already become a problem- by design.
When is Camarillo going to plan for their homeowners' benefit instead of for the
developer's bottom line? Camarillo allows far too many units & does not ensure
enough space for their communities to live comfortably. They allow the developers
to pack in as many units as possible & Camarillo planning rubber stamps it.
Camarillo has done this for years- Case in point: we currently live at Golf Villas I at
Spanish Hills which was built 20 years ago. Even at that time, Camarillo used the same
poor judgement & did not provide sufficient parking for the development to grow &
age. It has become the biggest HOA battle we have- lack of sufficient parking for our
community.

Those are just two HUGE problems already occurring with these approved developments-
and now this new proposal for a development of 386 units. According to the Camarillo
plan, these will be built in the same fashion- with insufficient space, insufficient parking
& they will become an unhappy place to live because of it. That is exactly what has happened
at both Golf Villas I & II at Spanish Hills.

When will Camarillo planning & the City of Camarillo WAKE UP & stop being all about the
dollar signs?? When do they begin to consider the quality of life of those who will live in
these developments????

Thank you,
Rosemary Spira

Concerned Camarillo homeowner & investor in multiple Camarillo properties since 1994

From: Jason Urcan <jason@cpins.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 9:55 AM
To: David Moe
Subject: Verdugo Traffic

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello, I was surprised to see that you were thinking about adding even more building to area on Verdugo Street. Have you ever driven anywhere near that freeway onramp?? It's already crazy busy and causes a traffic jam every day. Not sure how you could add more people getting on/off it without making some drastic changes to the way traffic flows in our area. You're already considering adding more homes to Camarillo Springs Road (I know because my mother lives in the Miramonte Estates and is incredibly worried about more traffic).

Our Camarillo freeway onramps/offramps are a big reason that traffic backs up the grade every single day. I work off of Camarillo Springs Road and have to dodge cars using our offramp and Ridge View Street as a kind of secondary freeway ñ it really sucks.

Jason Urcan

Centerpointe Insurance is the exclusive insurance provider for INA Towing Network, don't forget to like us on Facebook!

Centerpointe Ins. Serv. Ltd.
807 B Camarillo Springs Road
Camarillo, CA 93012-9464
www.centerpointeinsurance.com
License # 0735759
800-451-8766 x118
805-384-1166 x118
805.384.8036 Fax
jasonu@cpins.com

This e-mail (including any attachments) is intended solely for the intended recipient. It may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any reliance on, use, disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail or attachments

is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by telephone (805) 384-1166 and delete the e-mail and all attachments immediately.

From: Kathy Wagner <sillykc@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 6:33 AM
To: David Moe
Subject: Camino Ruiz Apartment Community -Response

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good Morning David,

I received notice to make a comment since I own a house in a Fairfield II neighborhood.

The area of concern related to the traffic and the apartment project is where the traffic ends it day. I would like to see plenty of parking on the site and not on the streets. Relying on the City to maintain and clean after the vehicles should not land on the City. Parked cars on the street leave oil, trash, and catch debris. This clean up should fall on the apartment owner and management.

Thank you for letting me comment.

Kathy Wagner

Sent from my iPad

From: Trisha Wymer <t.wymer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 21, 2019 4:14 PM
To: David Moe
Subject: Planned development in Mission Oaks

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To whom it may concern:

I strongly oppose the new development on Mission Oaks, off Santa Rosa road and Verdugo Way.
This
will only increase traffic and cause more crime throughout the city.

Thank you,

Trisha Wymer
(805) 279-9875
5338 Heather Street
Camarillo, CA 93012

Sent from my iPhone