



## **NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND INTENT TO ADOPT A SUBSEQUENT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The County of Ventura Resource Management Agency (RMA) Planning Division, as the designated Lead Agency, has reviewed the following project:

1. **Entitlement:** Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Case No. PL21-0091
2. **Applicant:** Glenn Forster
3. **Location:** 8643 Shekell Road, Somis
4. **Assessor's Parcel No's.:** 500-0-090-235, 500-0-090-315, and 500-0-090-345
5. **Parcel Size:** 226.93-acre
6. **General Plan Designation:** Open Space
7. **Zoning Designation:** Open Space
8. **Responsible and/or Trustee Agencies:** Caltrans-District 7
9. **Project Description:** Conditional Use Permit to extend the life of the existing CUP for an additional 20-year time period, expand the current paintball and airsoft operations previously approved, and add a mud run event area.

Airsoft and Paintball Operations: Expand CUP boundary and parking facilities to increase maximum occupancy from 250 people per day to 450 people per day. Paintball/Airsoft events would not take place on days when mud run events would also be taking place. Hours of operation for Airsoft/Paintball operations would be Saturday and Sunday, 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

Mud Run Events: Proposed addition of a mud run event area. Mud run events would be limited to a maximum of 1000 people per day, which include staff and vendors. Participants for the mud run events would choose between 3 time slots per day. Each time slot would be limited to a maximum of 300 participants each day. Ten employees would staff mud run events. Two Emergency Medical Technicians (EMT's) would be on site to provide medical assistance if needed. Vendors, media, and spectators would be limited to 88 per day. Hours of operation for Mud Run events would be Saturday and Sunday, 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Mud Run events would be limited to a maximum of 3 per year for a total of 6 days per calendar year.

In accordance with Section 15070 of the California Code of Regulations, the RMA Planning Division determined that this proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, however mitigation measures are available that would reduce the

impacts to less than significant levels. As such, a Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and the applicant has agreed to implement the mitigation measures.

**List of Potentially Significant Environmental Impacts Identified:**

Section 27a(2), Transportation & Circulation-Roads and Highways-Safety and Design of Public Roads: The Initial Study finds that the proposed use of the site as a mud run event facility does have the potential to alter the level of safety of roadways and intersections near the project site. In order to reduce the impacts related to the safety and design of County roads to a less than significant level, mitigation measures requiring a Traffic Control Plan and Encroachment Permit(s) will be imposed on the project.

The public review period is from September 29, 2022 to October 28, 2022. The Initial Study/Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review on-line at [www.ventura.org/rma/planning](http://www.ventura.org/rma/planning) (select "CEQA Environmental Review") or at the County of Ventura, RMA, Planning Division, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, California from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday. The public is encouraged to submit written comments to Thomas Chaffee, no later than 5:00 p.m. on **October 28, 2022** to the address listed above. Alternatively, you may e-mail your comments to the case planner at [Thomas.Chaffee@ventura.org](mailto:Thomas.Chaffee@ventura.org).



---

**Mindy Fogg, Manager**  
Commercial and Industrial Permits Section

---

9/29/22  
**Date**



## **SUBSEQUENT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

### **A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

**Entitlement:** Conditional Use Permit No. PL21-0091

**Applicant:** Glenn Forster

**Location:** 8643 Shekell Road, Somis

**Assessor's Parcel Nos.:** 500-0-090-235, 500-0-090-315, and 500-0-090-345

**Parcel Size:** 226.93 acres

**General Plan Designation:** Open Space

**Zoning Designation:** Open Space

**Responsible and/or Trustee Agencies:** Caltrans-District 7

**Project Description:** Conditional Use Permit to extend the life of the existing CUP for an additional 20-year time period, expand the current paintball and airsoft operations previously approved, and add a mud run event area.

Airsoft and Paintball Operations: Expand CUP boundary and parking facilities to increase maximum occupancy from 250 people per day to 450 people per day. Paintball/Airsoft events would not take place on days when mud run events would also be taking place. Hours of operation for Airsoft/Paintball operations would be Saturday and Sunday, 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

Mud Run Events: Proposed addition of a mud run event area. Mud run events would be limited to a maximum of 1000 people per day, which include staff and vendors. Participants for the mud run events would choose between 3 time slots per day. Each time slot would be limited to a maximum of 300 participants each day. Ten employees would staff mud run events. Two Emergency Medical Technicians (EMT's) would be on site to provide medical assistance if needed. Vendors, media, and spectators would be limited to 88 per day. Hours of operation for Mud Run events would be Saturday and Sunday, 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Mud Run events would be limited to a maximum of 3 per year for a total of 6 days per calendar year.

**B. STATEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS:**

State law requires the Resource Management Agency, Planning Division, as the lead agency for the proposed project, to prepare an Initial Study (environmental analysis) to determine if the proposed project could significantly affect the environment. Based on the findings contained in the attached Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment; however, mitigation measures are available that would reduce the impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, a Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and the applicant has agreed to implement the mitigation measures.

**C. LISTING OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

**IDENTIFIED:** Transportation & Circulation-Roads and Highways-Safety and Design of Public Roads

**D. PUBLIC REVIEW:**

**Legal Notice Method:** Direct mailing to property owners within 300 feet of the property on which the proposed project is located, and a legal notice in the *Ventura County Star*.

**Document Posting Period:** September 29, 2022 through October 28, 2022

**Public Review:** The Initial Study/Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review online at <https://vcrma.org/divisions/planning> (select "CEQA Environmental Review") or at the County of Ventura, Resource Management Agency, Planning Division, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, California, from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday.

**Comments:** The public is encouraged to submit written comments regarding this Initial Study/Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration no later than 5:00 p.m. on the last day of the document posting period to Thomas Chaffee, the case planner, at the County of Ventura Resource Management Agency, Planning Division, 800 South Victoria Avenue L#1740, Ventura, CA 93009. You may also e-mail the case planner at [Thomas.Chaffee@ventura.org](mailto:Thomas.Chaffee@ventura.org).

**E. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION:**

Prior to approving the project, the decision-making body of the Lead Agency must consider this Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration and all comments received. That body may adopt the Subsequent Mitigated Negative Declaration if it finds that all the significant effects have been identified and that the proposed mitigation measures will reduce those effects to less than significant levels.

**Prepared by:**

*Thomas Chaffee*

---

Thomas Chaffee, Case Planner  
(805) 654-2406

**Reviewed for Release to the Public by:**

*MJ*

---

Mindy Fogg, Manager  
Commercial and Industrial Permits Section





# County of Ventura Planning Division

---

800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009-1740 • (805) 654-2488 • <http://www.ventura.org/rma/planning>

## Initial Study for Ambush Paintball Facility

### Section A – Project Description

1. **Project Case Number:** PL21-0091
2. **Name of Applicant:** Glenn Forster
3. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number(s):** 8643 Shekell Road  
APN's: 500-0-090-345, 500-0-090-235, and 500-0-090-315.
4. **General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning Designation of the Project Site:**
  - a. **General Plan Land Use Designation:** Open Space
  - b. **Zoning Designation:** OS-20 ac and OS-10 ac
5. **Description of the Environmental Setting:** The proposed project would be operated throughout the 226.93-acre property owned by a private individual. Agricultural land uses exist to the south and east of the subject site and mining operations to the north. Grimes Canyon Road lies along the eastern boundary of the site and Shekell Road to the south. The project site was previously developed with a commercial egg processing facility. It is currently requested that a modified Conditional Use Permit (CUP) be granted to authorize the continued operation and expansion of an outdoor paintball facility, and the addition of periodic mud run events on site.
6. **Project Description:** Conditional Use Permit to extend the life of the existing CUP for an additional 20-year time period, expand the current paintball and airsoft operations previously approved, and add a mud run event area.

Airsoft and Paintball Operations: Expand CUP boundary and parking facilities to increase maximum occupancy from 250 people per day to 450 people per day. Paintball/Airsoft events would not take place on days when mud run events would also be taking place. Hours of operation for Airsoft/Paintball operations would be Saturday and Sunday, 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

Mud Run Events: Proposed addition of a mud run event area. Mud run events would be limited to a maximum of 1000 people per day, which include staff and vendors. Participants for the mud run events would choose between 3 time slots per day. Each time slot would be limited to a maximum of 300 participants each day. Ten employees would staff the mud run events. Two Emergency Medical

Technicians (EMT's) would be on site to provide medical assistance if needed. Vendors, media, and spectators would be limited to 88 people per day. Hours of operation for Mud Run events would be Saturday and Sunday, 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Mud Run weekends would be limited to a maximum of three (3) per year for a total of six days per calendar year.

Access to the property would continue to be provided through the main gate located at 8643 Shekell Road.

**7. List of Responsible and Trustee Agencies:** None

**8. Methodology for Evaluating Cumulative Impacts:** County staff utilized a combination of the “list approach” methodology and “plan approach” methodology in evaluating the combination of the project’s impacts with related impacts from other projects to determine whether such impacts are cumulatively considerable. In utilizing the list approach, staff prepared the following list of pending and recently approved Ventura County Planning-Division projects that are located within a three-mile radius of the proposed project and that may have similar effects as those of the proposed project:

Permit No.	Description	Distance from Project	Status
PL21-0062	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 3.5 miles	Approved
PL20-0077	New LCA contract application	Approx. 3 miles	Pending
PL22-0121	Rescind and Re-entry for LCA contract	Approx. 5 miles	Pending
PL21-0084	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 1 mile	Pending
PL21-0081	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 1 mile	Pending
PL22-0092	10-year LCA contract	Approx. .5 mile	Pending
PL22-0091	10-year LCA contract	Approx. .5 mile	Pending
PL21-0074	20-year FCZA/LCA contract	Approx. 3 miles	Pending
PL21-0106	Permit Adjustment to switch out a non-stealth wireless facility to a stealth faux pine wireless facility.	Approx. 4.5 miles	Approved
PL21-0112	Requested Minor Modification to add an industrial sand processing facility to an existing CUP.	Approx. 2 miles	Pending
PL13-0116	Requested modification to existing sand and gravel mine to expand CUP boundaries and extend the life of the permit.	Approx. .5 mile	Pending
PL22-0107	Rescind and Re-entry for LCA contract	Approx. 1 mile	Pending
SD09-0025	Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 5837 to subdivide a 580-acre property into 24	Approx. 4.5 miles	Pending

Permit No.	Description	Distance from Project	Status
	residential lots.		
PL21-0083	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 1 mile	Pending
PL21-0072	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 3 miles	Pending
PL21-0065	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 2 miles	Pending
PL22-0036	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 3.5 miles	Pending
PL22-0005	Permit Adjustment to existing CUP to add satellite tracking dishes to existing facility.	Approx. 4.5 miles	Pending
PL22-0100	Rescind and Re-entry for LCA contract	Approx. 5 miles	Pending
PL22-0102	Rescind and Re-entry for LCA contract	Approx. 5 miles	Pending
PL22-0103	Rescind and Re-entry for LCA contract	Approx. 5 miles	Pending
PL22-0104	Rescind and Re-entry for LCA contract	Approx. 5 miles	Pending
PL22-0101	Rescind and Re-entry for LCA contract	Approx. 5 miles	Pending
PL22-0106	Rescind and Re-entry for LCA contract	Approx. 4 miles	Pending
PL21-0077	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 3.5 miles	Approved
PL22-0117	Rescind and Re-entry for LCA contract	Approx. 3.5 miles	Pending
PL21-0066	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 3 miles	Pending
PL19-0091	Ministerial lot line adjustment	Approx. .5 mile	Pending
PL21-0063	Conditional Use Permit to replace an expired CUP for an existing wireless facility.	Approx. 4.5 miles	Pending
PL20-0074	20-year FCZA/LCA contract	Approx. 4 miles	Pending
PL21-0064	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 4.5 miles	Pending
PL21-0049	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 5 miles	Approved
PL22-0074	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 1 mile	Pending
PL21-0033	Minor modification to an existing CUP for the continued operation of an existing dog kennel.	Approx. .5 mile	Pending
PL20-0067	Rescind and Re-entry for LCA contract	Approx. 1 mile	Pending
PL21-0082	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 1.5 miles	Pending
PL21-0110	Conditional Use Permit in reinstitute a farmworker dwelling unit.	Approx. 2 miles	Pending
PL21-0070	10-year LCA contract	Approx. 4 miles	Pending

For applicable environmental issues in Section B (below), Planning staff evaluated the combined effects of the proposed project and of the projects identified in Table 1 (above).

The plan approach relies on the Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Ventura County 2040 General Plan, which was certified in September of 2020. As described throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would be consistent with the County's General Plan. As such, the proposed development has already been reviewed for potential cumulative impacts at a programmatic level. The General Plan Update EIR is hereby incorporated by reference and can be reviewed using this link:

<https://vcrma.org/docs/images/pdf/planning/plans/VCGPU-FEIR.pdf>.

## Section B – Initial Study Checklist and Discussion of Responses<sup>1</sup>

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>RESOURCES:</b>								
<b>1. Air Quality (VCAPCD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Exceed any of the thresholds set forth in the air quality assessment guidelines as adopted and periodically updated by the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD), or be inconsistent with the Air Quality Management Plan?		X						
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 1 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X						

### Impact Discussion:

**1a.** Regional air quality impacts include estimating ozone precursor emissions in the ambient air generated from a specific project, as Ventura County remains in a non-attainment status for the State 1-hr and 8-hr ambient air quality standards for ozone and the Federal 8-hr ambient air quality standard for ozone. Reactive organic compounds (ROC) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) are called ozone precursors because they create ground-level ozone when reacted with sunlight; ground-level ozone is commonly known as smog. The major sources of NO<sub>x</sub> in Ventura County are motor vehicles and other combustion processes. The major sources of ROC in Ventura County are cleaning and coating operations, petroleum production, and solvent evaporation. Long-term exposure of ground-level ozone can cause shortness of breath, nasal congestion, coughing, eye irritation, sore throat, headache, chest discomfort, breathing pain, throat dryness, wheezing, fatigue, and nausea.

Based on information provided by the applicant, regional air quality impacts would be less than significant and below the 25 pounds per day (lbs./day) significance threshold for reactive organic compounds (ROC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) for the Moorpark Non-Growth Area. Determination was based on information provided by the applicant of proposed operations. Air emissions were estimated based on the ATE Revised Traffic

<sup>1</sup> The threshold criteria in this Initial Study are derived from the *Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines* (April 26, 2011). For additional information on the threshold criteria (e.g., definitions of issues and technical terms, and the methodology for analyzing each impact), please see the *Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines*.

Study's Table 1, by subtracting the existing daily max trips from the proposed daily max trips (worst case scenario includes the proposed weekend-only Mud Run Events). There are no proposed construction operations that would emit quantifiable air pollutants (no grading, no demolition, no building construction, no painting buildings) and no proposed energy (natural gas, electricity) or area (landscaping, solvent use, painting buildings for maintenance). The CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0 air emissions model was used using a recreational land use which included increase in daily max trips (1493-271=1222). Estimated ozone precursor emissions are at 2.6 and 2.0 lbs./day of ROG and NOx, respectively. A copy of the air emissions report is attached to this memo via email.

**1b.** Local air quality impacts for the review of discretionary projects may involve a qualitative analysis for project-generated emissions of dust, odors, carbon monoxide, and toxics, if applicable, that can affect the health and safety of any nearby sensitive receptors. Sensitive receptors are considered the young, the elderly, and those susceptible to respiratory diseases such as asthma and bronchitis. Sensitive receptors can be found in schools, playgrounds, hospitals, and elderly care facilities. Residential areas can also be considered sensitive receptors, as some residents may reside in their homes for long periods of time. Based on information provided by the applicant, the subject project will generate less than significant local air quality impacts. A brief discussion follows.

#### CARBON MONOXIDE (CO)

Some localized areas, such as traffic-congested intersections, can have elevated levels of CO concentrations (CO hotspots). CO hotspots are defined as locations where ambient CO concentrations exceed the State Ambient Air Quality Standards (20 ppm for 1-hr standard, 9 ppm for 8-hr standard). The Federal Ambient Air Quality Standard for CO is 35 ppm for 1-hr standard and 9 ppm for the 8-hr standard. In Ventura County, ambient air monitoring for CO stopped in 2004, with the approval of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency- Region 9, because CO background concentrations in El Rio, Simi Valley, and Ojai were much lower than the State Ambient Air Quality Standard (highest recorded CO background concentration in Ventura County was in Simi Valley at 6.2 ppm for 1-hr, 1.6 ppm for 8-hr (*Air Quality Assessment Guidelines, Table 6-2*). Therefore, no CO hotspots are expected to occur in the Moorpark Non-Growth Area where the proposed project is located, and additional CO modeling analysis is not warranted. In addition, with over 80% of the CO in urban areas emitted by motor vehicles, and with stricter, cleaner emission standards to the mobile fleet, CO ambient concentrations should remain at or lower than the most recent CO monitoring data available for Ventura County.

#### AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN CONSISTENCY

The proposed project must be consistent with the AQMP if estimated operational emissions exceed 2 lbs./day or greater for ROG or NOx, as described in the AQAG, *Section 4.2*. The proposed project's operational emissions exceed 2 lbs./day for both ozone precursor pollutants. The project is not expected to contribute to the Moorpark Non-Growth Area population forecasts because there is no proposed increase in the



number of employees. Furthermore, the operation is recreational in nature and it is not expected that any participants will relocate to the Moorpark Non-Growth Area due to this project expansion being approved. Therefore, the project would not conflict or obstruct with implementation of the most recent AQMP adopted (Initial Study Item Checklist C. Air Quality, Item 1) and would have a less than significant impact.

#### ODORS

The project is not expected to generate odorous emissions in such quantities as to be a nuisance to nearby land uses, as defined by APCD Rule 51, Nuisance and the California Health and Safety Code Section 41705. The facility is for paintball and proposed mud run recreational activities. In addition, the facility is not in an urbanized location, is surrounded by agricultural land on each side, and there are very few sensitive receptors (presumed to be ranch homes), less than six, within a one-mile screening distance. Odor impacts are expected to be less than significant. A standard condition of approval will be included in the CUP for compliance with APCD Rule 51, *Nuisance*, which is complaint-driven for the discharge of air contaminants.

#### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>2A. Water Resources – Groundwater Quantity (WPD)</b>								
Will the proposed project:								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
1) Directly or indirectly decrease, either individually or cumulatively, the net quantity of groundwater in a groundwater basin that is overdrafted or create an overdrafted groundwater basin?		X				X		
2) In groundwater basins that are not overdrafted, or are not in hydrologic continuity with an overdrafted basin, result in net groundwater extraction that will individually or cumulatively cause overdrafted basin(s)?		X				X		
3) In areas where the groundwater basin and/or hydrologic unit condition is not well known or documented and there is evidence of overdraft based upon declining water levels in a well or wells, propose any net increase in groundwater extraction from that groundwater basin and/or hydrologic unit?		X				X		
4) Regardless of items 1-3 above, result in 1.0 acre-feet, or less, of net annual increase in groundwater extraction?		X				X		
5) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 2A of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

2A-1. The Project overlies the East Las Posas Management Area (ELPMA) of the Las Posas Valley Basin, a high priority groundwater basin designated by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) as Basin No. 4-008. The proposed project is located within the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA) boundaries. In addition to being the Groundwater Management Agency, FCGMA is the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) for the basins under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). FCGMA's basin management includes regulation of wells and establishment of groundwater extraction allocations for well owners and operators within its boundary.

The applicant reported that water will be provided by Ventura County Waterworks District 1 (VCWWD-1). Per the *2020 Urban Water Management Plan for Ventura County Waterworks District 1* (2020 UWMP) VCWWD-1 distributes potable water as a blend of imported SWP water supplied CMWD from the Metropolitan Water District

(MWD) and groundwater from VCWWD-1 wells in the East Las Posas Management Area (ELPMA). Imported water constitutes 80% of the total supply with groundwater and recycled water comprising the remaining 20% (UWMP 2020). The applicant reported that the proposed mud run events would consume an estimated additional 0.110 acre-feet per year (AFY) (6,000 gallons per event, for six events). The site operations currently use 0.055 AFY and the total site water use is anticipated to be 0.166 AFY. No additional impervious surfaces have been proposed.

An active industrial well, State Well Number (SWN) 03N19W19P02S is located on APN 500-0-090-315. The applicant reported that the well is operated by Grimes Rock, Inc. and supplied dust control water to the site which is reportedly now sourced from VCWWD-1. A destroyed industrial well (SWN 03N19W19K01S) is located in the center of the same parcel. Two destroyed agricultural wells identified as SWNs 03N19W19N03S and -N01S are located in the southwestern corner of the same parcel outside. A domestic well (SWN 03N19W19N02S) that is located on APN 500-0-090-315 is listed with County records as "Cannot Locate" status. Per County Ordinance 4468, a well search will need to be performed by a registered well inspector to verify the existence of the well. If the well is located, it will need to be brought to "active" status or destroyed.

The proposed project will not directly or indirectly decrease, either individually or cumulatively, the net quantity of groundwater in an overdrafted groundwater basin because it is not located in an overdrafted basin and a minimal additional amount of water use has been proposed. Additionally extracted groundwater and allocations are regulated by the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency.

2A-2. The Project overlies the East Las Posas Management Area (ELPMA) of the Las Posas Valley Basin, a high priority groundwater basin designated by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) as Basin No. 4-008. The proposed project is located within the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA) boundaries. In addition to being the Groundwater Management Agency, FCGMA is the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) for the basins under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). FCGMA's basin management includes regulation of wells and establishment of groundwater extraction allocations for well owners and operators within its boundary.

The applicant reported that water would be provided by Ventura County Waterworks District 1 (VCWWD-1). Per the *2020 Urban Water Management Plan for Ventura County Waterworks District 1* (2020 UWMP) VCWWD-1 distributes potable water as a blend of imported SWP water supplied CMWD from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) and groundwater from VCWWD-1 wells in the East Las Posas Management Area (ELPMA). Imported water constitutes 80% of the total supply with groundwater and recycled water comprising the remaining 20% (UWMP 2020). The applicant reported that the proposed mud run events will consume an estimated additional 0.110 acre-feet per year (AFY) (6,000 gallons per event, for six events). The site operations currently use 0.055 AFY and the total site water use is anticipated to be 0.166 AFY. No additional impervious surfaces have been proposed.

An active industrial well, State Well Number (SWN) 03N19W19P02S is located on APN 500-0-090-315 outside of the current and proposed CUP boundaries. The applicant reported that the well is operated by Grimes Rock, Inc. and supplied dust control water to the site which is reportedly now sourced from VCWWD-1. A destroyed industrial well (SWN 03N19W19K01S) is located in the center of the same parcel. Two destroyed agricultural wells identified as SWNs 03N19W19N03S and -N01S are located in the southwestern corner of the same parcel outside of the current and proposed CUP boundaries. A domestic well (SWN 03N19W19N02S) outside of the current and proposed CUP boundaries is listed with County records as “Cannot Locate” status.

The proposed project will not result in net groundwater extraction that will individually or cumulatively cause an overdrafted basin because a minimal additional amount of water use has been proposed. Additionally extracted groundwater and allocations are regulated by the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency.

2A-3. The question is not applicable, because the proposed project overlies a well-documented groundwater basin.

2A-4. The Project overlies the East Las Posas Management Area (ELPMA) of the Las Posas Valley Basin, a high priority groundwater basin designated by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) as Basin No. 4-008. The proposed project is located within the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA) boundaries. In addition to being the Groundwater Management Agency, FCGMA is the Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) for the basins under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). FCGMA's basin management includes regulation of wells and establishment of groundwater extraction allocations for well owners and operators within its boundary. The applicant reported that water would be provided by Ventura County Waterworks District 1 (VCWWD-1). Per the *2020 Urban Water Management Plan for Ventura County Waterworks District 1* (2020 UWMP) VCWWD-1 distributes potable water as a blend of imported SWP water supplied CMWD from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) and groundwater from VCWWD-1 wells in the East Las Posas Management Area (ELPMA). Imported water constitutes 80% of the total supply with groundwater and recycled water comprising the remaining 20% (UWMP 2020). The applicant reported that the proposed mud run events would consume an estimated additional 0.110 acre-feet per year (AFY) (6,000 gallons per event, for six events). The site operations currently use 0.055 AFY and the total site water use is anticipated to be 0.166 AFY. No additional impervious surfaces have been proposed.

2A-5. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 2A of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines and is considered less than significant impact to groundwater quantity.

### **Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>2B. Water Resources - Groundwater Quality (WPD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Individually or cumulatively degrade the quality of groundwater and cause groundwater to exceed groundwater quality objectives set by the Basin Plan?		X				X		
2) Cause the quality of groundwater to fail to meet the groundwater quality objectives set by the Basin Plan?		X				X		
3) Propose the use of groundwater in any capacity and be located within two miles of the boundary of a former or current test site for rocket engines?		X				X		
4) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 2B of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

2B-1. Sanitary sewage for the Site facilities is reportedly handled via portable restrooms that are serviced periodically.

The applicant provided a Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) for the paintballs (marking capsules) used at the site. The paintballs consist mainly of polyethylene glycol and gelatin and are not considered hazardous per 29 CFR 1910.1200 and have a NFPA Health Hazard Rating of 0.

The proposed project would not individually or cumulatively degrade the quality of groundwater and cause groundwater to exceed groundwater quality objectives set by the Basin Plan.

2B-2. The proposed project would not cause the quality of groundwater to fail to meet the groundwater quality objectives set by the Basin Plan if appropriate containment mitigations for petroleum, chemical and hazardous materials storage are implemented.

2B-3. The project is not located within two miles of the boundary of a former or current test site for rocket engines.

2B-4. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 2B of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines and is considered less than significant.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>2C. Water Resources - Surface Water Quantity (WPD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Increase surface water consumptive use (demand), either individually or cumulatively, in a fully appropriated stream reach as designated by SWRCB or where unappropriated surface water is unavailable?		X				X		
2) Increase surface water consumptive use (demand) including but not limited to diversion or dewatering downstream reaches, either individually or cumulatively, resulting in an adverse impact to one or more of the beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan?		X				X		
3) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 2C of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

2C-1 and 2C-2. The Shekell Road Drain Tributary flows through the proposed mud run area. Surface water is not proposed to be used for this project.

2C-3. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 2C of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines and is considered less than significant to surface water quantity.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.



Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>2D. Water Resources - Surface Water Quality (WPD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Individually or cumulatively degrade the quality of surface water causing it to exceed water quality objectives as contained in Chapter 3 of the three Basin Plans?		X				X		
2) Directly or indirectly cause storm water quality to exceed water quality objectives or standards in the applicable MS4 Permit or any other NPDES Permits?		X				X		
3) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 2D of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

2D-1 and 2D-2. The Ventura County Watershed Protection district reviewed the proposed project and deemed impacts surface water quality as less than significant. The proposed project is not expected to result in a violation of any surface water quality standards as defined in the Los Angeles Basin Plan. In accordance with the Ventura Countywide Municipal Stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit CAS004002, "Development Construction Program" Subpart 4.F and the California NPDES General Construction Stormwater Permit (No. CAS000002), the applicant will be required to include Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to ensure compliance and implementation of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control measures to protect surface water quality during construction. The Ventura County Stormwater Quality Management Ordinance (Ordinance No. 4142) includes standard requirements prohibiting the deposition of any litter into any watercourse during ongoing operations of the proposed use. Therefore, neither the individual project nor the cumulative threshold for significance is being exceeded and the project is expected to have less than significant impact on surface water quality.

2D-3. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 2D of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>3A. Mineral Resources – Aggregate (Plng.)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Be located on or immediately adjacent to land zoned Mineral Resource Protection (MRP) overlay zone, or adjacent to a principal access road for a site that is the subject of an existing aggregate Conditional Use Permit (CUP), and have the potential to hamper or preclude extraction of or access to the aggregate resources?		X				X		
2) Have a cumulative impact on aggregate resources if, when considered with other pending and recently approved projects in the area, the project hampers or precludes extraction or access to identified resources?						X		
3) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 3A of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

3A-1 and -2. The project site is located immediately adjacent to an MRP Overlay Zone. The proposed project would not create any permanent structures and does not have the potential to hamper or preclude extraction of or access to aggregate resources. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on the extraction of or access to mineral resources.

3A-3. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 3A of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**	Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>3B. Mineral Resources – Petroleum (Plng.)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Be located on or immediately adjacent to any known petroleum resource area, or adjacent to a principal access road for a site that is the subject of an existing petroleum CUP, and have the potential to hamper or preclude access to petroleum resources?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 3B of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

3B-1. The proposed project is not located within or immediately adjacent to any known petroleum resource area, or adjacent to a principal access road for a site that is the subject of an existing petroleum CUP. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to hamper or preclude access to petroleum resources and would not impact these resources and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to petroleum resources.

3B-2. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable 2040 General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 3B of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>4. Biological Resources</b>								
<b>4A. Species</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project, directly or</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
1) Impact one or more plant species by reducing the species' population, reducing the species' habitat, fragmenting its habitat, or restricting its reproductive capacity?		X				X		
2) Impact one or more animal species by reducing the species' population, reducing the species' habitat, fragmenting its habitat, or restricting its reproductive capacity?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

4A-1. The project site is heavily altered from natural conditions due to the previous authorized use as a commercial egg production facility. The open flat areas are generally denuded of vegetation or dominated by non-native annual species. Therefore, the site does not support natural vegetation and there is limited to no potential to support protected biological resources on site.

4A-2. The existing non-native and/or ornamental trees and shrubs may provide a limited potential for nesting birds. The Planning Division would impose the standard Avoidance of Nesting Birds condition to protect any nesting birds that could be impacted during the development phase of the project. Therefore, impacts to animal species are considered to be less than significant.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>4B. Ecological Communities - Sensitive Plant Communities</b>								
Will the proposed project:								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
1) Temporarily or permanently remove sensitive plant communities through construction, grading, clearing, or other activities?		X				X		
2) Result in indirect impacts from project operation at levels that will degrade the health of a sensitive plant community?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

4B-1 and 4B-2. The parcel is heavily altered from natural conditions due to previous authorized use as a commercial egg production facility. Therefore, the parcel does not support natural vegetation and there is limited to no potential to support protected biological resources on site.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>4C. Ecological Communities - Waters and Wetlands</b>								
Will the proposed project:								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
1) Cause any of the following activities within waters or wetlands: removal of vegetation; grading; obstruction or diversion of water flow; change in velocity, siltation, volume of flow, or runoff rate; placement of fill; placement of structures; construction of a road crossing; placement of culverts or other underground piping; or any disturbance of the substratum?		X				X		
2) Result in disruptions to wetland or riparian plant communities that will isolate or substantially interrupt contiguous habitats, block seed dispersal routes, or increase vulnerability of wetland species to exotic weed invasion or local extirpation?		X				X		
3) Interfere with ongoing maintenance of hydrological conditions in a water or wetland?		X				X		
4) Provide an adequate buffer for protecting the functions and values of existing waters or wetlands?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

4C-1 through -4. The proposed project does not include construction, grading or permanent development. The siting of all equipment and temporary portable structures will occur onsite. As stated in Section 2D (above) the project will be subject to conditions of approval related to compliance with the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Composting Operations and NPDES Permit to ensure that the paintball/airsoft and mud run event operations do not contribute to impairments of the Ventura River watershed. As described in Section 31b (below) the existing and proposed drainage conditions will be similar and runoff will be returned to natural sheet flow conditions. No other waters or wetlands occur on or near the subject property; therefore, no direct, indirect, or cumulatively considerable impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.



Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>4D. Ecological Communities - ESHA (Applies to Coastal Zone Only)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Temporarily or permanently remove ESHA or disturb ESHA buffers through construction, grading, clearing, or other activities and uses (ESHA buffers are within 100 feet of the boundary of ESHA as defined in Section 8172-1 of the Coastal Zoning Ordinance)?	X				X			
2) Result in indirect impacts from project operation at levels that will degrade the health of an ESHA?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

4D-1. and 4D-2. The project is not located within the coastal zone. Therefore, no impacts on ESHA would result from project implementation.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impacts identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>4E. Habitat Connectivity</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
1) Remove habitat within a wildlife movement corridor?		X				X		
2) Isolate habitat?		X				X		
3) Construct or create barriers that impede fish and/or wildlife movement, migration or long term connectivity or interfere with wildlife access to foraging habitat, breeding habitat, water sources, or other areas necessary for their reproduction?		X				X		
4) Intimidate fish or wildlife via the introduction of noise, light, development or increased human presence?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

4E-1 through 4E-4. The project site is heavily altered from natural conditions due to previous authorized uses of a commercial egg production facility site. The existing site is dominated by non-native plant species in groundcover. The open flat areas are primarily denuded of vegetation or dominated by non-native annual species. There is no proposed grading or construction associated with the project that would result in the removal or isolation of habitat. No new fencing is included in the proposed project and any future fencing would have to be designed according to Sections 8109-4.8.3.6(c)(2) and 8109-4.8.3.7(a) (Wildlife Fencing) of the Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance (NCZO). Adherence to these regulations ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
4F. Will the proposed project be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 4 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

4F. The proposed project site is heavily altered from natural conditions, due to its previous use of a commercial egg processing facility. The site does not support natural vegetation and in turn, there is limited to no potential to support protected biological resources on site. No mapped wetlands, critical habitat areas, or wildlife movement corridors occur within the proposed project site.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>5A. Agricultural Resources – Soils (Plng.)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Result in the direct and/or indirect loss of soils designated Prime, Statewide Importance, Unique or Local Importance, beyond the threshold amounts set forth in Section 5a.C of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			
2) Involve a General Plan amendment that will result in the loss of agricultural soils?	X				X			
3) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 5A of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

5A-1. According to the Important Farmland Inventory Map, the project site does not include soil designated as prime, unique, or of statewide importance. Therefore, as the proposed project would not result in the removal or covering of these important soil classifications, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to agricultural soils.

5A-2. The proposed project does not include a General Plan amendment that would result in the loss of designated agricultural soils. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant impact.

5A-3 The proposed project is consistent with the applicable *Ventura County General Plan Goals and Policies* for Item 5a of the *Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines*.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>5B. Agricultural Resources - Land Use Incompatibility (AG.)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) If not defined as Agriculture or Agricultural Operations in the zoning ordinances, be closer than the threshold distances set forth in Section 5b.C of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 5b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

5B-1. The evaluation pertains to the introduction of incompatible land uses in proximity of off-site agricultural lands and off-site crop production. The threshold of significance is a distance (setback) of 300 feet between new non-agricultural structures or use areas and offsite areas that are used or classified as Important Farmland on the Ventura County Important Farmland Inventory Map (2008).

There are a variety of Important Farmland soils located adjacent to the project site. Prime, statewide and unique soils are located east, west and south of the parcel boundary. Crops are under production on lands immediately east, southwest and southeast of the parcel boundary.

The proposed project involves the operation of a recreational paintball facility and mud run event center. The subject property would be segregated into a series of playfields used for various contests. Some of the paintball activities would occur less than 300 feet from the adjacent agricultural lands. Thus, at first look, impacts on agricultural resources would potentially result from the operation of this facility. However, the Initial Study Guidelines for topic 5.b provide a list of criteria for a waiver or deviation from the 300 foot setback threshold. Criterion "H" and is applicable here:

h. Individuals are not continuously present in the proposed structures or use areas

Although the proposed project is non-agricultural, individuals will not be continuously present in the playfield areas that are within 300 feet of the common boundary lines shared with off-site Important Farmlands. Approximately half of the playfield areas are located less than 300 feet from off site adjacent agriculture. Additionally, the facility would operate on a limited schedule with a maximum of 116 days per year. Eighty percent (80%) of the proposed event days are planned through private group reservation i.e. birthday parties, church groups, corporate team building. To assure that potential conflicts are minimized, the following condition will be imposed on the project:

**Purpose:** In order to minimize potential conflicts between a non-agricultural event use and adjacent agricultural operations, the Permittee shall provide notification of all temporary events.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall notify the owner(s) of each agriculturally-zoned property located within 300 feet of the project parcel of all temporary events to be held at the proposed facility.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall provide a written schedule of planned temporary events to the owners of all adjacent agriculturally-zoned land. This schedule shall specify the date, time, type and attendance of each event. The Permittee shall maintain a record of all events held at the facility to be made available to the County Planning Division upon request.

**Timing:** The required schedule shall be regularly updated such that notice is provided a minimum of 30 days prior to each event.

**Monitoring:** In accordance with the Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Division will periodically review the operation of the permitted facility for compliance with the terms and conditions of the conditional use permit. The Planning Division has the authority to initiate enforcement actions if a lack of compliance is identified through public complaints or discovered during required periodic review.

In addition, the applicant will be subject to a condition of approval that will require all paintball related activities, facility employees and customers to be setback 50 feet from the western property line.

Given the temporary nature of the events and implementation of the conditions of approval noted above, project-specific and cumulative impacts to agricultural land use incompatibility would be less than significant.

5B-2. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable *Ventura County General Plan* Goals and Policies for Item 5B of the *Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines*.

## Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>6. Scenic Resources (PInG.)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Be located within an area that has a scenic resource that is visible from a public viewing location, and physically alter the scenic resource either individually or cumulatively when combined with recently approved, current, and reasonably foreseeable future projects?		X				X		
b) Be located within an area that has a scenic resource that is visible from a public viewing location, and substantially obstruct, degrade, or obscure the scenic vista, either individually or cumulatively when combined with recently approved, current, and reasonably foreseeable future projects?		X				X		
c) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 6 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

## Impact Discussion:

6a and 6b. The proposed project is not located in a Scenic Resource Protection overlay zone. No scenic resources exist onsite and the subject site is not considered a scenic vista or within a scenic vista or viewshed. The project site is not visible from Grimes Canyon Road. Also, there are no residences within 1,000 feet of the view shed of playfield areas. Some of the temporary structures (air filled bunkers, hay bales, wooden spools, wooden walls, dirt mounds, sandbag walls, building facades) located in playfield areas nos. 1 to 4 would be visible from Shekell Road. However, this impact would be less than significant, as the temporary structures would be less than eight feet in height and painted dark or earth tone colors. The three proposed sea cargo containers and parking areas would be visible from Shekell Road. To ensure that visual impacts are less than significant, the project will be conditioned to require that the sea cargo containers be painted a light tan color so as to blend with the surrounding landscape. Therefore, based on the design and location of the proposed project, project-specific and cumulative impacts related to visual resources would be less than significant.



6c. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable *Ventura County General Plan Goals and Policies* for Item 6 of the *Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines*.

### **Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>7. Paleontological Resources</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) For the area of the property that is disturbed by or during the construction of the proposed project, result in a direct or indirect impact to areas of paleontological significance?		X				X		
b) Contribute to the progressive loss of exposed rock in Ventura County that can be studied and prospected for fossil remains?		X				X		
c) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 7 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### **Impact Discussion:**

7a and 7b. The subject property is underlain by the Saugus formation. According to the VCISAG, the Saugus formation is given a paleontological importance ranking of "high". According to the Guidelines, a Paleontological Phase 1 Study would be required for the proposed project. A Paleontological Phase 1 study was prepared by Bruce Landers of Engineering Sciences in July 1988 for Tentative Tract Map No. 5277 (approved in January 2005). This study concluded that the tract map would not create any adverse impacts to paleontological resources. As no permanent structures are proposed with the subject project, and portions of the site would only require compaction and contouring of the land to allow for dirt and asphalt to be installed in the parking and playfield areas, project-specific and cumulative impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

7c. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable *Ventura County General Plan Goals and Policies* for Item 7 of the *Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines*.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>8A. Cultural Resources - Archaeological</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Demolish or materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for the inclusion of the resource in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code?	X				X			
2) Demolish or materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an archaeological resource that convey its archaeological significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for the purposes of CEQA?	X				X			
3) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 8A of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

8A-1 and -2. The proposed project does not include any ground-disturbing activities and would not demolish or materially alter in an adverse manner any physical characteristics of the project site that account for the inclusion of the resource in a local register of historical resources. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on archaeological resources and will not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to archaeological resources.

8A-3. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable 2040 General Plan policies for Item 8A of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines

## Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>8B. Cultural Resources – Historic (Plng.)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Demolish or materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources?	X				X			
2) Demolish or materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code?	X				X			
3) Demolish or materially alter in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for purposes of CEQA?	X				X			
4) Demolish, relocate, or alter an historical resource such that the significance of the historical resource will be impaired [Public Resources Code, Sec. 5020(q)]?	X				X			

## Impact Discussion:

8B-1 through -4. The project site is a lot that previously contained a commercial egg processing facility. The proposed project does not include ground disturbing activities or the construction of permanent structures. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on historical resources and will not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact to historical resources.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>9. Coastal Beaches and Sand Dunes</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Cause a direct or indirect adverse physical change to a coastal beach or sand dune, which is inconsistent with any of the coastal beaches and coastal sand dunes policies of the California Coastal Act, corresponding Coastal Act regulations, Ventura County Coastal Area Plan, or the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs?	X				X			
b) When considered together with one or more recently approved, current, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects, result in a direct or indirect, adverse physical change to a coastal beach or sand dune?					X			
c) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 9 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

9a and 9b. The proposed project site is located in the Ventura County unincorporated area of Moorpark, more than 10 miles away from the coast. Thus, the proposed project would not be located near or on a coastal beach or sand dune. Therefore, based on the location of the proposed project, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to coastal beaches and sand dunes.

9c. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable 2040 General Plan policies for Item 9 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>10. Fault Rupture Hazard (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Be at risk with respect to fault rupture in its location within a State of California designated Alquist-Priolo Special Fault Study Zone?	X							
b) Be at risk with respect to fault rupture in its location within a County of Ventura designated Fault Hazard Area?	X							
c) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 10 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

10a and 10b. There are no known active or potentially active faults extending through the proposed lot based on State of California Earthquake Fault Zones in accordance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and Ventura County General Plan Hazards Appendix –Figure 2.2.3b. Therefore, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to fault rupture hazards.

There is no known cumulative fault rupture hazard impact that will occur as a result of other approved, proposed, or probable projects.

10c. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable *Ventura County General Plan* Goals and Policies for Item 10 of the *Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines*.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>11. Ground Shaking Hazard (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
a) Be built in accordance with all applicable requirements of the Ventura County Building Code?	X				X			
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 11 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

11a. The hazards from ground shaking will affect each project individually; and no cumulative ground shaking hazard will occur as a result of other approved, proposed, or probable projects.

11b. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable *Ventura County General Plan* Goals and Policies for Item 11 of the *Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines*.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>12. Liquefaction Hazards (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Expose people or structures to potential adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction because it is located within a Seismic Hazards Zone?		X						
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 12 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

The hazards from liquefaction will affect each project individually. No cumulative liquefaction hazard would occur as a result of other projects.

12a and 12b. Any discussion of potential impacts of seismic and geologic hazards to the proposed project is provided for informational purposes only and is neither required by CEQA nor subject to its requirements. The property is located within a potential liquefaction zone based on the Ventura County General Plan Hazards Appendix – Figure 2.4b. This map is a compilation of the State of California Seismic Hazards Maps for the County of Ventura and was used as the basis for delineating the potential liquefaction hazards within the county. There are no structures proposed as part of this application and any future proposed structure will require a geotechnical report to be submitted as part of the building permit, must address and mitigate any potential hazards resulting from liquefaction as part of the building permit process. In this regard the potential hazards resulting from liquefaction are considered to be less than significant.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No mitigation measures are required. Residual impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>13. Seiche and Tsunami Hazards (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Be located within about 10 to 20 feet of vertical elevation from an enclosed body of water such as a lake or reservoir?	X							
b) Be located in a mapped area of tsunami hazard as shown on the County General Plan maps?	X							
c) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 13 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

13a. Any discussion of potential impacts of seismic and geologic hazards to the proposed project is provided for informational purposes only and is neither required by CEQA nor subject to its requirements. The site is not located adjacent to a closed or restricted body of water based on aerial imagery review (photos dated November 3, 2016, aerial imagery is under the copyrights of Pictometry, Source: Pictometry©,

November 3, 2016) and is not subject to seiche hazard. There is no hazard from potential seiche and no impact to the proposed project.

13b. Any discussion of potential impacts of seismic and geologic hazards to the proposed project is provided for informational purposes only and is neither required by CEQA nor subject to its requirements. The project is not mapped within a tsunami inundation zone based on the Ventura County General Plan, Hazards Appendix, Figure 2.6, dated October 22, 2013. There is no impact from potential hazards from tsunami. The hazards from seiche and tsunami will affect each project individually; and no cumulative seiche and tsunami hazard will occur as a result of other approved, proposed, or probable projects.

13c. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable *Ventura County General Plan* Goals and Policies for Item 13 of the *Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines*.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>14. Landslide/Mudflow Hazard (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Result in a landslide/mudflow hazard, as determined by the Public Works Agency Certified Engineering Geologist, based on the location of the site or project within, or outside of mapped landslides, potential earthquake induced landslide zones, and geomorphology of hillside terrain?	X							
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 14 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

14a and 14b. Any discussion of potential impacts of seismic and geologic hazards to the proposed project is provided for informational purposes only and is neither required by CEQA nor subject to its requirements. The site is located in a hillside area of Ventura County. No cumulative landslide/mudslide hazard would occur as a result of other projects. The site is not located in a mapped landslide, not located within a hillside area,



and is not located in a potential seismically induced landslide zone, based on analysis conducted by the California Geological Survey as part of California Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, 1991, Public Resources Code Sections 2690-2699.6. The project does not include any excavations into a hillside. There are no impacts to the project resulting from landslide hazard.

The hazards from landslides/mudslides would affect each project individually; and no cumulative landslide/mudslide hazard would occur as a result of other approved, proposed, or probable projects.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>15. Expansive Soils Hazards (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Expose people or structures to potential adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving soil expansion because it is located within a soils expansive hazard zone or where soils with an expansion index greater than 20 are present?	X							
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 15 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

15a. and 15b. No permanent development is proposed as part of this project. Future development at the site will be subject to the requirements of the County of Ventura Building Code adopted from the California Building Code, in effect at the time of construction that requires mitigation of potential adverse effects of expansive soils. There is no impact from potential hazards from expansive soils.

The hazards from expansive soils will affect each project individually; and no cumulative expansive soils hazard will occur as a result of other approved, proposed, or probable projects.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>16. Subsidence Hazard (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Expose people or structures to potential adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving subsidence because it is located within a subsidence hazard zone?	X							
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 16 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

16a and 16b. The subject property is not within the probable subsidence hazard zone as delineated on the Ventura County General Plan Hazards Appendix, Figure 2.8. In addition, the project is not for oil, gas or groundwater withdrawal; therefore, the project is considered to have no impact on the hazard of subsidence.

The hazards from subsidence will affect each project individually; and no cumulative subsidence hazard will occur as a result of other approved, proposed, or probable projects.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>17a. Hydraulic Hazards – Non-FEMA (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
1) Result in a potential erosion/siltation hazard and flooding hazard pursuant to any of the following documents (individually, collectively, or in combination with one another): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2007 Ventura County Building Code Ordinance No.4369</li> <li>• Ventura County Land Development Manual</li> <li>• Ventura County Subdivision Ordinance</li> <li>• Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance</li> <li>• Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance</li> <li>• Ventura County Standard Land Development Specifications</li> <li>• Ventura County Road Standards</li> <li>• Ventura County Watershed Protection District Hydrology Manual</li> <li>• County of Ventura Stormwater Quality Ordinance, Ordinance No. 4142</li> <li>• Ventura County Hillside Erosion Control Ordinance, Ordinance No. 3539 and Ordinance No. 3683</li> <li>• Ventura County Municipal Storm Water NPDES Permit</li> <li>• State General Construction Permit</li> <li>• State General Industrial Permit</li> <li>• National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)?</li> </ul>	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 17A of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

17A-1. There is not an increase in impervious area proposed. No increase in flooding hazard or potential for erosion or siltation will occur as a result of the proposed project.

17A-2. There is not an increase in impervious area proposed. No increase in flooding hazard or potential for erosion or siltation will occur as a result of the proposed project. No new impervious area will be added as part of the project. Therefore, the project is consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 17a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

## Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>17b. Hydraulic Hazards – FEMA (WPD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Be located outside of the boundaries of a Special Flood Hazard Area and entirely within a FEMA-determined 'X-Unshaded' flood zone (beyond the 0.2% annual chance floodplain: beyond the 500-year floodplain)?		X				X		
2) Be located outside of the boundaries of a Special Flood Hazard Area and entirely within a FEMA-determined 'X-Shaded' flood zone (within the 0.2% annual chance floodplain: within the 500-year floodplain)?		X				X		
3) Be located, in part or in whole, within the boundaries of a Special Flood Hazard Area (1% annual chance floodplain: 100-year), but located entirely outside of the boundaries of the Regulatory Floodway?		X				X		
4) Be located, in part or in whole, within the boundaries of the Regulatory Floodway, as determined using the 'Effective' and latest available DFIRMs provided by FEMA?		X				X		
5) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 17B of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

## Impact Discussion:

17B-1 through -4. The project site is in a location identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as an area of minimal flood hazard Zone X unshaded. This is evidenced on FEMA Map Panel 06111C0810E effective January 20, 2010. The proposed development is therefore deemed to be less than significant (LS).

17B-5. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable 2040 General Plan policies for Item 17b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

## Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>18. Fire Hazards (VCFPD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Be located within High Fire Hazard Areas/Fire Hazard Severity Zones or Hazardous Watershed Fire Areas?		X				X		
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 18 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

18a. Although the project is in a high fire hazard area, there are no structures proposed that would require protection in the event of a brush fire. In addition, the design (a large play field area with no permanent structures) and nature of the proposed project does not involve any hazardous operations that could lead to a fire and could spread to the brush area. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to fire hazards would be less than significant.

18b. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable 2040 General Plan policies for Item 17b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>19. Aviation Hazards (Airports)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
a) Comply with the County's Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan and pre-established federal criteria set forth in Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77 (Obstruction Standards)?	X				X			
b) Will the proposed project result in residential development, a church, a school, or high commercial business located within a sphere of influence of a County airport?	X				X			
c) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 19 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

19a, 19b and 19c. The proposed project site is not located within an Airport Safety Zone or Airport Sphere of Influence. County policies related to aviation hazards do not apply.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impacts identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>20a. Hazardous Materials/Waste – Materials (EHD/Fire)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Utilize hazardous materials in compliance with applicable state and local requirements as set forth in Section 20a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 20a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

20A-1. Proposed project will not store hazardous materials which require permitting or inspection from Ventura County Environmental Health Division/Certified Unified Program Agency.

20A-2. The proposed project will be consistent with the General Plan for Item 20a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impacts identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>20b. Hazardous Materials/Waste – Waste (EHD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Comply with applicable state and local requirements as set forth in Section 20b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 20b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

20b-1. The proposed project is not considered an activity that generates hazardous waste. Therefore, the project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts relative to hazardous wastes.

20b-2. The proposed project will be consistent with the General Plan for Item 20b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impacts identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>21. Noise and Vibration</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
a) Either individually or when combined with other recently approved, pending, and probable future projects, produce noise in excess of the standards for noise in the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs (Section 2.16) or the applicable Area Plan?		X				X		
b) Either individually or when combined with other recently approved, pending, and probable future projects, include construction activities involving blasting, pile-driving, vibratory compaction, demolition, and drilling or excavation which exceed the threshold criteria provided in the Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (Section 12.2)?		X				X		
c) Result in a transit use located within any of the critical distances of the vibration-sensitive uses listed in Table 1 (Initial Study Assessment Guidelines, Section 21)?		X				X		
d) Generate new heavy vehicle (e.g., semi-truck or bus) trips on uneven roadways located within proximity to sensitive uses that have the potential to either individually or when combined with other recently approved, pending, and probable future projects, exceed the threshold criteria of the Transit Use Thresholds for rubber-tire heavy vehicle uses (Initial Study Assessment Guidelines, Section 21-D, Table 1, Item No. 3)?		X				X		
e) Involve blasting, pile-driving, vibratory compaction, demolition, drilling, excavation, or other similar types of vibration-generating activities which have the potential to either individually or when combined with other recently approved, pending, and probable future projects, exceed the threshold criteria provided in the Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment [Hanson, Carl E., David A. Towers, and Lance D. Meister. (May 2006) Section 12.2]?		X				X		



Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
f) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 21 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

21a-21e. The Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines define noise as “any unwanted sound that is undesirable because it interferes with speech and hearing, or is intense enough to damage hearing, or is otherwise annoying.” The Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines require an analysis of noise impacts, based on whether the project is a “Noise Sensitive Use” or a “Noise Generator.” Noise sensitive uses are dwellings, schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches and libraries; since the project does not include the construction or use of these types of uses, the proposed project does not involve a “noise sensitive use.” However, the project has the potential to generate noise and, therefore, is subject to evaluation as a “noise generator.”

In order for a project to be a noise generator, the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines state that the project must generate noise at the nearest noise sensitive use/residential district that exceeds:

- 55 dB(A) between 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.,
- 50 dB(A) between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m., or
- 45 dB(A) between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.

The airsoft and paintball facility is expected to produce some noise during scheduled paintball games. However, the firing of a paintball gun does not create the level of noise as that of a firearm. In addition, the nearest sensitive receptor to the proposed playfield areas of the paintball facility consist of a single family dwelling located more than 1,700 feet south of the project site. Several accessory buildings are located approximately 995 feet east of the project site (APN No. 500-0-090-310). However, a search of the permit history for this parcel revealed that these buildings were not permitted for habitable use and were associated with the former Egg City agricultural facility. Therefore, as the nearest noise sensitive receptor is located more than 1,700 feet away from the proposed playfield area, and the noise created by the firing of the paintball gun would be lower than that of a firearm, the noise generated by the paintball facility will not produce noise levels that exceed the noise levels noted above. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to noise would be less than significant.

21f. The proposed project will be consistent with the General Plan for Item 21 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>22. Daytime Glare</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Create a new source of disability glare or discomfort glare for motorists travelling along any road of the County Regional Road Network?	X				X			
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 22 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

22a. The proposed project would not create a new source of glare for motorists or persons travelling along any road of the County Regional Road Network, such as Shekell Road and Grimes Canyon Road. In addition, no exterior lighting is proposed for the project, as the facility proposes to operate only during daylight hours. Therefore, the project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts relative to daytime glare.

22b. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 22 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impacts identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>23. Public Health (EHD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
a) Result in impacts to public health from environmental factors as set forth in Section 23 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 23 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

23a. The proposed project may have impacts to public health from hazardous materials. Compliance with applicable state regulations enforced by the Environmental Health Division will reduce potential project-specific and cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

23b. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 23 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>24. Greenhouse Gases (VCAPCD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Result in environmental impacts from greenhouse gas emissions, either project specifically or cumulatively, as set forth in CEQA Guidelines §§ 15064(h)(3), 15064.4, 15130(b)(1)(B) and -(d), and 15183.5?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

24a. Greenhouse gases (GHG) are gases that trap heat in the atmosphere, including, but not limited to carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>).

Water vapor, although it is a gas that traps heat, is excluded from the list of GHGs because it is short-lived in the atmosphere and its atmospheric concentrations are largely determined by natural processes, such as oceanic evaporation. GHGs are emitted both naturally and anthropogenically (human-caused). Of these GHGs, CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> are emitted in the largest amounts from anthropogenic activities, such as the combustion of fossil fuel resources and organic processing and storage operations, respectively.

Neither APCD nor the County has adopted a threshold of significance applicable to Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions from projects subject to the County's discretionary land use permitting authority. The County has, however, routinely applied a 10,000 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent per year (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/Yr) threshold of significance to industrial projects, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(a)(2). APCD has concurred with the County's approach. APCD supports the application of this numeric threshold as stated in the GHG Threshold Report APCD published in 2011 at the request of the APCD Board, which concludes "Unless directed otherwise, District staff will continue to evaluate and develop suitable interim GHG threshold options for Ventura County with preference for GHG threshold consistency with the South Coast AQMD and the SCAG region". The South Coast AQMD at the same time proposed an interim screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/Yr for commercial/residential projects. Industrial projects or facilities are defined as stationary emission sources that have or are required to have an APCD Permit to Operate.

Based on information provided by the applicant, greenhouse gas impacts will be less than significant. Air emissions were estimated based on the ATE Revised Traffic Study's Table 1 (Attachment ), by subtracting the existing daily max trips from the proposed daily max trips (worst case scenario includes the proposed weekend-only Mud Run Events). There are no proposed construction operations that would emit quantifiable air pollutants (no grading, no demolition, no building construction, no painting buildings) and no proposed energy (natural gas, electricity) or area (landscaping, solvent use, painting buildings for maintenance). The CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0 air emissions model was used using a recreational land use which included increase in daily max trips (1493-271=1222). The model estimated 272.3 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/Yr, which is below the more conservative 3,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/Yr recommended threshold for commercial projects. A copy of the GHG emissions report is attached to this initial study as Attachment .

### **Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>25. Community Character (PIng.)</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Either individually or cumulatively when combined with recently approved, current, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects, introduce physical development that is incompatible with existing land uses, architectural form or style, site design/layout, or density/parcel sizes within the community in which the project site is located?		X				X		
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 25 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

25a. The project site is located at 8463 Shekell Road within the unincorporated Moorpark area of Ventura County, west of State Route 23/Grimes Canyon Road. The proposed project site is currently not in use and contains patches of concrete from the former Egg City agricultural facility. Orchards are present adjacent to the western boundary of the project site. The Grimes Canyon mining operation abuts the project site to the north and open space/agricultural uses surround the project site to the south, west and east. The nearest single-family residence is located more than 1,700 feet south of the proposed project site. The proposed project will not be out of character with the agricultural and open space uses surrounding the site, as each of the temporary structures (e.g., air filled bunkers, hay bales, wooden spools, wooden walls, dirt mounds, sandbag walls, building facades) will not be more than 8 feet in height. The three proposed sea cargo containers would be 400 square feet each and located south of the parking area. Although the roll off containers would be visible from Shekell Road, the project will be conditioned to require that the containers be painted a light tan color.

Due to the location and design of the proposed project, it will not be out of character with the surrounding lots and uses. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to community character would be less than significant.

25b. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 25 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>26. Housing (PLng.)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Eliminate three or more dwelling units that are affordable to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• moderate-income households that are located within the Coastal Zone; and/or,</li> <li>• lower-income households?</li> </ul>	X				X			
b) Involve construction which has an impact on the demand for additional housing due to potential housing demand created by construction workers?	X				X			
c) Result in 30 or more new full-time-equivalent lower-income employees?	X				X			
d) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 26 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

26a. The proposed project will not eliminate any existing dwelling units. Therefore, the project would not result in an impact and will not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact, related to the elimination of existing housing stock.

26b. The proposed project does not involve any permanent construction activities. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any project-specific impacts, or make a contribution to cumulative impacts, related to the demand for construction worker housing.

26c. The proposed project will not result in 30 or more new full-time-equivalent lower-income employees, as the project would not require that number of employees. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an impact and will not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact, related to the demand for housing for employees associated with commercial or industrial development.

26d. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 26 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impacts identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>27a(1). Transportation &amp; Circulation - Roads and Highways – Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) (PWA)</b>								
<b>Would the proposed project:</b>								
a) Meet a screening criterion or be below the applicable VMT significance threshold in the County's <i>Transportation &amp; Circulation—Vehicle Miles Traveled</i> document?		x				x		

27a(1)-a. The proposed project would generate additional traffic on the Regional Road Network and local public roads. According to the traffic study prepared by Associated Traffic Engineers dated April 28, 2022, the ADT (average daily trips) generated by this project is less than 76, and therefore the adverse impacts on traffic are considered less than significant by the County of Ventura's current VMT Administrative Guidance.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>27a(2). Transportation &amp; Circulation - Roads and Highways - Safety and Design of Public Roads (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Have an Adverse, Significant Project-Specific or Cumulative Impact to the Safety and Design of Roads or Intersections within the Regional Road Network (RRN) or Local Road Network (LRN)?			x			x		

## **Impact Discussion:**

27a(2)-a. The project, as proposed, does have the potential to alter the level of safety of roadways and intersections near the project. Therefore, impacts related to safety/design of County roads would be potentially significant; and mitigation, as described below, would reduce the impact to below a level of significance.

## **Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

### Traffic Control Plan

**Purpose:** In order to ensure public safety during the Mud Run Events, the applicant/permittee shall have an approved Traffic Control Plan (TCP) and Encroachment Permit (EP).

**Requirement:** The Mud Run Events have the potential to temporarily cause a substantial increase in the traffic on adjacent roads near the Mud Run Events; therefore, the TCP and EP are required.

- a. Contact the VCPWA-RT Permits Section, by phone at (805) 654-2055 or by e-mail at [pwa.transpermits@ventura.org](mailto:pwa.transpermits@ventura.org), for the requirements of the TCP and EP. The application shall be submitted to the VCPWA-RT.
- b. The applicant/permittee shall provide adequate parking on-site. No parking shall be allowed on any local county public road.
- c. The applicant/permittee shall post temporary "No Parking" signs on Shekell Road two (2) hours before the event, during the event, and two (2) hours after the event.
- d. The maximum number of Mud Run Events is 3 per year.
- e. The maximum number of attendees is 1000 per event. The maximum number of employees is 10 employees per event. The maximum number of service trucks is 1 service truck per event.
- f. The applicant as part of the TCP requirements, the applicant/permittee shall keep a log of the total number of vehicles for each event. The annual average along with all logs shall be included for the following year's renewal of the TCP.
- g. The Traffic Control Plan shall be updated every year and brought up to current standards and safety requirements.
  - I. The Traffic Control Plan shall be prepared by a License Civil Engineer in the State of California, signed, and stamped.



- II. The TCP shall state the maximum number of people at the site
- III. Use trained and qualified traffic control officers and/or off-duty safety officers.
- IV. Use advance warning signs and Changeable Message Signs (CMS).
- V. Provide each officer with communication devices to control traffic volumes exiting the parking lot on to Shekell Road, Grimes Canyon (SR23), and Broadway Road, creating gaps in traffic to allow for local circulation.
- VI. The traffic control plan shall include the encroachment permit from both the County of Ventura and Caltrans.
- VII. Other appropriate measures required by the County Permits Engineer, County Traffic Engineer, and the engineer preparing the TCP.

**Documentation:** The TCP shall be prepared by a License Civil Engineer in the State of California, signed, and stamped. Annual logs of the total number of vehicles for each event.

**Timing:** The first TCP shall be completed and approved by VCPWA-RT prior to zoning clearance and issuance of the CUP. Each year the TCP shall be renewed through VCPWA-RT.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The VCPWA-RT will review the TCP, and EP application, and supporting documentation.

#### Encroachment Permit

**Purpose:** The current right-of-way width on Shekell Road ranges from 40 to 67 feet wide. An Encroachment Permit is required for any work conducted within the County Road right-of-way, for example but not limited to, signage and material for traffic control, people directing traffic, driveways improvements, road improvements, utility installation, planter walls, and landscaping and any construction related storage in the County Road right-of-way.

**Requirement:** The applicant/permittee shall contact the Permits Division at (805) 654-2055 for requirements of the permit.

An Encroachment Permit (EP) is required for the traffic control and any work and construction related storage conducted within the County right-of-way. Contact the VCPWA-RT Permits Section, by phone at (805) 654-2055 or by e-mail at [pwa.transpermits@ventura.org](mailto:pwa.transpermits@ventura.org), for the requirements of the EP. The application shall be submitted to the VCPWA-RT.

An Encroachment Permit with Caltrans is required for the traffic control on Grimes Canyon, SR 23. The applicant/permittee shall contact Caltrans and obtain an encroachment permit for at least the needs for the traffic control plan.

**Documentation:** The application shall be submitted to the VCPWA-RT. When applying for the permit, the applicant/permittee shall provide sufficient documentation, including, but not limited to, a (1) Resource Management Agency (RMA) Project Number (for discretionary projects), (2) a copy of the Roads & Transportation Conditions of Approval, (3) a sketch or map showing the work to be accomplished, project, project parcel, Assessor Parcel Number (APN), address and street name. Permit applications without sufficient documentation for processing may not be accepted for processing.

**Timing:** This condition shall be met prior to the issuance of the approval of the Traffic Control Plan.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The VCPWA-RT will review the application and supporting documentation. The VCPWA-RT Inspectors the traffic control and verify that the plan is performed, and completed, in accordance with the Traffic Control Plan and Encroachment Permit.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

With implementation of the above measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>27a(3). Transportation &amp; Circulation - Roads &amp; Highways – Safety &amp; Design of Private Access (VCFPD)</b>								
a) If a private road or private access is proposed, will the design of the private road meet the adopted Private Road Guidelines and access standards of the VCFPD as listed in the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		
b) Will the project be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27a(3) of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

27a(3)-a. The Ventura County Fire Protection District comments that the transportation and circulation system is adequate without any required improvements. Shekell Road and Grimes Canyon Road provide access to the project site. The roads in the vicinity of the project site are in full compliance with the County Public Roads Standards and Ventura County Fire Protection District Private Road Guidelines. Therefore, there are no project-specific and cumulative impacts relating tactical access

27a(3)-b. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27a(3) of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>27a(4). Transportation &amp; Circulation - Roads &amp; Highways - Tactical Access (VCFPD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Involve a road or access, public or private, that complies with VCFPD adopted Private Road Guidelines?		X				X		
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27a(4) of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

27a(4)-a. The Ventura County Fire Protection District comments that the transportation and circulation system is adequate without any required improvements. Shekell Road and Grimes Canyon Road provide access to the project site. The roads in the vicinity of the project site are in full compliance with the County Public Roads Standards and Ventura County Fire Protection District Private Road Guidelines. Therefore, there are no project-specific and cumulative impacts relating tactical access.

27a(4)-b. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27a(4) of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>27b. Transportation &amp; Circulation - Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities (PWA/Plng.)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Will the Project have an Adverse, Significant Project-Specific or Cumulative Impact to Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities within the Regional Road Network (RRN) or Local Road Network (LRN)?		X				X		
2) Generate or attract pedestrian/bicycle traffic volumes meeting requirements for protected highway crossings or pedestrian and bicycle facilities?		X				X		
3) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

27b-1 and 27b-2. The project, as proposed, will not generate significant pedestrian or bicycle traffic.

27b-3. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>27c. Transportation &amp; Circulation - Bus Transit</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Substantially interfere with existing bus transit facilities or routes, or create a substantial increase in demand for additional or new bus transit facilities/services?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27c of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

27c-1. The project site is not located near any bus transit facilities. In addition, the proposed airsoft and paintball facility is not a use that will generate new demand for bus transit. Therefore, the proposed project will not have project-specific and cumulative impacts related to bus transit.

27c-2. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27c of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impacts identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>27d. Transportation &amp; Circulation – Railroads</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Individually or cumulatively, substantially interfere with an existing railroad's facilities or operations?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27d of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

**Impact Discussion:**

27d-1. The project site is not located near any railroads. In addition, the proposed airsoft and paintball facility is not a use that will generate new demand for railroads. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to railroads.

27d-2. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27d of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

**Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

No impacts identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>27e. Transportation &amp; Circulation – Airports (Airports)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Have the potential to generate complaints and concerns regarding interference with airports?	X				X			
2) Be located within the sphere of influence of either County operated airport?	X				X			
3) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27e of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

**Impact Discussion:**

27e-1, -2 and -3. The proposed project is located 8.5 miles from the nearest airport, Santa Paula, and is not located within the sphere of influence of any County-operated airport. County policies related to airports do not apply.

**Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

No impacts identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**	Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>27f. Transportation &amp; Circulation - Harbor Facilities (Harbors)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Involve construction or an operation that will increase the demand for commercial boat traffic and/or adjacent commercial boat facilities?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27f of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

27f-1 and -2. The proposed project is located over 20 miles from the nearest harbor, Oxnard Harbor. Additionally, the use of the paintball and mud run facility would not increase commercial boat traffic in the nearest harbor facilities. The proposed project would have no adverse impacts to harbor facilities. County policies related to harbor facilities do not apply.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impacts identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>27g. Transportation &amp; Circulation – Pipelines</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Substantially interfere with, or compromise the integrity or affect the operation of, an existing pipeline?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 27g of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

27g-1 and -2 The proposed project is located 8 miles from the nearest major and minor pipelines. Due to the distance to the nearest major or minor pipelines, the proposed project would not interfere with, or compromise the integrity or affect the operation of, an existing pipeline. County policies related to pipelines do not apply.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>28a. Water Supply – Quality (EHD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Comply with applicable state and local requirements as set forth in Section 28a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 28a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

28a-1. Domestic water supply for the proposed project will be provided via an existing connection to Ventura River Water District. The proposed project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to the domestic water supply.

28a-2. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for Item 28a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines regarding permanent domestic water supply.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>28b. Water Supply – Quantity (WPD)</b>								



Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Have a permanent supply of water?		X				X		
2) Either individually or cumulatively when combined with recently approved, current, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects, introduce physical development that will adversely affect the water supply - quantity of the hydrologic unit in which the project site is located?		X				X		
3) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 28b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

28b-1. Water will continue to be provided by Ventura County Waterworks District 1 (VCWWD-1). Per the *2020 Urban Water Management Plan for Ventura County Waterworks District 1* (2020 UWMP) VCWWD-1 distributes potable water as a blend of imported SWP water supplied CMWD from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) and groundwater from VCWWD-1 wells in the East Las Posas Management Area (ELPMA). Imported water constitutes 80% of the total supply with groundwater and recycled water comprising the remaining 20% (UWMP 2020). The applicant reported that the proposed mud run events will consume an estimated additional 0.110 acre-feet per year (AFY) (6,000 gallons per event, for six events). The site operations currently use 0.055 AFY and the total site water use is anticipated to be 0.166 AFY.

28b-2. The proposed project will not, either individually or cumulatively when combined with recently approved, current, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects, introduce physical development that would adversely affect the water supply – quantity.

28b-3. The proposed project will be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 28b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines and is considered **less than significant**.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>28c. Water Supply - Fire Flow Requirements (VCFPD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Meet the required fire flow?		X				X		
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 28c of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

28c-1. This project will be required to satisfy VC Fire Protection District regulations for fire flow and water in storage. The Conditions of Approval of the requested CUP will include the requirement for the Permittee to demonstrate prior to the onset of operations to the satisfaction of the VCFPD that adequate fire flow is available to serve the facility.

28c-2. This project meets the goals and policies of the general plan.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>29a. Waste Treatment &amp; Disposal Facilities - Individual Sewage Disposal Systems (EHD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Comply with applicable state and local requirements as set forth in Section 29a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 29a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

29a-1. The proposed project will not utilize an onsite wastewater treatment system. The project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts related to an onsite wastewater treatment system. Standard conditions will be included in the CUP to ensure portable toilets are operated and serviced in a safe and sanitary manner.

29a-2. Proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for Item 29a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### **Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>29b. Waste Treatment &amp; Disposal Facilities - Sewage Collection/Treatment Facilities (EHD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Comply with applicable state and local requirements as set forth in Section 29b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 29b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### **Impact Discussion:**

29b-1. The proposed project will not require a connection to a sewer collection facility. The project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to a sewage collection facility. Standard conditions will be included in the CUP to ensure portable toilet are operated and serviced in a safe and sanitary manner.

29b-2. The proposed project will not require connection to a sewage collection facility and is consistent with the General Plan for Item 29b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### **Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>29c. Waste Treatment &amp; Disposal Facilities - Solid Waste Management (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Have a direct or indirect adverse effect on a landfill such that the project impairs the landfill's disposal capacity in terms of reducing its useful life to less than 15 years?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 29c of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

29c-1. The proposed paintball and mud run event facility would not have a direct or indirect adverse effect on the landfills. The minimal waste associated with attendees at these temporary events will not reduce the useful life of the landfill to less than 15 years.

29c-2. Proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for Item 29c of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>29d. Waste Treatment &amp; Disposal Facilities - Solid Waste Facilities (EHD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
1) Comply with applicable state and local requirements as set forth in Section 29d of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 29d of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

29d-1. Pursuant to the IWMD's factors determining the significance of project impacts to solid waste facilities within Ventura County, any discretionary development project generating solid waste will impact the County's remaining solid waste disposal capacity. Additionally, as required by California Public Resources Code (PRC) 41701, Ventura County's Countywide Siting Element (CSE), adopted in June of 2001 and updated annually, confirms Ventura County has at least 15 years of disposal capacity available for waste generated by in-County projects. Therefore, because the County currently exceeds the minimum disposal capacity required by state PRC, no individual project should have a significant impact upon remaining Ventura County solid waste disposal capacity.

29d-2. Proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for Item 29d of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>30. Utilities</b>								
Will the proposed project:								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
a) Individually or cumulatively cause a disruption or re-routing of an existing utility facility?	X				X			
b) Individually or cumulatively increase demand on a utility that results in expansion of an existing utility facility which has the potential for secondary environmental impacts?	X				X			
c) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 30 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

30a. 30a., 30b., and 30c. Electrical service would be provided by Southern California Edison. The proposed project would not increase demand on the electrical utility that results in expansion of an existing electric utility facility. The proposed project would not have adverse impacts on utility facilities, and it would be consistent with the General Plan Goals and Policies that pertain to item 30.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>31a. Flood Control Facilities/Watercourses - Watershed Protection District (WPD)</b>								
Will the proposed project:								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
1) Either directly or indirectly, impact flood control facilities and watercourses by obstructing, impairing, diverting, impeding, or altering the characteristics of the flow of water, resulting in exposing adjacent property and the community to increased risk for flood hazards?		X				X		
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 31a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

31a-1. The proposed project is situated immediately Northwest of South Grimes Canyon Wash, which is a Watershed Protection jurisdictional redline channel. No direct connections to the WP channel appear to be proposed or indicated on the applicant's submitted materials.

This proposed project would not increase the amount of impervious surface which is beneficial for stormwater infiltration and peak flow to South Grimes Canyon Wash. However, site development, must be implemented in conformance with County of Ventura Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, Land Development Services requirements, which state that runoff from the project site will be released at no greater than the existing flow rate and in such manner as to not cause an adverse impact downstream in peak discharge, velocity, or duration.

The proposed project design with the would reduce the direct and indirect project-specific and cumulative impacts to flood control facilities and watercourses. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant.

31a-2. Proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for Item 31a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>31b. Flood Control Facilities/Watercourses - Other Facilities (PWA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Result in the possibility of deposition of sediment and debris materials within existing channels and allied obstruction of flow?		X				X		
2) Impact the capacity of the channel and the potential for overflow during design storm conditions?		X				X		
3) Result in the potential for increased runoff and the effects on Areas of Special Flood Hazard and regulatory channels both on and off site?		X				X		
4) Involve an increase in flow to and from natural and man-made drainage channels and facilities?		X				X		
5) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 31b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

31b-1 through 31b-4. The proposed project is situated immediately Northwest of South Grimes Canyon Wash, which is a Watershed Protection jurisdictional redline channel. No direct connections to the WP channel appear to be proposed or indicated on the applicant's submitted materials.

This proposed project would not increase the amount of impervious surface which is beneficial for stormwater infiltration and peak flow to South Grimes Canyon Wash. However, site development, must be implemented in conformance with the County of Ventura Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, Land Development Services requirements, which state that runoff from the project site will be released at no greater than the existing flow rate and in such manner as to not cause an adverse impact downstream in peak discharge, velocity, or duration.

The proposed project design reduces the direct and indirect project-specific and cumulative impacts to flood control facilities and watercourses. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant.



31b-5. Proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for Item 31b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>32. Law Enforcement/Emergency Services (Sheriff)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Have the potential to increase demand for law enforcement or emergency services?	X				X			
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 32 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

32a. According to the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines, the project is not a use that could generate a potentially significant increase in demand for law enforcement or emergency services. Therefore, the proposed project has no project-specific or cumulative impacts related to law enforcement and emergency services.

32b. Proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for Item 32 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>33a. Fire Protection Services - Distance and Response (VCFPD)</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Be located in excess of five miles, measured from the apron of the fire station to the structure or pad of the proposed structure, from a full-time paid fire department?		X				X		
2) Require additional fire stations and personnel, given the estimated response time from the nearest full-time paid fire department to the project site?		X				X		
3) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 33a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

33a-1. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on response time. Distance from full time, paid fire station is within a reasonable distance for response within acceptable time frame. Therefore, the project is expected to have less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts on distance and response time.

33a-2. The proposed project would not require additional fire stations or personnel. The nearest Fire Station to the project site is Ventura County Fire station #42 and response time and personnel are adequate.

33a-3. Proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for Item 33a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>33b. Fire Protection Services – Personnel, Equipment, and Facilities (VCFPD)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
1) Result in the need for additional personnel?		X				X		
2) Magnitude or the distance from existing facilities indicate that a new facility or additional equipment will be required?		X				X		
3) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 33b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		X				X		

### Impact Discussion:

33b-1 and 33b-2. The Ventura County Fire Protection District determined that the proposed project does not require additional personnel or equipment. There are no proposed structures and the project site is essentially a large playfield area. A significant rise in call volume to this site is not anticipated based upon the type of business proposed. Therefore, the project is expected to have less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts on personnel and equipment.

33b-3. Proposed project is consistent with the General Plan for Item 33b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>34a. Education – Schools</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Substantially interfere with the operations of an existing school facility?	X				X			
2) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 34a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

**Impact Discussion:**

34a-1. and 34a-2. The proposed paintball and mud run event facility is non-residential in nature. According to the ISAGs, non-residential projects would not have an impact on the demand for schools. In addition, because the proposed non-residential project is not located adjacent to a school (no school is located within one mile of the proposed project), it would not interfere with the operations of an existing school. County policies related to schools do not apply. The project is located within the Moorpark Unified School District (MUSD). Furthermore, the proposed project is not located adjacent to any school facilities and will not have any impact on school facilities or operations. Therefore, the proposed project will not have project-specific or cumulative impacts on schools.

**Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>34b. Education - Public Libraries (Lib. Agency)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
1) Substantially interfere with the operations of an existing public library facility?	X							
2) Put additional demands on a public library facility which is currently deemed overcrowded?	X							
3) Limit the ability of individuals to access public library facilities by private vehicle or alternative transportation modes?	X							
4) In combination with other approved projects in its vicinity, cause a public library facility to become overcrowded?					X			
5) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 34b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

**Impact Discussion:**

34b-1., 34b-2., 34b-3., 34b-4., and 34b-5. The proposed paintball and mud run event facility project is non-residential in nature. According to the ISAGs, non-residential projects would not have an impact on the demand for public libraries. In addition, the proposed project would not be located adjacent to a public library facility (no libraries are located within one mile of the project). The proposed project would not substantially interfere with the operations of an existing public library facility, put additional demands on a public library facility which is currently deemed overcrowded, or limit the ability of individuals to access public library facilities. County policies related to public libraries do not apply.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>35. Recreation Facilities (GSA)</b>								
<b>Will the proposed project:</b>								
a) Cause an increase in the demand for recreation, parks, and/or trails and corridors?	X				X			
b) Cause a decrease in recreation, parks, and/or trails or corridors when measured against the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Parks/Facilities - 5 acres of developable land (less than 15% slope) per 1,000 population;</li> <li>Regional Parks/Facilities - 5 acres of developable land per 1,000 population; or,</li> <li>Regional Trails/Corridors - 2.5 miles per 1,000 population?</li> </ul>	X				X			
c) Impede future development of Recreation Parks/Facilities and/or Regional Trails/Corridors?	X				X			
d) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 35 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

35a-35c. The proposed project would not result in an increase in population within the Moorpark area, thereby creating a new demand for parks, trails, or other recreational facilities. Although Happy Camp Canyon Park is located within five miles of the project site, the proposed project does not involve development that could adversely interfere with the use or development of the park. Finally, there are no trails located within the vicinity of the project site with which the proposed project could interfere. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to local or regional parks, trails, or other recreational facilities.

35d. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 35.

### **Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

### **Topics Not Covered by County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines: State CEQA Guidelines Topics**

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>37. Energy</b>								
<b>Would the project:</b>								
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	X				X			
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	X				X			

### **Impact Discussion:**

37a and 37b. The proposed project is a request for the continued operation and expansion of a paintball/airsoft facility and the addition of a periodic mud run event area. The project does not include any permanent construction or development and would be used during daylight hours only. The proposed project would not result in significant energy useage.

The policies and programs of the Ventura County 2040 General Plan do not compel privately-initiated discretionary development to comply with specific renewable energy or energy efficiency standards or requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in potentially significant environmental effects due to the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy or conflict with a known local renewable or energy efficiency plan. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

### **Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)**

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.

Issue (Responsible Department) *	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
<b>38. Wildfire</b>								
<b>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</b>								

Issue (Responsible Department) *	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	X				X			
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	X				X			
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	X				X			
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	X				X			

### Impact Discussion:

38a. through 38d. The proposed project site is not located within any State Responsibility Areas or Fire Hazard Severity Zones. The VCFPD has reviewed the project and determined that it is not located within a high fire hazard area and that the project would be located within five miles of the nearest fire station. In addition, the project will be conditioned to have adequate fire flow at the project site and adequate access for emergency vehicles. Furthermore, the VCFPD determined that the proposed project would not cause adverse fire-related impacts and that it would be consistent with the applicable 2040 General Plan fire-related goals and policies. Finally, the project would not expose people or structures to risk related to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

### Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

No impact identified. No mitigation measures are required.



**\*Key to the agencies/departments that are responsible for the analysis of the items above:**

Airports - Department Of Airports	AG. - Agricultural Department	VCAPCD - Air Pollution Control District
EHD - Environmental Health Division	VCFPD - Fire Protection District	GSA - General Services Agency
Harbors - Harbor Department	Lib. Agency - Library Services Agency	PIng. - Planning Division
PWA - Public Works Agency	Sheriff - Sheriff's Department	WPD – Watershed Protection District

**\*\*Key to Impact Degree of Effect:**

N – No Impact  
LS – Less than Significant Impact  
PS-M – Potentially Significant but Mitigable Impact  
PS – Potentially Significant Impact

## Section C – Mandatory Findings of Significance

Based on the information contained within Section B:		
	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		<b>X</b>
2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one that occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future).		<b>X</b>
3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effect of other current projects, and the effect of probable future projects. (Several projects may have relatively small individual impacts on two or more resources, but the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)		<b>X</b>
4. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		<b>X</b>

### Findings Discussion:

1. As stated in Section B, above, the proposed project would be located in an area that is heavily altered from natural conditions due to previous authorized use of a commercial egg processing facility and there is no suitable habitat for special status plants or wildlife species to occur. No historical or archaeological resources have been identified on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
2. As stated in Section B, above, the proposed project has the potential to result in impacts related to safety/design of roads or intersections. In response, the Permittee must prepare and implement a Traffic Control Plan and Encroachment

Permit as approved by the County Public Works Agency and Caltrans. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, the proposed project would not be incompatible with Transportation & Circulation-Roads and Highways-Safety and Design of Public Roads. No other significant impacts to long-term environmental goals were identified by County staff.

3. For applicable environmental issues in Section B, Planning staff utilized the list method to evaluate the combined effects of the proposed project with related effects of pending and recently approved projects (Table 1 of Section A, above).

Planning staff also utilized the plan approach by relying on the Program EIR for the Ventura County 2040 General Plan, which was certified in September of 2020. As described throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would be consistent with the County's General Plan. Thus, the proposed development has already been reviewed for potential cumulative impacts at a programmatic level.

Staff determined that when considered with other past, present, or probable future projects, the proposed project would not have any cumulatively considerable effects.

4. No environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly have been identified that would result from project implementation.

## Section D – Determination of Environmental Document

Based on this initial evaluation:

[ ]	I find the proposed project <b>could not</b> have a significant effect on the environment, and a <b>Negative Declaration</b> should be prepared.
[X]	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measure(s) described in Section B of the Initial Study will be applied to the project. A <b>Mitigated Negative Declaration</b> should be prepared.
[ ]	I find the proposed project, individually and/or cumulatively, MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an <b>Environmental Impact Report (EIR)</b> is required.*
[ ]	I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An <b>Environmental Impact Report</b> is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.*
[ ]	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, <b>nothing further is required.</b>

*Thomas Chaffee*

9/29/2022

---

Thomas Chaffee, Planner

---

Date

### Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Aerial Location Maps

Attachment 2 – Project Plans


Attachment 3 – Map of Pending and Recently Approved Projects Used in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Attachment 4 – Works Cited

Attachment 5 – Previous ND adopted by BOS 11.20.12

Attachment 6 – Traffic Study prepared 04.28.22









Ventura County, California  
Resource Management Agency  
GIS Development & Mapping Services  
Map created on 09-21-2022




## County of Ventura Planning Director Hearing PL21-0091 Location Map

0 10,000 20,000 Feet

Disclaimer: This Map was created by the Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Mapping Services - GIS which is designed and operated solely for the convenience of the County and related public agencies. The County does not warrant the accuracy of this map nor does it involve a risk of economic loss or physical injury should be made in reliance thereon.







County of Ventura  
Resource Management Agency  
GIS Development & Mapping Services  
Map created on 09-21-2022  
Source: Moorpark U.S.G.S.  
7.5 Minutes Quadrangle  
Contour Interval = 20 ft




# County of Ventura Planning Director Hearing PL21-0091 Topo Map

0 500 1,000 Feet


Disclaimer: This Map was created by the Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Mapping Services - GIS which is designed and operated solely for the convenience of the County and related public agencies. The County does not warrant the accuracy of this map and no decision involving a risk of economic loss or physical injury should be made in reliance thereon.











PROPERTY OWNER

HYPERICUM LAND COMPNAY, LLC  
11950 SAN VIECENTE BLVD, SUITE 200  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049-5013  
PHONE: (310) 442-6006

APPLICANT

WARPED PAINTBALL PARK, LLC  
4215 TIERRA REJADA RD SUITE 205  
MOORPARK, CA 93021  
PHONE: (310) 466-4093  
E-MAIL: INFO@WARPEDPAINTBALLPARK.COM

SITE STATISTICS

APN: 500-0-090-235 (NO ASSINGED ADDRESS)  
PARCEL MAP BOOK 3 PAGE 94  
CUP BONDARY TO INCLUDE 3 PARCELS BELOW:

- APN: 500-0-090-235  
PARCEL: 57.11 ACRES

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATEION: OPEN SPACE (OS)  
ZONE DESIGNATION: OPEN SPACE OS-20 AC AND OS-10 AC

- APN: 500-0-090-315  
PARCEL AREA: 90.73 ACRES

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATEION: OPEN SPACE (OS)  
ZONE DESIGNATION: OPEN SPACE OS-20 AC AND OS-10 AC

- APN: 500-0-090-345  
PARCEL AREA: 79 ACRES

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATEION: OPEN SPACE (OS)  
ZONE DESIGNATION: OPEN SPACE OS-20 AC AND OS-10 AC

PROPOSED CUP LEGEND

PROPOSED DIRT MUD RUN COURSE	
PROPOSED PARKING	
PROPOSED PLAYING FIELD	

CURRENT CUP LEGEND

CUP#  
ON PARCEL: APN 500-0-90-235

EXISTING DIRT PLAYING FIELD	
EXISTING ARTIFICIAL TURF	
EXISTING ASPHALT / CONCRETE	
EXISTING DRAINAGE CHANNEL	
EXISTING CUP LINE	
EXISTING CONCRETE PAD	
EXISTING PROPERTY LINE	
EXISTING SETBACK LINE	
EXISTING FLOWLINE	

SETBACKS

FRONT: 20 FEET  
SIDE: 10 FEET  
REAR: 15 FEET

MAXIMUM PERCENTAGE OF BUILDING COVERAGE: 5% OF LOT AREA

EXISTING THREE (3) STORAGE CONTAINERS (40'X10')  
PROPOSED THREE (3) ADDITIONAL STORAGE CONTAINERS (40'X10')


PERMITTED USES IN OPEN SPACE

VENTRUA COUNTY NON-COSTAL ORDINACE SECTION 8105-4 PERMITTED  
USE IN OPEN SPACE:

PERIODIC OUTDOOR SPORTING EVENTS IS AN APPROVED USE WITH A  
DIRECTOR-APPROVED  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT.


TEMPORARY (WEEKEND USE) PARKING AREA:

EXISTING NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES: 130  
PROPOSED ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES: 675





LOCATION MAP

N.T.S.




VICINITY MAP

N.T.S.









## **Attachment 4 – Works Cited**

### **Conditional Use Permit, Case No. PL21-0091**

**Ventura County Resource Management Agency (2022).** Geographic Information System Viewer.

**Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Planning Division (February 2022).** Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

**Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Planning Division (February 2022).** Ventura County 2040 General Plan.

**Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Environmental Health Division (December 2021).** Environmental health review by Ashley Kennedy.

**Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Planning Division (April 26, 2011).** Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

**Ventura County Agricultural Commissioner (December 2021).** Agricultural resource review by Alec Thille.

**Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (December 2021).** Air quality review by Nicole Collazo.

**Ventura County Fire Protection District (August 2021).** Fire Protection review by Sydney Molinar.

**Ventura County Public Works Agency, Development and Inspection Services Division (July 2021).** Grading review by Ben Fischetti.

**Ventura County Public Works Agency, Development and Inspection Services Division (July 2021).** Geology review by Jim O'Tousa.

**Ventura County Public Works Agency, Integrated Waste Management Division (November 2021).** Waste management review by Tobie Mitchell

**Ventura County Public Works Agency, Roads and Transportation Department (September 2020).** Roads and transportation review by Darren Arrieta.

**Ventura County Public Works Agency, Watershed Protection District (September 2020).** Jurisdictional drainage and floodplain drainage review by Dawn Stidham-Husted.

**Ventura County Public Works Agency, Watershed Protection District,  
Groundwater Section (October 2021).** Groundwater review by James Maxwell.

**Ventura County Public Works Agency, Watershed Protection District, Surface  
Water Quality Section (September 2020).** Surface water quality review by Ewelina  
Mutkowska.



# ASSOCIATED TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS

100 N. Hope Avenue, Suite 4, Santa Barbara, CA 93110 • (805)687-4418 • [main@atesb.com](mailto:main@atesb.com)

Since 1978

Richard L. Pool, P.E.  
Scott A. Schell

April 28, 2022

21037L04

Glenn Forster  
Warped Paintball Park  
4215 Tierra Rejada, Suite 205  
Moorpark, CA 930021

## TRAFFIC STUDY FOR THE WARPED PAINTBALL PARK CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT MODIFICATION APPLICATION - VENTURA COUNTY

Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) has prepared the following traffic study for the Warped Paintball Park Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Modification Application Permit (the "Project"), located in the unincorporated Ventura County area north of the City of Moorpark. Comments made by Ventura County staff have been incorporated into the revised traffic study.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Warped Paintball Park is located at 8643 Shekell Road. The Park is currently allowed to host 104 events (days) per year (92 events on weekends and the remaining 12 events on holidays and or weekdays by reservation only) with a maximum guest occupancy of 250 persons and 10 employees between the hours of 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM on Saturday and Sunday. Warped Paintball Park is seeking approval to increase the event guest occupancy to 450 persons (including vendors). In addition to the increased Park guest occupancy, a new event ("Mud Run") with a maximum of 1,000 guests (including 100 vendors) held 12 days per year on Saturday and Sunday between the hours of 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM is proposed as part of the modification request. The Mud Run events will be slotted over three time periods; Morning 7:00 - 10:00 AM; Mid-morning 10:00 - 1:00 PM; and Afternoon 1:00 PM - 4:00 PM); with a maximum of 300 attendees per each time slot. Note that



the Mud Run events would not occur concurrent with the typical weekend Park events. A total of 675 parking space will be provided on-site. Currently, site access is via an existing driveway connection to Shekell Road. The attached Figure 1 illustrates the Project site plan. The applicant no longer describes the operation by stating the number of fields. The reason for is field size changes daily based on the number of players in a group. Example: a smaller group of 10 may only use only 10,000 square-feet, while larger groups may use 10 acres for one game. All playing area can be sectioned off by a rope to make it larger or smaller.

## PROJECT TRIP GENERATION ESTIMATE

Since the proposed Project is not consistent with any land use categories contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation, 11<sup>th</sup> Edition or the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), San Diego Traffic Generators, trip generation estimates were developed for the Project based on operational data provided by the applicant for the Project. The data provided for the site operations is summarized below.

### Existing Park Operations:

Employees. The Park is staffed by 10 employees who work Saturday and Sunday, holidays and limited weekdays between the hours of 9:00 AM till the close of business.

Park Guests and Vendors. The park hosts 104 events with 250 guests and vendors per day on weekends (Saturday and Sunday), holidays or weekdays by reservation only. The park guests arrive and depart between the hours of 9:00 AM - 4:00 PM on weekends and holidays. On limited weekdays with reservations, guests arrive and depart between the hours of 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM outside the peak hour commute periods on State Routes 23 and 118. In addition to guests and vendors, there are service deliveries.

### Proposed Park Operations:

Employees. The Park will be staffed by 10 employees who work Saturday and Sunday, holidays and limited weekdays between the hours of 9:00 AM till the close of business. *The CUP Modification would result in no change in the number of Park employees or event days.*

Park Guest and Vendors. The Park will host 92 events days with 450 guests and vendors per day on weekends (Saturday and Sunday only) holidays or weekdays by reservation only. The park guests arrive and depart between the hours of 9:00 AM - 4:00 PM on weekends. On limited weekdays with reservations, guest arrive and depart between the hours of 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM outside the weekday AM and PM peak hour commute periods on State Routes 23 and 118. In addition to guest and vendors, there are service deliveries. EMT's will be on site for each Mud Run Event. They are part of the 1000 per day head count. *The CUP Modification would result in an increase in the number of Park guests.*

Mud Run Employees. The Park will be staffed by 10 employees who work weekends between the hours of 7:00 AM till the close of business. Employee commute trips would occur on weekends and holidays. *The CUP Modification would result in no change in the*



*number of Park employees or event days.*

Mud Run Park Guests and Vendors. The Park will host 12 events days with 1,000 guests and vendors per day Saturday and Sunday only. The Park guests arrive and depart between the hours of 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM on weekends and holidays The Mud Run will be slotted over three time periods; Morning 7:00 - 10:00 AM; Mid-morning 10:00 - 1:00 PM; and Afternoon 1:00 PM - 4:00 PM); with a maximum of 300 attendees per each time slot. In addition to guests and vendors, there are service deliveries. *The CUP Modification would result in 1,000 guest and vendors hosted by the Park for 12 event days a year.*

ATE utilized following methodology to determine the annual average daily trips (AADT) for the CUP. This is the same methodology utilized for the Project's current CUP and is attached for reference. The methodology assumes a vehicle occupancy of 2 persons per vehicle. The Park's CUP required an annual log documenting the number of trips including employee, customer, and truck deliveries. However, the data was not collected. The Park has started collecting data and will submit the data to Ventura County moving forward. Recently collected data is attached.

- **AADT = Vehicles per Event X 2 Trips per Vehicle X # of Events per Year/365 Days per Year**

Table 1 presents the trip generation estimates developed for the existing and the proposed Warped Paintball Park based on the operational data presented above.

**Table 1**  
**Project Trip Generation Estimates**

Land Use	Number	Vehicles Per Event Day	Trips Per Day	Trips Per Year	AADT
<u>Existing Park Operation:</u> (104 Event Days)	(104 Event Days)				
- Employees	10 per event	10	20	2,080	
- Guest and Vendors	250 per event <sup>(a)</sup>	125	250	26,000	
- Service Truck	1 per 2 events	<u>0.50</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>104</u>	
		135.5	271	28,184	77.21
<u>Proposed Park Operation:</u> (92 Event Days)	(92 Event Days)				
- Employees	10 per event	10	20	1,840	
- Guest and Vendors	450 per event <sup>(a)</sup>	225	450	41,400	
- Service Truck	1 per 2 events	<u>0.50</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>92</u>	
		235.5	471	43,332	118.71
(12 Mud Run Event Days)	(12 Event Days)				
- Employees	10 per event	10	20	240	
- Guest and Vendors	1,000 per event <sup>(a)</sup>	500	1,000	12,000	
- Service Truck	1 per event	<u>1.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>24</u>	
		511	1,022	12,264	33.60
<b>Total Proposed Park Operation Trip Generation:</b>		746	1,493	55,596	152.31
<b>Net Trip Generation Increase:</b>					75.10

(a) Assumes an average vehicle occupancy of 2.0.

The data presented in Table 1 indicate that the Warped Paintball Park existing operation generates 77.21 AADT. The proposed Warped Paintball Park operation is estimated to generate 152.31 AADT. The CUP Modification will therefore result in a net increase of 75.10 AADT.

## **SITE ACCESS**

As shown on Figure 1, the main entrance to the Park is provided by an existing driveway connection on Shekell Road. Given the existing and forecasted traffic volumes, the Shekell Road/Project driveway intersection will operate acceptably with normal Park event traffic. The Mud Run event will use the existing Park driveway connection on Shekell Road. The Shekell Road driveway will be monitored and controlled by Park staff during Mud Run event days. Mud Run participants will be given directions/map to the Park. On Mud Run event days there will be signage directing participants to the Shekell Road driveway. Signage shall be incorporated into traffic control plan which is pending review/approval for an annual road encroachment permit. With proper traffic control and monitoring by event staff, the Shekell Road driveway would provide adequate site access for Mud Run event traffic.

## **TRANSPORTATION POLICIES**

### **County of Ventura General Plan Policies**

The County's 2040 General Plan Update includes the following policy regarding potential traffic inconsistencies for Project's located within unincorporated areas in the County.

#### *Policy CTM-1.1: Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) standards and CEQA Evaluation*

The County shall require evaluation of County General Plan land use designation changes, zone changes and discretionary development for their individual (i.e. project-specific) and cumulative transportation impacts based on Vehicle Miles Travels (VMY) under the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to the methodology and thresholds of significance criteria set forth in the County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

#### *Policy CTM-1.2: Projects with Significant Transportation Impacts*

County General Plan land use designation changes, zone changes and discretionary development that would cause an individual (i.e. project-specific) or cumulative significant transportation impacts based on Vehicle Miles Travels (VMY) under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) shall be prohibited unless:

1. There are no feasible mitigation measures available that would reduce the impact to a less than significant level; and
2. The County's decision-making body, after balancing as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits of the project against its unavailable transportation impact and other environmental risk, determines that the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts and adopt a statement of overriding considerations pursuant to CEQA.



*Policy CTM-1.4: Levels of Service (LOS) Evaluation*

County General Plan land use designation changes, zone changes shall be evaluated for their individual (i.e. project-specific) or cumulative effects, and discretionary developments shall be evaluated for their individual effects, on Level of Service (LOS) on existing and future roads, to determine whether the project:

- a. Would cause existing roads within the Regional Road Network or County maintained roadways that are currently functioning at acceptable LOS to function below an acceptable LOS;
- b. Would add traffic to existing roadways within the Regional Road Network or County-maintained roadways that are currently functioning below acceptable LOS; and
- c. Could cause future roads planned for addition within the Regional Road Network or County-maintained roadways to function below and acceptable LOS.
- d. The Level of Service (LOS) evaluation shall be conducted based on methods established by the County.

**POTENTIAL CEQA VMT IMPACTS**

Recent legislation, Senate Bill 743, requires that a project's potential traffic impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) be evaluated based on a new metric that assesses a project's change in "Vehicle Miles Travelled", rather than the Level of Service metrics used in the past. Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. For land use projects, vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Cities and counties were required to implement Senate Bill 743 by July 1, 2020. The County of Ventura has adopted VMT thresholds of significance that are consistent with the guidelines published by the State of California, as reviewed below.

CEQA Guidelines. The California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) published a Technical Advisory on Transportation that includes recommendations regarding assessment of VMT, thresholds of significance, and mitigation measures.<sup>1</sup> The Technical Advisory provides screening tools to determine when a project may have a significant VMT impacts, as follows:

"Many agencies use "screening thresholds" to quickly identify when a project should be expected to cause a less-than-significant impact without conducting a detailed study. (See e.g., CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15063(c)(3)(C), 15128, and Appendix G.) As explained below, this technical advisory suggests that lead agencies may screen out VMT impacts using project size, maps, transit availability, and provision of affordable housing.

*Screening Threshold for Small Projects*

---

<sup>1</sup> Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, December 2018.

Many local agencies have developed screening thresholds to indicate when detailed analysis is needed. Absent substantial evidence indicating that a project would generate a potentially significant level of VMT, or inconsistency with a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) or general plan, projects that generate or attract fewer than 110 trips per day generally may be assumed to cause a less-than significant transportation impact."

As shown in Table 1, the Warped Paintball Park CUP Modification is forecast to generate a net increase of 75.10 AADT. Thus, the Project would have a less-than-significant VMT impact based on the new CEQA guidelines (Project would generate less traffic than 110 ADT screening impact threshold for small projects).

## POTENTIAL PROJECT TRAFFIC IMPACTS

### EXISTING CONDITIONS

#### Street Network

The project study area is served by a network of freeways, arterial streets and collector streets, as illustrated in Figure 1. The following text provides a brief discussion of the primary components of the study-area street network.

**Grimes Canyon Road (State Route 23)**, located east of the Project site, is a 2-lane Class II/III roadway in the study-area. State Route 23 serves as the primary north-south route between the Cities of Moorpark and Fillmore. Grimes Canyon Road is uncontrolled at Shekell Road. Regional access to the Project site is provided via State Route 23.



**Broadway Road (State Route 23)**, located south of the Project site, is a 2-lane Class II roadway that extends from Stockton Road becoming State Route 23 east of Grimes Canyon Road. Broadway Road serves primarily agricultural and residential land uses. Broadway Road is uncontrolled at Shekell Road. Regional access to the Project site is provided via Broadway Road.



**Shekell Road**, located adjacent to the Project site, is a 2-lane Class II roadway that extends west from Grimes Canyon Road to Broadway east of Stockton Road. Shekell Road provides direct access to the Project site via an existing driveway connection. Shekell Road serves primarily agricultural land uses. Shekell Road is STOP-sign controlled at Broadway and Grimes Canyon Road (State Route 23).



### Existing Traffic Volumes

Figure 2 illustrates the study-area intersections, existing traffic controls and the intersection geometries. Existing Saturday peak hour turning volumes for the two study-area intersections are illustrated on Figure 3. The peak hour turning volumes were collected by ATE in January 22, 2022 in conjunction with this study. The peak hour at the Broadway Road/Shekell Road intersection occurred between 11:00 AM and Noon and at the Grimes Canyon Road/Shekell Road intersection between 3:00 PM and 4:00 PM. Traffic count data is attached for reference. Note that trips generated by the existing Park Saturday operation are contained in the existing traffic volumes collected by ATE. Park vehicle counts are attached for reference.

### Existing Baseline Intersection Levels of Service

Because traffic flow on urban arterials is most restricted at intersections, a detailed analysis of traffic flow must examine the operating conditions of critical intersections during peak flow periods. "Levels of Service" (LOS) A through F are used to rate intersection operations.

Intersection levels of service for the study-area intersections were calculated assuming the Existing Saturday traffic volumes illustrated on Figure 3. Worksheets illustrating the calculations are provided in the Technical Appendix. Table 2 list the results of the calculations and existing baseline level of service.

**Table 2**  
**Existing Intersection Levels of Service**

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Control	Saturday Peak Hour	
			Vehicle Delay	LOS
Grimes Canyon Rd./Shekell Rd. Northbound Approach	County/Caltrans	STOP-Sign	9.4 sec.	A
Southbound Approach			7.7 sec.	A
Eastbound Approach			8.0 sec.	A
Westbound Approach			10.0 sec.	A
			0.0 sec.	A
Broadway Rd./Shekell Rd. Southbound Approach	County	STOP-Sign	8.6 sec.	A
Eastbound Left-Turn			8.9 sec.	A
			7.4 sec.	A

The data presented in Table 3 show that the study-area intersections operate acceptably at LOS A with existing Saturday traffic volumes. In May of 2012, as part of Ventura County Public Works staff review of the existing CUP, staff determined that Park traffic would not have a significant impact on the regional roadway network (Ventura County staff findings attached).

#### Project Traffic Impacts

The trip generation analysis completed for the Park indicated that the proposed CUP Modification would generate 152.31 AADT. The existing Warped Paintball Park generates 77.21 AADT. The Park CUP Modification would therefore result in a net increase of 75.10 AADT. In addition, the Park CUP Modification would result in 0 AM and 0 PM peak hour trips on weekdays. Because the Park trips occur on weekends and holidays outside the weekday AM and PM peak hour periods, the Park would therefore not impact State Route 23 or 118 during the AM and PM weekday peak hour periods, and thus would not generate significant traffic impacts based on the County's current General Plan policies. During the weekends the estimated peak hour trip generation is 32 peak hour trips (225 vehicles per day/7 hours). The worst-case, due to the overlap of attendees entering and exiting (300 attendees per time slot with an AVO of 2 attendees per vehicle) during the Mud Run event, the estimated peak hour trip generation is 300 peak hour trips (150 vehicles inbound/150 vehicles outbound).

#### Existing Saturday + Mud Run Event Analysis

As a worst-case analyses ATE evaluated the addition of Mud Run event traffic added to the regional street system. Mud Run event traffic was distributed and assigned to the Grimes Canyon Road/Shekell Road and Broadway Road/Shekell Road based the traffic patterns exhibited on a typical Saturday operational day. Figure 4 illustrates the Mud Run event trip distribution and assignment. Intersection levels of service for the study-area intersections were calculated assuming the Existing Saturday + Mud Run event (Worst-Case) traffic volumes illustrated on Figure 5. Worksheets illustrating the calculations are provided in the Technical Appendix. Table 3 list the results of the calculations and Existing + Mud Run Event level of service.

**Table 3**  
**Existing + Mud Run Event Intersection Levels of Service**

Intersection	Jurisdiction	Control	Saturday Peak Hour			
			Existing		Existing + Mud Run	
			Vehicle Delay	LOS	Vehicle Delay	LOS
Grimes Canyon Rd./Shekell Rd. Northbound Approach Southbound Approach Eastbound Approach Westbound Approach	County/Caltrans	STOP-Sign	9.4 sec.	A	9.6 sec.	A
			7.7 sec.	A	8.0 sec.	A
			8.0 sec.	A	8.0 sec.	A
			10.0 sec.	A	11.0 sec.	B
			0.0 sec.	A	0.0 sec.	A
Broadway Rd./Shekell Rd. Southbound Approach Eastbound Left-Turn	County	STOP-Sign	8.6 sec.	A	8.2 sec.	A
			8.9 sec.	A	9.0 sec.	A
			7.4 sec.	A	7.5 sec.	A

The data presented in Table 3 show that the study-area intersections would operate acceptably at LOS A with addition of Mud Run event traffic volumes.

### COLLISION ANALYSIS

ATE conducted a collision analysis for Grimes Canyon Road (State Route 23) and Broadway Road in order to consider potential safety implications related to the roadway design.

Collision data for the 2 study-area intersections and the Shekell Road and Broadway Road roadway segments were received from the Ventura County. No collision data for the Shekell Road/Project driveway entrance intersection provided. The collision data covers a 5-year period from January 1, 2015 to December 31, 2020 and is attached for review. The following summarizes the collision data for the Broadway Road/Shekell Road intersection, the Grimes Canyon Road (State Route 23)/Shekell Road intersection and the segments of Shekell Road from Broadway Road to Grimes Canyon Road and Broadway from Broadway Road from Stockton Road to Grimes Canyon Road.

*Broadway Road/Shekell Road (2-Way STOP-Sign controlled):* A total of 1 collision occurred at this intersection during the 5-year period. No collisions occurred on a Saturday during hours when the Park was operational. The collision type by frequency was 1 hit object collision. The contributing factor was unsafe speed.

*Grimes Canyon Road/Shekell Road (2-Way STOP-Sign controlled):* A total of 2 collisions occurred at this intersection during the 5-year period. One collision occurred on a Saturday during hours when the Park was operational. The collision type by frequency was 1 sideswipe collision and 1 overturned vehicle collision. The contributing factors by frequency were wrong side of road and improper turning.

*Shekell Road from Broadway Road to Grimes Canyon Road:* A total of 6 collisions occurred along this roadway segment during the 5-year period. Two collisions occurred on a Saturday during hours when the Park was operational. Many of the reported collisions occurred in the vicinity of the intersections at Broadway Road and Grimes Canyon Road. The collision type by



frequency was 4 hit object collisions, 1 overturn vehicle collision, and 1 sideswipe collision. The contributing factors by frequency were 2 unsafe speed, 2 improper turning, 1 driving under the influence, and 1 wrong side of the road.

*Broadway Road from Stockton Road to Grimes Canyon Road:* A total of 19 collisions (including 1 bicycle) occurred along this roadway segment during the 5-year period. Four collisions occurred on a Saturday, 2 occurred during hours when the Park was operational. Many of the reported collisions occur at the intersections at Grimes Canyon Road, Shekell Road and Stockton Road. The collision type by frequency was 10 hit object collisions, 3 broadside collisions, 3 sideswipe collision, 1 head on collision, 3 hit object collisions, 1 bicycle collision, and 1 overturn vehicle collision. The contributing factors by frequency were 7 improper turning, 6 unsafe speed, 5 right-of-way violations and 1 driving under the influence.

ATE's review of the collision data determined that the primary causes of the collisions were aggressive (i.e. speeding, improper turning, right-of-way violations) or inattentive driving and driving under the influence. Geometric improvements would not reduce the type of collisions (rear ends, broadsides, sideswipes) reported at the intersections or the roadway segments. A Traffic Control Plan would help reduce potential collisions during event days.

## **RADAR SPEED SURVEY**

An engineering and traffic survey per California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 627 and as set forth in Chapter 2 of the Caltrans Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) was conducted by Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE). Speed data for traffic traveling (both directions) along Broadway Road at Shekell Road and Grimes Canyon Road at Shekell Road was gathered on January 22, 2022 between 10:00 AM and 12:00 PM and 12:10 PM to 2:10 PM. The speed measurements were made using a calibrated radar unit as noted in the data collection procedures. No unusual conditions were observed during the collection of the radar speed survey. The posted speed limit for Grimes Canyon Road is 45 mph. The speed survey results are summarized in Table 4 below.

**Table 4**  
**Speed Survey Results**

<b>Roadway Segment</b>	<b>85<sup>th</sup> Percentile Speed</b>	<b>Posted Speed</b>
Broadway Road	54 MPH	Unposted 55 MPH
Grimes Canyon Road	56 MPH	45 MPH

As shown in Table 4, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds on Broadway Road and Grimes Canyon Road are above 45 MPH. Speed can be a contributing factor in collisions. No speed survey data was collected for Shekell Road. The collision data showed that of the 6 collisions reported for Shekell Road only 2 were related to speed and they occurred in 2015 and 2018. No speed related collisions were reported in the past 3 years.

## SIGHT DISTANCE ANALYSIS

Sight distances were evaluated to determine if the sight lines along Broadway Road and Grimes Canyon Road (State Route 23) are adequate for turning from Shekell Road. Sight distances were evaluated using the sight distance standards outlined under Topic 405.1(2)(a) in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM).

Broadway Road/Shekell Road. The intersection is controlled by a Stop-Sign for traffic outbound from Shekell Road. Broadway Road is relatively flat and straight in both directions adjacent to Shekell Road. The unposted speed and floating car surveys found that most vehicles travel at or below 55 MPH adjacent to Shekell Road. The 54 MPH vehicle speeds on Broadway Road requires a Caltrans corner sight distance of 605 feet for drivers turning from Shekell Road. The required stopping sight distance is 500 feet.

Figure 6 (attached) illustrates the driver's view along Broadway Road looking to the east from Shekell Road and Figure 7 (attached) illustrates the driver's view along Broadway Road looking to the west from Shekell Road. The corner sight distance looking west is limited by a bank with vegetation along the north side of Broadway Road and west side of Shekell Road. Thus, the sight distances looking to the west from Shekell Road does not satisfy the Caltrans minimum requirement for 605 feet of corner sight distance. It is recommended that tree limbs and shrubs be maintained so that growth does not block the sight distance looking to the west from Shekell Road. Stopping sight distance east bound and west bound is adequate to satisfy the Caltrans minimum requirement of 500 feet. However, County Public Works staff reviewed the sight distance at the intersection and found it to be adequate (Ventura County staff findings attached).

Grimes Canyon Road/Shekell Road. The intersection is controlled by a Stop-Sign for traffic outbound from Shekell Road. Grimes Canyon Road (State Route 23) is relatively flat and straight in both directions adjacent to Shekell Road. The posted speed limit on Grimes Canyon Road is 45 MPH and the radar surveys found that most vehicles travel at or below 56 MPH adjacent to Shekell Road. The 56 MPH vehicle speeds on Grimes Canyon Road requires a Caltrans corner sight distance of 605 feet for drivers turning from Shekell Road. The required stopping sight distance is 500 feet.

Figure 8 (attached) illustrates the driver's view along Grimes Canon Road looking to the north from Shekell Road and Figure 9 (attached) illustrates the driver's view along Grimes Canyon Road looking to the south from Shekell Road.

The corner sight distance looking to the north is limited by a vertical curve about 650 feet from Shekell Road and the corner sight distance looking to the south is limited by a horizontal curve about 1,600 feet from Shekell Road. Thus, the sight distances looking to the north and south from Shekell Road far exceed the Caltrans minimum requirement for 605 feet of corner sight distance. Stopping sight distance north bound and south bound is adequate to satisfy the Caltrans minimum requirement of 500 feet. As shown on Figures 8 and 9, there is a trees and shrubs located on the west side of Grimes Canyon Road north and south of Shekell Road. It is recommended that the tree limbs and shrubs be maintained so that growth does not block the sight distance looking from Shekell Road. County Public Works staff reviewed the sight distance at the intersection and found it to be adequate (Ventura County staff findings attached).



## MUD RUN EVENT TRAFFIC CONTROL

The Project would develop a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) to be approved by Ventura County Public Works staff to manage Mud Run event day traffic. Prior to arrival, Mud Run event participants will be given directions/map to the Park. A field review by ATE staff determined that existing street signs at the intersections of Grimes Canyon Road/Shekell Road and Broadway Road/Shekell Road are small, worn, and hard to read by drivers unfamiliar with the area. Event day signage would help drivers unfamiliar with



the Park location. As part of the TCP, advance event day signage would be placed along Grimes Canyon Road and Broadway Road that will alert drivers to approaching turns at Shekell Road from Grimes Canyon Road or Broadway Road depending on the direction of travel. This will require a Caltrans encroachment permit. The Shekell Road driveway will be monitored and controlled by Park staff during the Mud Run event. Inbound and outbound traffic will be directed to/from event parking or event staging areas to/from Shekell Road. With proper traffic control and monitoring by Mud Run event staff, the Shekell Road driveway would provide adequate site access for Mud Run event traffic.

## SUMMARY


In May of 2012, as part of Ventura County Public Works staff review of the existing CUP, staff determined that traffic generated by the Warped Paintball Park would not have a significant impact on the regional roadway network. The Park's existing operation under the current CUP generates 77.21 AADT. The proposed Park operation is estimated to generate 152.31 AADT. The CUP Modification will therefore result in a net increase of 75.10 AADT. In addition, the Park would result in 0 AM and 0 PM peak hour trips on weekdays. Because the Park trips occur on weekends and holidays outside the weekday AM and PM peak hour periods, the Park would therefore not impact State Route 23 or 118 during the AM and PM weekday peak hour periods, and thus would not generate significant traffic impacts based on the County's current General Plan policies. During the weekends, the estimated peak hour trip generation is 32 peak hour trips (225 vehicles per day/7 hours). Due to the overlap of attendees (300 attendees per time slot with an AVO of 2 attendees per vehicle) during the Mud Run event, the estimated peak hour trip generation is 300 peak hour trips (150 vehicles inbound/150 vehicles outbound).

ATE's review of the collision data determined that the primary causes of the collisions were aggressive or inattentive driving and driving under the influence. Geometric improvements would not reduce the type of collisions (rear ends, broadsides, sideswipes) reported at the intersections or the roadway segments. The intent of the Traffic Control Plan is to help reduce collisions during event days. The majority of the reported collisions occurred during the weekday when the Park was closed. The corner sight distance looking west at the Broadway Road/Shekell



Road intersection is limited by a bank with vegetation along the north side of Broadway Road and west side of Shekell Road. Thus, the sight distances looking to the west from Shekell Road does not satisfy the Caltrans minimum requirement for 605 feet of corner sight distance. Stopping sight distance east bound and west bound is adequate to satisfy the Caltrans minimum requirement of 500 feet. The corner sight distance at the Grimes Canyon Road/Shekell Road intersection looking to the north is limited by a horizontal curve about 650 feet from Shekell Road and the corner sight distance looking to the south is limited by a vertical curve about 1,600 feet from Shekell Road. Thus, the sight distances looking to the north and south from Shekell Road far exceed the Caltrans minimum requirement for 605 feet of corner sight distance. Stopping sight distance north bound and south bound is adequate to satisfy the Caltrans minimum requirement of 500 feet. It is recommended that the tree limbs and shrubs be maintained at both intersections so that growth does not block the sight distance looking from Shekell Road. County Public Works staff reviewed the sight distance at both intersections and found it to be adequate. The Project would develop a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) to be approved by Ventura County Public Works staff to manage Mud Run event day traffic. As part of the TCP, advance event day signage would be placed along Grimes Canyon Road and Broadway Road that will alert drivers to approaching turns at Shekell Road. This will require a Caltrans encroachment permit.

Associated Transportation Engineers



By: Richard L. Pool, P.E.  
Principal Engineer



RLP/SAS/DFN

Attachments: Figure 1- Project Site Plan

Figure 2 - Existing Lane Geometry and Traffic Control

Figure 3 - Existing Saturday Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Figure 4 - Mud Run Event Trip Distribution and Assignment

Figure 5 - Existing Saturday + Mud Run Event Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

Figure 6 - Driver's View Looking East on Broadway Road

Figure 7 - Driver's View Looking West on Broadway Road

Figure 8 - Driver's View Looking North on Grimes Canyon Road

Figure 9 - Driver's View Looking South on Grimes Canyon Road

Existing CUP ADT Calculation Methodology

LOS Worksheets

Ventura County Public Works Memorandum May 16, 2012

January 22, 2022 Park Attendance Data

Month of April 2022 Park Attendance and Vehicle Count Data

December 12, 2021 Castaic Mud Run Attendance and Vehicle Count Data

Traffic Count Data

Radar Speed Survey Data


Collison History





FIGURE 1

GM-ATE#21037

**PROPERTY OWNER.**

HYPERICUM LAND COMPANY, LLC  
11950 SAN VICENTE BLVD, SUITE 200  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049-5013  
PHONE: (310) 442-5006

## APPLICANT

WARPED PAINTBALL PARK, LLC  
1215 TIERRA REJADA RD SUITE 205  
MOORPARK, CA 93021  
PHONE: (310) 466-4093  
E-MAIL: INFO@WARPEDPAINTBALLPARK.COM

## SITE STATISTICS

APN: 500-0-090-235 (NO ASSIGNED ADDRESS)  
PARCEL MAP BOOK 3 PAGE 94; PARCEL A: 57.11 ACRES

APN: 500-0-090-235  
CUP BOUNDARY AREA: 57.11 ACRES

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: OPEN SPACE (OS)  
ZONE DESIGNATION: OPEN SPACE OS-20 AC AND OS-10 AC









PN: 500-0-090-315  
PARCEL AREA: 90.73 ACRES  
UP BOUNDARY AREA: 90.73 ACRES

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: OPEN SPACE (OS)  
ONE DESIGNATION: OPEN SPACE OS-20 AC AND OS-10 AC

PN: 500-0-090-345  
PARCEL AREA: 79 ACRES  
UP BOUNDARY AREA: 79A ACRES

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: OPEN SPACE (OS)  
ONE DESIGNATION: OPEN SPACE OS-20 AC AND OS-10 AC

**CURRENT CUP LEGEND**  
CUP#  
ON PARCEL: APN 500-0-90-235

	EXTENDING BOTT PLACING PENCIL
	EXTENDING REFERENCE LINE
	EXTENDING ANCHOR / COORDINATE
	EXTENDING CH-Anchor (Quadrant)
	EXTENDING CAP / LINE
	EXTENDING COORDINATE TAG
	EXTENDING ANCHOR LINE
	EXTENDING STRAND LINE

## SETBACKS

**PERMITTED USES IN OPEN SPACE**

CIVIL ENGINEERING, NON-CENTRAL, ORIGINATE SECTION II US-4 PERMITTED USE IN OPEN SPACE.



RECREATION, OUTDOOR SPORTING EVENTS IS AN APPROVED USE WITH A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT.



**TEMPORARY (WEEKEND USE) PARKING AREA:**

DURING PERIOD OF HOLIDAY TRAVEL, 100

TEMPORARY (OFFKEND USE) RESIDING AREA.

EXISTING NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES: 130  
REQUIREMENTS FOR ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACE:






LEGEND

XX - Peak Hour Volume






<table border="1"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>52</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>52</td> </tr> </table>	1	52		52	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8</td> <td>90</td> </tr> </table>	2	8	8	90
1	52								
	52								
2	8								
8	90								

# LEGEND

- XX - Peak Hour Volume
- % - Distribution Percentage





<div>1</div> <table><tr><td>58</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>60</td></tr></table>	58	4	3	60	<table><tr><td>55</td><td>40</td></tr></table>	55	40				
58	4	3	60								
55	40										
<div>2</div> <table><tr><td>10</td><td>215</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr></table>	10	215	0	0	<table><tr><td>10</td><td>0</td><td>110</td><td>306</td><td>97</td><td>1</td></tr></table>	10	0	110	306	97	1
10	215	0	0								
10	0	110	306	97	1						

# LEGEND

XX - Peak Hour Volume



NOT TO SCALE


















ASSOCIATED  
TRANSPORTATION  
ENGINEERS



DRIVER'S VIEW LOOKING SOUTH ON GRIMES CANYON ROAD

FIGURE 9

CM-ATE#21037



**Documentation:** If a grading permit is required, all materials, as detailed on Public Works Agency Form DS-37 and/or DS-44, must be submitted to Development and Inspection Services Division for review and approval.

**Timing:** All applicable documentation, as specified above, must be approved prior to issuance of a zoning clearance for use inauguration, or issuance of a Building Permit.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** Public Works Agency engineers will review grading plans and reports for compliance with Ventura County codes, ordinances and standards, as well as state and federal laws. Public Works Agency inspectors will monitor the proposed grading to verify that the work is done in compliance with the approved plans and reports.

## Transportation Department (TD) Conditions

### 29. Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee:

**Purpose:** To address the cumulative adverse impacts of traffic on the Regional Road Network, Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee Ordinance 4246 and County General Plan (GP) 4.2.2 require that the Transportation Department collect a Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee (TIMF).

**Description of Requirement:** The Permittee shall deposit with the Transportation Department a TIMF. The trip generation rate and TIMF will be calculated based on the applicant's information. The Permittee may choose to submit additional information or provide a Traffic Study to supplement the information currently provided to establish the trip generation rate. The TIMF may be adjusted for inflation at the time of deposit in accordance with the latest version of the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index. Based on the applicant's information:

A. The fee due to the County is \$1,312.67.

$$77.21 \text{ ADT} \times \$17.00^1 / \text{ADT} = \underline{\$1,312.67}$$

$$77.21 \text{ ADT} = [135.5 \text{ Vehicles/Event} \times 2 \text{ Trips/Vehicle} \times 104 \text{ Events}^2/\text{Year}] / 365^6 \text{ Days/Year}$$

$$\frac{135.5 \text{ Vehicles}}{\text{Event}} = \frac{250 \text{ Guests/Event}^2}{2 \text{ Guests/Vehicle}^4} + \frac{10 \text{ Employee Vehicles}^2}{\text{Event}} + \frac{1 \text{ Service Truck}^3}{2 \text{ Events}}$$

#### Assumptions/Notes:

1. 2011 TIMF in Moorpark Traffic Impact District #4.
2. Per applicant, up to 250 guests per event, 10 employees per event, and 104 events per year.
3. Assume 1 delivery truck to service portable toilets for every two events.
4. Assume 2 guests per vehicle.
5. Each vehicle makes two trips, one going and one coming from project site.



# HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report


## General Information

Analyst	Darryl F. Nelson
Agency/Co.	ATE
Date Performed	2/20/2022
Analysis Year	2022
Time Analyzed	Existing Peak Hour
Intersection Orientation	North-South
Project Description	Warped Paintball Park

## Site Information

Intersection	Grimes Canyon/Shekell
Jurisdiction	Ventura County
East/West Street	Shekell Road
North/South Street	Grimes Canyon Road
Peak Hour Factor	0.92
Analysis Time Period (hrs)	0.25

## Lanes



## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

Approach	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound			
Movement	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R
Priority		10	11	12		7	8	9	1U	1	2	3	4U	4	5	6
Number of Lanes		0	1	1		0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Configuration		LT		R			LTR				LTR				LTR	
Volume (veh/h)		2	0	20		0	0	0		7	306	1		0	215	2
Percent Heavy Vehicles (%)		3	3	3		3	3	3		3				3		
Proportion Time Blocked																
Percent Grade (%)	0				0											
Right Turn Channelized	No															
Median Type   Storage	Undivided															

## Critical and Follow-up Headways

Base Critical Headway (sec)		7.1	6.5	6.2		7.1	6.5	6.2		4.1				4.1		
Critical Headway (sec)		7.13	6.53	6.23		7.13	6.53	6.23		4.13				4.13		
Base Follow-Up Headway (sec)		3.5	4.0	3.3		3.5	4.0	3.3		2.2				2.2		
Follow-Up Headway (sec)		3.53	4.03	3.33		3.53	4.03	3.33		2.23				2.23		

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

Flow Rate, v (veh/h)		2		22			0			8				0		
Capacity, c (veh/h)		420		802						1325				1220		
v/c Ratio		0.01		0.03						0.01				0.00		
95% Queue Length, Q <sub>95</sub> (veh)		0.0		0.1						0.0				0.0		
Control Delay (s/veh)		13.6		9.6						7.7				8.0		
Level of Service (LOS)		B		A						A				A		
Approach Delay (s/veh)	10.0								0.2				0.0			
Approach LOS	A															

Average Weighted Delay = 9.4 sec. [LOS A]



# HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report


## General Information

Analyst	Darryl F. Nelson
Agency/Co.	ATE
Date Performed	2/20/2022
Analysis Year	2022
Time Analyzed	Existing Peak Hour <i>+ Project</i>
Intersection Orientation	North-South
Project Description	Warped Paintball Park

## Site Information

Intersection	Grimes Canyon/Shekell
Jurisdiction	Ventura County
East/West Street	Shekell Road
North/South Street	Grimes Canyon Road
Peak Hour Factor	0.92
Analysis Time Period (hrs)	0.25

## Lanes



## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

Approach	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound			
Movement	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R
Priority		10	11	12		7	8	9	1U	1	2	3	4U	4	5	6
Number of Lanes		0	1	1		0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Configuration		LT		R			LTR				LTR				LTR	
Volume (veh/h)		10	0	110		0	0	0		97	306	1		0	215	10
Percent Heavy Vehicles (%)		3	3	3		3	3	3		3				3		
Proportion Time Blocked																
Percent Grade (%)	0				0											
Right Turn Channelized	No															
Median Type   Storage	Undivided															

## Critical and Follow-up Headways

Base Critical Headway (sec)		7.1	6.5	6.2		7.1	6.5	6.2		4.1				4.1		
Critical Headway (sec)		7.13	6.53	6.23		7.13	6.53	6.23		4.13				4.13		
Base Follow-Up Headway (sec)		3.5	4.0	3.3		3.5	4.0	3.3		2.2				2.2		
Follow-Up Headway (sec)		3.53	4.03	3.33		3.53	4.03	3.33		2.23				2.23		

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

Flow Rate, v (veh/h)		11		120			0			105				0		
Capacity, c (veh/h)		287		797						1316				1220		
v/c Ratio		0.04		0.15						0.08				0.00		
95% Queue Length, Q <sub>95</sub> (veh)		0.1		0.5						0.3				0.0		
Control Delay (s/veh)		18.1		10.3						8.0				8.0		
Level of Service (LOS)		C		B						A				A		
Approach Delay (s/veh)	11.0									2.5				0.0		
Approach LOS	B															

*Average Weighted Delay = 9.6 sec. [LOS A]*



# HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report


## General Information

Analyst	Darryl F Nelson
Agency/Co.	ATE
Date Performed	2/20/2022
Analysis Year	2022
Time Analyzed	Existing Peak Hour
Intersection Orientation	East-West
Project Description	Warped Paintball Park

## Site Information

Intersection	Broadway/Road/Shekell Roa
Jurisdiction	Ventura County
East/West Street	Broadway Road
North/South Street	Shekell Road
Peak Hour Factor	0.92
Analysis Time Period (hrs)	0.25

## Lanes



## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

Approach	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound			
Movement	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R
Priority	1U	1	2	3	4U	4	5	6		7	8	9		10	11	12
Number of Lanes	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0		0	1	0
Configuration		LT						TR							LR	
Volume (veh/h)		3	40				60	3						4		6
Percent Heavy Vehicles (%)		3												3		3
Proportion Time Blocked																
Percent Grade (%)													0			
Right Turn Channelized																
Median Type   Storage	Undivided															

## Critical and Follow-up Headways

Base Critical Headway (sec)		4.1												7.1		6.2
Critical Headway (sec)		4.13												6.43		6.23
Base Follow-Up Headway (sec)		2.2												3.5		3.3
Follow-Up Headway (sec)		2.23												3.53		3.33

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

Flow Rate, v (veh/h)		3													11	
Capacity, c (veh/h)		1526													943	
v/c Ratio		0.00													0.01	
95% Queue Length, Q <sub>95</sub> (veh)		0.0													0.0	
Control Delay (s/veh)		7.4													8.9	
Level of Service (LOS)		A													A	
Approach Delay (s/veh)	0.5												8.9			
Approach LOS													A			

Average Weighted Delay = 8.6 sec. (LOS A)



# HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report


## General Information

Analyst	Darryl F Nelson
Agency/Co.	ATE
Date Performed	2/20/2022
Analysis Year	2022
Time Analyzed	Existing Peak Hour + Project
Intersection Orientation	East-West
Project Description	Warped Paintball Park

## Site Information

Intersection	Broadway/Road/Shekell Roa
Jurisdiction	Ventura County
East/West Street	Broadway Road
North/South Street	Shekell Road
Peak Hour Factor	0.92
Analysis Time Period (hrs)	0.25

## Lanes



Major Street: East-West

## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

Approach	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound			
Movement	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R
Priority	1U	1	2	3	4U	4	5	6		7	8	9		10	11	12
Number of Lanes	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0		0	1	0
Configuration		LT						TR							LR	
Volume (veh/h)		55	40				60	3						4		50
Percent Heavy Vehicles (%)		3												3		3
Proportion Time Blocked																
Percent Grade (%)														0		
Right Turn Channelized																
Median Type   Storage																

## Critical and Follow-up Headways

Base Critical Headway (sec)		4.1												7.1		6.2
Critical Headway (sec)		4.13												6.43		6.23
Base Follow-Up Headway (sec)		2.2												3.5		3.3
Follow-Up Headway (sec)		2.23												3.53		3.33

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

Flow Rate, v (veh/h)		60													59	
Capacity, c (veh/h)		1526													967	
v/c Ratio		0.04													0.06	
95% Queue Length, Q <sub>95</sub> (veh)		0.1													0.2	
Control Delay (s/veh)		7.5													9.0	
Level of Service (LOS)		A													A	
Approach Delay (s/veh)		4.4												9.0		
Approach LOS															A	

Average Weighted Delay = 8.2 sec. [LOS A]





PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY  
TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT  
Traffic, Advance Planning & Permits Division

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 16, 2012

TO: RMA - Planning Division  
Attention: Kristina Roodsari

FROM: Behnam Emami, Engineering Manager II *Ben*

SUBJECT: APPLICATION COMPLETENESS (Clarification)

PROJECT NO: LU 11-0030 (CUP)

PERMITTEE: Glen Forester

Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Outdoor Periodic Sporting  
Events for a paintball and air-soft sports center.

8643 Shekell Road (MPK)

APN 500-0-090-23

Pursuant to your request, the Public Works Agency - Transportation Department has reviewed the citizen's attorney letter and discussed the comments reportedly made during the recent public hearing on April 19, 2012, with regard to turning movements at the three intersections near the project site. This Response Memorandum is being written to clarify and reiterate our views after the meeting with RMA Staff on April 23<sup>rd</sup> at 2:30 p.m.

This project is a CUP for Outdoor Periodic Sporting Events for a paintball and air-soft sports center to be open from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. no more than 116 days per year. The sports center will have the games/matches for 104 weekend days per year (any Saturday or Sunday of the year) with an additional 12 days available for games/matches on any weekday or holiday (Monday through Friday). No more than 250 persons will participate in the paintball games in any one day. The facility is restricted from allowing more than 250 persons enter the facility in any one event day. There will be 10 employees. The project is located at 8643 Shekell Road near the City of Moorpark on the property formerly known as Egg City.

Given our understanding of the project, it is our view that the project would have very minimal impact on intersections near the project which are: (1) Shekell Road at Broadway Road (southwest of the project site); (2) Shekell Road at Grimes Canyon Road (State Route 23) (northeast); and (3) Grimes Canyon Road (State Route 23) at Broadway Road (southeast).



We offer the following comments:

1. According to the project description, most project generated traffic will occur on Saturdays or Sundays during off-peak hours. Consequently, the traffic generated by the project will contribute minimal traffic during the peak periods of congestion on State Route 23 which would occur Monday through Friday in the mornings and afternoons.
2. Although unlikely, on event days where the maximum number of guests would use the facility, we estimate that the 250 guests would generate approximately 125 vehicles at a conservative occupancy rate of two persons per vehicle. This is the worst-case scenario. It is likely that larger groups would carpool with more than two persons per vehicle.
3. In addition, the project-related trips, whether occurring on a weekend or weekday, will be distributed over a seven-hour period during the operational hours. Therefore, the worst scenario of 125 vehicles coming to the facility would arrive and leave at 18 per hour. Any temporary spike in traffic over this estimated rate would occur infrequently with a duration of a few minutes.
4. And lastly, based on our observations of traffic at the three intersections near the project, visibility is adequate for making right or left turns.

Our review is limited to the impacts this project may have on the County's Regional Road Network.

Please contact me at 654-2087 if you have questions.

F:\transport\LanDev\County\LU 11-0030-3 (CUP).doc

# Ambush Paintball Park Schedule for 01/22/22

[Print](#)

					<b>Player Count : 107</b> <b>50 Caliber Low Impact Gun : 10</b> <b>Air soft Rental M4 (Mask included if needed) : 14</b> <b>Full Rental Kit : 82</b>				
<b>LG Cheese Pizza : 3</b> <b>LG Pepperoni Pizza : 7</b>									

## Super Party Package : 500 rds pp

	ArrivalTime	Players	Rentals	Disc	Per	Paid	FinalCost	Due	Promo
Athletes First Travis Allen - 5178981726 tallen@athletesfirst.net	12:00 PM	20	20	\$0.00	\$50.00	\$100.00	\$1,000.00	\$900.00	

Customer Note: may be north of 20 ppl

Admin Note: Might have some cameras with them. This group trains potential NFL players for the draft.

Jameson, Zac Lora Guerrero - 8059148141 loraanguerrero@gmail.com	11:30 AM	10	10	\$0.00	\$55.00	\$100.00	\$610.00	\$510.00	
--	----------	----	----	--------	---------	----------	----------	----------	--

Customer Note: Jameson (turning 10) & Zac's (turning 11) Birthday Party

Waivers Lora Guerrero ( Jameson Guerrero - Andre Guerrero - ) / Kolbe Del toro / Brian Kelley ( Thomas Kelley - ) / Natalie Guvlekjian ( Audrey Sims - ) /

1 - LG Cheese Pizza  
3 - LG Pepperoni Pizza

Karma Karma - 8056163736 Karmasantiago88@gmail.com	9:00 AM	15	15	\$0.00	\$55.00	\$100.00	\$825.00	\$725.00	
--	---------	----	----	--------	---------	----------	----------	----------	--

Admin Note: Requesting john Robinson as ref

Waivers Michael Dueñas / Eric Vasquez / German Vasquez / Felix Santos / Fabian Hernandez / Abel Morales / Martin Morales / Adrian Villegas-perez / Nick Hoyle / Karma Santiago / Francisco Morales / Freddy Vasquez / Elvia Hernandez ( Osvaldo Morales - ) / Alex Dobbs / Roberto Arreola / Martin Morales ( Osvaldo Morales - ) /

OAKS CHRISTIAN SCHOOL - RES LIFE Dina Castillo - 8188249429 dcastillo@oakschristian.org	1:00 PM	20	20	\$0.00	\$50.00	\$100.00	\$1,000.00	\$900.00	
--	---------	----	----	--------	---------	----------	------------	----------	--

Customer Note: 8188249429

Waivers Dina Castillo ( Yuxing Ji - Xiaohua Chen - Boyu Yang - ) / Dina Castillo ( Yulin Liu - Shihan Zhang - ) / Dina Castillo ( YuanHao Qi - ) / Dina Castillo ( Yung-lun Chen - Yanbo Hou - Jiazheng Huang - Zhen Li - Jia Qian Ye - Zhan Zhang - Junqi Zhou - Patipharn Udomphornvirat - ) / Katina Beach ( Stephan Beach - ) / Danil Nezhdanov ( Konstantin Nezhdanov - ) / Amber Nungester ( Joshua Nungester - ) / Rui Chen / Mike McDowell / Andrew DeCarolis / Mike McDowell ( Ziheng Zhuang - ) /

Yosef Chason Yosef Chason - 3109759995 ychason@yahoo.com	10:00 AM	10	10	\$0.00	\$55.00	\$100.00	\$595.00	\$495.00	
--	----------	----	----	--------	---------	----------	----------	----------	--

Customer Note: 3109759995

Waivers Yosef Chason ( Shimone Chason - Ariye Chason - Asher Chason - ) / Yael Shakked ( Yoav Shakked - Yuval Shakked - Yonatan Shakked - Yossi Shakked - ) /

3 - LG Pepperoni Pizza

## Deluxe Walk-On: 1000 rds pp

	ArrivalTime	Players	Rentals	Disc	Per	Paid	FinalCost	Due	Promo
Savage Angel Hernandez - 8057416642 a.hernandez805@hotmail.com	12:00 PM	6	6	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$0.00	\$360.00	\$360.00	

Waivers Danny Morgan / Angel Hernandez / Roberto Estrada / Fabian DeLeon / Jacob Dean / Ben Carreno /

Savage 2 Angel Hernandez - 8057416642 a.hernandez805@hotmail.com	12:00 PM	1	1	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	
---	----------	---	---	--------	---------	--------	---------	---------	--

**Airsoft Private**

	ArrivalTime	Players	Rentals	Disc	Per	Paid	FinalCost	Due	Promo
Taleen Chahmelikian Taleen Chahmelikian - 8186057834 tchahmelikian@gmail.com	11:00 AM	15	14	\$0.00	\$65.00	\$100.00	\$975.00	\$875.00	

*Waivers* Nayiri Demir ( Allen Demir - ) / Taleen Chahmelikian ( Antranig Chahmelikian - ) / Abraham Mitilian ( Harout Mitilian - ) / Lena Berghoudian ( Sako Arimian - ) / Shane Shakarentz ( Aren Shakarentz - ) / Maral Tarpinian ( Harut Tarpinian - ) / Maral Bulanikian ( Ara Bulanikian - ) / Nela Kedikian ( Julian Kedikian - ) / Talar Ohannessian ( Paul Ohannessian - ) / Candice Titizian ( Tony Titizian - ) / Nora Markarian ( Aren Markarian - ) /

**Kids Low-Impact Party : 4000 rds to share**

	ArrivalTime	Players	Rentals	Disc	Per	Paid	FinalCost	Due	Promo
Graham's 9th Birthday Party Melanie Justice - 3107016922 melajust@gmail.com	12:30 PM	10	10	\$0.00	\$50.00	\$100.00	\$545.00	\$445.00	

*Customer Note:* We will come early and bring pizza.

*Waivers* Heather Donley ( Nathan Donley - ) / Andrea Iranpour ( Joaquin Iranpour - ) / Rose Lockwood ( Vinny Lockwood - Joseph Lockwood - ) / Sarah Schwendimann / Sarah Schwendimann ( Zach Schwendimann - ) / Melanie Justice ( Graham Justice - ) / Greg Shaffer ( Travis Shaffer - ) / London Sanders / London Sanders ( Liam Bond - ) / Megan Leark ( Owen Leark - Henry Leark - ) / Jennifer Steinert ( Griffin Steinert - ) /

2 - LG Cheese Pizza

1 - LG Pepperoni Pizza

**Unattached Waivers**

Brian Belmontez - 8056572730

Zaid Cruz - 8059069573

Diana Vazquez - 8052317266 (Minors - Giovanni Navarrete, )



4/18/22

TO : Thomas Chaffee  
Gianfranco Laurie, P.E., T.E.

Subject: **PROJECT NO: PL21-0091**

Addressing questions raised by Gianfranco Laurie, regarding the average # of participants that travel together, per-vehicle, to a typical paintball & Airsoft park vs. The average # of participants that travel together, per-vehicle, to a typical Mud Run event.

This past Saturday 4/16/22. I counted all vehicles and participants at both of my locations.

Moorpark CA and Castaic CA

I did not count Sunday because this was Easter and I had very few participants.

This is the data I compiled:

Castaic location:

Participants	- 116	Vehicles – 55
Staff	- 8	Vehicles – 5

Moorpark location:

Participants	- 199	Vehicles – 84
Staff	- 10	Vehicles – 8

After combining my Participants and staff together, I calculate at average vehicle occupancy of  
(333 participants / 152 vehicles = 2.2)

I also walked into the administration office at Castaic Lake and talked to Tanya at the front desk.

She shared with me her compiled data report that she filed with the State of CA on their last Mud Run event hosted by "Spartan Inc" on 12/12/21

The report she shared with is attached for your reference.

I hope this Data helps answers your questions.

Sincerely,

Glenn Forster



# Castaic location

Date	16-Apr	17-Apr	23-Apr	24-Apr	Total	Total people	total vehicles	Average # per vehicle
participants	116	33	117	215	481	507	228	2.223684211
participants vehicles	55	15	52	85	207			
staff	8	2	8	8	26			
staff vehicles	5	2	7	7	21			

# Moorpark Location

Date	16-Apr	17-Apr	23-Apr	24-Apr	Total	Total people	total vehicles	Average # per vehicle
participants	199	64	127	230	620	649	291	2.23024055
participants vehicles	84	28	49	105	266			
staff	10	4	7	8	29			
staff vehicles	8	4	6	7	25			

DATE: 12-12-21

PLEASE DON'T ENTER VALUES IN HIGHLIGHTED SECTIONS!

	SATURDAY VEHICLE SALES		ESTIMATED # OF PEOPLE
		TOTAL	
VEHICLES	803	803	3533.2
SENIOR VEHICLES	36	36	158
RV'S	1	1	4.4
Veh. Annuals Reg & Snr		0	0

	SUNDAY VEHICLE SALES		ESTIMATED # OF PEOPLE
		TOTAL	
VEHICLES	596	596	2622
SENIOR VEHICLES	20	20	88
RV'S		0	0
Veh. Annuals Reg & Snr	2	2	9

	WEEKEND VEHICLE TOTALS		ESTIMATED # OF PEOPLE
		TOTAL	
VEHICLES	1399	1399	6156
SENIOR VEHICLES	56	56	246
RV'S	1	1	4.4
Veh. Annuals Reg & Snr	2	2	9

	# OF CAMPSITES OCCUPIED	ESTIMATED # OF PEOPLE
# OF OCCUPIED CAMPSITES SATURDAY	6	36
# OF OCCUPIED CAMPSITES SUNDAY	9	54

SATURDAY'S TOTAL (VEHICLES + CAMPSITES)	3732
SUNDAY'S TOTAL (VEHICLES + CAMPSITES)	2773





**Location:** Grimes Canyon Rd & Shekell Rd  
**City:** Moorpark  
**Control:** 1-Way Stop(EB)

## Data - Totals

NS/EW Streets:

Grimes Canyon Rd

NORTHBOUND

NL

0

NT

0

NR

0

NU

0

0

0

SL

0

ST

0

SR

0

SU

0

0

0

EL

0

ET

0

ER

0

EU

0

0

0

WL

0

WT

0

WR

0

WU

0

0

0

SOUTHBOUND

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0





# Shekell Rd & Broadway Rd

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count

ID: 22-050001-002  
City: Moorpark

Day: Saturday  
Date: 1/22/2022



## National Data &amp; Surveying ServicesIntersection Turning Movement Count

**Location:** Shekell Rd & Broadway Rd  
**City:** Moorpark  
**Control:** 1-Way Stop(SB)

Project ID: 22-050001-002  
Date: 1/22/2022

## Data - Totals

NS/EW Streets:		Shekell Rd										Shekell Rd										Broadway Rd										Broadway Rd									
		NORTHBOUND					SOUTHBOUND					EASTBOUND					WESTBOUND					EASTBOUND					WESTBOUND														
		NL	NT	NR	NU	0	SL	ST	SR	SU	0	EL	ET	ER	EU	0	WL	WT	WR	WU	0	EL	ET	ER	EU	0	WL	WT	WR	WU	0										
AM	9:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
	9:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
	9:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
	9:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
	10:00 AM	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
	10:15 AM	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
	10:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
	10:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0										
	TOTAL VOLUMES :		2	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	1	82	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
	APPROACH %'s :		50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.19%	97.62%	1.19%	0.00%	0.00%	1.02%	91.84%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%								
PEAK HR VOL :		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
PEAK HR FACTOR :		0.000	0.000	0.250	0.000	0.250	0.250	0.000	0.375	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.639	0.250	0.000	0.000	0.250	0.722	0.417	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.917									
		NORTHBOUND					SOUTHBOUND					EASTBOUND					WESTBOUND					EASTBOUND					WESTBOUND														
		NL	NT	NR	NU	0	SL	ST	SR	SU	0	EL	ET	ER	EU	0	WL	WT	WR	WU	0	EL	ET	ER	EU	0	WL	WT	WR	WU	0										
NOON	11:00 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	11:15 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	11:30 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	11:45 AM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	12:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	12:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	12:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	12:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	1:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
	1:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
1:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
1:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
TOTAL VOLUMES :		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
APPROACH %'s :		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	43.75%	0.00%	56.25%	0.00%	0.00%	3.75%	96.24%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	93.20%	6.80%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%								
PEAK HR VOL :		0	0	0	0	0	4	0	6	0	0	3	40	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
PEAK HR FACTOR :		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.500	0.000	0.300	0.000	0.000	0.375	0.769	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.882	0.375	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.829	0.375	0.000	0.000	0.906									
		NORTHBOUND					SOUTHBOUND					EASTBOUND					WESTBOUND					EASTBOUND					WESTBOUND														
		NL	NT	NR	NU	0	SL	ST	SR	SU	0	EL	ET	ER	EU	0	WL	WT	WR	WU	0	EL	ET	ER	EU	0	WL	WT	WR	WU	0										
PM	2:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	2:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	2:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	2:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	3:00 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	3:15 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	3:30 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	3:45 PM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
	TOTAL VOLUMES :		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
	APPROACH %'s :		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	92.86%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	5.08%	94.92%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	92.96%	5.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%							
PEAK HR VOL :		0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	32	0	0	0	0	0	33	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
PEAK HR FACTOR :		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.750	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.375	0.667	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.550	0.375	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.713									
		NORTHBOUND					SOUTHBOUND					EASTBOUND					WESTBOUND					EASTBOUND					WESTBOUND														
		NL	NT	NR	NU	0	SL	ST	SR	SU	0	EL	ET	ER	EU	0	WL	WT	WR	WU	0	EL	ET	ER	EU	0	WL	WT	WR	WU	0										
TOTAL VOLUMES :		0	0	0	0	0	13	0	1	0	0	3	56	0	0	0	0	66	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
APPROACH %'s :		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	92.86%	0.00%	7.14%	0.00%	0.00%	5.08%	94.92%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	92.96%	5.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%								
PEAK HR VOL :		0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	32	0	0	0	0	33	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
PEAK HR FACTOR :		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.750	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.375	0.667	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.550	0.375	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.713									



# Spot Speed Study

Prepared by: National Data & Surveying Services


## City of Moorpark

DATE: 1/22/2022  
TIME: 12:10-14:10

Location: 11070 Broadway Rd  
Posted Speed: None Clear/Dry

Project #: 22-050003-002

### Eastbound & Westbound Spot Speeds



SPEED PARAMETERS									
Class	Count	Range	50th Percentile	85th Percentile	10 MPH Pace	# in Pace	Percent in Pace	% / # Below Pace	% / # Above Pace
ALL	119	28 - 62	47 mph	54 mph	44 - 53	69	58%	24% / 29	18% / 21

# Spot Speed Study

Prepared by: National Data & Surveying Services


## City of Moorpark

DATE: 1/22/2022  
TIME: 10:00-12:00

Location: 8800 Grimes Canyon Rd  
Posted Speed: 45 MPH Clear/Dry

Project #: 22-050003-001

### Northbound & Southbound Spot Speeds



SPEED PARAMETERS									
Class	Count	Range	50th Percentile	85th Percentile	10 MPH Pace	# in Pace	Percent in Pace	% / # Below Pace	% / # Above Pace
ALL	212	30 - 61	50 mph	56 mph	47 - 56	140	66%	22% / 48	12% / 24



County of Ventura-PWA  
Traffic Engineering Section

1/18/22

From 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2020

Total Collisions: 2

Injury Collisions: 2

Fatal Collisions: 0

Collision Summary Report

GRIMES CANYON RD & SHEKELL RD

Page 1 of 1

90631786	12/23/2017	10:10	Saturday	GRIMES CANYON RD - SHEKELL RD	0'	Direction: Not Stated	Daylight	Clear	Pty at Fault: 1
	Sideswipe	North	Traveling Wrong Way	Wrong Side of Road	21650	Hit & Run: No	Severe Injury		# Inj: 1 # Killed: 0
Party 1 Driver				Female Age: 24					No Injury
Veh Type: Passenger Car			Sobriety: HNBD	Assoc Factor: Not Stated	Air Bag Deployed		Not Stated		No Injury
Party 2 Driver				Female Age: 53					No Injury
Veh Type: Passenger Car			Sobriety: HNBD	Assoc Factor: Not Stated	Air Bag Not Deployed		Not Stated		No Injury
20-03-0211	3/2/2020	10:30	Monday	SHEKELL RD - GRIMES CANYON RD	50'	Direction: West	Daylight	Clear	Pty at Fault: 1
	Overtaken		Non-Collision	Improper Turning	22107	Hit & Run: No	Complaint of Pain		# Inj: 2 # Killed: 0
Party 1 Driver				Age:					No Injury
Veh Type: Passenger Car			Other Unsafe Turning	Assoc Factor: None Apparent			Passenger Car, Station Wagon, Jeep		No Injury
			Sobriety: HNBD				Cell Phone Not In Use		

Settings for Query:

Street: GRIMES CANYON RD

Cross Street: SHEKELL RD

Intersection Related: True

Sorted By: Date and Time

County of Ventura-PWA  
Traffic Engineering Section

1/18/22

Collision Summary Report

From 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2020

Total Collisions: 1

Injury Collisions: 0

Fatal Collisions: 0

BROADWAY RD & SHEKELL RD

15-02-048	2/12/2015	19:37	Thursday	BROADWAY RD - SHEKELL RD	0'	Direction: Not Stated	Dark - No Street	Clear	Page 1 of 1	
	Hit Object	South	Fixed Object	Unsafe Speed	22350	Hit & Run: No	Property Damage Only	# Inj: 0	Pty at Fault: 1	# Killed: 0
Party 1	Driver		Ran Off Road	Age:						
Veh Type:			Sobriety: HNBD	Assoc Factor:					No Injury	

Settings for Query:

Street: BROADWAY RD  
Cross Street: SHEKELL RD  
Intersection Related: True  
Sorted By: Date and Time

County of Ventura-PWA  
Traffic Engineering Section

1/18/22

From 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2020

Total Collisions: 6

Injury Collisions: 3

Fatal Collisions: 0

Collision Summary Report

SHEKELL RD from GRIMES CANYON RD to BROADWAY RD

Page 1 of 2

15-02-048	2/12/2015	19:37	Thursday	BROADWAY RD - SHEKELL RD	0'	Direction: Not Stated	Dark - No Street	Clear	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Hit Object	South	Ran Off Road	Unsafe Speed	22350	Hit & Run: No	Property Damage Only	# Inj: 0	# Killed: 0
Veh Type:			Sobriety: HNBD	Age:				No Injury	
15-07-028	7/8/2015	06:00	Wednesday	SHEKELL RD - GRIMES CANYON RD	4224'	Direction: West	Daylight	Cloudy	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Hit Object	West	Fixed Object	Improper Turning	22107	Hit & Run: No	Property Damage Only	# Inj: 0	# Killed: 0
Veh Type: Passenger Car				Age:		Passenger Car, Station Wagon, Jeep		No Injury	
90283566	9/26/2016	16:40	Monday	SHEKELL RD - BROADWAY RD	1700'	Direction: North	Daylight	Clear	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Hit Object	North	Fixed Object	Driving Under Influence	23152A	Hit & Run: No	Other Visible Injury	# Inj: 1	# Killed: 0
Veh Type: Pickup Truck				Age: 26		Cell Phone Not In Use		Other Visible Injury	
90631786	12/23/2017	10:10	Saturday	GRIMES CANYON RD - SHEKELL RD	0'	Direction: Not Stated	Daylight	Clear	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Sideswipe	North	Other Motor Vehicle	Wrong Side of Road	21650	Hit & Run: No	Severe Injury	# Inj: 1	# Killed: 0
Veh Type: Passenger Car				Age: 24		Air Bag Deployed	Not Stated	No Injury	
Party 2 Driver		North	Making Left Turn	Assoc Factor: Not Stated				No Injury	
Veh Type: Passenger Car				Age: 53		Air Bag Not Deployed	Not Stated	No Injury	
18-11-1258	11/10/2018	10:30	Saturday	SHEKELL RD - GRIMES CANYON RD	65'	Direction: West	Daylight	Clear	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Hit Object	West	Fixed Object	Unsafe Speed	22350	Hit & Run: No	Property Damage Only	# Inj: 0	# Killed: 0
Veh Type: Passenger Car				Age:		Passenger Car, Station Wagon, Jeep		No Injury	
20-03-0211	3/2/2020	10:30	Monday	SHEKELL RD - GRIMES CANYON RD	50'	Direction: West	Daylight	Clear	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Overtaken	West	Non-Collision	Improper Turning	22107	Hit & Run: No	Complaint of Pain	# Inj: 2	# Killed: 0
Veh Type: Passenger Car				Age:		Passenger Car, Station Wagon, Jeep		No Injury	
				Assoc Factor: None Apparent		Cell Phone Not In Use			

**SHEKELL RD from GRIMES CANYON RD to BROADWAY RD**

Segment Length: 1.35 miles (7,129')

Collisions per mile: 4.44

Settings for Query:

Segment: SHEKELL RD between GRIMES CANYON RD and BROADWAY RD

Include Intersection Related at Limit 1 (GRIMES CANYON RD): True

Include Intersection Related at Limit 2 (BROADWAY RD): True

Include Intersection Related at Intermediate Intersections: True

Sorted By: Date and Time



## Traffic Engineering Section

From 1/1/2015 to 12/31/2020

Total Collisions: 19

### Injury Collisions: 6

**Fatal Collisions: 1**

## Collision Summary Report

1/18/22

## BROADWAY RD from STOCKTON RD to GRIMES CANYON RD (E)

15-02-048	2/12/2015	19:37	Thursday	BROADWAY RD - SHEKELL RD	0'	Direction: Not Stated	Dark - No Street	Clear	# Inj: 0	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Hit Object	South	Fixed Object	Unsafe Speed	22350	Hit & Run: No	Property Damage Only		No Injury	
Veh Type:		Ran Off Road		Age:						
15-05-140	5/29/2015	02:50	Friday	BROADWAY RD - GRIMES CANYON RD (W)	15'	Direction: West	Dark - No Street	Clear	# Inj: 0	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Hit Object	East	Fixed Object	Improper Turning	22107	Hit & Run: Misde	Property Damage Only		No Injury	
Veh Type: Pickup Truck		Other Unsafe Turning		Age:		Pickups & Panels				
15-10-302	10/20/2015	11:10	Tuesday	BROADWAY RD - GRIMES CANYON RD (W)	1163'	Direction: East	Daylight	Clear	# Inj: 0	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Broadside	West	Other Motor Vehicle	Auto R/W Violation	21801A	Hit & Run: No	Fatal		# Inj: 1	# Killed: 1
Veh Type: Pickup Truck		Making Left Turn		Age:		Pickups & Panels			No Injury	
Party 2 Driver	East	Proceeding Straight		Assoc Factor: None Apparent		Cell Phone Not In Use			No Injury	
Veh Type: Truck		Sobriety: HNBD		Age:		Truck Tractor				
16-02-202B	2/16/2016	06:20	Tuesday	GRIMES CANYON RD - BROADWAY RD (E)	0'	Direction: Not Stated	Daylight	Clear	# Inj: 0	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Head-On	North	Other Motor Vehicle	Auto R/W Violation	21802A	Hit & Run: No	Property Damage Only		# Inj: 0	# Killed: 0
Veh Type: Passenger Car		Making Left Turn		Age:		Passenger Car, Station Wagon, Jeep			No Injury	
Party 2 Driver	East	Proceeding Straight		Assoc Factor: None Apparent		Cell Phone Not In Use			No Injury	
Veh Type: Passenger Car		Sobriety: HNBD		Age:		Sport Utility Vehicle				
16-06-701	6/18/2016	21:45	Saturday	BROADWAY RD - GRIMES CANYON RD (E)	45'	Direction: West	Dark - No Street	Clear	# Inj: 1	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Hit Object	West	Fixed Object	Driving Under Influence	23152A	Hit & Run: No	Other Visible Injury		# Inj: 1	# Killed: 0
Veh Type: Pickup Truck		Proceeding Straight		Age:		Pickups & Panels			No Injury	
16-08-967	8/20/2016	11:25	Saturday	BROADWAY RD - GRIMES CANYON RD (W)	0'	Direction: Not Stated	Daylight	Clear	# Inj: 1	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Bicyclist	Other	West	Bicycle	Improper Turning	22107	Hit & Run: No	Other Visible Injury		# Inj: 1	# Killed: 0
Veh Type: Bicycle		Making Left Turn		Age:		Bicycle			No Injury	
Party 2 Driver	West	Proceeding Straight		Assoc Factor: None Apparent		Cell Phone Not In Use			No Injury	
Veh Type: Passenger Car		Sobriety: HNBD		Age:		Sport Utility Vehicle				
16-08-1004	8/29/2016	18:35	Monday	BROADWAY RD - STOCKTON RD	125'	Direction: East	Daylight	Clear	# Inj: 0	Pty at Fault:1
Party 1 Driver	Hit Object	West	Fixed Object	Improper Turning	22107	Hit & Run: No	Property Damage Only		# Inj: 0	# Killed: 0



## Page 2 of 3

<b>Party 1</b> Driver Veh Type: Passenger Car <b>90265623</b>	East <b>9/2/2016</b>	Other Sobriety: HNBD <b>15:37</b> Friday	Age: Assoc Factor: None Apparent BROADWAY RD - STOCKTON RD	Other Motor Vehicle	Auto R/W Violation	21804A	300'	Direction: East Hit & Run: No	Passenger Car, Station Wagon, Jeep Cell Phone Not In Use Daylight	Clear	Pty at Fault:2 # Inj: 1 # Killed: 0
<b>Party 1</b> Driver Veh Type: Motorcycle <b>Party 2</b> Driver Veh Type: Truck <b>17-06-0652</b>	West <b>6/7/2017</b>	Proceeding Straight Sobriety: HNBD Making Right Turn Sobriety: HNBD <b>15:22</b> Wednesday	Male Age: 60 Assoc Factor: Not Stated Male Age: 26 Assoc Factor: Not Stated Assoc Factor: Not Stated	Other Motor Vehicle	Auto R/W Violation	Not Stated Not Required 21802A	0'	Direction: Not Stated Hit & Run: No	Not Stated Daylight Property Damage Only	Clear	Other Visible Injury No Injury Pty at Fault:1 # Inj: 0 # Killed: 0
<b>Party 1</b> Driver Veh Type: Passenger Car <b>Party 2</b> Driver Veh Type: Pickup Truck <b>18-02-0207</b>	West <b>2/24/2018</b>	Making Left Turn Sobriety: HNBD Proceeding Straight Sobriety: HNBD <b>12:22</b> Saturday	Age: Assoc Factor: None Apparent Age: Assoc Factor: None Apparent	Other Motor Vehicle	Auto R/W Violation	22350	40'	Direction: Not Stated Hit & Run: No	Passenger Car, Station Wagon, Jeep Cell Phone Not In Use Pickups & Panels Cell Phone Not In Use Daylight	Clear	No Injury No Injury Pty at Fault:1 # Inj: 1 # Killed: 0
<b>Party 1</b> Driver Veh Type: Motorcycle <b>18-04-0488</b>	East <b>4/25/2018</b>	Proceeding Straight Sobriety: HNBD <b>13:40</b> Wednesday	Age: Assoc Factor: None Apparent	Other Motor Vehicle	Auto R/W Violation	21802A	0'	Direction: Not Stated Hit & Run: No	Motorcycle Cell Phone Not In Use Daylight	Clear	No Injury Pty at Fault:1 # Inj: 0 # Killed: 0
<b>Party 1</b> Driver Veh Type: Truck <b>Party 2</b> Driver Veh Type: Pickup Truck <b>90982633</b>	East <b>4/30/2019</b>	Making Right Turn Sobriety: HNBD Proceeding Straight Sobriety: HNBD <b>22:30</b> Tuesday	Age: Assoc Factor: None Apparent Age: Assoc Factor: None Apparent	Other Motor Vehicle	Auto R/W Violation	22350	80'	Direction: Not Stated Hit & Run: No	Truck Tractor Cell Phone Not In Use Pickups & Panels Cell Phone Not In Use	Clear	No Injury No Injury Pty at Fault:1 # Inj: 0 # Killed: 0
<b>Party 1</b> Driver Veh Type: Pickup Truck <b>Party 2</b> Driver Veh Type: Pickup Truck <b>19-08-0910</b>	East <b>8/29/2019</b>	Slowing/Stopping Sobriety: HNBD Slowing/Stopping Sobriety: HNBD <b>17:55</b> Thursday	Male Age: 54 Assoc Factor: Not Stated Male Age: 35 Assoc Factor: Not Stated	non-collision	Unsafe Speed	22350	32'	Direction: West Hit & Run: No	Dark - Street Ligh Property Damage Only	Clear	Pty at Fault:1 # Inj: 0 # Killed: 0
<b>Party 1</b> Driver Veh Type: Passenger Car <b>19-11-1143</b>	West <b>11/2/2019</b>	Ran Off Road Sobriety: HNBD Saturday	Age: Assoc Factor: None Apparent	Other Motor Vehicle	Auto R/W Violation	22107	14'	Direction: Not Stated Hit & Run: Misde	Passenger Car, Station Wagon, Jeep Cell Phone Not In Use Dark - No Street	Clear	No Injury Pty at Fault:1 # Inj: 0 # Killed: 0
<b>Party 1</b> Driver Veh Type: <b>91144845</b>	East <b>12/6/2019</b>	Other Unsafe Turning Sobriety: Impairment Not Kno Friday <b>22:10</b>	Age: Assoc Factor: None Apparent GRIMES CANYON RD - BROADWAY RD (E)	Fixed Object	Unsafe Speed	22350	0'	Direction: Not Stated Hit & Run: No	Cell Phone Not In Use Dark - No Street Property Damage Only	Raining	Pty at Fault:1 # Inj: 0 # Killed: 0



## Page 3 of 3

y

**Collisions per mile: 16.94**

Segment: BROADWAY RD between STOCKTON RD and GRIMES CANYON RD (E)

**Include Intersection Related at Limit 1 (STOCKTON RD): True**

Include Intersection Related at Limit 2 (GRIMES CANYON RD (E)): True

**Include Intersection Related at Intermediate Intersections: True**

Sorted By: Date and Time



# HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report


## General Information

Analyst	Darryl F Nelson
Agency/Co.	ATE
Date Performed	2/20/2022
Analysis Year	2022
Time Analyzed	Existing Peak Hour
Intersection Orientation	East-West
Project Description	Warped Paintball Park

## Site Information

Intersection	Broadway/Road/Shekell Roa
Jurisdiction	Ventura County
East/West Street	Broadway Road
North/South Street	Shekell Road
Peak Hour Factor	0.92
Analysis Time Period (hrs)	0.25

## Lanes



## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

Approach	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound			
Movement	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R
Priority	1U	1	2	3	4U	4	5	6		7	8	9		10	11	12
Number of Lanes	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0		0	1	0
Configuration		LT						TR							LR	
Volume (veh/h)		3	40				60	3						4		6
Percent Heavy Vehicles (%)		3												3		3
Proportion Time Blocked																
Percent Grade (%)													0			
Right Turn Channelized																
Median Type   Storage	Undivided															

## Critical and Follow-up Headways

Base Critical Headway (sec)		4.1												7.1		6.2
Critical Headway (sec)		4.13												6.43		6.23
Base Follow-Up Headway (sec)		2.2												3.5		3.3
Follow-Up Headway (sec)		2.23												3.53		3.33

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

Flow Rate, v (veh/h)		3												11		
Capacity, c (veh/h)		1526												943		
v/c Ratio		0.00												0.01		
95% Queue Length, Q <sub>95</sub> (veh)		0.0												0.0		
Control Delay (s/veh)		7.4												8.9		
Level of Service (LOS)		A												A		
Approach Delay (s/veh)	0.5												8.9			
Approach LOS													A			

Average Weighted Delay = 8.6 sec. (LOS A)



# HCS7 Two-Way Stop-Control Report


## General Information

Analyst	Darryl F Nelson
Agency/Co.	ATE
Date Performed	2/20/2022
Analysis Year	2022
Time Analyzed	Existing Peak Hour <i>+ Project</i>
Intersection Orientation	East-West
Project Description	Warped Paintball Park

## Site Information

Intersection	Broadway/Road/Shekell Roa
Jurisdiction	Ventura County
East/West Street	Broadway Road
North/South Street	Shekell Road
Peak Hour Factor	0.92
Analysis Time Period (hrs)	0.25

## Lanes



## Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

Approach	Eastbound				Westbound				Northbound				Southbound			
Movement	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R	U	L	T	R
Priority	1U	1	2	3	4U	4	5	6		7	8	9		10	11	12
Number of Lanes	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0		0	0	0		0	1	0
Configuration		LT						TR							LR	
Volume (veh/h)		55	40				60	3						4		50
Percent Heavy Vehicles (%)		3												3		3
Proportion Time Blocked																
Percent Grade (%)														0		
Right Turn Channelized																
Median Type   Storage																

## Critical and Follow-up Headways

Base Critical Headway (sec)		4.1												7.1		6.2
Critical Headway (sec)		4.13												6.43		6.23
Base Follow-Up Headway (sec)		2.2												3.5		3.3
Follow-Up Headway (sec)		2.23												3.53		3.33

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

Flow Rate, v (veh/h)		60													59	
Capacity, c (veh/h)		1526													967	
v/c Ratio		0.04													0.06	
95% Queue Length, Q <sub>95</sub> (veh)		0.1													0.2	
Control Delay (s/veh)		7.5													9.0	
Level of Service (LOS)		A													A	
Approach Delay (s/veh)		4.4												9.0		
Approach LOS															A	

Average-Weighted Delay = 8.2 sec. LOS A

# Spot Speed Study

Prepared by: National Data & Surveying Services


## City of Moorpark

DATE: 1/22/2022  
TIME: 10:00-12:00

Location: 8800 Grimes Canyon Rd  
Posted Speed: 45 MPH Clear/Dry

Project #: 22-050003-001

### Northbound & Southbound Spot Speeds



SPEED PARAMETERS									
Class	Count	Range	50th Percentile	85th Percentile	10 MPH Pace	# in Pace	Percent in Pace	% / # Below Pace	% / # Above Pace
ALL	212	30 - 61	50 mph	56 mph	47 - 56	140	66%	22% / 48	12% / 24



# Spot Speed Study

Prepared by: National Data & Surveying Services


## City of Moorpark

DATE: 1/22/2022  
TIME: 12:10-14:10

Location: 11070 Broadway Rd  
Posted Speed: None Clear/Dry

Project #: 22-050003-002

### Eastbound & Westbound Spot Speeds



SPEED PARAMETERS									
Class	Count	Range	50th Percentile	85th Percentile	10 MPH Pace	# in Pace	Percent in Pace	% / # Below Pace	% / # Above Pace
ALL	119	28 - 62	47 mph	54 mph	44 - 53	69	58%	24% / 29	18% / 21

**NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND INTENT TO ADOPT A  
NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

The County of Ventura Planning Division, as the Lead Agency, has reviewed the following proposed project:

1. **Entitlement**: Conditional Use Permit No. LU11-0030
2. **Applicant**: Glenn Forster of Warped Paintball, LLC
3. **Location**: 8643 Shekell Road, in the unincorporated area of Moorpark
4. **Assessor Parcel No(s)**: 500-0-090-235 & portion of 500-0-090-315
5. **Parcel Size**: 57.11 acres
6. **General Plan Designation**: Open Space
7. **Existing Zoning**: OS 20 ac (Open Space 20 acres minimum lot size) and OS 10 ac (Open Space 10 acres minimum lot size).
8. **Responsible and/or Trustee Agencies**: None
9. **Project Description**: The applicant requests the issuance of a conditional use permit (CUP) to authorize the operation and maintenance of a paintball and airsoft sports facility. The proposed paintball and airsoft sporting facility would be located at 8643 Shekell Road in the Moorpark Area. Onsite development includes the:
  - removal of 267,073 sq. ft. (square feet) or 6.13 acres of existing concrete paving in order to install dirt fields and parking;
  - removal of 74,593 sq. ft. or 1.71 acres of existing asphalt in order to install dirt fields and parking; and,
  - installation of 24,000 sq. ft. of un-engineered artificial turf in the play area.

The sporting events are proposed to occur on weekends and on occasional holidays and weekdays for a maximum of 116 days a year. Weekend events would occur on all 104 weekend days per year. The remaining 12 operational days would occur on weekdays and holidays through reservation only. A maximum total of 250 participants and up to 10 employees would be on site each business day. (On any operational day, the facility would close to further business when the 250<sup>th</sup> customer of the day arrives at the facility regardless of the time of day.) The maximum hours of operation would be from 9 am to 4 pm on Saturday and Sunday. The maximum hours of operation for weekday and holiday events would be through reservation only between 9 am and 4 pm.

POSTED  
DEC 15 2011  
MARK A. LUNN  
Ventura County Clerk and Recorder  
By: \_\_\_\_\_, Deputy





Referees would be present to ensure safety during the games. Participants will be required to wear safety goggles and face masks. Each player will have a paintball marker that fires a small biodegradable paintball propelled by compressed air or CO<sub>2</sub>.

No noise amplification or air horns are proposed. A total of 130 parking spaces would be provided for the participants. Three sea cargo containers would be installed on the site to store supplies. Public access to the site is provided by an existing 20-foot wide asphalt driveway connected to Shekell Road. Secondary access for emergency purposes will be provided by a second driveway connected to Shekell Road. No water service will be connected to the site. The operator will use a water truck for dust control. Bottled drinking water will be supplied by the operator to the customers. Wastewater disposal will be accomplished through the use of portable toilets. No native vegetation or specimen trees would be impacted by the proposed development. Trash dumpsters would be provided for trash collection.

Temporary structures will be placed in the designated playfield areas and consist of: air filled bunkers, hay bales, wooden spools, wooden walls, dirt mounds, sandbag walls, building facades. These structures will each be less than eight feet in height. Air filled bunkers will be painted a dark blue & red. The other barriers and structures will be all earth tone colors.

The project also includes a 3.50 acre stockpile area north of playfield Nos. 1 and 2. This area will be used during construction to temporarily store the concrete and asphalt that would be removed, and the artificial turf and dirt that would be installed.

In accordance with Section 15070 of the California Code of Regulations, the Ventura County Planning Department has determined that this proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration has been prepared.

The public review period is from December 16, 2011 to January 14, 2012. The Initial Study/Negative Declaration is available for public review on-line at [www.ventura.org/planning](http://www.ventura.org/planning) (select "CEQA Environmental Review") or at the County of Ventura, Resource Management Agency, Planning Department, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, California from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday. The public is encouraged to submit written comments to Kristina Roodsari, no later than 5:00 p.m. on January 14, 2012 to the address listed above. In the alternative, you may fax your comments to (805) 654-2509 or e-mail the case planner at [kristina.roodsari@ventura.org](mailto:kristina.roodsari@ventura.org).

Following the review period, consideration of the project will be given at a Planning Director public hearing to be held **Thursday, February 2, 2012, at 10:00 A.M.** in the Room 311, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Brian R. Baca", is written over a horizontal line.

**Brian R. Baca, Manager**  
Commercial & Industrial Permits Section

12-12-11

**Date**

## NEGATIVE DECLARATION

### A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

**Entitlement:** Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Case No. LU11-0030

**Applicant:** Glenn Forster of Warped Paintball, LLC

**Location:** 8643 Shekell Road, in the unincorporated area of Moorpark

**Assessor Parcel Nos:** 500-0-090-235 & portion of 500-0-090-315

**Parcel Size:** 57.11 acres

**General Plan Designation:** Open Space

**Existing Zoning:** OS 20 ac (Open Space 20 acres minimum lot size) and OS 10 ac (Open Space 10 acres minimum lot size).

**Responsible and/or Trustee Agencies:** None

**Project Description:** The applicant requests the issuance of a conditional use permit (CUP) to authorize the operation and maintenance of a paintball and airsoft sports facility. The proposed paintball and airsoft sporting facility would be located at 8643 Shekell Road in the Moorpark Area. Onsite development includes the:

- removal of 267,073 sq. ft. (square feet) or 6.13 acres of existing concrete paving in order to install dirt fields and parking;
- removal of 74,593 sq. ft. or 1.71 acres of existing asphalt in order to install dirt fields and parking; and,
- installation of 24,000 sq. ft. of un-engineered artificial turf in the play area.

The sporting events are proposed to occur on weekends and on occasional holidays and weekdays for a maximum of 116 days a year. Weekend events would occur on all 104 weekend days per year. The remaining 12 operational days would occur on weekdays and holidays through reservation only. A maximum total of 250 participants and up to 10 employees would be on site each business day. (On any operational day, the facility would close to further business when the 250<sup>th</sup> customer of the day arrives at the facility regardless of the time of day.) The maximum hours of operation would be from 9 am to 4 pm on Saturday and Sunday. The maximum hours of operation for weekday and holiday events would be through reservation only between 9 am and 4 pm.



Referees would be present to ensure safety during the games. Participants will be required to wear safety goggles and face masks. Each player will have a paintball marker that fires a small biodegradable paintball propelled by compressed air or CO<sub>2</sub>.

No noise amplification or air horns are proposed. A total of 130 parking spaces would be provided for the participants. Three sea cargo containers would be installed on the site to store supplies. Public access to the site is provided by an existing 20-foot wide asphalt driveway connected to Shekell Road. Secondary access for emergency purposes will be provided by a second driveway connected to Shekell Road. No water service will be connected to the site. The operator will use a water truck for dust control. Bottled drinking water will be supplied by the operator to the customers. Wastewater disposal will be accomplished through the use of portable toilets. No native vegetation or specimen trees would be impacted by the proposed development. Trash dumpsters would be provided for trash collection.

Temporary structures will be placed in the designated playfield areas and consist of: air filled bunkers, hay bales, wooden spools, wooden walls, dirt mounds, sandbag walls, building facades. These structures will each be less than eight feet in height. Air filled bunkers will be painted a dark blue & red. The other barriers and structures will be all earth tone colors.

The project also includes a 3.50 acre stockpile area north of playfield Nos. 1 and 2. This area will be used during construction to temporarily store the concrete and asphalt that would be removed, and the artificial turf and dirt that would be installed.

**B. STATEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS:**

State law requires that an Initial Study (environmental analysis) be conducted to determine if this project could significantly affect the environment. Based on the findings contained in the attached Initial Study, it has been determined that this project will not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration has been prepared.

**C. PUBLIC REVIEW:**

**Legal Notice Method:** Direct mailing to property owners within 300 feet of proposed project boundary, and a legal notice in a newspaper of general circulation.

**Document Posting Period:** December 16, 2011 through January 14, 2012



**Public Review:** The Initial Study prepared for this proposed project has determined that the project will not have adverse environmental impacts. The Initial Study/Negative Declaration is available for public review on-line at [www.ventura.org/planning](http://www.ventura.org/planning) (select "CEQA Environmental Review") or at the County of Ventura, Resource Management Agency, Planning Department, 800 South Victoria Avenue, Ventura, California from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday through Friday.

**Comments:** The public is encouraged to submit written comments regarding this Negative Declaration no later than 5:00 p.m. on the last day of the above posting period to the case planner, Kristina Roodsari, at the County of Ventura Resource Management Agency, Planning Department, 800 South Victoria Avenue L#1740, Ventura, CA 93009. The Planning Division's FAX number is (805) 654-2509. You may also e-mail the case planner at [kristina.roodsari@ventura.org](mailto:kristina.roodsari@ventura.org).

**D. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION:**

Prior to approving the project, the decision-making body of the Lead Agency must consider this Negative Declaration and all comments received during public review. That body shall approve the Negative Declaration if it finds that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

**Prepared by:**

  
Kristina Roodsari, Case Planner  
(805) 654-2467

**Reviewed for Release to the Public by:**

  
Brian R. Baca, Manager  
Commercial & Industrial Permits Section

**Recommended for Approval by  
Lead Agency by:**

Kim L. Prillhart, Director  
Ventura County Planning Division



**Conditional Use Permit Case No. LU11-0030**  
**Warped Paintball, LLC**

**Section A. Project Description**

1. **Project Number(s):** Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") Case No. LU11-0030
2. **Name of Applicant:** Glenn Forster of Warped Paintball, LLC
3. **Project Location:** 8643 Shekell Road, in the Ventura County unincorporated area of Moorpark
4. **Specific Description of the Nature and Purpose of the Project:**

The applicant requests the issuance of a conditional use permit (CUP) to authorize the operation and maintenance of a paintball and airsoft sports facility. The proposed paintball and airsoft sporting facility would be located at 8643 Shekell Road in the Moorpark Area. Onsite development includes the:

- removal of 267,073 sq. ft. (square feet) or 6.13 acres of existing concrete paving in order to install dirt fields and parking;
- removal of 74,593 sq. ft. or 1.71 acres of existing asphalt in order to install dirt fields and parking; and,
- installation of 24,000 sq. ft. of un-engineered artificial turf in the play area.

The sporting events are proposed to occur on weekends and on occasional holidays and weekdays for a maximum of 116 days a year. Weekend events would occur on all 104 weekend days per year. The remaining 12 operational days would occur on weekdays and holidays through reservation only. A maximum total of 250 participants and up to 10 employees would be on site each business day. (On any operational day, the facility would close to further business when the 250<sup>th</sup> customer of the day arrives at the facility regardless of the time of day.) The maximum hours of operation would be from 9 am to 4 pm on Saturday and Sunday. The maximum hours of operation for weekday and holiday events would be through reservation only between 9 am and 4 pm.

Referees would be present to ensure safety during the games. Participants will be required to wear safety goggles and face masks. Each player will have a paintball marker that fires a small biodegradable paintball propelled by compressed air or CO<sub>2</sub>.

No noise amplification or air horns are proposed. A total of 130 parking spaces would be provided for the participants. Three sea cargo containers would be installed on the site to store supplies. Public access to the site is provided by an existing 20-foot wide asphalt driveway connected to Shekell Road. Secondary access for emergency purposes will be provided by a second driveway connected to Shekell Road. No water service will be connected to the site. The operator will use a water truck for dust control. Bottled drinking water will be supplied by the operator to the customers. Wastewater disposal will be accomplished through the use of portable toilets. No native vegetation or specimen trees would be impacted by the proposed development. Trash dumpsters would be provided for trash collection.

Temporary structures will be placed in the designated playfield areas and consist of: air filled bunkers, hay bales, wooden spools, wooden walls, dirt mounds, sandbag walls, building facades. These structures will each be less than eight feet in height. Air filled bunkers will be painted a dark blue & red. The other barriers and structures will be all earth tone colors.

The project also includes a 3.50 acre stockpile area north of playfield Nos. 1 and 2. This area will be used during construction to temporarily store the concrete and asphalt that would be removed, and the artificial turf and dirt that would be installed.

**5. Existing and Proposed General Plan Designation and Zoning of the Project Site:**

<b>APN</b>	500-0-090-235 and a portion of 500-0-090-315 (access to site via Shekell)
<b>Acreage of Parcel</b>	57.11 acres
<b>Acreage of CUP Area</b>	18.30 acres (21.97 acres includes for access to paintball park and temporary stockpile area)
<b>Ventura County General Plan Land Use Designation</b>	Open Space
<b>Zoning Designation:</b>	OS 20 ac (Open Space 20 acres minimum lot size) and OS 10 ac (Open Space 10 acres minimum lot size).

**6. Description of the Physical Alterations/Improvements Caused by the Project (including site plan, elevations, off-site improvements, etc):**

Development includes the:

- removal of 267,073 sq. ft. (square feet) or 6.13 acres of concrete in order to install dirt fields and parking;



- removal of 74,593 sq. ft. or 1.71 acres of asphalt in order to install dirt fields and parking; and,
- installation of 24,000 sq. ft. of artificial turf in the play area.

**7. Description of the Public Facilities (e.g., roads, water supply, sewers, utilities) that must be Extended or Expanded to Serve the Project:**

Access to the playfields would be provided by two existing driveways connected to Shekell Road.

No water is proposed to be onsite though the developer has access to a water truck for dust control. Portable toilets are proposed to provide waste water disposal. No native vegetation or specimen trees would be impacted by the proposed development. Trash dumpsters would be provided for trash control.

No public facilities and/or services would be extended or expanded as a result of this project.

**8. List of Responsible Agencies: None**

**Exhibits:**

Exhibit A- Location, Zoning & Aerial Map

Exhibit B- Plans

**Section B**  
**Initial Study Checklist and Discussion of Responses**  
**Conditional Use Permit Case No. LU11-0030**  
**Warped Paintball, LLC**

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
1. Air Quality Impacts (APCD)		X				X		

Regional Air Quality Impacts: The Ventura County Air Pollution Control District reviewed the proposed project. This District stated that based on information provided by the applicant, air quality impacts will be below the 25 pounds per day threshold for reactive organic compounds and oxides of nitrogen as described in the Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines. Therefore, the project will have less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts on regional air quality.

Local Air Quality Impacts: Based on information in the project application, the District stated that the subject project will generate local air quality impacts but those impacts are not likely to be significant. Although the project is not expected to result in any significant local air quality impacts, the District recommends the following conditions be placed on the permit to help minimize fugitive dust and particulate matter that may result from site preparation (short-term) vehicles parking on the site (long-term) activities:

1. All project construction and site preparation operations shall comply with all applicable VCAPCD Rules and Regulations which include but are not limited to Rule 10 (Permits Required), Rule 50 (Opacity), Rule 51 (Nuisance), and Rule 55 (Fugitive Dust).
2. The Permittee shall comply with the provisions of applicable VCAPCD ROC and NOx Construction Mitigation Measures, which include but are not limited to, provisions of Section 7.4.3 of the Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines.
3. The Permittee shall obtain an Authority to Construct prior to installation and a Permit to Operate prior to operation, if needed, for concrete and asphalt demolition. To help prevent project delays, the Permittee or their representative should contact the VCAPCD Engineering Division at the earliest practicable date to determine any air permit requirements.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Alicia Stratton of the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, dated April 13, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
2. Water Resources a. Groundwater Quantity		X				X		

Only bottled water would be used as part of the operation of the project. There would be no increase in annual groundwater usage with the approval of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to groundwater quantity

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Ewelina Mutkowska of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Water and Environmental Resources Division, dated April 18, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
2b. Groundwater Quality		X				X		

The Ventura County Watershed Protection district reviewed the proposed project and deemed groundwater quality impacts as less than significant. No septic systems are proposed to be installed to serve the proposed use. Portable toilets would be used by patrons during event days. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to groundwater quality.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Ewelina Mutkowska of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Water and Environmental Resources Division, dated April 18, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
2c. Surface Water Quantity		X				X		

The Ventura County Watershed Protection district reviewed the proposed project and deemed impacts to surface water quantity as less than significant. No surface water is proposed to be used in the operation of the proposed facility. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to surface water quantity.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Ewelina Mutkowska of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Water and Environmental Resources Division, dated April 18, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
2d. Surface Water Quality		X				X		

The Ventura County Watershed Protection district reviewed the proposed project and deemed impacts surface water quality as less than significant. The proposed project is not expected to result in a violation of any surface water quality standards as defined in the Los Angeles Basin Plan. In accordance with the Ventura Countywide Municipal Stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit CAS004002, "Development Construction Program" Subpart 4.F and the California NPDES General Construction Stormwater Permit (No. CAS000002), the applicant will be required to include Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to ensure compliance and implementation of an effective combination of erosion and sediment control measures to protect surface water quality during construction. The Ventura County Stormwater Quality Management Ordinance (Ordinance No. 4142) includes standard requirements prohibiting the deposition of any litter into any watercourse during ongoing operations of the proposed use. Therefore, neither the individual project nor the cumulative threshold for significance is being exceeded and the project is expected to have less than significant impact on surface water quality.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Ewelina Mutkowska of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Water and Environmental Resources Division, dated April 18, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
3 Mineral Resources a. Aggregate Resources		X				X		

The Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines ("VCISAG") states that aggregate resources consist of sand, gravel, and crushed rock used in the construction industry. The Ventura County Non-coastal Zoning Ordinance includes a Mineral Resource Protection (MRP) overlay zone for areas that maintain or may maintain important mineral resources and the extraction of these resources may be a compatible land use. The MRP zone is located approximately 335 feet north of the project parcel boundary. The nearest proposed play areas (areas nos. 1 & 2) are located approximately 1,900 feet south of the MRP overlay zone boundary area. The temporary stockpile area is located approximately 1,050 feet south of the MRP overlay zone



boundary area. Due to the location and the nature of the proposed use, the proposed project would not have the potential to hamper or preclude extraction of or access to the aggregate resources located north of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts on aggregate resources.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance (2011: §8104), and Planning GIS data layers (Overlay Zone).

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
3b. Petroleum Resources		X				X		

The VCISAG states that any land use that is proposed to be located on or immediately adjacent to any known petroleum resource area, or adjacent to a principal access road to an existing petroleum CUP, has the potential to hamper or preclude access to petroleum resources. The proposed project is not located within a petroleum resource area, or within or adjacent to the boundary of an oil extraction CUP. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts on petroleum.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Planning GIS data layers (Oil & Gas Resources).

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
4. Biological Resources		X				X		

This analysis of the potential impacts on biological resources is based on maps of biological resources, including watercourses, wetlands, regional wildlife corridors, critical habitat, and the California Natural Diversity Database; aerial imagery; and a site visit conducted on November 28, 2011.

Species: The majority of the project site (i.e., the lease area) is covered with concrete slabs from the previous agricultural facility. The only vegetation occurring on the project site is growing in between the concrete slabs and is composed of mostly non-native species and a few scattered common native species (including California sagebrush, mulefat, and telegraph weed) that typically inhabit disturbed areas. Given that the project site is highly disturbed by previous development and is mostly covered with concrete, there is no suitable habitat for special status species. Therefore the project would not impact special status species.

**Ecological Communities:** Ruderal vegetation (i.e., vegetation that grows on highly disturbed land) occurs on the project site within crevices and in between the concrete slabs. These patches of ruderal vegetation among the concrete do not constitute a sensitive ecological community. No natural watercourses or wetlands exist on the site. A concrete channel that was constructed as part of the previous agricultural facility carries runoff flows from the existing concrete slabs. No natural communities are associated with this concrete channel. The removal of concrete to create dirt playing fields could result in increased sediments being carried with stormwater flows to sensitive ecological communities downstream. However, as described in the evaluation of potential surface water quality impacts, the applicant is required to implement erosion and sediment control measures to protect surface water quality during construction as well as meet County standard requirements prohibiting the deposition of any litter into any watercourse during ongoing operations of the proposed use. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impacts on sensitive ecological communities.

#### Habitat Connectivity

The project site is not located within a known habitat connectivity feature, such as a regional linkage, local riparian corridor, or other identified important feature for wildlife movement. The project site, in its existing condition with the concrete slabs, does not contain significant wildlife habitat, but it also does not pose a significant barrier to wildlife movement, and therefore wildlife likely moves through the site. The project does not involve construction of any new permanent structures or other barriers to wildlife movement. The sporting events would take place between the hours of 8 am and 4 pm, which avoids the peak times of day of animal activity during dawn and dusk and at night. Because the location proposed for the periodic sporting events is a highly disturbed site that is not within a habitat connectivity feature, the project would not impact habitat connectivity.

Therefore, based on the applicant's project description and observations made in the field by the Planning Biologist, project-specific and cumulative impacts relating to biological resources are less than significant.

Source Document: Memo from Christina Danko, Planning Biologist, dated November 28, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
5. Agricultural Resources a. Soils	X				X			

According to the Important Farmland Inventory Map, the project site does not include soil designated as prime, unique, or of statewide importance. Therefore, as the proposed project would not result in the removal or covering of these important soil

classifications, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to agricultural soils.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Planning GIS data layers (Important Farmland Inventory Map).

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
5b. Land Use Incompatibility		X				X		

The evaluation pertains to the introduction of incompatible land uses in proximity of off-site agricultural lands and off-site crop production. The threshold of significance is a distance (setback) of 300 feet between new non-agricultural structures or use areas and offsite areas that are used or classified as Important Farmland on the Ventura County Important Farmland Inventory Map (2008).

There are a variety of Important Farmland soils located adjacent to the project site. Prime, statewide and unique soils are located east, west and south of the parcel boundary. Crops are under production on lands immediately east, southwest and southeast of the parcel boundary.

The proposed project involves the operation of a recreational paintball facility. The subject property would be segregated into a series of playfields used for various contests. Some of the paintball activities would occur less than 300 feet from the adjacent agricultural lands. Thus, at first look, impacts on agricultural resources would potentially result for the operation of this facility. However, the Initial Study Guidelines for topic 5.b provide a list of criteria for a waiver or deviation from the 300 foot setback threshold. Criterion "H" and is applicable here:

h. Individuals are not continuously present in the proposed structures or use areas

Although the proposed project is non-agricultural, individuals will not be continuously present in the playfield areas that are within 300 feet of the common boundary lines shared with off-site Important Farmlands. Approximately half of the playfield areas are located less than 300 feet from off site adjacent agriculture. Additionally, the facility would operate on a limited schedule with a maximum of 116 days per year. Eighty percent (80%) of the proposed event days are planned through private group reservation i.e. birthday parties, church groups, corporate team building. To assure that potential conflicts are minimized, the following condition will be imposed on the project:

**Purpose:** In order to minimize potential conflicts between a non-agricultural event use and adjacent agricultural operations, the Permittee shall provide notification of all temporary events.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall notify the owner(s) of each agriculturally-zoned property located within 300 feet of the project parcel of all temporary events to be held at the proposed facility.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall provide a written schedule of planned temporary events to the owners of all adjacent agriculturally-zoned land. This schedule shall specify the date, time, type and attendance of each event. The Permittee shall maintain a record of all events held at the facility to be made available to the County Planning Division upon request.

**Timing:** The required schedule shall be regularly updated such that notice is provided a minimum of 30 days prior to each event.

**Monitoring:** In accordance with the Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Division will periodically review the operation of the permitted facility for compliance with the terms and conditions of the conditional use permit. The Planning Division has the authority to initiate enforcement actions if a lack of compliance is identified through public complaints or discovered during required periodic review.

Given the temporary nature of the events and implementation of the condition of approval noted above, project-specific and cumulative impacts to agricultural land use incompatibility would be less than significant.

Source Documents: Memo from Brian Baca of the Ventura County Planning Division, dated July 13, 2011 and email from Rudy Martel of the Ventura County Agricultural Commissioner's Office, dated August 19, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
6. Scenic Resources		X				X		

Planning staff evaluated visual impacts during a site visit on April 7, 2011 and November 28, 2011. The proposed project is not located in a Scenic Resource Protection overlay zone. No scenic resource exist onsite and the subject site is not considered a scenic vista or within a scenic vista or viewshed. Four of the proposed playfields (Playfield nos. 1 to 4) are located at the on a plateau overlooking Shekell Road and SR 118. The project site is not visible from Grimes Canyon Road. Also, there are no residences within 1,000 feet of the view shed of playfield areas nos. 1 through 4. In addition, some of the temporary structures (air filled bunkers, hay bales, wooden spools, wooden walls, dirt mounds, sandbag walls, building facades) located in playfield areas nos. 1 to 4 would be visible from Shekell Road. However, this impact would be less than significant, as the temporary structures would be less than eight feet in height and painted dark or earth tone colors. The three proposed sea cargo containers and



parking areas would be visible from Shekell Road. To ensure that visual impacts are less than significant, the project will be conditioned to require that the sea cargo containers be painted a light tan color so as to blend with the surrounding landscape. Therefore, based on the design and location of the proposed project, project-specific and cumulative impacts related to visual resources would be less than significant.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, applicant's site plan and Planning GIS data layers (aerial imagery).

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
7. Resources Paleontological Resources		X				X		

The subject property is underlain by the Saugus formation. According to the VCISAG, the Saugus formation is given a paleontological importance ranking of "high". According to the Guidelines, a Paleontological Phase 1 Study would be required for the proposed project. A Paleontological Phase 1 study was prepared by Bruce Landers of Engineering Sciences in July 1988 for Tentative Tract Map No. 5277 (approved in January 2005). This study concluded that the tract map would not create any adverse impacts to paleontological resources. As no permanent structures are proposed with the subject project, and portions of the site would only require compaction and contouring of the land to allow for dirt and asphalt to be installed in the parking and playfield areas, project-specific and cumulative impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

In the unlikely event that paleontological resources would be uncovered by ground disturbance activities, the proposed project would be conditioned to require that construction be suspended until the find can be evaluated and recovered. This condition would cause a temporary cessation of all ground disturbances, notification of the Planning Director, and assessment of the find by a paleontological consultant or professional geologist. The Planning Director would review the recommendations of the consultant and decide on the disposition of the resources encountered. Therefore, the proposed project would create less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to paleontological resources.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Paleontological Phase 1 study prepared by Bruce Landers of Engineering Sciences in July 1988 for Tentative Tract Map No. 5277.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
8. Resources a. Cultural Resources	X				X			

Planning Staff determined that the project would not require a Phase I archeological study, as no permanent structures are proposed with the subject project, and portions of the site would only require compaction and contouring of the land to allow for dirt and asphalt to be installed in the parking and playfield areas. Moreover, a search of the County's Archeological Report database found that there are no archeologically important sites within ½ mile of the proposed project site. Therefore, based on the location and nature of the proposed project, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to archeological resources.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, Planning GIS data layers (Archeological Reports).

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
8b. Historical Resources		X				X		

Planning staff conducted a site visit on April 7, 2011 and November 28, 2011. The proposed project site is located at the former Egg City agricultural facility which operated onsite from the early 1960's to the 1980's. Remnants of the former Egg City observed during the site visit included, concrete pads and partially paved roads throughout the parcel. There are no buildings onsite. Staff researched the parcel history for the subject site and surrounding sites in the County's Permits Plus database system, and found that the buildings associated with the former Egg City facility were considered historic buildings (although the site was never designated an historical landmark or place of interest). As these buildings no longer exist onsite, the historical use of the parcel is no longer present. Therefore, the project-specific and cumulative impacts of the project on historical resources would be less than significant.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, Planning GIS data layers (historical aerial maps) and Permits Plus database system.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
9. Coastal Beaches and Sand Dunes	X				X			

The proposed project site is located in the Ventura County unincorporated area of Moorpark, more than 10 miles away from the coast. Thus, the proposed project would not be located near or on a coastal beach or sand dune. Therefore, based on the location of the proposed project, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to coastal beaches and sand dunes.

Source Document: Planning GIS data layers (2011 aerial imagery).

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
Hazards 10. Fault Rupture	X				X			

There are no known active or potentially active faults extending through the proposed lot based on State of California Earthquake Fault Zones in accordance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and Ventura County General Plan Hazards Appendix –Figure 2.2.3b. Therefore, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to fault rupture hazards.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from James O'Tousa of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, dated April 19, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
11. Ground Shaking		X				X		

The property would be subject to moderate to strong ground shaking from seismic events on local and regional fault systems. The County of Ventura Building code, adopted from the California Building Code, dated 2010, Chapter 16, Division IV, requires the structures be designed to withstand this ground shaking. As there are no structures associated with the proposed project, the effects of ground shaking are considered to be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would create less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to ground shaking.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from James O'Tousa of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, dated April 19, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
12. Liquefaction	X				X			

The site is not located within a potential liquefaction zone based on the Ventura County General Plan Hazards Appendix – Figure 2.4b. This map is a compilation of the State of California Seismic Hazards Maps for the County of Ventura and is used as the basis for delineating the potential liquefaction hazards within the county. Therefore, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to liquefaction.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from James O'Tousa of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, dated April 19, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
13. Seiche & Tsunami	X				X			

The site is not located adjacent to a closed or restricted body of water based on aerial photograph review (photos dated January 2011) and would not be subject to seiche hazard. The project is also not located within a tsunami inundation zone based on the Ventura County General Plan, Hazards Appendix Figure 2.6. Therefore, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to seiche & tsunami.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from James O'Tousa of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, dated April 19, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
14. Landslide and Mudslide	X				X			

The site is not located in a mapped landslide area, located within a hillside, and is not located in a potential seismically induced landslide zone, based on analysis conducted by the California Geological Survey. Therefore, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to landslides/mudslides.



Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from James O'Tousa of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, dated April 19, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
15. Expansive Soils	X				X			

This project does not involve the design or construction of any structures. Therefore, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to expansive soils.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from James O'Tousa of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, dated April 19, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
16. Subsidence	X				X			

The subject property is not within the probable subsidence hazard zone as delineated on the Ventura County General Plan Hazards Appendix Figure 2.8 (January 27, 2004) and the project does not relate to oil, gas or groundwater withdrawal. Therefore, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to subsidence.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from James O'Tousa of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, dated April 19, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
17. Hydraulic Hazards a. Non-FEMA (PWA)		X			X			

The project proposes the removal of almost 8 acres of impervious paving. No grading or permanent structures are proposed. According to the drainage study for the project dated March 11, 2011, and prepared by Penfield and Smith, there will be a net reduction in runoff from the site. Therefore, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to hydraulic hazards.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Jim Myers of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, dated March 30, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
17b. FEMA		X				X		

The subject property is located out of a 1% annual chance floodplain as evidenced on the latest "Effective" Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map (DFIRM) issued by FEMA (January 20, 2010) (Panel 810 of 1275, Map # 06111C0810E). Mitigation of the flood risk can be achieved through the issuance of a Floodplain Clearance. The property is mapped in an 'X Unshaded Zone' on the DFIRM Rate Map (outside the 100-year but within the 500-year floodplain). A Floodplain Development Permit is not required. However, a Floodplain Clearance will be required prior to the issuance of a Building Permit and/or a Grading Permit. Therefore, the proposed project would create less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts related to FEMA flood hazards.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Brian Trushinski of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Advanced Planning Section, dated April 14, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
Fire Hazards 18. Fire Hazards		X				X		

Although the project is in a high fire hazard area, there are no significant structures proposed that would require protection in the event of a brush fire. In addition, the design (a large play field area with no permanent structures) and nature of the proposed project does not involve any hazardous operations that could lead to a fire and could spread to the brush area. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to fire hazards would be less than significant.

Source Document: Memo from Richard Martinez of the Ventura County Fire Protection District, dated July 22, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
19. Aviation Hazards	X				X			

The proposed is not located within the sphere of influence of Oxnard, Camarillo, Santa Paula or Naval Base Ventura County airports. Therefore, there would be no project-specific or cumulative impacts to aviation hazards.

Source Documents: Planning GIS data layers (Airport Sphere of Influence).

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
20a. Hazardous Materials and Waste (EH/FIRE)		X				X		

The Environmental Health Division comments that the proposed project includes the use of hazardous materials. Improper storage, handling, and disposal of these material(s) could result in the creation of adverse impacts to public health. However, the project's compliance with existing state regulations will reduce potential project-specific and cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

The Ventura County Fire Protection District comments that any hazardous materials used onsite will be regulated and permitted according to the Ventura County Fire Code. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials and waste would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Source Document: Memo from Melinda Talent of the Environmental Health Division, dated July 14, 2011 and Memo from Richard Martinez of the Ventura County Fire Protection District, dated July 22, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
20b. Hazardous Waste (EH)	X				X			

The proposed project is not considered an activity that generates hazardous waste. Therefore, the project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts relative to hazardous wastes.

Source Document: Memo from Melinda Talent of the Environmental Health Division, dated July 14, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
21. Noise and Vibration		X				X		

The Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines define noise as “any unwanted sound that is undesirable because it interferes with speech and hearing, or is intense enough to damage hearing, or is otherwise annoying.” The Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines require an analysis of noise impacts, based on whether the project is a “Noise Sensitive Use” or a “Noise Generator.” Noise sensitive uses are dwellings, schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches and libraries; since the project does not include the construction or use of these types of uses, the proposed project does not involve a “noise sensitive use.” However, the project has the potential to generate noise and, therefore, is subject to evaluation as a “noise generator.”

In order for a project to be a noise generator, the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines state that the project must generate noise at the nearest noise sensitive use/residential district that exceeds:

- 55 dB(A) between 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.,
- 50 dB(A) between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m., or
- 45 dB(A) between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.

The airsoft and paintball facility is expected to produce some noise during scheduled paintball games. However, the firing of a paintball gun does not create the level of noise as that of a firearm. In addition, the nearest sensitive receptor to the proposed playfield areas of the paintball facility consist of a single family dwelling located more than 1,700 feet south of the project site. In addition, several accessory buildings are located approximately 995 feet east of the project site (APN No. 500-0-090-310). However, a search of the permit history for this parcel revealed that these buildings were not permitted for habitable use and were associated with the former Egg City agricultural facility. Therefore, as the nearest noise sensitive receptor is located more than 1,700 feet away from the proposed playfield area, and the noise created by the firing of the paintball gun would be lower than that of a firearm, the noise generated by the paintball facility will not produce noise levels that exceed the noise levels noted above. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to noise would be less than significant.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, Applicant's project description, dated July 6, 2011, Permits Plus and Planning GIS data layers (aerial imagery).



Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
22. Daytime Glare	X				X			

The proposed project would not create a new source of glare for motorists or persons travelling along any road of the County Regional Road Network, such as Shekell Road and Grimes Canyon Road. In addition, no exterior lighting is proposed for the project, as the facility proposes to operate only during daylight hours. Therefore, the project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts relative to daytime glare.

Source Document: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
23. Public Health		X				X		

The proposed project may have impacts to public health from hazardous materials. Compliance with applicable state regulations enforced by the Environmental Health Division will reduce potential project-specific and cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

Source Document: Memo from Melinda Talent of the Environmental Health Division, dated July 14, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
24. Greenhouse Gases		X				X		

The Ventura County Air Pollution Control District has not yet adopted any approach to setting a threshold of significance for land use development projects in the area of project greenhouse gas emissions. The project will generate less than significant impacts to regional and local air quality and the project will be subject to a condition of approval to ensure that all project construction and operations shall be conducted in compliance with all APCD Rules and Regulations. Furthermore, the amount of greenhouse gases anticipated from the project will be a small fraction of the levels being considered by the APCD for greenhouse gas significance thresholds and far below those adopted to date by any air district in the state. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to greenhouse gases would be less than significant.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, dated April 13, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
25. Community Character		X				X		

The project site is located at 8463 Shekell Road within the unincorporated Moorpark area of Ventura County, west of State Route 23/Grimes Canyon Road. The proposed project site is currently not in use and contains patches of concrete from the former Egg City agricultural facility. Orchards are present adjacent to the western boundary of the project site. The Grimes Canyon mining operation abuts the project site to the north and open space/agricultural uses surround the project site to the south, west and east. The nearest single family residence is located more than 1,700 feet south of the proposed project site. The proposed project will not be out of character with the agricultural and open space uses surrounding the site, as each of the temporary structures (e.g., air filled bunkers, hay bales, wooden spools, wooden walls, dirt mounds, sandbag walls, building facades) will not be more than 8 feet in height. The three proposed sea cargo containers would be 400 square feet each and located south of the parking area. Although the roll off containers would be visible from Shekell Road, the project will be conditioned to require that the containers be painted a light tan color. Therefore, due to the location and design of the proposed project, it will not be out of character with the surrounding lots and uses. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to community character would be less than significant.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Planning GIS data layers (2011 aerial maps and land use layers).

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
26. Housing	X				X			

The project does not include the elimination of any existing dwelling units, as the project is a request to operate an airsoft and paintball facility. The project will not create a demand for new housing, as the airsoft and paintball events would occur a maximum of 116 days per year. There is expected to be no project specific or cumulative impact on housing demand in order to accommodate the proposed employees of the airsoft and paintball facility, as only 10 employees are proposed to work at the facility during designated hours of operation. Therefore, the project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts related to housing.

Source Document: Ventura County initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
27. Public Facilities & Services a. Transportation & Circulation (1). Level of Service		X				X		

The Transportation Department comments that the proposed project will generate additional traffic on the local public roads and the Regional Road Network. The rural county road (Shekell Road) to be used to access the project site currently has a very low traffic volume per day and the highest level of safety (LOS A). The anticipated maximum of 130 vehicles that would arrive at the site per day would not substantially burden Shekel Road or other nearby roadways in the vicinity. These vehicle arrivals would generally be spread out over a 7-hour operational day in non-peak traffic hours. Even if the total 250-person customers were to arrive at one time, the temporary spike in traffic would be of short duration. In addition, 104 of the total 116 operational days would occur on weekends. Impacts on level of service would be less than significant.

To address the cumulative adverse impacts of traffic on the Regional Road Network, Ventura County Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee (TIMF) Ordinance 4246 and General Plan (GP) Policy 4.2.2 require that the Transportation Department of the Public Works Agency collect a TIMF from developments. This project is subject to this Ordinance. With payment of the TIMF, the level of service (LOS) and safety of the existing roads would remain consistent with the County's GP.

Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to level of service on public roads would be less than significant.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Behnam Emami of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Transportation Division, dated April 26, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
27a. Transportation & Circulation (2). Safety & Design of Public Roads		X				X		

The Transportation Department comments that the anticipated low volume of traffic generated by this project would not warrant improvements to the rural county road (Shekell Road) that will be used to access the project. The proposed project does not have the potential to alter the level of safety of this road. Furthermore, the proposed

project parcel does not have frontage along this road. Main access to the play areas will be provided by an existing driveway on an adjacent parcel southeast of the project parcel. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to the safety and design of public roads would be less than significant.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Behnam Emami of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Transportation Division, dated April 26, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
27a. Transportation & Circulation (3). Safety & Design of Private Access		X				X		

The Ventura County Fire Protection District comments that private roads and highways surrounding the project site meet fire department minimum requirements for safety and design. In addition, the nature of the proposed airsoft and paintball facility will not generate enough additional traffic to negatively impact the existing system. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts relating to the safety and design of private roads would be less than significant. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to the safety and design of private access would be less than significant.

Source Document: Memo from Richard Martinez of the Ventura County Fire Protection District, dated July 22, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
27a. Transportation & Circulation (4). Tactical Access	X				X			

The Ventura County Fire Protection District comments that the transportation and circulation system is adequate without any required improvements. Shekell Road and Grimes Canyon Road provide access to the project site. The roads in the vicinity of the project site are in full compliance with the County Public Roads Standards and Ventura County Fire Protection District Private Road Guidelines. Therefore, there are no project-specific and cumulative impacts relating tactical access.

Source Document: Memo from Richard Martinez of the Ventura County Fire Protection District, dated July 22, 2011.



Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
27b. Pedestrian/Bicycle		X				X		

The Transportation Department comments that the guests will arrive via motorized transport. Thus, the project will not generate significant pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Furthermore, the county road (Shekell Road) to be accessed by the project is of a rural nature and this road would not be required to have pedestrian or bicycle facilities per the applicable county road standard for rural roads. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts to pedestrian/bicycle access would be less than significant.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Behnam Emami of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Transportation Division, dated April 26, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
27c. Bus Transit	X				X			

The project site is not located near any bus transit facilities. In addition, the proposed airsoft and paintball facility is not a use that will generate new demand for bus transit. Therefore, the proposed project will not have project-specific and cumulative impacts related to bus transit.

Source Document: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
27d. Railroads	X				X			

The project site is not located near any railroads. In addition, the proposed airsoft and paintball facility is not a use that will generate new demand for railroads. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to railroads.

Source Document: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
27e. Airports	X				X			

The proposed project is not located within two miles of any public airport. In addition, the proposed airsoft and paintball facility is not a use that will generate new demand for airports. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to air traffic safety.

Source Document: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
27f. Harbors	X				X			

The proposed project is not adjacent to any harbor, will not affect the operations of a harbor, and will not increase the demands on harbor facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts related to harbors.

Source Document: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
27g. Pipelines	X				X			

The proposed project is not located on, or within the vicinity of, a pipeline facility or route. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts related to pipelines.

Source Document: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
28. Water Supply a. Water Supply Quality	X				X			

The proposed project will include the use of bottled water for consumption by customers and employees, and use a water truck for dust control. . No new water facilities will be constructed to serve the site. Therefore, the project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to water quality.

Source Document: Memo from Melinda Talent of the Environmental Health Division, dated July 14, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
28b. Water Supply Quantity		X				X		

The proposed project does not require a permanent supply of water. Therefore, the project will have less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts to water supply quantity.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Ewelina Mutkowska of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Water and Environmental Resources Division, dated April 18, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
28c. Fire Flow	X				X			

The proposed project will include the use of bottled water for consumption by customers and employees, and use a water truck for dust control. . No new water facilities will be constructed to serve the site. However, if any permanent structures are proposed, water supply shall be evaluated as part of the building permit process. Therefore, based on the design of the proposed project, the project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts on fire flow.

Source Document: Memo from Richard Martinez of the Ventura County Fire Protection District, dated July 22, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
29. Waste Treatment/Disposal a. Individual Sewage Disposal System	X				X			

Wastewater disposal will be accomplished through the use of portable toilets. The proposed project will not require the use of an on-site sewage disposal system. Therefore, the project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to on-site sewage disposal.

Source Document: Memo from Melinda Talent of the Environmental Health Division, dated July 14, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
29b. Sewage Collection & Treatment	X				X			

Wastewater disposal will be accomplished through the use of portable toilets. Therefore, the project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to a sewage collection facility.

Source Document: Memo from Melinda Talent of the Environmental Health Division, dated July 14, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
29c. Solid Waste Management		X				X		

Pursuant to the IWMD's factors determining the significance of project impacts to solid waste facilities within Ventura County, any discretionary development project generating solid waste will impact the County's remaining solid waste disposal capacity. Additionally, as required by California Public Resources Code (PRC) 41701, Ventura County's Countywide Siting Element (CSE), adopted in June of 2001 and updated annually, confirms Ventura County has at least 15 years of disposal capacity available for waste generated by in-County projects. Therefore, because the County currently exceeds the minimum disposal capacity required by state PRC, no individual project should have a significant impact upon remaining Ventura County solid waste disposal capacity. Therefore, the project will have less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts to solid waste management.



Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Derrick Wilson of the Ventura County Public Works Agency, Integrated Waste Management Division, dated April 1, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
29d. Solid Waste Facilities	X				X			

The proposed project does not include a solid waste facility. Therefore, the project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts relating to solid waste facilities.

Source Document: Memo from Melinda Talent of the Environmental Health Division, dated July 14, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
30. Utilities	X				X			

The VCISAG states that any proposed project that would cause a disruption or re-routing of an existing utility facility, or increase demand on a utility that results in the expansion of an existing utility facility which has the potential for secondary environmental impacts has the potential for significant impacts. The proposed project is an airsoft and paintball facility and would not utilize any natural gas or electric heaters, and would not involve a wireless communications facility. In addition, the project site is currently served by electrical facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts related to utilities.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
31. Flood Control/ Drainage a. WPD Facilities & Watercourses		X				X		

The Watershed Protection District, Planning and Regulatory Division reviewed the hydrology report (prepared by Penfield & Smith, dated March 17, 2011), which was submitted with the CUP application. The District comments that the site imperviousness will be reduced from approximately 50% to 32% through the removal of a portion of the

existing concrete pads. The project is not adjacent to District red line jurisdictional channels.

District staff further comments that no additional improvements are required beyond those already included in the project design. Also, the project design mitigates the direct and indirect project-specific and cumulative impacts to flood control facilities and watercourses. Therefore, project-specific and cumulative impacts are considered less than significant on red line channels under the jurisdiction of the Watershed Protection District.

Source Document: Memo from Tom Wolfington of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Planning and Regulatory Division, dated April 15, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
31b. Other Facilities & Watercourses		X				X		

The project is not adjacent to County Watershed Protection District red line jurisdictional channels. The hydrology report submitted for the proposed project, states that the site imperviousness will be reduced from approximately 50% to 32% through the removal of a portion of the existing concrete pads.

District staff further comments that no additional improvements are required beyond those already included in the project design. Also, the project design mitigates the direct and indirect project-specific and cumulative impacts to flood control facilities and watercourses. Therefore the environmental assessment is less than significant on red line channels under the jurisdiction of the Watershed Protection District. Therefore, the project is expected to have less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts on Watershed Protection District facilities.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011, and Memo from Tom Wolfington of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Planning and Regulatory Division, dated April 15, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
32. Law Enforcement & Emergency Services	X				X			

The proposed project is an airsoft and paintball facility. According to the VCISAG, the project is not a use that could generate a potentially significant increase in demand for law enforcement or emergency services.. Therefore, the proposed project has no project-specific or cumulative impacts related to law enforcement and emergency services.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
33. Fire Protection a. Distance and Response Time		X				X		

The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on response time. Distance from full time, paid fire station is within a reasonable distance for response within acceptable time frame. Therefore, the project is expected to have less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts on distance and response time.

Source Document: Memo from Richard Martinez of the Ventura County Fire Protection District, dated July 22, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
33b. Personnel and Equipment		X				X		

The Ventura County Fire Protection District comments that the proposed project does not require additional personnel or equipment. There are no proposed significant structures and the project site is essentially a large playfield area. The District comments that they do not anticipate a significant rise in call volume to this site based upon the type of business proposed. Therefore, the project is expected to have less than significant project-specific and cumulative impacts on personnel and equipment.

Source Document: Memo from Richard Martinez of the Ventura County Fire Protection District, dated July 22, 2011.

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
34. Education a. Schools	X				X			

The project is located within the Moorpark Unified School District (MUSD). The proposed project does not involve a residential use. Furthermore, the proposed project is not located adjacent to any school facilities and will not have any impact on school facilities or operations. Therefore, the proposed project will not have project-specific or cumulative impacts on schools.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011 and Planning GIS data layer (schools).

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
34b. Libraries	X				X			

The closest library is the Moorpark Library, which is approximately 7.5 miles from the project site. The proposed project does not involve a residential use that could result in an increase in population and a corresponding increase in demand for libraries. Furthermore, the proposed project is not located adjacent to any library facilities and will not have any impact on library facilities or operations. Therefore, the proposed project will not have project-specific or cumulative impacts on schools.

Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011 and Planning GIS data layer (libraries).

Issue (Responsible Department)	Project Impact Degree Of Effect*				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect*			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
35. Recreation	X				X			

The proposed paintball and airsoft facility would not result in an increase in population within the Moorpark area, thereby creating a new demand for parks, trails, or other recreational facilities. Although Happy Camp Canyon Park is located within 5 miles of the project site, the proposed paintball and airsoft facility does not involve development that could adversely interfere with the use or development of the park. Finally, there are no trails located within the vicinity of the project site with which the proposed project could interfere. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to local or regional parks, trails, or other recreational facilities.



Source Documents: Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines of April 2011 and Planning GIS data layer (trails).

**Degree of Effect:**

N = No Impact.  
 LS = Less Than Significant  
 PS-M = Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated.  
 PS = Potentially Significant Impact.

**Agencies:**

Airports - Department Of Airports  
 Ag. Dept. - Agricultural Department  
 APCD - Air Pollution Control District  
 EH - Environmental Health Division  
 Fire - Fire Protection District  
 GSA - General Services Agency

Harbors - Harbor Department  
 Lib. Agency - Library Services Agency  
 Plng. - Planning Division  
 PWA - Public Works Agency  
 Sheriff - Sheriff's Department  
 WPD - Watershed Protection District

**Section C- Mandatory Findings of Significance**

Based on the information contained within Sections B and C:	Yes/ Maybe	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one that occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future).		X
3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effect of other current projects, and the effect of probable future projects. (Several projects may have relatively small individual impacts on two or more resources, but the total of those impacts on the environment is significant).		X
4. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

## Section D. - Determination of Environmental Document


<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	On the basis of this initial evaluation: 1. I find the proposed project <b>could not</b> have a significant effect on the environment, and a <b>Negative Declaration</b> should be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	2. I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measure(s) described in section C of the Initial Study will be applied to the project. A <b>Mitigated Negative Declaration</b> should be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	3. I find the proposed project, individually and/or cumulatively, MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an <b>Environmental Impact Report</b> is required.*
<input type="checkbox"/>	4. I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An <b>Environmental Impact Report</b> is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	5. I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, <b>nothing further is required</b> .



Signature of Person Responsible for Administering the Project

12/12/11  
Date

\*EIR Issues of Focus:



Ventura County  
Resource Management Agency  
Information Systems

Date Printed: 12/09/2011

Conditional Use Permit  
Case No. LU11-0030  
Exhibit A - Aerial, General Plan  
and Zoning Map



