



NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND INTENT TO ADOPT A 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, Case No. PL21-0122
2. **Applicant:** Albert Castaneda
3. **Location:** 13515 West Telegraph Road, Santa Paula, CA 93060
4. **Assessor's Parcel No.:** 090-0-060-115
5. **Parcel Size:** 35.96 acres
6. **General Plan Designation:** Agricultural
7. **Zoning Designation:** Agricultural Exclusive-40-acre minimum lot area
8. **Responsible and/or Trustee Agencies:** None
9. **Project Description:** The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the use of a 3.3-acre portion of land in the southeast corner of an overall 35.96-acre parcel for temporary outdoor events for an initial five-year term. The proposed venue would be called Tuscan Rose Ranch. The area for events would consist of a ceremony area, gardens, a reception area, an existing gated entry with compacted gravel driveway and walkways, and a parking area. Two existing storage buildings (each measuring 120 square feet) would be utilized as a bridal changing room and a groom's room. The maximum number of proposed events would be 60 events per year. The maximum number of attendees would be 265, comprising of 250 guests and 15 vendors. Events would be proposed Thursdays through Sundays; however, most events are expected to occur on weekends. Proposed event hours would be as follows:
 - Vendors arrive no earlier than 9:00 AM
 - Guests arrive no earlier than 4:00 PM
 - Music ends at 11:00 PM (10:00 PM on Thursday and Sunday)
 - Guests leave no later than 11:30 PM (10:30 PM on Thursday and Sunday)
 - Vendors clean-up and leave no later than 12:00 AM (11:00 PM on Thursday and Sunday)

Based on the proposed number of guests and vendors, 140 parking spaces are proposed. Food and beverage service would be provided by a catering service. Each event would utilize security provided by a third-party service. In the event of inclement weather, a temporary canopy or tent would be provided over the reception area.

The property would be accessible from Ventura or Santa Paula using State Route 126 to the Briggs Road offramp, to West Telegraph Road. The property is approximately 0.93 mile from the intersection of Briggs and Telegraph Roads (a stop light intersection). A new driveway entrance was recently approved (Encroachment Permit #PE21-0361-1).

Domestic water is supplied to the property by the City of Santa Paula. The onsite domestic water would be used for refilling handwashing stations and portable restrooms. Water for agricultural uses on the remainder of the site is provided by an onsite well (SWN 03N21W19L01S).

A portable restroom trailer would be provided during events and serviced regularly by a licensed vendor. The restroom location is indicated on the site plan.

Lighting associated with the project would be low-voltage, garden-type lighting throughout the venue area and shielded downward, where necessary. String “market” lights would be placed over the reception area. The project would not propose permanent development or construction, or require grading associated with installation of the compacted gravel driveway, walkways, parking area, or any landscape area.

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 Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and the applicant has agreed to implement the mitigation measures.

List of Potentially Significant Environmental Impacts Identified:

Section 21, Noise and Vibration: The Initial Study finds that the proposed use of a portion of the site for temporary outdoor events would include the use of amplified noise and a public address (PA) system for announcements. In order to minimize the associated impacts, mitigation measure Noise Mitigation Measure MM-1 (Pre-Event Noise Monitoring), MM-2 (Contact Person), MM-3 (Resolution of Noise Complaints), and MM-4 (Noise Monitor and Sound Monitoring System) will be imposed on the project.

The public review period is from **September 29, 2022, through October 28, 2022**. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review on-line at 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 John Kessler, 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 john.kessler@ventura.org.



Mindy Fogg, Manager
Commercial and Industrial Permits Section

September 29, 2022
Date



MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Entitlement: Conditional Use Permit, Case No. PL21-0122

Applicant: Albert Castaneda

Location: 13515 West Telegraph Road, Santa Paula, CA 93060

Assessor's Parcel No.: 090-0-060-115

Parcel Size: 35.96 acres

General Plan Designation: Agricultural

Zoning Designation: Agricultural Exclusive-40-acre minimum lot area

Responsible and/or Trustee Agencies: None

Project Description: The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the use of a 3.3-acre portion of land in the southeast corner of an overall 35.96-acre parcel for temporary outdoor events for an initial five-year term. The proposed venue would be called Tuscan Rose Ranch. The area for events would consist of a ceremony area, gardens, a reception area, an existing gated entry with compacted gravel driveway and walkways, and a parking area. Two existing storage buildings (each measuring 120 square feet) would be utilized as a bridal changing room and a groom's room. The maximum number of proposed events would be 60 events per year. The maximum number of attendees would be 265, comprising of 250 guests and 15 vendors. Events would be proposed Thursdays through Sundays; however, most events are expected to occur on weekends. Proposed event hours would be as follows:

- Vendors arrive no earlier than 9:00 AM
- Guests arrive no earlier than 4:00 PM
- Music ends at 11:00 PM (10:00 PM on Thursday and Sunday)
- Guests leave no later than 11:30 PM (10:30 PM on Thursday and Sunday)
- Vendors clean-up and leave no later than 12:00 AM (11:00 PM on Thursday and Sunday)

Based on the proposed number of guests and vendors, 140 parking spaces are proposed. Food and beverage service would be provided by a catering service. Each event would utilize security provided by a third-party service. In the event of inclement weather, a temporary canopy or tent would be provided over the reception area.

The property would be accessible from Ventura or Santa Paula using State Route 126 to the Briggs Road offramp, to West Telegraph Road. The property is approximately 0.93 mile from the intersection of Briggs and Telegraph Roads (a stop light intersection). A new driveway entrance was recently approved (Encroachment Permit #PE21-0361-1).

Domestic water is supplied to the property by the City of Santa Paula. The onsite domestic water would be used for refilling handwashing stations and portable restrooms. Water for agricultural uses on the remainder of the site is provided by an onsite well (SWN 03N21W19L01S).

A portable restroom trailer would be provided during events and serviced regularly by a licensed vendor. The restroom location is indicated on the site plan.

Lighting associated with the project would be low-voltage, garden-type lighting throughout the venue area and shielded downward, where necessary. String "market" lights would be placed over the reception area. The project would not propose permanent development or construction, or require grading associated with installation of the compacted gravel driveway, walkways, parking area, or any landscape area.

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 Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and the applicant has agreed to implement the mitigation measures.

C. LISTING OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED: Noise and Vibration

D. PUBLIC REVIEW:

Legal Notice Method: Direct mailing to property owners within 1,500 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/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/Mitigated Negative Declaration no later than 5:00 p.m. on the last day of the document posting period to John Kessler, 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 john.kessler@ventura.org.

D. CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION:

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

Prepared by:



John Kessler, Case Planner
(805) 654-2461

Reviewed for Release to the Public by:



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 Tuscan Rose Ranch Temporary Outdoor Events

Section A – Project Description

1. **Project Case Number:** PL21-0122
2. **Name of Applicant:** Albert Castaneda
3. **Project Location and Assessor's Parcel Number:** The proposed project would be operated on a 3.3-acre portion of a 35.96-acre parcel located at 13515 West Telegraph Road, Santa Paula, CA 93060. The Tax Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) for the subject property is 090-0-060-115, as shown on the attached map.
4. **General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning Designation of the Project Site:**
 - a. **General Plan Land Use Designation:** Agricultural
 - b. **Zoning Designation:** AE-40 ac (Agricultural Exclusive-40-acre minimum lot area)
5. **Description of the Environmental Setting:** The proposed project comprising of temporary outdoor events would be operated within a 3.3-acre portion of land in the southeast corner of an overall 35.96-acre parcel. The project site is located within and would continue to be surrounded by existing agricultural land uses including row crops and citrus orchards. Existing development on the project site includes a single-family dwelling, which is currently occupied by the landowner who would also be the future operator of the proposed temporary outdoor event use comprised of this project, along with other ancillary buildings (i.e.: detached garage, barn and animal shade structures), a circular horse pen and greenhouses for row crops. West Telegraph Road provides access along the southern boundary of the project site.

The area surrounding the project site consists of the following (Attachment 1):

Location in Relation to the Project Site	Zoning	Land Uses/Development
North	AE-40 ac	Agricultural orchard
East	AE-40 ac	Agricultural, A&M Wholesale flower growers, greenhouses and row crops
South	AE-40 ac	West Telegraph Road, followed by agricultural orchard

Location in Relation to the Project Site	Zoning	Land Uses/Development
West	AE-40 ac	Agricultural row crops, flowers and greenhouses

6. **Project Description:** The applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the use of a 3.3-acre portion of land in the southeast corner of an overall 35.96-acre parcel for temporary outdoor events for an initial five-year term. The proposed venue would be called Tuscan Rose Ranch. The area for events would consist of a ceremony area, gardens, a reception area, an existing gated entry with compacted gravel driveway and walkways, and a parking area. Two existing storage buildings (each measuring 120 square feet) would be utilized as a bridal changing room and a groom's room. The maximum number of proposed events would be 60 events per year. The maximum number of attendees would be 265, comprising of 250 guests and 15 vendors. Events would be proposed Thursdays through Sundays; however, most events are expected to occur on weekends. Proposed event hours would be as follows:

- Vendors arrive no earlier than 9:00 AM
- Guests arrive no earlier than 4:00 PM
- Music ends at 11:00 PM (10:00 PM on Thursday and Sunday)
- Guests leave no later than 11:30 PM (10:30 PM on Thursday and Sunday)
- Vendors clean-up and leave no later than 12:00 AM (11:00 PM on Thursday and Sunday)

Based on the proposed number of guests and vendors, 140 parking spaces are proposed. Food and beverage service would be provided by a catering service. Each event would utilize security provided by a third-party service. In the event of inclement weather, a temporary canopy or tent would be provided over the reception area.

The property would be accessible from Ventura or Santa Paula using State Route 126 to the Briggs Road offramp, to West Telegraph Road. The property is approximately 0.93 mile from the intersection of Briggs and Telegraph Roads (a stop light intersection). A new driveway entrance was recently approved (Encroachment Permit #PE21-0361-1).

Domestic water is supplied to the property by the City of Santa Paula. The onsite domestic water would be used for refilling handwashing stations and portable restrooms. Water for agricultural uses on the remainder of the site is provided by an onsite well (SWN 03N21W19L01S).

A portable restroom trailer would be provided during events and serviced regularly by a licensed vendor. The restroom location is indicated on the site plan (Attachment 2).

Lighting associated with the project would be low-voltage, garden-type lighting throughout the venue area and shielded downward, where necessary. String “market” lights would be placed over the reception area. The project would not propose permanent development or construction, or require grading associated with installation of the compacted gravel driveway, walkways, parking area, or any landscape area.

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 5-mile radius of the proposed project that may have similar effects as those of the proposed project:

Table 1

Permit No.	Description	Distance from Project	Status
PL17-0154	Approved text amendment to the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance and CUP authorizing changes to an existing agricultural compost facility.	Approx. 0.7 miles	Approved
PL19-0109	Requested ministerial Conditional Certificate of Compliance for an illegal lot, for sale, lease and finance purposes only.	Approx. 1 mile	Pending
PL20-0129	Requested CUP to authorize industrial indoor and outdoor storage for a furniture moving company.	Approx. 2.5 miles	Pending
PL21-0041	Requested ministerial Lot Line Adjustment Permit involving four parcels.	Approx. 4.6 miles	Pending
PL21-0067	Requested Land Conservation Act (LCA) contract for a 10-year period.	Approx. 0.2 miles	Pending
PL21-0071	Requested LCA contract for a 10-year period.	Approx. 3.5 miles	Pending
PL21-0080	Approved LCA contract for a 10-year period.	Approx. 3.7 miles	Approved

Permit No.	Description	Distance from Project	Status
PL21-0115	Requested Permit Adjustment Permit (PAJ) to expand a CUP boundary by approx. six percent and to legalize construction of a storage shed and shade structures and allow for inclusion of gasoline storage areas and right-of-way improvements.	Approx. 2.5 miles	Pending
PL22-0054	Requested Minor Modification of a CUP to authorize the continued use, operation and maintenance of an existing Wireless Communication Facility for a 10-year period.	Approx. 5 miles	Pending
PL22-0067	Requested PAJ for a one-time, seven-day professional golf tournament at the Saticoy Golf Club.	Approx. 2.5 miles	Approved
PL22-0072	Requested monthly Farmers Market at Saticoy Park.	Approx. 2.6 miles	Pending
PL22-0089	Requested LCA contract for a 20-year period.	Approx. 3.3 miles	Pending
PL22-0108	Requested rescission and re-entry of a new LCA contract for a 10-year period.	Approx. 4.9 miles	Pending
PL22-0116	Requested rescission and re-entry of a new LCA contract for a 10-year period.	Approx. 4.5 miles	Pending
PL22-0118	Requested rescission and re-entry of a new LCA contract for a 10-year period.	Approx. 4.5 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 Responses¹

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
RESOURCES:								
1. Air Quality (VCAPCD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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				x		
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 1 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?		x				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 (NOx) 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 NOx 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 below the 25 pounds per day significance thresholds for reactive organic compounds (ROC) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx). The operational emissions resulting from the trips per day proposed were estimated at 0.60 lbs./day ROC and 0.46 lbs./day NOx. The emissions were calculated using the latest version of the state-wide used air emissions

¹ 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*.

model program CalEEMod (version 2020.4.0). The model program incorporates the EMFAC2017 emission factors for on-road mobile vehicles and method AP-42 for fugitive dust. The model was generated using a parking lot land use category and as a worst-case scenario of maximum guest parking spaces occupied (140), including spaces for the vendors (max 15). This information was found in the Application Questionnaire and Project Description submitted by the applicant. All maximum trips per day, or event, were multiplied by two to account for roundtrips (total max trips 280 one-way trips). In order for the model to calculate peak max emissions based on max one-way trips, the max trips per event (day) was entered for Saturday and Sunday so that the model can calculate peak emissions per event/day, regardless of the number of events per year (60). If the peak max trips were entered for the “weekday” input value, the model multiplies all of the peak trips by 365 operational days. This is the best estimate for a project such as this that has sporadic temporary one-day events throughout the year. In addition, the model did not include energy emissions (natural gas usage), area emissions (painting, solvents, etc.), or water and solid waste-generated emissions as the applicant has stated that portable restrooms would be provided, no natural gas usage utilities (propane tanks), and the facilities such as bride and groom changing rooms are existing.

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 would generate less than significant local air quality impacts. A brief discussion follows.

AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN (AQMP) CONSISTENCY

The proposed project must be consistent with the AQMP if estimated operational emissions exceed 2 lbs./day or greater for ROC or NO_x, as described in the Air Quality Assessment Guidelines (AQAG), Section 4.2. The proposed project's operational emissions do not exceed 2 lbs./day for either ozone precursor, therefore, an AQMP consistency analysis is not required. 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.

CARBON MONOXIDE (CO)

The major source of CO in urban areas is incomplete combustion of carbon containing fuels (primarily gasoline, diesel fuel, and natural gas). However, it also results from combustion processes, including forest fires and agricultural burning. Over 80 percent of the CO emitted in urban areas is contributed by motor vehicles. Ambient CO concentrations are generally higher in the winter, usually on cold, clear days and nights

with little or no wind. Low wind speeds inhibit horizontal dispersion, and surface inversions inhibit vertical mixing.

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 (AQAG, Table 6-2). Therefore, no CO hotspots are expected to occur in the Santa Paula 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.

DUST

Fugitive dust impacts are expected to be less than significant. The project would have a maximum of 60 1-day events throughout the year and so there should not be any long-term fugitive dust impacts provided the permittee is in compliance with any applicable provisions in APCD Rule 55, Fugitive Dust. In addition, a condition of approval will be imposed with the project to require signage limiting speed throughout the parking area to not exceed 15 MPH, as most of the fugitive dust would be generated from vehicles coming in and out of the site at the tail ends of each event. Fugitive dust can also be generated by wind-driven events, in which case the water truck would be very effective in reducing wind-blown dust, provided the water truck is on-site at all times to immediately alleviate the problem and that it waters down unpaved areas if needed. To ensure no violations of fugitive dust occur, signage would be required as a condition of approval that would include the APCD 24-Hour Complaints Hotline to be posted and visible to the public off site.

ODORS

The project is not expected to generate other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people. The project is for temporary one-day outdoor events, such as weddings, and are not expected to generate any problematic odors. The project is not expected to emit any aggravating odors that would create a public nuisance as defined by APCD Rule 51, Nuisance, which states "A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public or which endangers the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public or which cause or have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property."

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
2A. Water Resources – Groundwater Quantity (WPD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. And 2A-2. The proposed project site overlies the Santa Clara River Valley Basin – Santa Paula Subbasin (Department of Water Resources [DWR] Basin No. 4-004.04),

an adjudicated, very low-priority subbasin. The project site is hydro-geologically continuous with the Mound Subbasin (DWR Basin No. 4-004.03) which is in continuity with the Oxnard Subbasin (DWR Basin No. 4-004.02), a critically-over drafted subbasin. The proposed project would not, either individually or cumulatively, cause an over-drafted basin from a groundwater basin that is not over-drafted or not in hydrologic/hydrogeologic continuity with an over-drafted basin because no development would be proposed and water for the proposed activities would be sources from an adjudicated subbasin.

Domestic water would be supplied to the property by the City of Santa Paula and used for refilling handwashing stations and a proposed portable restroom trailer. The City of Santa Paula sources its water from groundwater wells within the Santa Paula Subbasin. There is one active domestic well within the property boundaries (State Well Number [SWN] 03N21W19L01S) that is used for agricultural irrigation for the remainder of the site. Additionally, the project would not involve grading and all other existing surfaces consist of pervious materials such as turf, pavers, gravel and landscaping.

2A-3. The proposed project site would overlies the Santa Clara River Valley Basin – Santa Paula Subbasin, a well-known and documented groundwater basin.

2A-4. The proposed project would not involve development, any additional water usage or new groundwater extraction. There is one active domestic well within the property boundaries (State Well Number [SWN] 03N21W19L01S) that is used for agricultural irrigation for the remainder of the site. Domestic water is supplied to the property by the City of Santa Paula. The City of Santa Paula sources its water from groundwater wells within the Santa Paula Subbasin, an adjudicated subbasin. The domestic water service would be used for refilling handwashing stations and portable restrooms. The number of proposed attendees per event is 265 with a maximum of 60 events per year. The estimated calculated annual water usage for the portable restrooms and handwashing stations is approximately 15,000 gallons (0.05-acre feet per year).

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 would be considered a less than significant impact to groundwater quantity.

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
2B. Water Resources - Groundwater Quality (WPD)								
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) 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 and 2B-2. The project site would not include any known existing sewer service or septic systems. Portable restrooms would be provided during events and be serviced regularly by a licensed contractor.

Implementation of the proposed project would not degrade the quality of groundwater or cause groundwater to exceed groundwater quality objectives set by the Basin Plan as no new septic or onsite wastewater treatment systems would be constructed.

2B-3. The project would not be 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.

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
2C. Water Resources - Surface Water Quantity (WPD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. The proposed project would not include the use of surface water from a fully appropriated stream reach as designated by the State Water Resources Control Board or where unappropriated surface water is unavailable.

2C-2. The proposed project would not include an increase in 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.

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.

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
2D. Water Resources - Surface Water Quality (WPD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. The proposed project would not individually or cumulatively degrade the quality of surface water causing it to exceed water quality objectives contained in Chapter 3 of the Los Angeles Basin Plan as applicable for this area. The proposed project would not result in a violation of any surface water quality standards as defined in the Los Angeles Basin Plan.

2D-2 The proposed project would allow use of approximately 3.3 acres of the 35.96-acre parcel for temporary events (ceremony area, gardens, a reception area, a gated entry with compacted gravel driveway and walkways, and a parking area). These areas would consist of existing pervious and impervious surfaces that would be repurposed for the proposed CUP. No construction or grading would be proposed as part of this project. As such, neither the individual project nor the cumulative threshold for significance would be exceeded and the project is expected to have a less than significant impact related to water quality objectives or standards in the applicable MS4 Permit or any other NPDES Permits.

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)

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
3A. Mineral Resources – Aggregate (Plng.)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 3A-2. The project site would not be located within a MRP Overlay Zone or located adjacent to land classified as MRP. In addition, the project site would not be located adjacent to a principal access road to an existing mining facility. Therefore, the proposed project would have no project-specific or cumulative 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 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
3B. Mineral Resources – Petroleum (Plng.)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 project site would not be 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. In addition, the project site would not have the potential to hamper or preclude access to petroleum resources resulting in an impact these resources. Therefore, the proposed project would have no project-specific or cumulative impact 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
4. Biological Resources								
4A. Species								
Will the proposed project, directly or indirectly:								

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 parcel is heavily altered from natural conditions, due to intense installation of landscape, hardscaping and permeable pavement (i.e.: gravel parking lot, concrete paver driveway and walkways, etc.). Therefore, the parcel would be limited in supporting protected biological resources on site. The existing trees and shrubs are likely non-native and/or ornamental. The applicant's landscape and screening plan would not include any invasive plant species or watch list plants as inventoried by the California Invasive Plant Council. The landscape plan would include native species, including landscaping to provide for a buffer from nearby existing agricultural fields. Therefore, impacts to plant species would be considered less than significant.

4A-2. The existing non-native and/or ornamental trees and shrubs may provide a limited potential for nesting birds. As no development, construction or grading would be proposed, impacts to animal species would be 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
4B. Ecological Communities - Sensitive Plant Communities								
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 intense agricultural practices. Therefore, the parcel does not support natural vegetation and in turn, there is limited to no potential to support protected biological resources on site. The existing trees and shrubs are non-native and/or ornamental.

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
4C. Ecological Communities - Waters and Wetlands								
Will the proposed project:								
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		

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
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 4C-3. Planning staff conducted research using the County's Resource Management Agency (RMA) Geographic Information System (GIS) Viewer and determined that the proposed project site is not located in a wetland, waterbody, or wetland buffer area. The proposed project site is located east of Todd Barranca which drains into Santa Clara River. According to staff from the Ventura County Watershed Protection—County Stormwater Program, surface water runoff from the proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause stormwater quality to exceed water quality objectives or standards.

According to staff from Ventura County Watershed Protection – Planning and Permits Division, the project would be situated roughly 850 feet northeast of Todd Barranca, which is a jurisdictional redline channel. However, project implementation would not directly connect to this channel or impair the channel.

4C-4. Planning staff conducted research using the County's RMA GIS Viewer and determined that the proposed project site would not be located in a wetland, waterbody, or wetland buffer area.

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
4D. Ecological Communities - ESHA (Applies to Coastal Zone Only)								
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 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
4E. Habitat Connectivity								
Will the proposed project:								
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			

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
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. According to the RMA GIS Viewer, the proposed project site is not located within a mapped wildlife movement corridor or overlay zone and is not located within a mapped wetland or waterbody buffer. No critical habitat areas are within the proposed project site. No adverse impacts to habitat connectivity would occur.

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
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 intense agricultural practices. 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.

These factors support the determination that the project was reviewed and found to be consistent with the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Programs and Policies for Item 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
5A. Agricultural Resources – Soils (Plng.)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. Planning staff reviewed the Important Farmland Inventory map layers in the RMA-GIS Viewer program to determine whether the proposed project would result in the direct and/or indirect loss of soils designated Prime, Statewide Importance, Unique or Local Importance. Although the proposed facility would include impervious areas that would result in the covering of approximately 45,512 square feet of agricultural soils designated Prime farmland for installation of an extended driveway, walkways and compacted gravel parking area, no new development or grading is proposed. Additionally, the amount of designated Prime farmland removed or covered by the proposed project would not exceed the acreage-loss threshold amounts set forth in Section 5a.C of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines. Therefore, project specific impacts are considered less than significant. In addition, the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines states that that County's General Plan contains policies and programs that serve to partially mitigate the cumulative impacts of agricultural soil loss and that additional cumulative environmental analysis is not required for any project that is consistent with the General Plan. As the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan, cumulative impacts are not considerable.

5A-2. The proposed project would not Involve a General Plan amendment that would result in the loss of agricultural soils.

5A-3. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 5A 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
5B. Agricultural Resources - Land Use Incompatibility (AG.)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 proposed project, as a non-agricultural use, would be subject to the threshold distances as noted in the Ventura County Agricultural/Urban Buffer Policy. The project would be located immediately adjacent to Important Farmland (Prime) on the East, South, and West. However, development on those soils adjoins the proposed project on each side. As such, the distance to undeveloped Important Farmland is 218 feet to the East, 66 feet to the South, and 281 feet to the West; all within threshold distances. As noted in the Ventura County Agricultural/Urban Buffer Policy, a vegetative screen would reduce the threshold distances to 150 feet, and the project, as proposed, would only have uses permitted under the Ventura County Agricultural/Urban Buffer policy within the remainder of the southern setback. As such, a condition of approval to require a vegetative screen would be imposed to reduce project impacts to less than significant.

On August 10, 2022, the applicant presented a proposed landscape plan deviating from exact vegetative screen requirements to the Ventura County Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee (APAC). The APAC unanimously approved the deviation request, namely utilizing a single row of Carolina Cherry trees that form a continuous barrier, backed by shade cloth-enhanced fencing, where vegetative screening would otherwise be required (Attachment 5²). In addition, a condition of approval will be included in the CUP to require a notification and response plan to notify employees and visitors of agricultural activities within 300 feet of the project boundary. The plan must indicate how employees

² The August 10, 2022 Minutes are in Draft version and are expected to be approved with no changes or amendments at a future APAC meeting.

and visitors would be notified that normal farming operations may cause nuisances and how employees and visitors would be instructed to respond in the rare event that adjacent agricultural operations present a hazard. With the installation of the approved deviated landscape planting plan and with implementation of the condition of approval regarding notification, the proposed project would not be incompatible with adjacent agricultural resources and operations.

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)

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
6. Scenic Resources (PInG.)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 would be located within a farmland setting containing orchards, residential structures, and principal and accessory agricultural structures. According to the RMA GIS Viewer, the proposed project and the surrounding area are

not located within the County's Scenic Resource Protection Overlay Zone. The RMA GIS Viewer does not identify any Scenic Resource Protection viewing locations (County scenic lakes, publicly owned parcels, or designated scenic roads) that could be obstructed, obscured, or degraded by implementation of the proposed project. While West Telegraph Road is designated as an Eligible County Scenic Highway, photo simulations of the proposed project site indicate that the proposed landscaping and the remaining orchards would reduce the project's visibility from West Telegraph Road (the nearest public viewing location of the project site).

6c. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 6 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
7. Paleontological Resources								
Will the proposed project:								
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. Although the proposed project would include components of a new gravel driveway and parking lot, totaling 45,512 square feet, no development, grading or earthmoving would occur. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in a direct or indirect impact to areas of paleontological significance. As such, the proposed project would not create a project-specific impact and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact, to paleontological resources.

7b. The proposed project would not contribute to the progressive loss of exposed rock in Ventura County that can be studied and prospected for fossil remains. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a project-specific impact and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact, to paleontological resources.

7c. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 7 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
8A. Cultural Resources - Archaeological								
Will the proposed project:								
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 8A-2. The proposed project would 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 would have no impact

on archaeological resources and would 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
8B. Cultural Resources – Historic (PInG.)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 8B-4. According to the RMA GIS Viewer, no historic resources or cultural heritage locations are located within the proposed project site. The Ventura County Cultural Heritage Program staff evaluated the proposed project site and surrounding properties. Cultural Heritage Program staff stated that there are no historical resources on project site or surrounding properties. Due to the absence of historic and cultural resources, the subject property is not eligible to be listed as a cultural heritage site. The Program Coordinator finds no impact to cultural resources and, therefore, no conditions are required for the proposed project.

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
9. Coastal Beaches and Sand Dunes								
Will the proposed project:								
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 through 9c. The project site is located approximately 9.4 miles from the coast and therefore, would not have the potential to adversely impact a coastal beach or sand dune. Thus, the project would not create a direct or indirect adverse physical change to

a coastal beach or sand dunes. Additionally, County policies related to development in the coastal zone 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
10. Fault Rupture Hazard (PWA)								
Will the proposed project:								
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:

There is no known cumulative fault rupture hazard that would occur as a result of other projects.

10a. through 10c. 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. There are no known active or potentially active faults extending through the proposed project based on State of California Earthquake Fault Zones in accordance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, and Ventura County General Plan Section 7.4 Geologic and Seismic Hazards, HAZ-4.1, HAZ-4.2, and HAZ-4.17. Furthermore, the project would not propose development of habitable structures within 50 feet of a mapped trace of an active fault.

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
11. Ground Shaking Hazard (PWA)								
Will the proposed project:								
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:

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

11a. and 11b. 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 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, requires structures be designed to withstand this ground shaking. Although, no permanent structures would be proposed with the project, the seismic design of any future structures would need to be updated to the building code in effect at the time the application for a building permit is submitted to the County. As such, the requirements of the building code in effect at that time would reduce the effects of ground shaking to 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
12. Liquefaction Hazards (PWA)								
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) 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 project site would not be located within a potential liquefaction zone based on the State of California Seismic Hazards Maps for the County of Ventura. These maps are used as the basis for delineating the potential liquefaction hazards within the county. The 2040 Ventura County General Plan Chapter 7 (HAZ-4.8) requires the county to prohibit development of habitable structures with areas prone to liquefaction unless a geotechnical report is prepared, and sufficient safeguards are incorporated into the project. As the site is not within a potential liquefaction zone and would not propose development of habitable structures, there would be no impact from potential hazards from liquefaction.

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
13. Seiche and Tsunami Hazards (PWA)								
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) 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:

The hazards from seiche and tsunami would affect each project individually. No cumulative seiche and tsunami hazard would occur as a result of other projects.

13a. through 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. According to the 2040 Ventura County General Plan, Chapter 7 (HAZ-4.14 and HAZ-4.18) and the Background Report Section 11.2, Figure 11.9, the project would not be located within 10 to 20 vertical feet of a closed water body. Additionally, according to aerial imagery review (photos dated December 2019, aerial imagery is under the copyrights of Pictometry from the RMA GIS Viewer), the site would not be located adjacent to a closed or restricted body of water and therefore, would not be subject to seiche hazard. Thus, there would be no hazard from potential seiche.

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
14. Landslide/Mudflow Hazard (PWA)								
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) 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:

The hazards from landslides/mudslides would affect each project individually. No cumulative landslide/mudslide hazard would occur as a result of other projects.

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. 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 site would not be located within a mapped landslide area, located within a hillside area or located in a potential seismically induced landslide zone. A map showing the location of Deep-Seated Landslide Area is included as Figure 11-3 in the 2040 Ventura County General Plan Background Report, Section 11.1. Thus, there would be no impacts to the project resulting from landslide hazard.

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
15. Expansive Soils Hazards (PWA)								
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) 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:

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

15a. and 15b. Future development at the site would 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. Thus, impact from potential hazards from expansive soils would 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
16. Subsidence Hazard (PWA)								
Will the proposed project:								
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							

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
b) Be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 16 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines?	x				x			

Impact Discussion:

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

16a and 16b. The subject property would not be located within the probable subsidence hazard zone as delineated on the Ventura County General Plan Hazards Appendix, Figure 2.8 (Data Source: United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, 1968). In addition, the project would not involve oil, gas or groundwater withdrawal; therefore, the project would have no impact on the hazard of subsidence.

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
17a. Hydraulic Hazards – Non-FEMA (PWA)								
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) 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"> • 2007 Ventura County Building Code Ordinance No.4369 • Ventura County Land Development Manual • Ventura County Subdivision Ordinance • Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance • Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance • Ventura County Standard Land Development Specifications • Ventura County Road Standards • Ventura County Watershed Protection District Hydrology Manual • County of Ventura Stormwater Quality Ordinance, Ordinance No. 4142 • Ventura County Hillside Erosion Control Ordinance, Ordinance No. 3539 and Ordinance No. 3683 • Ventura County Municipal Storm Water NPDES Permit • State General Construction Permit • State General Industrial Permit • National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)? 	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. Project implementation would not require grading, would not increase impervious area, or would change existing drainage patterns. No development or increase in flooding hazard or potential for erosion or siltation would occur as a result of the project.

17A-2. Project implementation would not result in an increase in impervious area for the project site. Additionally, flooding hazard or potential for erosion or siltation would not occur as a result of the proposed project. Finally, no new impervious area would be added as part of the project. Therefore, the project would be 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
17b. Hydraulic Hazards – FEMA (WPD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 17B-5. 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 06111C0778E effective January 20, 2010. The proposed development is therefore, deemed 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
18. Fire Hazards (VCFPD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. The proposed project would not be located in a high fire hazard area.

18b. County policies related to development in the High Fire Hazard Areas would 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
19. Aviation Hazards (Airports)								
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) 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 through 19c. The proposed project site would not be located within an Airport Safety Zone or Airport Sphere of Influence. County policies related to aviation hazards would 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
20a. Hazardous Materials/Waste – Materials (EHD/Fire)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. The proposed project would store hazardous materials in the form of approximately 62 gallons of propane. Per County requirements, the applicant must obtain a permit to operate from Ventura County Environmental Health Division/Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) and submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) to the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) within 30 days of storing hazardous materials if the amounts are at, or above reporting thresholds (55 gallons or 200 cubic feet), and annually thereafter. If the propane is used for the sole purpose of cooking, heating employee work areas, and heating within that facility, then the reportable threshold is 500 gallons, unless CUPA finds that the handling of the on-premises propane requires the submission of a business plan, in response to public health, safety, or environmental concerns. Improper storage, handling, and disposal of these materials could result in the creation of adverse impacts to the environment. Compliance with applicable state and local regulations would reduce potential project specific and cumulative impacts to a level considered less than significant.

20A-2. The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan for Item 20a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines, provided the business maintains compliance with all applicable laws and regulations related to hazardous materials handling, storage, and disposal.

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
20b. Hazardous Materials/Waste – Waste (EHD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 a temporary outdoor event facility and would not generate hazardous wastes, which require a Ventura County Environmental Health

Division/Certified Unified Program Agency permit. No project specific or cumulative impact related to hazardous waste is expected.

20b-2. The proposed project would not generate hazardous waste and would 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
21. Noise and Vibration								
Will the proposed project:								
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			

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
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		
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. The proposed project for temporary outdoor events may involve the use of a public address (PA) system announcements and amplified music. Therefore, the applicant retained Advanced Engineering Acoustics to prepare a noise/acoustical study (dated, June 16, 2021) (Attachment 4), which analyzed the proposed project's noise impacts.

The significance thresholds that Advanced Engineering Acoustics used when preparing the noise study were based on the maximum acceptable noise levels that are set forth in the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs Noise Compatibility Standards, Policy HAZ-9.2, and are also the significance thresholds set forth in the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines (2011). More specifically, the proposed project would create a significant noise impact if the proposed project generates noise that exceeds:

- Leq1H of 55 dBA or ambient noise level plus 3 dBA, whichever is greater, during any hour from 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM;
- Leq1H of 50 dBA or ambient noise level plus 3 dBA, whichever is greater, during any hour from 7:00 PM to 10:00 PM; or
- Leq1H of 45 dBA or ambient noise level plus 3 dBA, whichever is greater, during any hour from 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM.

As part of the noise study, Advanced Engineering Acoustics measured the noise at three sensitive receptor locations (residences) and also at 10 feet from the speaker in the disc jockey (DJ) setup area by using four portable sound level and audio recording meters (NTi XL2 Type 1), which were all calibrated according to the manufacturer's instructions before and after the measurements. Advanced Engineering Acoustics measured the ambient noise levels between 7:30 pm and 10:00 pm and determined that the lowest 15-minute average ambient measurement within 10 feet of the DJ setup area was 49.9 decibels A (dBA). Since the lowest 15-minute average ambient measurement within the project site between 7:30 pm and 10:00 pm was 49.9 dBA, the ambient level of 50 dBA was selected as the significance threshold for those hours.

The noise study evaluated the noise impacts at three other locations (locations "B", "C" and "D"), which are located approximately 290 feet, 400 feet and 1,000 away from the DJ setup area. Advanced Engineering Acoustics conducted three tests between the hours of 8:15 pm and 9:00 pm. Location "B" experienced noise levels ranging from 46.2 dBA to 49.9 dBA, location "C" experienced noise levels ranging from 53.0 dBA to 54.0 dBA, and location "D" experienced noise levels ranging from 64.1 dBA to 65.8 dBA, which are higher than the maximum acceptable 50 dBA noise level between 7:00 pm and 10:00 pm.

Additionally, Advanced Engineering Acoustics conducted another test at the same four locations (10 feet from the DJ setup area and at locations "B", "C" and "D") from 8:15 pm and 9:00 pm. Noise levels averaged from 82 dBA at 10 feet from the DJ setup area and 48.2 dBA, 51.8 dBA and 65.2 dBA, which also are higher than the maximum acceptable 50 dBA noise level between 7:00 pm and 10:00 pm. Because these levels are averaged over a one-hour time period, there may be periods when the noise generated from the site exceeds these averages and thresholds of the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guideline. Therefore, the proposed project would have a potentially significant noise impact that may also be cumulatively considerable. However, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in this initial study (below), the noise impacts would be reduced to below significance.

21b. The proposed project would not include construction or grading activities. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant project-specific impact related to construction-related noise. The proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative construction-related noise impact.

21c. The proposed project would not involve the introduction of a new transit use within a critical distance from a vibration-sensitive use. Further, the proposed project would not result in vibration-generating activities or construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant project-specific impact or make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact, related to the introduction of a new transit use within a critical distance from vibration sensitive uses.

21d. The proposed project would result in a maximum of 60 events per year. While cars may be used to transport event guests to the project site, all parking of such vehicles would be located on the proposed project site and within the CUP boundary. Since the proposed project would result in a limited number of events, the project would not exceed the threshold criteria of the Transit Use Thresholds for rubber-tire heavy vehicle uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant project-specific impact or make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact, related to vibration and noise impacts from new heavy vehicle trips.

21e. The proposed project would not include blasting, pile-driving, vibratory compaction, demolition, drilling, excavation, or other similar types of vibration-generating activities. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a project-specific impact or make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact, related to vibration-generating activities.

21f. As stated in Section 21a of this initial study (above), the proposed project has the potential to exceed the maximum acceptable noise levels set forth in the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs Noise Compatibility Standards (HAZ-9.2), due to the use of amplified sound and music during the proposed outdoor events. However, with the inclusion of the mitigation measures set forth below, the proposed project would not exceed the maximum acceptable noise levels set forth in Noise Compatibility Standards, Policy HAZ-9.2, and the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 21 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

Mitigation

Noise Mitigation Measure MM-1: Pre-Event Noise Monitoring

Purpose: To ensure that the outdoor events do not generate sound levels that exceed the maximum acceptable noise levels set forth in the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs Noise Compatibility Standards (HAZ-9.2).

Requirement: The Permittee shall conduct pre-event noise monitoring during music performance sound checks and, if needed, adjust the sound levels, to ensure that the sound levels do not exceed 89 dBA at 10 feet from the source of amplified music between 6:00 am and 7:00 pm, or exceed 87 dBA at 10 feet from the source of amplified music between 7:00 pm and 10:00 pm, or exceed 79 dBA at 10 feet from the source of amplified music between 10:00 pm and 6:00 am, which is the maximum

acceptable noise level set forth in the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs Noise Compatibility Standards, Policy HAZ-9.2.

Documentation: The Permittee shall maintain a written record of noise readings from pre-event noise monitoring during music performance/DJ sound checks and must maintain the noise reading records for a period of one year from the date of the event.

Timing: The Permittee shall conduct a sound check prior to each event that involves the use of PA systems and/or amplified music. The Permittee shall maintain a record of noise readings for each event for one year from the event date.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division has the authority to periodically confirm that the pre-event noise monitoring and reporting is consistent with the requirements of this mitigation measure, pursuant to § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance. Additionally, the Planning Division has the authority to request a copy of the noise monitoring reports for events up to a year after the event has occurred.

Noise Mitigation Measure MM-2: Contact Person

Purpose: To designate a Contact Person responsible for responding to complaints.

Requirement: The Permittee shall designate a contact person(s) to respond to complaints from citizens and the County which are related to the permitted uses of this CUP. The designated contact person shall be available, via telecommunication, 24 hours a day, during which an event is taking place at the subject property.

Documentation: The Permittee shall provide the Planning Director with the contact information (e.g., name and/or position title, address, business and cell phone numbers, and email addresses) of the Permittee's field agent who receives all orders, notices, and communications regarding matters of condition and code compliance at the CUP site.

Timing: Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for use inauguration, the Permittee shall provide the Planning Division the contact information of the Permittee's field agent(s) for the project file. If the address or phone number of the Permittee's field agent(s) should change, or the responsibility is assigned to another person, the Permittee shall provide the Planning Division with the new information in writing within three calendar days of the change in the Permittee's field agent.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division maintains the contact information provided by the Permittee in the respective project file. The Planning Division has the authority to periodically confirm the contact information consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

Noise Mitigation Measure MM-3: Resolution of Noise Complaints

Purpose: In order to resolve noise complaints during outdoor events and minimize noise related impacts.

Requirement: The Permittee shall provide the Planning Director and all adjacent property owners and residents with the name, title, address, and phone number of the Permittee, or Permittee's designee, who will be responsible for ensuring condition and code compliance during outdoor events at the project site.

The Permittee, or the Permittee's designee, must use the following process to resolve noise complaints received during outdoor events:

- a. Immediately investigate the complaint and then decide if any of the following actions can be taken to abate the noise complaint:
 - (1) lower speaker volumes of public address (PA) systems and/or amplified music below the maximum allowed (89 dBA at 10 feet from the source of amplified music between 6:00 am and 7:00 pm, or 87 dBA at 10 feet from the source of amplified music between 7:00 pm and 10:00 pm, or 79 dBA at 10 feet from the source of amplified music between 10:00 pm and 6:00 am);
 - (2) discontinue the use of PA systems;
 - (3) discontinue the use of amplified music and replace with acoustical music; and/or
 - (4) alter the timing and sequence of event activities to comply with the maximum acceptable noise levels set forth in the Ventura County's General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs Noise Compatibility Standards, Policy HAZ-9.2.
- b. Report back to the complaining party by telephone about their investigation findings and explain abatement actions taken, if any, to the complainant as soon as possible, but no later than 15 minutes after receiving the complaint, unless otherwise agreed to by the complainant.
- c. Notify the Planning Director in writing within 10 days of receiving a noise complaint. The notice shall indicate the date and time of the complaint(s), as well as the name, address, and phone number of the complainant(s).

The Permittee shall take all reasonable actions to prevent noise from adversely affecting nearby residents. If the problem persists, the Planning Director may initiate actions to prevent further complaints including, but not limited to, the use of a noise consultant, at the Permittee's expense, to monitor the event noise and implement measures to achieve compliance with the maximum noise levels. The Permittee's failure to curtail noise complaints using the methods set forth in this condition may result in the Planning Director modifying this CUP to disallow event activities that adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors.

Documentation: The Permittee must maintain current contact information for the Permittee or Permittee's designee and supply the current contact information to the County Planning Division.

Timing: Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for use inauguration, and annually on February 1st thereafter, the Permittee shall provide the Planning Division updated contact information for the individual who will be responsible for ensuring condition and code compliance during outdoor events at the project site. The Permittee, or Permittee's designee, shall be available for contact during events. If the contact information should change prior to the mandatory annual update, the Permittee shall provide the residents and Planning Director with the new information prior to the next event. The Permittee shall notify the Planning Director in writing within 10 days of receiving a noise complaint. The notice shall indicate the date and time of the complaint(s), as well as the name, address, and phone number of the complainant(s).

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division maintains the contact information provided by the Permittee in the project file. The Permittee shall provide the Planning Division notice of any complaints associated with the events to be maintained in the project file. In the event that complaints go on unabated, the Planning Director has the authority to review any complaints received by the Planning Division to determine whether this CUP should be modified or revoked.

Noise Mitigation Measure MM-4: Noise Monitor and Sound Monitoring System

Purpose: To ensure that project-generated noise does not exceed the maximum acceptable noise levels for sensitive receptors that are located within proximity to the project site, pursuant to the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs Noise Compatibility Standards, Policy HAZ-9.2.

Requirement:

The maximum acceptable noise levels during outdoor event are as follows:

- 55.0 dBA between 6:00 am and 7:00 pm, measured at the nearest wall of a sensitive receptor;
- 53.0 dBA between 7:00 pm and 10:00 pm, measured at the nearest wall of a sensitive receptor; and,
- 45.0 dBA between 10:00 pm and 6:00 am, measured at the nearest wall of a sensitive receptor.

In order to ensure that noise levels do not exceed the maximum noise levels set forth above, the maximum allowed sound level during daytime hours (6:00 am to 7:00 pm) over the course of a 15-minute period shall not exceed 89 dBA Leq (hr), or less, measured at 10 feet from the speakers. During evening hours (7:00 pm to 10:00 pm), the maximum allowed sound level over the course of a 15-minute period shall not exceed 87 dBA Leq (hr), or less, measured at 10 feet from the speakers. During nighttime hours (10:00 pm to 6:00 am), the maximum allowed sound level over the

course of a 15-minute period shall not exceed 79 dBA Leq (hr), or less, measured at 10 feet from the speakers.

If noise levels are found to exceed the maximum noise levels set forth in this mitigation measure, the Permittee shall adjust the speaker orientation and/or reduce the volume of the PA system and/or amplified music to achieve compliance with the noise standards set forth in this mitigation measure.

Documentation: The Permittee shall maintain a written record of noise readings during noise-monitored events and maintain the noise reading records for a period of one year from the date of the event.

Timing: The Permittee shall conduct noise monitoring throughout the life of the permit. Any outdoor event that involves amplified sound will be required to utilize a noise monitor and sound monitoring system to ensure that the noise levels do not exceed the maximum acceptable noise levels pursuant to the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines (as mentioned above).

Monitoring and Reporting: A noise monitor shall be present at all outdoor events with amplified sound to monitor the noise level at 10 feet from the sound emissions. When the noise monitor exceeds 89 dBA Leq (1hr) at 10 feet from the DJ area from 6:00 am to 7:00 pm or exceeds 87 dBA Leq (1hr) at 10 feet from the DJ area from 7:00 pm to 10:00 pm or exceeds 79 dBA Leq (1hr) at 10 feet from the DJ area from 10:00 to 6:00 am, the amplified music shall be reduced to not exceed the allowable limits.

The Permittee is required to maintain a written log of noise monitoring results for a period of one year from the date of the event and submit them to the Planning Division, upon request. The Planning Division has the authority to periodically confirm that noise monitoring is occurring during events, consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

With the implementation of the mitigation measures listed above (Noise Mitigation Measures MM-1 through MM-4), residual project-specific impacts would be less than significant, and the proposed project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to noise and vibration.

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								
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) 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 site is adjacent to West Telegraph Road, which is identified by RMA GIS Viewer as a road segment of the County's Regional Road Network. The only proposed structure for the project would include a portable restroom trailer. The walls and roof of the portable restroom trailer would be comprised of metal panels which would be painted in a non-reflective white color. The portable trailer would be placed approximately 350 feet from West Telegraph Road atop the gravel driveway and would not be visible from West Telegraph Road or any public viewpoint. Daytime glare from West Telegraph Road would be nonexistent because landscaping is proposed between the proposed portable restroom trailer and West Telegraph Road.

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
23. Public Health (EHD)								
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) 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 due to onsite storage and/or handling of hazardous materials. Compliance with applicable hazardous materials regulations would reduce potential project-specific and cumulative impacts to a level considered less than significant. Proposed project activities would include food service operations during private functions. All food providers, including restaurants, food trucks, caterers, and concession stands, must comply with all applicable state and local requirements to reduce impacts to less than significant. Additionally, the proposed project would have the potential to impact public health due to the toilet facilities onsite. The portable toilets may potentially create a public health concern if not routinely cleaned, maintained and pumped out regularly. Portable toilets must be routinely serviced by a chemical toilet pumper truck with an active permit to operate issued by Ventura County Environmental Health Division. All septage wastes must be disposed of in an approved manner. Potable water must also be provided for hand washing purposes.

23b. The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan for Item 23 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines if food service providers comply with all state and local food safety requirements, portable toilets are operated and serviced in a safe and sanitary manner, and all hazardous materials are handled properly.

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
24. Greenhouse Gases (VCAPCD)								
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) 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 (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆). 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, CO₂ and CH₄ 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 (MTCO₂e/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 MTCO₂e/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 would be less than significant. The emissions were calculated using the latest version of the state-wide used air emissions model program CalEEMod (version 2020.4.0). The model program incorporates the EMFAC2017 emission factors for on-road mobile vehicles and method AP-42 for fugitive dust. The model was generated using a parking lot land use category and as a worst-case scenario of maximum guest parking spaces occupied (140), including spaces for the vendors (max 15). This information was found in the Application Questionnaire and Project Description submitted by the applicant. All maximum trips per day, or event, were multiplied by two to account for roundtrips (total

max trips 280 one-way trips). In order for the model to calculate peak max emissions based on max one-way trips, the max trips per event (day) was entered for Saturday and Sunday so that the model can calculate peak emissions per event/day, regardless of the number of events per year (60). If the peak max trips were entered for the “weekday” input value, the model multiply all of the peak trips by 365 operational days. This is the best estimate for a project such as this that has sporadic temporary 1-day events throughout the year. In addition, the model did not include energy emissions (natural gas usage), area emissions (painting, solvents, etc.), or water and solid waste-generated emissions as the applicant has stated that portable restrooms would be provided, no natural gas utilities (propane tanks), and the facilities such as bride and groom changing rooms are existing. The model report is attached to this memo as a PDF.

The total GHG emissions including operational and construction emissions (amortized over a 30-yr average project lifespan) are approximately 62.8 MT CO₂e/Yr. This is well below the recommended 3,000 MT CO₂e/Yr interim numerical threshold for residential and commercial projects from the adjacent air district (SCAQMD).

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
25. Community Character (PIng.)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 proposed project would be located within a farmland setting which includes agricultural operations, orchards, residential structures, and principal and accessory agricultural structures. While the NCZO would allow for temporary event facilities to be located within the agricultural zone with the approval of a CUP, the NCZO does not define temporary event facilities as agricultural uses. The Agricultural Commissioner's Office identified the project's potential land use incompatibility related to persons associated with the proposed facility (employees, vendors, guests, etc.) being affected by the surrounding agricultural operations (e.g., dust, noise, use of fertilizers, and/or chemical pest controls) which could adversely restrict or limit agricultural operations in the vicinity. To address this incompatibility, the Agricultural Commissioner's Office recommends the installation of a vegetative screen to minimize potential conflicts between agricultural operations within 150 feet of the project boundary. On August 10, 2022, the applicant presented a proposed landscape plan deviating from exact vegetative screen requirements to the APAC. The APAC unanimously approved the deviation request, namely utilizing a single row of Carolina Cherry trees that form a continuous barrier, backed by shade cloth-enhanced fencing, where vegetative screening would otherwise be required (Attachment 5. The APAC approved landscape plan is included as Attachment 2). In addition, a Notification and Response Plan to minimize potential conflicts between agricultural operations within 300 of the project boundaries and the proposed activities will be imposed as a condition of approval for the project.

The proposed project would be compatible with the surrounding architectural style and site design. Residential dwellings of various architectural styles and functional agricultural structures prevail in the vicinity of the proposed project site. The walls and roof of the proposed portable restroom trailer would be comprised of non-reflective metal panels. No other structures would be proposed upon implementation of the project.

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
26. Housing (PIng.)								
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) Eliminate three or more dwelling units that are affordable to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • moderate-income households that are located within the Coastal Zone; and/or, • lower-income households? 	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 would not eliminate any existing dwelling units. Therefore, the project would not result in an impact and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact, related to the elimination of existing housing stock.

26b. The proposed project would not involve any permanent construction activities. Therefore, the proposed project would 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 would 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 would 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 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
27a(1). Transportation & Circulation - Roads and Highways - Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) (PWA)								
Will the proposed project:								
a) Meet a screening criterion or be below the applicable VMT significance threshold in the County's <i>Transportation & Circulation—Vehicle Miles Traveled</i> document?		x				x		

Impact Discussion:

27a(1)-a. According to information provided by the applicant, the operation of the proposed facility would involve 55 one-way passenger trips per day to the site for employees, guests and vendors. As such, vehicle trips associated with this facility would be below the 110 Average Daily Trip screening threshold for VMT impacts and therefore, adverse traffic impacts relating VMT would 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
27a(2). Transportation & Circulation - Roads and Highways - Safety and Design of Public Roads (PWA)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. Operation of the proposed project would generate fewer than 110 additional average daily trips on the Regional Road Network and local public roads and therefore, adverse traffic impacts relating to safety and design within the RRN or LRN would 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
27a(3). Transportation & Circulation - Roads & Highways – Safety & Design of Private Access (VCFPD)								
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. All roads leading to the project site are existing and meet the minimum required access standards. No private roads or private access would be proposed with the project.

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)

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
27a(4). Transportation & Circulation - Roads & Highways - Tactical Access (VCFPD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. All public roads leading to the proposed project are existing and meet minimum VCFPD Access Standards. No new roads or access would be required to allow for project implementation.

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)

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
27b. Transportation & Circulation - Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities (PWA/Plng.)								
Will the proposed project:								
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			

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
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. There are no designated bike lanes, sidewalks, or walking paths located adjacent to West Telegraph Road. According to the Public Works Agency, Roads and Transportation Department, the project would not generate additional pedestrian and/or bicycle traffic. No adverse effect on bicycle or pedestrian facilities has been identified that would result from project implementation.

27b-3: The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan goals and policies related to bicycle and pedestrian access.

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
27c. Transportation & Circulation - Bus Transit								
Will the proposed project:								
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 and 27c-2. According to the RMA GIS Viewer, no public transit stops are located adjacent to or within one mile of the proposed project site. According to the current Gold Coast Transit System Map, no transit routes are located on West Telegraph Road. The proposed project would not result in adverse impacts to transit facilities or routes or substantially increase the demand bus transit facilities or services. County policies related to bus transit would not apply. Implementation of the project would not result in a substantial increase in demand for additional or new bus transit facilities/services.

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
27d. Transportation & Circulation - Railroads								
Will the proposed project:								
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 and 27d-2. According to the RMA GIS Viewer, the proposed project site would be located approximately 2,300 feet from the nearest railroad line and approximately 4,700 feet from the nearest railroad crossing. While the proposed project would generate additional traffic trips, it is unlikely that such trips would result in substantial interference with existing railroad facilities or operations. In addition, the proposed project would not be a use that would generate new demand for railroads. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan Goals and Policies that pertain to item 27d 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
27e. Transportation & Circulation – Airports (Airports)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 through 27e-3. According to the RMA GIS Viewer, the proposed project site would be located approximately 3.4 miles away from the nearest airport (Santa Paula Airport) and would not be located within an Airport Safety Zone or Airport Sphere of Influence. Additionally, County policies related to airports would not apply. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan Goals and Policies that pertain to item 27e 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
27f. Transportation & Circulation - Harbor Facilities (Harbors)								
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) 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 27f-2. The proposed project is located approximately 9.4 miles from the nearest harbor (Ventura Harbor). The proposed project would have no adverse impacts to harbor facilities. Additionally, County policies related to harbors would not apply. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan Goals and Policies that pertain to item 27f 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
27g. Transportation & Circulation - Pipelines								
Will the proposed project:								
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 27g-2. According to the RMA GIS Viewer, the proposed project site is adjacent to an existing major pipeline along the northern property line boundary of the project site. However, the proposed CUP boundary would be located approximately

2,300 feet south of the pipeline and would request the use of 3.3 acres of the overall 35.95-acre parcel. Project implementation would have no impact on existing pipelines. County policies related to pipelines do not apply. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan Goals and Policies that pertain to item 27g 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
28a. Water Supply – Quality (EHD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 would be provided via an existing connection to the City of Santa Paula, as verified by water bill dated September 29, 2021. The proposed project would not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to the domestic water supply.

28a-2. The proposed project would be 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

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 (WPD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. There is one active domestic well within the property boundaries (State Well Number [SWN] 03N21W19L01S) that is used for agricultural irrigation for the remainder of the site. Domestic water would be supplied to the property from the City of Santa Paula. The City of Santa Paula sources its water from groundwater wells within the Santa Paula Subbasin, an adjudicated subbasin. The domestic water service would be used for refilling handwashing stations and portable restrooms.

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

28b-3. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 28b 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
28c. Water Supply - Fire Flow Requirements (VCFPD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 has been reviewed and found to comply with VCFPD minimum requirements for fire flow. Conditions of Approval would be included with the requested CUP to ensure that the Permittee would continue to demonstrate that adequate fire flow is available to serve the facility upon request by the VCFPD.

28c-2. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 28c 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
29a. Waste Treatment & Disposal Facilities - Individual Sewage Disposal Systems (EHD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 involves a temporary outdoor event facility and requests to utilize portable toilets and therefore, would not utilize an onsite wastewater treatment system. Therefore, the project would not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts related to an onsite wastewater treatment system.

29a-2. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 29a of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines regarding sewage disposal.

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
29b. Waste Treatment & Disposal Facilities - Sewage Collection/Treatment Facilities (EHD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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 involves a temporary outdoor event facility and requests to utilize portable toilets. The project would not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts to a sewage collection facility.

29b-2. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 29b of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines regarding sewage disposal.

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
29c. Waste Treatment & Disposal Facilities - Solid Waste Management (PWA)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. As required by California Public Resources Code (PRC) 41701, Ventura County's Countywide Siting Element (CSE), adopted in June 2001 and updated annually, confirms Ventura County has at least 15 years of disposal capacity available for waste generated by in-County projects. Because the County currently exceeds the minimum disposal capacity required by state PRC, the proposed project would have less than a significant project-specific impacts upon Ventura County's solid waste disposal capacity.

29c-2. In accordance with California's Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) and, Ventura County Ordinance No. 4590, all discretionary permit applicants, unless those exempt under Section 4773-4 of the ordinance, whose proposed project includes construction and/or demolition activities to reuse, salvage, recycle, or compost the current required diversion amount prescribed in CALGreen of the solid waste generated by their project. Public Works Agency-Water & Sanitation Department's construction and demolition waste diversion program (Form B Recycling Plan/Form C Report) ensures the CALGreen diversion goal is met prior to issuance of a final zoning clearance for use inauguration or occupancy, consistent with the 2040 Ventura County General Plan's Solid and Hazardous Waste Goals PSF 5.3 and 5.9. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant project-specific impacts and would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to the Ventura County General Plan's goals and policies for solid waste disposal capacity.

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
29d. Waste Treatment & Disposal Facilities - Solid Waste Facilities (EHD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. The proposed project would not involve a solid waste operation or facility. The project would not have any project-specific or cumulative impacts related to a solid waste operation or facility.

29d-2. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies 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
30. Utilities								
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. through 30c. Electrical service would be provided by Southern California Edison. The proposed project would not increase demand on the electrical utility that would result 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 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
31a. Flood Control Facilities/Watercourses - Watershed Protection District (WPD)								
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. This project would not alter or create an obstruction of flow in the existing drainage as site runoff would maintain the drainage patterns that presently exist. Additionally, the proposed project would be situated roughly 850 feet Northeast of Todd Barranca, which is a jurisdictional redline channel. No direct connections to this channel are proposed.

This proposed project would not include development, grading, or result in an increase of impervious area within the subject property. It is understood that stormwater drainage design within the parcel area would be required under the conditions imposed by the County of Ventura Public Works Agency, Engineering Services Division, Land Development Services, requiring that runoff from the proposed project site would 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, impacts would be less than significant on redline channels under the jurisdiction of the Ventura County Watershed Protection District.

31a-2. Stormwater runoff flow rates and drainage patterns would not change as a result of the project. Therefore, project implementation would not impact the capacity of drainage channels or potential for increasing overflow from existing conditions.

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
31b. Flood Control Facilities/Watercourses - Other Facilities (PWA)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. This project would not alter or create an obstruction of flow in the existing drainage as site runoff would maintain the drainage patterns that presently exist. The project would be implemented according to current codes and standards that would require no increase in sediment discharge or obstruction of flows in existing channels.

31b-2. and 31b-3. Stormwater runoff flow rates and drainage patterns would not change as a result of the project. Therefore, project implementation would not impact the capacity of drainage channels or potential for increasing overflow from existing conditions.

31b-4. There would be no Areas of Special Flood Hazard or regulatory channels on site or in the vicinity of the parcel. The drainage conditions would remain similar to the existing conditions with no increase in runoff upon implementation of the project.

31b-5. No increase in impervious area would be proposed by this project and drainage patterns would remain the same as existing conditions. Therefore, there would be no

increase in flow to and from natural and man-made drainage channels and facilities. The project would not result in an increase in runoff from the existing conditions.

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
32. Law Enforcement/Emergency Services (Sheriff)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. The proposed project would have the potential to increase the demand for law enforcement or emergency services. However, the proposed facility would be enclosed by chain link fencing to address potential increases in theft, vandalism, or disturbances. A vehicular entry gate is also installed to prevent unwanted entry to the site. In addition, decorative market lights would be installed in the reception and gathering areas within the CUP boundary. The permittee also intends to install necessary security and pathway lighting to deter disturbances.

32b. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 32 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
33a. Fire Protection Services - Distance and Response (VCFPD)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. and 33a-2. According to the RMA GIS Viewer, the proposed project site is located within three miles of the nearest fire station and no new fire stations, or personnel would be required.

33a-3. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 33a 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
33b. Fire Protection Services – Personnel, Equipment, and Facilities (VCFPD)								
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) 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. through 33b-3. No new personnel would be required, and no new facilities or equipment would be required for project implementation. In addition, the proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 33b 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
34a. Education - Schools								
Will the proposed project:								
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 facility is non-residential in nature. According to the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines, 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 non-residential project), the project would not interfere with the operations of an existing school. County policies related to schools would 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
34b. Education - Public Libraries (Lib. Agency)								
Will the proposed project:								
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. through 34b-5. The proposed facility is non-residential in nature. According to the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines, non-residential projects would not have an impact on the demand for public libraries. In addition, the proposed non-residential project is not located adjacent to a public library facility (no libraries are located within one mile of the project). The proposed non-residential 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 would 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
35. Recreation Facilities (GSA)								
Will the proposed project:								
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"> • <u>Local Parks/Facilities</u> - 5 acres of developable land (less than 15% slope) per 1,000 population; • <u>Regional Parks/Facilities</u> - 5 acres of developable land per 1,000 population; or, • <u>Regional Trails/Corridors</u> - 2.5 miles per 1,000 population? 	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. through 35c. As the proposed project would not involve a subdivision or increase in housing, the project would not cause an increase in the demand for recreation, parks, or trails. Also, the proposed project would not decrease recreational areas, parks, and/or trails and corridors because it would not be in, or adjacent to public recreational areas, parks, and/or trails and corridors.

35d. The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable General Plan Goals and Policies for Item 35 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.

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
36. Wildfire								
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:								
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:

36a. through 36d. According to the RMA GIS Viewer, the proposed project site is not located within any State Responsibility Areas or Fire Severity Zones. The nearest State Responsibility Area (of moderate severity) is approximately 4,800 feet from the proposed project site. The VCFPD determined that the proposed project would not be

located within a high fire hazard area and that the project would be located within three miles of the nearest fire station. In addition, the VCFPD has determined that adequate fire flow is available at the proposed project site and that VCFPD vehicles are provided adequate access to the project site. 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 Ventura County Public Works Agency—Land Development Services analyzed the proposed project and determined that it would not result in adverse effects with regard to slope instability, landslides, drainage, or flooding.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measure is required.

Issue (Responsible Department)*	Project Impact Degree Of Effect**				Cumulative Impact Degree Of Effect**			
	N	LS	PS-M	PS	N	LS	PS-M	PS
37. Energy								
Would the project:								
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 would include energy efficiency features which would reduce the consumption of energy resources (low voltage pathway and security lighting and decorative market lights) and would not include any construction.

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)

Residual impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation measure is 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?		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

Findings Discussion:

- As stated in Section B (above), the proposed project would be located in an agricultural zone where crops have been actively farmed and agricultural activities conducted. Because of the intense historical and current agricultural practices in the project area, there would be 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 would 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.
- As stated in Section B (above), the proposed project would have the potential to be incompatible with the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and

Programs Noise Compatibility Standards, Policy HAZ-9.2. In response, a noise study (Attachment 4) was prepared by Advanced Engineering Acoustics who evaluated noise at three sensitive receptor locations (residences) and also at 10 feet from the speaker in the DJ setup area by using four portable sound level and audio recording meters. The result of the noise study provided recommendation and the permittee has consented to four mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measure MM-1 would require the permittee to conduct pre-event noise monitoring during music performance sound checks and, if needed, adjust the sound levels, to ensure that the sound levels do not exceed noise level thresholds. Mitigation Measure MM-2 would require the permittee to designate a contact person(s) to respond to complaints from citizens and the County which are related to the permitted uses of this CUP. The designated contact person shall be available, via telecommunication, 24 hours a day, during which an event is taking place at the subject property. Mitigation Measure MM-3 would require the permittee to resolve noise complaints by providing the Planning Director and all adjacent property owners and residents with the name, title, address, and phone number of the Permittee, or Permittee's designee, who will be responsible for ensuring condition and code compliance during outdoor events at the project site. Mitigation Measure MM-4 would require the permittee to install and have present a noise monitor for all outdoor events with a public announcement system and/or amplified sound. The noise monitor shall be placed at 10 feet from the DJ speakers. When sound monitoring exceeds noise thresholds, the speaker orientation and/or volume of the public announcement system and/or amplified music shall be reduced to achieve compliance with the noise standards.

With the implementation of the mitigation measures listed above (Mitigation Measures MM-1 through MM-4), the proposed project would not exceed the maximum acceptable noise levels set forth in the Noise Compatibility Standards, Policy HAZ-9.2 and thus, would not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.

3. For applicable environmental issues in Section B (above), 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). For instance, Planning considered the proposed project's operational noise effects and found that with a sound monitoring system, the noise generated by the implementation of the proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to the cumulative noise generated by other projects and uses in the vicinity.

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. As mentioned in C2. (above), the proposed project would be subject to a mitigation measure related to the noise and vibration, to ensure that amplified music and PA announcements would not exceed the County noise limits which could adversely affect human beings.

As mentioned in Section B, no other significant effects to human beings (either directly or indirectly) or the environment were identified by County staff.

Section D – Determination of Environmental Document

Based on this initial evaluation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Negative Declaration should be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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 Mitigated Negative Declaration should be prepared.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find the proposed project, individually and/or cumulatively, MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.*
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An Environmental Impact Report is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.*
<input type="checkbox"/>	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, nothing further is required .



John Kessler, Associate Planner

September 29, 2022
Date

Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Aerial and Location Map

Attachment 2 – Project Plans

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

Attachment 4 – Noise/Acoustical Study, dated June 16, 2021

Attachment 5 – APAC Minutes of August 10, 2022

Attachment 6 – Works Cited



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




**County of Ventura
Planning Director Hearing
PL21-0122
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 decision involving a risk of economic loss or physical injury should be made in reliance thereon.





Ventura County, California
Resource Management Agency
GIS Development & Mapping Services
Map Created on 09-20-2022
This aerial imagery is under the
copyrights of Vexcel 2020




County of Ventura
Planning Director Hearing
PL21-0122
Aerial Photography




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.



Plot date: Aug 31, 2022 - 9:57am






Ventura County, California
Resource Management Agency
GIS Development & Mapping Services
Map Created on 08-25-2022
This aerial imagery is under the
copyrights of Pictometry
Source: Vexcel 2020



5 Miles Radius Map of parcel **APN: 090-060-115** **Project: PL21-0122**



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 no warrant the accuracy of this map and no decision involving a risk of economic loss or physical injury should be made in reliance thereon.



Advanced Engineering Acoustics
663 Bristol Avenue
Simi Valley, California 93065-5402
(805) 583-8207 - Voice (805) 231-1242 - Cell (805) 522-6636 - Fax

June 16, 2021

Mr. Albert Castaneda
13515 W. Telegraph Road
Santa Paula, CA 93060

SUBJECT: Castaneda Wedding & Event Venue CUP, Santa Paula, CA
 Ambient Noise and Propagated Music with Residential Noise Impacts

Dear Mr. Castaneda,

At your request, Advanced Engineering Acoustics (AEA) has conducted ambient noise measurements and music & vocal sound propagation tests at three nearby residential receivers. This letter report summarizes the results of our acoustical testing, residential noise impact assessments and gives our recommendations for DJ noise limits to comply with the Ventura County noise code..

Acoustical Testing - Ambient noise measurements were conducted at three residential locations on either side of the subject property and also at 10 feet from the speaker in the DJ setup area on Thursday, May 27, 2021. During the Thursday ambient noise measurements on May 27th, the DJ music/sound sources at the reception location and the three residential receiver measurement locations were monitored. The ambient noise measurements and music/sound source monitoring results are reported herein and are compared with the County of Ventura noise standards. The acoustical tests were conducted using four NTi XL2 Type 1 sound level and audio recording meters, which were all calibrated according to the manufacturer's instructions before and after the measurements. The sound meters were located as previously described with the control point NTi sound meter at 10 feet from the test DJ music/sound source. Figure 1 shows the vicinity of the subject property, the DJ test site (red star), and the locations of the three area residential receptor sites located nearest the venue.

Fundamentals of Sound - Physically, sound pressure magnitude is measured and quantified in terms of the decibel (dB), which is associated with a logarithmic scale based on the ratio of a measured sound pressure to the reference sound pressure of 20 micropascal ($20 \mu\text{Pa} = 20 \times 10^{-6} \text{ N/m}^2$). However, the decibel system can be very confusing. For example, doubling or halving the number of sources of equal noise (a 2-fold change in acoustic *energy*) changes the receptor noise by only 3 dB, which is a barely perceptible sound change for humans. While doubling or halving the sound *loudness* at the receiver results from a 10 dB change and also represents a 10-fold change in the acoustic *energy*. In addition, the human hearing system is not equally sensitive to sound at all frequencies. Because of this variability, a frequency-dependent adjustment called "A-weighting" has been devised so that sound may be measured in a manner similar to the way the human hearing system responds. The A-weighted sound level is abbreviated "dBA".

County Noise Standards - The noise standards for the County of Ventura are outlined in Sec. 2.16 Noise et. al., of the Ventura County General Plan Policies (see this information online at www.ventura.org/planning). Table 1 shows the noise standards for noise-generating sources.




Figure 1. Venue with DJ site and sound meter measurement locations at residences

Table 1. Ventura County General Plan Noise Source Limits

<p>(4) Noise generators, proposed to be located near any <i>noise sensitive use</i>, shall incorporate noise control measures so that ongoing outdoor noise levels received by the noise sensitive receptor, measured at the exterior wall of the building, do not exceed any of the following standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Leq(1hr) of 55 dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3 dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Leq(1hr) of 50 dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3 dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. Leq(1hr) of 45 dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3 dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.

Summary of Test Results - Table 2 shows the distances between the music at the DJ location and the measurement sites at the nearest residences. Table 3 shows the measured 15-minute ambient and

sound test results and the county fixed and variable hourly average noise limits. Table 4 shows the hourly sound test results with variable hourly average noise limits at DJ and Receiver sites..

Table 2. Distances from DJ Music & PA Source to Sound Measurement Locations

Sound Test Propagation Receiver	SLM A Distance, ft	SLM B Distance, ft	SLM C Distance, ft	SLM D Distance, ft
DJ source to sound meter locations	10	290	400	1,000

Table 3. Measured 15-Minute Average Ambient & Teat Noise (7:30 P.M. to 10:00 P.M.)

	Ambient & Test Time Periods	DJ 10-ft, SLM A Ambient /Test Leq, dBA	County Fixed Hourly Noise Limits	County Variable Noise Limit	SLM B Ambient & Test Leq, dBA	SLM C Ambient & Test Leq, dBA	SLM D Ambient & Test Leq, dBA
Amb.	19:30 – 19:45	50.6	50 Leq(hr) dBA	Amb. + 3 dB			
Amb.	19:45 – 20:00	51.7	50 Leq(hr) dBA	Amb. + 3 dB	61.6*	54.6	
Amb.	20:00 – 20:15	49.9	50 Leq(hr) dBA	Amb. + 3 dB	49.9	52.6	67.1
Test	20:15 – 20:30	87.2	50 Leq(hr) dBA	Amb. + 3 dB	49.9	54.0	65.6
Test	20:30 – 20:45	84.0	50 Leq(hr) dBA	Amb. + 3 dB	47.8	53.0	65.8
Test	20:45 – 21:00	81.7	50 Leq(hr) dBA	Amb. + 3 dB	46.2	53.1	64.1

* Barking dogs.

Table 4. Measured Hourly Average Music & PA Sound Level Results at Residential Receivers

Test Time Period	DJ 10-ft, SLM A Music / PA Leq(hr), dBA	County Fixed Hourly Noise Limits NOT APPLIED	County Variable Noise Limit APPLIED	SLM B Music/Sound Leq(hr), dBA	SLM C Music/Sound Leq(hr), dBA	SLM D Music/Sound Leq(hr), dBA
20:15 – 21:00	82	50 Leq(hr) dBA	Amb. + 3 dB	48.2	51.8	65.2
SLM A & B Limits	87	Variable Limit	Amb. + 3 dB	52.9*		
SLM A & C Limits	87	Variable Limit	Amb. + 3 dB		56.7	
SLM A & D Limits	87	Variable Limit	Amb. + 3 dB			70.1

* Dog barking omitted in ambient noise and noise limit calculation.


Findings and Conclusions - The ambient noise was caused by distant off-site noise sources (traffic on Telegraph Rd., the 126 Frwy, barking dogs, mainline railroad and aircraft). All noise measurements at the on-property SLM B, on-property SLM C and off-site SLM D residences were strongly influenced by ambient traffic noise.

Based on the ambient and music//PA sound level measurements at the nearest residences, it is concluded that during the daytime hours (7 am to 7 pm), event music/sound could be maintained at 89 dBA Leq (hr), or less, 10 feet from the DJ loudspeakers and still comply with the county General Plan daytime fixed noise limit of 55 dBA Leq (1 hr), at the nearest on-property residence (SLM B) to the southwest. During the evening hours (7 pm to 10 pm), the music could be maintained at 87 dBA Leq (hr), or less, 10 feet from the DJ loudspeakers, and still comply with the county General Plan evening variable noise limit of 53 dBA Leq (1 hr) or less at the nearest on-property residence (SLM B) to the southwest. During the nighttime hours (after 10 pm), the music must be maintained at 79 dBA Leq (hr) or less, 10 feet from the DJ loudspeakers, to comply with the county General Plan nighttime fixed noise limit of 45 dBA Leq (1 hr) or less, at the nearest on-property residence (SLM B) to the southwest and the nearest off-property residence (SLM D) 1,000 feet southeast of the DJ speaker location.

Recommendations – In order to assure that amplified DJ music and PA announcements do not exceed the County residential outdoor living area noise limits, we recommend you have professional acoustical consultants monitor your first one or two events to assist your event manager to correctly calibrate and verify the recommended noise limits (raising or lowering those limits based on actual DJ operations) so as to achieve compliance with these recommendations and County noise standards. We also recommend you purchase or rent a simple sound monitoring system (see Appendix), that can be used as a control point noise meter to monitor the DJ sound emissions 10 feet from the loudest side of event DJ speakers, with the meter set to the “A-weighting, slow response” settings. This control point sound level measurement system would allow you and the DJ to monitor the music and PA sound levels at 10 feet, allowing sound volume adjustments whenever the respective daytime, evening or nighttime control point noise limits mentioned above are exceeded.

This concludes my report on the acoustical evaluation of the proposed wedding reception venue. If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me by phone or email.

Sincerely,



Marlund E. Hale, Ph.D., P.E.(Acoustics - OR), INCE
noisedoc@aol.com

A P P E N D I X

Recommended Vendors - Sound monitoring systems:

Talk Light (a stop light style noise volume indicator system)

Talk Light Inc.

www.talklight.com

877-809-6250

Extech SL130 with the optional 15-foot remote microphone and optional external relay module (requires a third party “normally closed” relay switch that controls an AC power supply strip)

Manufactured by Extech Instruments

Local Distributor: Pulse Instruments, Van Nuys, CA, 818-909-0800

www.extech.com

Realistic Digital Display Sound Level Meter

Model: 33-2055

Sold by Radio Shack, Inc.

www.radioshack.com



VENTURA COUNTY

Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee



Sanger Hedrick, Chair, District 2; Scott Deardorff, District 1; Gordon Kimball, District 3; Patty Waters, District 4; Bobby Jones, District 5

MEETING MINUTES August 10, 2022

1. 9:21 a.m. – MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE

Committee: Sanger Hedrick, District 2, Chair
Scott Deardorff, District 1 - absent
Gordon Kimball, District 3
Patty Waters, District 4
Bobby Jones, District 5 - absent

Staff/Others Present: Ed Williams, Alec Thille, & Blair Brillante from the Ventura County Agricultural Commissioner's Office were present; committee members, presenters, members of the public, and representatives of interested parties participated via Zoom.

3. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

4. COMMENTS BY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

None.

5. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion: Approve agenda, with revisions

By Kimball, seconded by Waters

Vote: 3-0

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None

7. CONSENT CALENDAR

April and June agenda tabled for required quorum.

8. PRESENTATION/ACTION

A. Adoption of a resolution continuing the authorization of remote teleconference meetings of the Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee for a 30-day period pursuant to Government Code section 54953, subdivision (e), of the Ralph M. Brown Act.

- No public comments.
- Motion: Adopt the resolution
By Waters, seconded by Kimball
Vote: 3-0

B. Albert Castaneda, applicant for land use case PL21-0122 presented a proposed landscape plan deviating from exact vegetative screen requirements for APAC approval.

- No public comments.
- Motion: Approve the requested variance from the Agricultural/Urban buffer policy; namely utilizing a single row of Carolina Cherry trees that form a continuous barrier, backed by shade cloth-enhanced fencing, where vegetative screening is required.
By Kimball, seconded by Waters
Vote: 3-0

C. Ed Williams, Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer, presented a department update on activities and programs important to Ventura County agriculture.

- No Public Comment.
- No action taken.

9. COMMUNICATIONS

A. APAC Members

None

B. Staff

None

10. Meeting adjourned by Sanger Hedrick at 10:39 a.m.

Attachment 6 – Works Cited

Conditional Use Permit, Case No. PL21-0122

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.