



Planning Division
501 Poli Street
Ventura, CA 93001
805.654-7893
Fax 805.653-0763

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT NEGATIVE DECLARATION
CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA, CALIFORNIA**

I. The City of Ventura has reviewed an application for the following proposed project:

- A. Project Description for Case #EIR-11-10-4273:** PROJ-1290 consists of a design change (DRC-9-10-3785/MC-9-10-3789) to an existing 78,410 sq. ft. retail suite within the Riviera Shopping Center located at 4750 Telephone Road to accommodate an employee owned, 24-hour Winco supermarket. The request includes a new façade, reconfiguration and restriping of the parking lot, new landscaping, and a sign variance (SV-9-10-3790) to exceed the maximum amount of sign area allowed. Filed by Landmark Development, 2462 Sunshine Drive, Boise, ID 83712.
- B. Proposed finding.** In accordance with Section 15070 of the California Code of Regulations, the Planning Division of the City of Ventura has determined that there is no substantial evidence that the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment, and that a negative declaration (ND) may be adopted.
- C. Fish and Wildlife Impacts:** On the basis of the information contained in the Initial Study, and on the record as a whole, there is no evidence that there will be an adverse effect on fish or wildlife habitats or resources since none of the factors listed in Section 2R.450.530 of the Municipal Code are present.
- D. Hazards:** The project site is not on any of the lists enumerated under Government Code Section 65962.5 including, but not limited to, lists of hazardous waste facilities, land designated as hazardous waste property, and hazardous waste disposal sites.
- E. Document Review and Comment.** **The public review and comment period of the draft begins on December 4, 2010 and ends on December 24, 2010.** To view the draft document, please visit the city's website at www.ci.ventura.ca.us. Alternatively, the draft and referenced documents are available for review between 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday at the Planning Counter, City Hall, 501 Poli Street, Ventura CA 93001.

F. Public Hearing and Comments. A public hearing on the project described above is tentatively scheduled for **January 12, 2010 at 6:00 pm in the City Council Chambers at City Hall located at 501 Poli Street, Ventura, CA 93001.** All comments concerning the draft ND should be provided in writing and received before 5:00 p.m. on the last day of the review period. Inquiries should be directed to Jared Rosengren, at (805) 658-4737. Written comments may be mailed or faxed (805/ 653-0763) to the City of Ventura, Planning Division, 501 Poli Street, CA 93001.

Date

Brian Randall, Principal Planner

cc: Applicant and property owner, County Clerk, ND Distribution List, and Property owners within 300-feet



CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA INITIAL STUDY

I. BACKGROUND:

- A. Case No.:** EIR-11-10-4273 of PROJ-1290
- B. Lead Agency Name/Address:** City of San Buenaventura
PO Box 99
Ventura, CA 93002
- Staff Planner/Telephone Number:** Jared Rosengren/(805) 658-4737
- Project Applicant Name/Address:** Landmark Development
2462 Sunshine Drive
Boise, ID 83712
- C. General Plan Designation:** Commerce (C)
- D. Zoning:** Commercial Planned Development (CPD)
- E. Project Description:** This project consists of a design change to an existing 78,410 sq. ft. retail suite within the Riviera Shopping Center located at 4750 Telephone Road (Attachment A). The vacant suite was formerly occupied by Mervyns, a middle scale department store, which subsequently closed in 2008. The proposed design change is to accommodate an employee owned, 24-hour Winco supermarket. The request includes a new façade, reconfiguration and restriping of the parking lot, new landscaping, and a sign variance to exceed the maximum amount of sign area allowed.

The portion of the shopping center proposed to be leased by Winco is 300,464 square feet (6.9-acres including the building) in size. Mervyns occupied the suite from the Shopping Center's original development in 1982 until 2008 when Mervyns closed many of its stores in Southern California. The footprint of the suite will remain unchanged. With additional architectural elements incorporated into the new façade the total height of the building will be 53' 8" high (an increase of 22 feet). The parking field area in front of the subject store will be reconfigured from angled spaces to 90-degree spaces that will result 12 more available parking spaces. The majority of existing landscaping in the parking lot will be removed and replaced with 36 new trees resulting in 13,661 square feet (4.5%) of landscaped area.

Winco stores typically employ 200 team members per store in three staggered shifts. Approximately 40% of the staff is full time or 40 hours per week. All employees working more than 20 hours per week receive full benefits. A typical store receives approximately 3,500 customers per day.

Security cameras provide 360-degree coverage of the building. WinCo's management is flexible in that if necessary, they have the ability to add extra man power security if warranted. All pay phones are proposed to be removed to decrease gang activity.

WinCo Foods stores are open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except Christmas. Deliveries are made during off-peak hours. A typical store will generate 150-160 truck deliveries per week, 45 of these consisting of semi-tractor and trailer and 105 requiring smaller delivery trucks. All trucks deliver to the rear of the store and are not allowed to drive across the front of the store.

F. Surrounding land uses and setting: The project site is located within the Riviera Shopping Center, which encompasses approximately 23 acres south of Highway 101, east of Telephone Road, west of Eastman Avenue and north of Westinghouse Street, in the City of Ventura. The Riviera Shopping center has a variety of uses, including retail, food and beverage sales, personal services and office and professional. The shopping center is surrounded by another shopping center to the west, industrial uses to the south and a movie theater and offices to the east.

G. Discretionary Permits and Approvals Required:

- a) **Design Review (DRC-9-10-3785)**
- b) **Minor Change (MC-9-10-3789)**
- c) **Sign Variance (SV-9-10-3790)**

H. Other Public Agencies whose approval is required: None

II. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors highlighted in **bold** below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages:

Aesthetics	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Population and Housing
Agriculture/Forestry	Hazards/Hazardous Material	Noise
Air Quality	Hydrology and Water Quality	Public Services/ Recreation
Biological Resources	Land Use and Planning	Transportation/Traffic
Cultural Resources	Mineral Resources	Utilities/Service Systems
Geology/Soils	Noise	Mandatory findings of significance

III. DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

X	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Print Name

Title

IV. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately

supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factor as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) Negative Declaration: “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion within this Initial Study identifies the following:
 - a) The earlier analysis used and where it is available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) The explanation of each issue should identify: a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and relevant provisions of the California Environmental Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended.

Section 15063(c) of the CEQA Guidelines defines an Initial Study as the proper preliminary method of analyzing the potential environmental consequences of a project. Among the purposes of an Initial Study are:

- 1) To provide the Lead Agency (the City of San Buenaventura) with the necessary information to decide whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or a Negative Declaration;
- 2) To enable the Lead Agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts, thus avoiding the need to prepare an EIR (if possible); and
- 3) Assist in the preparation of an EIR, if one is required.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION:

(References used to respond to the topic areas in Section II include those that are identified by capital letters in Section VII of this Initial Study. If emphasis is placed on a particular reference, the capital letter corresponding to that reference may be noted in parenthesis beneath each topic area heading.)

A. Aesthetics:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (2005 General Plan [GP]-Well Planned & Designed Community; FEIR GP, 4.1-Aesthetics)			X	
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (2005 GP-Well Planned & Designed Community, Our Natural Community; FEIR GP, 4.1-Aesthetics)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (2005 GP-Well Planned & Designed Community; FEIR GP, 4.1- Aesthetics; Community Design Guidelines)			X	

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (2005 GP-Well Planned & Designed Community; FEIR GP, 4.1-Aesthetics)			X	

Impact Discussion:

- The project site is located in an area designated for commercial and industrial uses and is visible from Highway 101. The 2005 General Plan designates Highway 101 as a view corridor, having particular scenic values. The project development requires Design Review Committee (DRC) approval to weigh any view impacts and assure the project would have a less than significant impact with regard to its effect on a locally designated view corridor open to public view. The relatively high travel speeds along the highway and consequent short term viewing, as well as the lack of any new structures proposed would result any impacts to a scenic vista less than significant.
- 2-4. The project site and the surrounding area was developed in the early 1980s. Currently the project site is developed with an existing shopping center. The new project does propose any new buildings or sources of light or glare that would substantially not have a negative effect on the surrounding area in regards to the impact of the aesthetics of the area.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the above discussion, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to aesthetic resources. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

B. Agricultural Resources:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Convert prime, unique, or statewide importance farmland, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use? (2005 General Plan; FEIR, 4.2-Agriculture)				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (2005 General Plan; FEIR, 4.2- Agriculture)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
5. Involve other changes to the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in a conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use? (2005 General Plan; FEIR, 4.2- Agriculture)				X

Impact Discussion:

1. The project site is not designated as Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (State of California Department of Conservation, Farmland, Mapping and Monitoring Program, 2002). There are no existing agricultural operations located on or adjacent to the proposed project site.
2. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not protected by a Williamson Act contract.
3. The project site is not located in or near a forest.
4. See item 3 above.
5. The project site is not in agricultural production nor is it adjacent to land in agricultural production. Therefore, no impacts related to the conversion of farmland would result from the proposed project.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the evaluation provided above, the proposed project would not result in impacts to agricultural resources. Therefore, no mitigation is

required.

C. Air Quality:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Impact Discussion:

1. The project site is located within the Ventura County Air Basin and is under the jurisdiction of two air quality management agencies. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is responsible for the control of the project site's mobile emission sources, and the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) has oversight on the regulation of stationary sources.

For purposes of identifying established air quality impact thresholds, the VCAPCD and the City consider operational air quality impacts to be significant if more than 25 pounds per day of Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC) or Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) would result from a project. Significant construction-related air quality impacts would result if fugitive dust emissions are generated in such quantities as to cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which may endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such

person or the public.

The proposed new construction does not include any additional square footage and is primarily change of the building's facade. The shopping center site is currently developed with existing buildings and parking lots. Uses allowed by the underlying zone and land use are similar to what currently exists and would not result in an increase in traffic trips, therefore the proposed boundary change would not result in ROC and/or NOx emissions in excess of 25 pounds per day.

2. See item 1 above.
3. See item 1 above.
4. The proposed project is located in an area that does not contain sensitive receptors.
5. See item 4 above.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the evaluation provided above, the proposed project would have no impact to air emission or air quality impacts. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

D. Biological Resources:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (GP FEIR, 4.4- Biological Resources; Local Coastal Plan)				X
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (GP FEIR, 4.4- Biological Resources; Local Coastal Plan)				X

Impact Discussion:

1. The project site is 100% developed with structures and asphalt concrete. The only vegetation on the site is ornamental landscaping. As a result, the project site contains no wetlands, riparian habitat or native plant or animal communities. This lack of natural habitat results in the absences of any unique, rare, threatened or endangered species or habitat on the site.
2. See item 1 above.
3. See item 1 above.
4. See item 1 above.
5. See item 1 above.
6. See item 1 above.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the evaluation provided above, the proposed project would have no impact to biological resources. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

E. Cultural Resources:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

Impact Discussion:

1. The project site is not located within an area of sensitivity for Native American resources. Due to previous construction activities associated with the development of the buildings and parking lots on the sites, and the proposed project does not include any new grading or underground facilities there is a very low probability that the project would have the potential to impact any significant cultural resources.
2. See item 1 above.
3. See item 1 above
4. See item 1 above

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the analysis provided above, the proposed project would have no impact to cultural resources. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

F. Geology and Soils:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
<p>1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>a. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (GP FEIR, 4.6- Geologic Hazards)</p>			X	
<p>b. Strong seismic ground shaking?</p>			X	
<p>c. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction or landslides?</p>			X	
<p>d. Landslides?</p>				X
<p>2. Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil?</p>				X
<p>3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?</p>			X	
<p>4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in 18--B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</p>			X	
<p>5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</p>				X

Impact Discussion:

1. No known faults cross the Project Area and the Project Area does not lie within a known fault hazard zone (A). The closest fault is the Oak Ridge fault and fault zone, located approximately 0.2 miles south of the Project Area (A). Other faults in close proximity to the Project Area are the Ventura-Foothill fault and the McGrath fault. These local faults are classified as active or potentially active. Potentially significant adverse impacts would occur if structures were proposed for construction overlying a fault due to the potential for surface rupture. However, because no faults are located within the boundaries of the Project Area, there would be no impact. Therefore, further analysis is not warranted.
 - a. The project site is not located with the Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.
 - b. Future seismic events could produce groundshaking throughout the city as well as surface rupture in some areas where future development could be accommodated. Groundshaking and surface rupture could damage structures and/or create adverse safety effects. Compliance with city policies, in combination with requirements of the Uniform Building Code and the Alquist-Priolo legislation will be required.
 - c. Although a hazard zone for liquefaction was identified south of the project area in EIR-378, the project site is not located within a liquefaction zone. Construction of new structures is not proposed as part of this project. New structures would be required to provide geology reports containing information regarding the liquefaction potential on the site at the time of building permits or entitlements.
 - d. The proposed project site is not located with an area subject to landslides.
2. The proposed project site will not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil since the site is 100% developed and no new construction is proposed.
3. See item 1c above.
4. The project area is not in an area with significant know risk of expansive soils.
5. The project site is served by City sewer.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the above discussion, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the geology/soils issue area. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

G. Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
2. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.			X	

Impact Discussion:

1. The site has been historically used for a commercial shopping center and the uses will remain commercial based. The proposed grocery store will be operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week and will be closed on Christmas Day. Typical daily trip rates are 95.2 trips/1,000 square feet (7,465 trips) and typical Saturday trip rates are 121.5 trips/1,000 square feet (9,527 trips). 52% of trip types are anticipated to be primary trips, 24% pass-by and 24% diverted. Between 150 and 160 truck deliveries consisting of 45 semi-tractor trailer and 105 smaller delivery truck are typically expected per week. The majority of deliveries occur in off peak hours and in the early morning. These proposed trip rates are consistent with other similar commercial uses in the existing commercial shopping center and to the commercial use that is being replaced, other potential sources of greenhouse gas emissions, including heating and cooling units, refrigerators, ovens, etc., will not significantly exceed emissions anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore any anticipated greenhouse gas emissions will not have a significant impact on the environment.
2. See #1 above

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the above discussion, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the greenhouse gas emissions issue area. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

H. Hazards and Hazardous Materials:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (2005 GP – Our Safe Community)				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (2005 GP – Our Safe Community)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (2005 GP – Our Safe Community)				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public)				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (2005 GP – Our Safe Community)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (2005 GP – Our Safe Community)				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (2005 GP – Our Safe Community)				X
8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (2005 GP – Our Safe Community)				X

Impact Discussion:

1. The proposed design changes would not have the potential to intensify uses beyond the use, currently on the site. However, the uses permitted by the underlying Commercial Planned Development zone would not result in transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
2. The proposed project would be required to comply with the city’s Hazardous Material regulations regarding storing, using and discarding chemical products typically used during the operation of a grocery store.
3. The project site is not within a quarter mile of any schools.
4. The project site is not listed as a hazardous materials site.
5. The project is not located within an airport land use plan.
6. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
7. The project site does not include new development and therefore would not interfere with an emergency response plan.
8. The project site is not located within a wildlands area.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the above discussion, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact upon the hazards issue area. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

I. Hydrology and Water Quality:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
redirect flood flows?				
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Impact Discussion:

1. All new construction must comply with Ventura County National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). At the time of any new construction the project will obtain NPDES permit approval in order to proceed.
2. The project would result in no impact with regard to the addition/withdrawal of groundwater since it would utilize city water.
3. The project would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site as the site is currently developed with structures and parking lots. When new construction is proposed for the site the impact to the drainage patterns on the site in relation to the Santa Clara River will be identified and any potential impacts mitigated.
4. See item 3 above.
5. The site is currently developed with structures and paved parking area. New development is not proposed on the site and will not create new runoff on the site.
6. Runoff pollutants such as petroleum hydrocarbons and heavy metals generally associated with urban developments are typically washed off streets and parking areas during the first storm of the winter season, provided at least one-half inch of rain falls. However, because the project is subject to the requirements of the City of San Buenaventura and County of Ventura National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for municipal storm water runoff, the conditions of which limit the volume of contaminants allowed to enter storm drain system, impacts are considered to be less than significant.
7. New housing is not a part of this application.
8. The site is not located within the 100 year flood plain

9. The site is currently developed and used for commercial activities. The change in land use will not further expose people to dangers associated with the failure of the Santa Clara River levee.

10. The project site is not in a tsunami hazard area.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the above discussion, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to water quality and hydrology issues. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

J. Land Use and Planning:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Physically divide an established community?				X
2. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Impact Discussion:

1. The project does not propose new construction that would divide the area.
2. The General Plan Designation for this area is Commerce, and has a zone designation of Commercial Planned Development (CPD) in which Food and Beverage sales is a permitted use. Furthermore, the site is contiguous to other existing Commerce land uses.
3. The site is not located within a habitat or natural community conservation plan area.

Mitigation/Residual Impacts: Based on the above discussion, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to the land use/city and regional plans issue

area. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

K. Mineral Resources:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Result in the loss of availability of known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on the General Plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X

Impact Discussion:

1. The City of San Buenaventura 2005 General Plan FEIR and the Ventura County General Plan Resource Protection Map (Amended 1996) indicate that the project site is not located within and identified Mineral Resource Zone.
2. See item 1 above.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the analysis provided above, the proposed project would not result in significant energy or mineral resource impacts. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

L. Noise:

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X

Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

Impact Discussion:

1. The proposed project would not result in the establishment of a land use that would have the potential to expose people to noise levels that exceed established standards.
2. The proposed project would not result in the establishment of a land use that would have the potential to expose people to excessive ground borne vibration or noise levels.
3. The project site is adjacent to commercial properties to the west, south and east, and Highway 101 to the north. There are no sensitive noise receptors located in the vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not result in operations that would have the potential to increase noise levels at or adjacent to the project site, or result in the generation of traffic that would have the potential to result in significant off-site noise impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant short and long-term noise impacts.
4. The uses allowed by right would not generate noise levels beyond those generated by existing uses within the shopping center. The project would result in no significant short-term impacts relating to construction since the city's Noise Ordinance (Municipal

Code § 10.650) restricts construction activity to the hours between 7 A.M. and 8 P.M., when people are generally less sensitive to noise. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact under this issue area.

5. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan area.
6. The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the impact evaluation provided above, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to noise. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

M. Population and Housing:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Impact Discussion:

1. Development can result in a growth inducing impact when it requires the extension of urban infrastructure or utility services into or near areas that are presently not provided with those services. The proposed project site is currently 100% developed and located in an urbanized area that is served by infrastructure and utility systems. The proposed project would not require the extension of urban infrastructure or result in the urbanization of land in an isolated location. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant growth inducing impact.
2. The proposed project would not result in the displacement of any existing housing units.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the impact evaluation provided above, the proposed project would have no impact to population or housing impacts. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

N. Public Services & Recreation:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following:			X	
a. Fire protection?			X	
b. Police protection?			X	
c. Schools?			X	
d. Parks?				X
e. Other public facilities?				X
2. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
3. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Impact Discussion:

- 1a. The Ventura Fire Department (VFD) provides fire protection service for the city. The VFD Fire Suppression Division provides direct responses to fire, emergency medical, hazardous material, hazardous conditions and public service incidents from five fire stations. All fire-fighting personnel are certified medical technicians. The project site is located approximately 0.5 miles from City Fire Station No. 5, at 4225 East Main Street

and the site can be reached within reasonable response times. However, the proposed land use change would not add new structures or businesses in the area and would not require additional fire protection services.

1b. The Ventura Police Department (PD) provides law enforcement and police protection within the city. The Ventura PD maintains a countywide mutual aid agreement with all law enforcement agencies within Ventura County. The closest police station is located approximately 0.9 miles from the project site at 1425 Dowell Drive. The project proposes security cameras providing 360-degree coverage of the building and parking areas. The applicant would be responsible to upgrade the public safety radio and data broadcast system if the system does not function within the business. All pay phones are proposed to be removed to decrease gang activities. Although the proposed 24-hour operation is a new use for the site, potentially requiring additional police calls for service, the additional store lighting, truck trips and store employees should provide sufficient security. With the proposed security measures in place the proposed grocery store would not place undue demands on police protection services.

1c. Any new development is subject to payment of School Mitigation Fees at issuance of building permits pursuant to state law. The proposed project does not have the potential to generate substantial population growth and therefore would not result in the need for construction of new school facilities.

1d. The General Plan does not intend for the project site to provide public recreational facilities. Therefore, there is no impact related to this issue area.

1e. The project would utilize no “other public facilities”. Therefore, no impact would result.

2. The project will not increase the population and will not have an impact on the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks.

3. The project does not propose to construct or expand any new recreation facilities.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the above discussion, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the public services issue area. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

O. Transportation/Traffic:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
5. Result in inadequate emergency access? (2005 GP- Our Healthy and Safe Community)				X
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				X

Impact Discussion:

1. The city utilizes Existing + Approved Project traffic conditions as a basis for determining the significance of traffic impacts. The city considers a Level-of-Service (LOS) of D at freeway interchange intersections and a LOS C for surface street intersections and roadway segments as acceptable. Level of service (LOS) relates to driving conditions, and is ranked from best to worst using an A through F ranking

system. For purposes of this analysis, the proposed project would result in significant traffic and circulation impacts if it causes any intersections to operate at or below a Level-of-Service (LOS) C.

The generation of approximately 3.1 trips/1,000 square feet (243 trips) AM Peak Hour Trip Rate and 8.7 trips/1,000 square feet (682 trips) for PM Peak Hour Trip Rate within the existing Commercial Planned Development zone would not result in traffic levels that would decrease LOS of surrounding streets to less than a C, nor the freeway intersection to less than D.

2. See discussion under item #1 above.
3. The project will not affect air traffic patterns.
4. The project will not alter the roadway pattern or add incompatible traffic uses to the area.
5. The project site is currently developed with buildings and parking areas. The land use amendment will not alter roadways or access points and will not affect emergency access to the area.
6. The project does not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the above discussion, the proposed project would have no impact with regard to the transportation/traffic issues in the area. Therefore, no mitigation measure(s) is required.

P. Utilities and Service Systems:

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
3. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Impact Discussion:

- Four districts, each with its own treatment facility, provide sewage service within the general Ventura area. The Ventura Water Reclamation Facility currently serves the project site. The wastewater system primarily utilizes a gravity flow wastewater line that corresponds to natural drainage patterns. The city's standard for sewer line capacity is a maximum line capacity of 50% for pipes 15-inches and smaller, and 75% for pipes 18-inches and larger. Any post-development increase over these sewer line capacity standards would be considered a potentially significant impact unless mitigated.

The project would not result in a generation of wastewater in excess of what currently exists, or result in an increased demand for wastewater treatment services.

- See item 1 above.

3. See item 1 above.
4. The City of San Buenaventura supplies water to the proposed project site. The primary water sources for the project site include three groundwater basins. Water diverted from the Ventura River is also used to service development on the eastern side of the city. Significant impacts would result under this issue area if sufficient domestic and/or fire protection water supply was not present to serve the project's current and long-term needs. The 2005 General Plan FEIR estimates the total water available for city use to be 28,262 acre-feet per year (AFY). The total water consumption reported in 2003 was 20,365 AFY. Therefore, adequate citywide capacity exists to satisfy the project sites peak domestic and irrigation demands, as well as fire protection flow rates at acceptable residual pressures. Therefore, given the above discussion regarding water service, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the water service issue area.
5. See item 4 above.
6. Solid waste disposal is an issue of regional and statewide significance. The traditional method of landfill disposal is becoming increasingly problematic, as landfills approach or reach their capacity and the ability to find and develop new landfills is complicated by numerous environmental, regulatory and political concerns. In 1991, the city adopted a Source Reduction & Recycling Element (SRRE), under the mandate of the California Integrated Waste Management Act. Waste reduction programs from the SRRE that are being implemented include recycling programs, re-use programs, and regional materials recovery.

Solid waste disposal in Ventura County can be disposed at any landfill depending upon the preference of individual solid waste haulers and other factors, such as proximity to the collection area, tipping fees, and daily capacities at the landfill sites. Currently, most solid waste collected within Ventura County by public and private haulers is disposed of in the County. At the time of new development for the site the project will be required to implement site specific source reduction, recycling, and re-use programs to comply with AB 939.

Mitigation/Residual Impact(s): Based on the above discussion, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with regard to the utilities and services issue area. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Q. Mandatory Findings of Significance:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impacts
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 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 effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	
3. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Findings Discussion:

1. Based on the information obtained in the preparation of this Initial Study and the inclusion of proposed conditions of approval, the proposed project would not 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 of restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, The project is located in an urban setting and is already developed with structures and parking lots with little to no vegetation. Therefore, the land use change would not affect rare or endangered plant

or animal communities or any significant historical or cultural resources.

2. Based on the information obtained in preparation of this Initial Study, as well as Ordinance Code requirements and permit conditions applicable to the project, no potentially significant individually limited or cumulative impacts were identified.
3. Based on the information contained in this Initial Study, the proposed project does not have the potential to directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

VI. CIRCULATE TO THE FOLLOWING AGENCIES/PERSONS:

VENTURA COUNTY

Agricultural Commissioner	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ventura County Clerk/Recorder* 1 original, 4 copies, unstapled (hand deliver to County)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
County of Ventura Resource Management Agency, Attn: Planning* Director (6 hard copies)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ventura County Transportation Commission* (VCTC)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ADJACENT COUNTIES

Kern County Planning & Development Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	County of Santa Barbara Planning Division	<input type="checkbox"/>
County of Los Angeles Dept. of Regional Planning Impact Analysis Section	<input type="checkbox"/>		

ADJACENT CITIES

City of Oxnard	<input type="checkbox"/>	City of Ojai	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------

OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES

Air Pollution Control District*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ventura County Organization of Government (VCOG)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ventura County Solid Waste Management Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ventura Regional Sanitation District*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Casitas Mutual Water District	<input type="checkbox"/>	South Coast Area Transit (SCAT)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ventura Unified School District	<input type="checkbox"/>		

LIBRARIES

Avenue Branch Library*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	E.P. Foster Branch Library*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------

STATE AGENCIES

California Coastal Commission South Central Coast Area Office	<input type="checkbox"/>	Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)* (3 copies)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
California Dept. of Fish & Game (Santa Barbara)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Caltrans District 7 Environmental Section	<input type="checkbox"/>
California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/>	State Department of Parks and Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>
California Integrated Waste Management Board, Permits Section	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dept. of Boating & Waterways	<input type="checkbox"/>
California Department of Toxic Substances Control	<input type="checkbox"/>	State Clearinghouse (10 copies)	<input type="checkbox"/>

FEDERAL AGENCIES

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	<input type="checkbox"/>	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------

CITIZEN GROUPS

Audubon Society	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sierra Club	<input type="checkbox"/>
Building Industry Association Greater Los Angeles/Ventura Region of Southern California, Inc.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	California Trout Surfrider Foundation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental Coalition	<input type="checkbox"/>	Friends of the Ventura River	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental Defense Center	<input type="checkbox"/>	League of Women Voters	<input type="checkbox"/>

Friends of the Santa Clara River	<input type="checkbox"/>	Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ventureano Canaliano Chumash	<input type="checkbox"/>	Owl Clan Consultants	<input type="checkbox"/>
Candelaria American Indian Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	Montalvo Property Owners Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ventura County Archaeological Society	<input type="checkbox"/>	Foothill Road Homeowners Association	<input type="checkbox"/>
Westside Community Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	East Ventura Community Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
Downtown Community Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	Midtown Community Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pierpont Community Council	<input type="checkbox"/>		

*Indicates agency/person always receives notice.

VII. LIST OF REFERENCES:

These references, and those previously cited within the text of this Initial Study/Environmental Assessment, are intended to provide a list of Supporting Information Sources and/or evidence staff has relied upon in completing this document and in reaching the conclusions contained herein. In addition, the materials that were submitted by the applicant have also been used in completing this document.

If any person or entity reviewing this Initial Study/Environmental Assessment has a question regarding the supporting information source and/or evidence, they may contact the staff planner at the address and telephone number noted on the front page of this document during the public review period.

- A. General Plan, including all technical appendices, maps, and the Final Environmental Impact Report prepared and certified therefore - City of San Buenaventura, 2005.
- B. Zoning Ordinance, including all maps and the Negative Declaration (EIR-2010) prepared and adopted therefore - City of San Buenaventura, 1992.
- C. Annual Transportation Report, Technical Appendix – City of San Buenaventura, April 2002
- D. Countywide Solid Waste Management Plan - Ventura County Solid Waste Management District, 1985.
- E. Air Quality Mitigation Program - City of San Buenaventura, 1993.
- F. Noise Ordinance - City of San Buenaventura.

- G. Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) MAPS, 1987.
- H. Uniform Building Code, 1998
- I. Environmental Impact Report, EIR-378

VIII. PERSONS AND/OR AGENCIES CONSULTED DURING PREPARATION OF THIS INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT:

<u>Person</u>	<u>City Agency</u>	<u>Comments</u>
None		

IX. ATTACHMENT:

- A. Project Site Information

	WINCO FOODS VENTURA 4750 TELEPHONE ROAD VENTURA, CA		ALL INFORMATION IS UNCLASSIFIED	DATE:	SHEET:
				PROJECT:	SCALE:

LOT SUMMARY TABLE


LOT AREA	200,464 SQ. FT.
BUILDING COVERAGE	78,408 SQ. FT.
PAVED AREA	175,014 SQ. FT.
LANDSCAPE AREA	13,981 SQ. FT.

AREA CALCULATIONS

MAIN BUILDING	78,408 SQ. FT.
MERCHANDISE STORAGE	

PARKING SPACES

STANDARDS	298
ACCESSIBLE	5
CONTRACT	28
TOTAL PARKING SPACES	389



INSERT SITE PLAN