

Planning Division
214 South C Street
Oxnard, CA 93030
(805) 385-7858

**INITIAL STUDY
NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 18-01
March 21, 2018**

MWS WIRE INDUSTRIES' NEW MANUFACTURING WAREHOUSE

Planning and Zoning Permit Nos.
PZ 17-200-05, (Development Design Review) MWS Wire

5.66 Acre Site Located at 3000 Camino del Sol in the McInnes Ranch Specific Plan Area.

Introduction

This *Initial Study* has been prepared in accordance with relevant provisions of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970*, as amended, and the *CEQA Guidelines* as revised. *Section 15063(c)* of the *CEQA Guidelines* indicates that the purposes of an Initial Study are to:

1. Provide the Lead Agency (i.e., the City of Oxnard) with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration;
2. Enable an applicant or Lead Agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts before an EIR is prepared, thereby enabling the project to qualify for a Negative Declaration;
3. Assist the preparation of an EIR, if one is required, by:
 - Focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant;
 - Identifying the effects determined not to be significant;
 - Explaining the reasons why potentially significant effects would not be significant; and
 - Identifying whether a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process can be used for analysis of the project's environmental effects.
4. Facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a project;
5. Provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding in a Negative Declaration that a project will not have a significant effect on the environment;
6. Eliminate unnecessary EIRs; and
7. Determine whether a previously prepared EIR could be used with the project.

The *City of Oxnard CEQA Guidelines* (May 2017) were used along with other pertinent information for preparing the *Initial Study* for this project.

The purpose of the *CEQA Guidelines* is to inform the public, project applicants, consultants and City staff of the threshold criteria and standard methodology used in determining whether or not a project (individually or cumulatively) could have a significant effect on the environment. Furthermore, the *CEQA Guidelines* provide instructions for completing the *Initial Study* and determining the type of environmental document required for individual projects.

Determining the significance of environmental impacts is a critical and often controversial aspect of the environmental review process. It is critical because a determination of significance may require that the project be substantially altered, or that mitigation measures be readily employed to avoid the impact or reduce it below the level of significance. If the impact cannot be reduced or avoided, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared. An EIR is a detailed statement that describes and analyzes the significant environmental impacts of a proposed project, discusses ways to reduce or avoid them, and suggests alternatives to the project, as proposed. The preparation of an EIR can be a costly and time-consuming process.

Determining the significance of impacts is often controversial because the decision requires staff to use their judgment regarding a subject that is not clearly defined by the law. The State *CEQA Guidelines* define the term “significant impact on the environment” as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project. However, there is no iron-clad definition of what constitutes a substantial change because the significance of an activity may vary according to location.

To help clarify and standardize decision-making in the environmental review process, Oxnard has developed thresholds of environmental significance. Thresholds are measures of environmental change that are quantitative for subjects like noise, air quality, and traffic; and qualitative for subjects like aesthetics, land use compatibility, and biology. These thresholds are used in the absence of other empirical data to define the significance of impacts. For some projects, however, special studies and/or the professional judgment of City staff may enter into the decision-making process. Therefore, Oxnard’s thresholds are intended to serve as guidelines, and to augment existing *CEQA* provisions governing the definition of significance.

The City’s environmental thresholds as defined by the *City of Oxnard, CEQA Guidelines* will be periodically updated as new information becomes available, or as standards regarding acceptable levels of environmental change are reevaluated. *CEQA* Thresholds will be updated as necessary based on new or changing information and regulations.

When other agencies have jurisdiction over a given site, the project proponent will have to meet the design, mitigation, and monitoring requirements imposed by those agencies, as well as any additional requirements established by the City of Oxnard.

CITY OF OXNARD

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

- 1-1. Project Title:
MWS Wire Industries, New manufacturing warehouse.
5.66 Acre site at 3000 Camino del Sol
APN: 216-0-153-115
- 1-2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
City of Oxnard, Planning Division
214 South "C" Street
Oxnard, CA 93030
Phone: 805-385-7556
- 1-3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
Paul McClaren, Associate Planner
Phone: 805-385-3945
paul.mcclaren@oxnard.org
- | | |
|---|---|
| 1-4. <u>Project Applicant Name and Address:</u>
WLD Construction Services, Inc.
c/o Lee Dukehart
20867 Exhibit Place
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 991-8553 | <u>Property Owners and Address:</u>
MWS Wire Industries
c/o Kenneth R. Goss
31200 Cedar Valley Drive
Westlake Village, CA 91362 |
|---|---|
- 1-5. General Plan Designation:
The subject parcel 2030 General Plan land use designation of the subject parcel is Industrial Light. The 2030 General Plan characterizes light industrial as manufacturing uses where the principal activity occurs within the building, but also permits incidental light outdoor assembly, fabrication and storage. Wholesale and retail sales of large commodities related to warehousing or services uses on-site may also be permitted. The development proposal conforms to the 2030 General Plan.
- 1-6. City Zoning Designation:
The zoning designation for subject parcel is M1-PD (Light Manufacturing - Planned Development). This is characterized as fabrication, manufacturing, assembly or processing of materials primarily within a building. Through development and performance standards the creation of smoke, gas, odor, dust, sound and vibration are limited. The proposed 60,367 square foot tilt-up building, inclusive of warehousing and office, conforms to the Light Manufacturing – Planned Development zone. Additionally, the project is located within the McInnes Ranch Specific Plan.

1-7. Description of Project:

A request to construct a new 60,367 square-foot tilt up concrete light industrial building with warehousing, office space and associated site improvements on a vacant 5.66-acre lot located at 3000 Camino Del Sol. The building is expected to provide industrial occupancy for typical industrial uses described in the Light Manufacturing (M-1) zoning ordinance of the City Code. No outdoor storage is proposed. A loading area, with 3 loading docks is located at the rear of the building. The proposed building height is 38 feet which is well below the allowed 55 feet and 120 parking spaces will be provided where 111 are required. The project is in complete compliance with all aspects of the development standards for the zoning and Specific Plan.

1-8. Project Location and Surrounding Land Uses:

The McInnes Ranch Specific Plan was adopted to assure development of the area as a coordinated industrial business park. This project is located near the center of the specific plan on an undeveloped 5.66-acre lot with frontage on Camino Del Sol. The surrounding properties in all directions have been developed with light industrial buildings similar to the proposed project and include two special use projects that are over 100,000 square feet. The following table lists the surrounding general plan, zoning designations and existing land uses.

DIRECTION	ZONING DESIGNATION	GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION	EXISTING LAND USE
North	Light Manufacturing - Planned Development	Industrial Light	Industrial Light
East	Light Manufacturing - Planned Development	Industrial Light	Industrial Light
South	Light Manufacturing - Planned Development	Industrial Light	Industrial Light
West	Light Manufacturing - Planned Development	Industrial Light	Industrial Light

The site is currently a vacant, relatively flat parcel of land with an existing 30' landscape buffer along Camino Del Sol with some existing trees installed. There are no trees on the site. The proposed project will connect to the existing utilities and infrastructure which is located within Camino Del Sol.

1-9. Planned and Pending Projects in the Site Vicinity:

The specific plan is nearly built out. There is a logistics warehouse proposed for the northwest corner of the intersection of Camino del Sol and Elevar Street at 2801 Camino del Sol on a 2.86-acre lot which is to the west of the proposed project. To the east, one other vacant lot (3.26) acres exists at 3151 Camino Del Sol.

1-10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:

None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics & Urban Design | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population, Education & Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services & Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation & Circulation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Climate Change & Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cumulative Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources & Tribal Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | |

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the 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 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.



Paul McClaren, Associate Planner

March 21, 2018

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 factors 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 off-site 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 (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” cited in support of conclusions reached in other sections may be cross-referenced).
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 should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used—Identify and state where they are 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. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. **Supporting Information Sources:** A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. 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.

A. AESTHETICS & URBAN DESIGN	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: 1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista such as an ocean or mountain view from an important view corridor or location as identified in the 2030 General Plan or other City planning documents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway or route identified as scenic by the County of Ventura or City of Oxnard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings such as by creating new development or other physical changes that are visually incompatible with surrounding areas or that conflict with visual resource policies contained in the 2030 General Plan or other City planning documents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Add to or compound an existing negative visual character associated with the project site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Create a source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- 1-5. The proposed project has been reviewed and found to be compliant with the applicable development standards for the M-1 City Ordinance and the McInnes Ranch Specific Plan. These standards include site illumination, textures, setbacks, height, parking, colors, architectural treatments and landscaping ensuring that the project will be pleasing and desirable.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

B. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or an existing Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of off-site Farmland, to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- 1-3. The site for the proposed project is a vacant 5.66-acre, cleared lot in an urbanized, developed area. Located near the center of the McInnes Ranch Specific Plan, the site is surrounded in all directions with light industrial buildings similar to the proposed project. No impacts are anticipated related to agricultural resources.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

C. AIR QUALITY	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Ventura County Air Quality Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Violate any federal or state air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality standard violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

C. AIR QUALITY Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria in excess of quantitative thresholds recommended by the VCAPCD?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations exceeding state or federal standards or in excess of applicable health risk criteria for toxic air contaminants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1-4. Results from a report generated by CalEEMod, indicate 2.5 lbs/day of reactive organic gases, 3.49 lbs/day of nitrogen oxides, and 813 metric tons/year CO₂e. All of these are below the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District's (VCAPCD) thresholds of significance for reactive organic compounds and oxides of nitrogen as described in the Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines. Therefore, the project will not have a significant impact on regional air quality.

The VCAPCD has not yet adopted any approach to setting a threshold of significance for land use development projects in regards to greenhouse gases. However, the amount of greenhouse gases anticipated from the project will be a small fraction of the levels being considered by the VCAPCD for greenhouse gas significance thresholds and far below those adopted to date by any air district in the state. The project will generate less than significant impacts to regional and local air quality.

5. The project will not create objectionable odors.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations adopted by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected waters of the U.S. as defined by Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or protected waters of the state as defined by Section 1600 et seq. of the California Fish and Game Code (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, and coastal wetlands) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1-6. The project site is an existing 5.66-acre vacant parcel created for light industrial planned development in 1989. This property is considered in-fill development in an urbanized area that is surrounded by similar land uses and is not in, or near an area identified as containing biological resources of significance (General Plan Background Report Fig. 5-1). The site is 3.8 miles from any water ways or wetland areas. Additionally, the proposed project is located near the center of the McInnes Ranch Specific Plan and surrounded in all directions with light industrial buildings similar to the proposed project.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

E. CLIMATE CHANGE & GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases or otherwise conflict with the state goal or reducing greenhouse gas emissions in California?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

E. CLIMATE CHANGE & GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: 3. Contribute or be subject to potential secondary effects of climate change (e.g., sea level rise, increase fire hazard)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1-3. Per the traffic study provided by LIN Consulting, Inc, the project will have fewer number of daily trips than anticipated by the McInnes Ranch Specific Plan or the General Plan EIR. Additionally, the occupant has a proactive environmental policy to limit, and in the future reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

F. CULTURAL & TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: 1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1-4. The Oxnard Plain, on which the City lies, has a history of human habitation of thousands of years. Portions of Ventura County were occupied by early Native American cultures from about 3,500 years ago to approximately the first century A.D. Chumash Indians settled in the area around 1500 A.D. Literature searches undertaken through the UCLA Institute of Archaeology, conducted between 1984 and 1986 identified seven archaeological sites in the County. A records check conducted through the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) indicated that cultural resources have been found in the vicinity of the project site.

Historically, the site has been previously graded for common farming practices. Nearby development, including building construction and infrastructure improvements have not revealed any cultural resources in the immediate vicinity. However, due to the nature of previously discovered archaeological and ethnographic resources in the close vicinity and the expressed concerns of the Native American community, the City has adopted standard conditions of approval for the entire City to address these circumstances.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

G. GEOLOGY & SOILS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
a. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Strong seismic ground shaking that cannot be addressed through compliance with standard Code requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

G. GEOLOGY & SOILS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. 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 an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse that cannot be addressed through compliance with standard Code requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property that cannot be addressed through compliance with standard Code requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche or tsunami?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Rely on dredging or other maintenance activity by another agency that is not guaranteed to continue?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1-5. The City of Oxnard is located in an area with a high seismic ground shaking potential as identified in the City's General Plan. Figure 6-1 of the Background Report indicates no active faults in the General Plan Area. However, active and/or potentially active faults are present in the surrounding region, and some of these may extend into the subsurface beneath the City. The majority of the General Plan Area, to include the project site, is also susceptible to liquefaction. As standard practice, the City's Development Services Division requires the submittal and approval of a soil, geologic and structural evaluation report prepared by a registered soils engineer and/or structural engineer for all new development. The recommendations of the soils report are reviewed as part of the plan check process and approved by City Development Services Staff.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

H. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Emit hazardous substances or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school in quantities or a manner that would create a substantial hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Be located on a site that 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 substantial hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- 1-5. The construction of the project will be required to comply with City Code, Uniform Building Code and Fire Code. The building is expected to provide industrial occupancy for typical industrial uses described in the Light Manufacturing (M-1) zoning ordinance of the City Code. The occupant/business shall meet the performance standards set forth in the zoning ordinance for handling materials deemed hazardous by the Fire Department and will be required to obtain a permit issued by the Certified Unified Program Agency

(CUPA). This Division of the Fire Department is responsible for insuring the safe handling and disposal of hazardous materials. The CUPA Division will review the levels and extent of hazardous materials used by the occupant/business and determine the need and the hazard range prior to issuing a CUPA permit.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

I. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a violation of any adopted water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 on- or off-site flooding or exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Place new structures 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

I. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. Impede or redirect flood flows such that it would increase on- or off-site flood potential?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Be exposed to a substantial risk related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- 1 & 3. The 5.66-acre site is currently vacant and therefore 100 percent pervious. The proposed project will alter the drainage pattern by adding impermeable areas. However, the project design is subject to compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) permit Best Management Practice requirements for discharge of surface runoff. Absorption rates, drainage patterns, and runoff rates of the site are expected to be altered by the proposed development, however the 2030 General Plan and the McInnes Ranch Specific Plan anticipated the development of the subject site. **No significant adverse water run-off is anticipated.**

2. The project will result in the need for water service, however the General Plan has anticipated development of the subject site and the demand of water service for typical industrial developments. **No significant adverse water quality impacts are anticipated.**

- 4-7. There are no surface water bodies or wetlands in or near the vicinity of the project site that could be affected by the proposed development. The project is outside of the tsunami zone and located in FEMA flood zone X (minimal flood hazard) as shown on FEMA panel 06111C0910E.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

J. LAND USE & PLANNING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
1. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of the City, or other agency with jurisdiction over the project, adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating a significant environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Involve land uses that are not allowed under any applicable airport land use compatibility plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1-4. The proposed 60,367 square-foot industrial development is located within the *McInnes Ranch Specific Plan* area and is zoned M1-PD (Light Manufacturing Planned Development). The development has been reviewed and determined to be consistent with the permitted uses and the development standards of the M-1 zone and the *McInnes Ranch Specific Plan*. The table below describes the development standards for the zoning and compares them with the proposed development

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	PROPOSED	COMPLIES?
Min. lot area (16-230)	15,000 square feet	247,274 sf/5.66 acres	Yes
Min. lot width (16-230)	100 feet	406' 52"	Yes
Min. lot depth (16-230)	150 feet	608' 27"	Yes

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	PROPOSED	COMPLIES?
Max. building height (16-231)	55 feet	38' 0"	Yes
Front yard setback (16-232)	30 feet when abutting designated scenic corridors	87' 3"	Yes
Side yard setback (16-232)	None	75' 0" (east side) 71' 6" (west side)	Yes
Rear yard setback (16-232)	Not less than height of building.	308' 8"	Yes
Max. lot coverage (16-233)	70% of total area	21.8%	Yes
Walls (16-234 & 16-311)	Must be included on plans.	Existing / Provided on Eng. Site Plan	Yes
Site access (16-235)	Typical from 74-foot wide collector street. Curb cuts min. 30 feet wide.	Shared access w/ (E) westerly development & new driveway approach on Camino Del Sol	Yes
Site landscaping (16-236 & 16-641)	Landscape plan required. Entire front yard setback area. 5% of parking area.	110,161 square feet (44.6 %)	Yes
Utilities, lighting, & trash (16-237)	In accordance with City Code. Need to be screened.	Illustrated on eng site plan. Some transformers already exist. 2 trash enclosures provided	Yes
Off-street Parking: Handicapped Motorcycle Loading Bicycle	111 total parking spaces required 5 Handicapped space (1 van accessible) 3 motorcycle spaces 3 loading spaces 5 bicycle spaces	110 standard spaces 6 Handicapped 4 motorcycle spaces 3 loading spaces 5 bicycle spaces	Yes

DEVELOPMENT STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	PROPOSED	COMPLIES?
Rooftop equipment	May not protrude above height of parapet.	An extended screening system is provided	Yes
Lighting	Comply with City Code. 1 foot-candle minimum and 7 foot-candle maximum	Photometric plan will be required at bldg pmt. process	Yes

Based on the above, the project does not result in the potential for a significant adverse effect on the environment related to land use or planning.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

K. MINERAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region or state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the 2030 General Plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1-2. According to the 2006 General Plan Background Report, Figure 15-6, the project will not create a unique demand on available mineral resources in the City, since the project site is not located in an area of importance for mineral deposits. The project lies within the MRZ-1 and MRZ-4 area and does not fall within any of the areas listed as having significant mineral deposits. **Therefore, no significant adverse effects on natural and mineral resources are expected.**

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

L. NOISE Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate or expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the Oxnard 2030 General Plan or Noise Ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Generate or expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Expose people residing or working in a project area located within the airport land use plan or Oxnard Airport or within two miles of Naval Base, Ventura County at Point Mugu, to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Would the project expose non-human species to excessive noise?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- 1-4. The project site is vacant and any new development will increase ambient noise levels. However, short term noise will be reduced through the application of standard construction practices to reduce noise levels. On-going noise generated by the operations of the industrial development are expected to be consistent to similar industrial developments located nearby and will be compliant with the maximum decibel levels as adopted in the City's noise ordinance.
5. The project site is located outside of the airport land use plan and is more than two miles from Naval Base, Ventura County at Point Mugu.

6. The project site is one of the last to be developed in the McInnes Ranch Specific Plan and will have no appreciable increase in noise for non-human species.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures beyond standard construction mitigation measures set forth in the standard conditions of approval are required or proposed.

M. POPULATION, EDUCATION, & HOUSING Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Involve a General Plan amendment that could result in an increase in population over that projected in the 2030 General Plan that may result in one or more significant physical environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Induce substantial growth on the project site or surrounding area, resulting in one or more significant physical environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Result in a substantial (15 single-family or 25 multi-family dwelling units – about one-half block) net loss of housing units through demolition, conversion, or other means that may necessitate the development of replacement housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Result in a net loss of existing housing units affordable to very low- or low-income households (as defined by federal and/or City standards), through demolition, conversion, or other means that may necessitate the development of replacement housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Cause an increase in enrollment at local public schools that would exceed capacity and necessitate the construction of new or expanded facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

M. POPULATION, EDUCATION, & HOUSING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: 6. Directly or indirectly interfere with the operation of an existing or planned school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1-6. The proposed industrial development is consistent with the industrial land use designation of the 2030 General Plan and the adopted land use designation of the *McInnes Ranch Specific Plan*. The project site is vacant and the proposed development will not affect the population of the City or displace housing or people. **Therefore, no adverse impacts to population and housing concerns are anticipated.**

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

N. PUBLIC SERVICES & RECREATION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: 1. Increase demand for fire protection services such that new or expanded facilities would be needed to maintain acceptable service levels, the construction of which may have significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Increase demand for law enforcement service such that new or expanded facilities would be needed to maintain acceptable service levels, the construction of which may have significant environment effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

N. PUBLIC SERVICES & RECREATION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. Would the project: Increase the use of existing park facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated or that new or expanded park facilities would be needed to maintain acceptable service levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Increase the need for or use of existing library or other community facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1. The project includes adequate fire hydrants, access, signage, alarms, and addressable smoke detectors and meets all requirements of the Uniform Fire Code which will minimize any potential impacts on Fire services. **No mitigation is necessary or required.**
2. The increase in tax base generated by the project will help fund police service expansion within the City. However, there is no anticipated increase in service requirements for this project. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a significant impact on police services. **No mitigation is necessary or required.**
- 3-4. The proposed development is not anticipated to have an impact on existing parks or library facilities in the City, however the developer shall be required to pay an in-lieu contribution fee in accordance with the standards and policies.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

O. TRANSPORTATION & CIRCULATION Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections) based on adopted City of Oxnard level of service (LOS) standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a LOS standard established by the Ventura County Congestion Management Program (CMP) for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- 1-2. The trips per day of the proposed industrial development were evaluated in accordance with the Oxnard Traffic Study using the 2003 intersection capacity utilization

methodology. The 2010 Highway Capacity Manual level of service (LOS) methodology was used for intersections in Caltrans jurisdiction. The proposed industrial project is anticipated to generate 235 total trips per day. The anticipated trips per day and the projections for cumulative increases from other projects predict no change in the current level of service to the intersections serving the property. **No significant impacts to traffic levels are anticipated.**

3. The project will have no impact on air traffic patterns.
- 4-6. The project proposes no new road alignments or changes to traffic circulations patterns that will create any hazards, result in changes to emergency access or conflict with any policies, plans or programs that support alternative transportation.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

P. UTILITIES & ENERGY	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
With respect to Utilities:				
1. Need new or expanded water supply entitlements that are not anticipated in the current Urban Water Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Require additional wastewater conveyance or treatment capacity to serve project demand and existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Generate solid waste that would exceed the permitted capacity of a landfill serving the City?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Conflict with federal, state, or local statutes or regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

P. UTILITIES & ENERGY Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
With respect to Energy: 5. Involve wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy during project construction, operation, maintenance, and/or removal?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Require additional energy facilities, the provision of which may have a significant effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7. Be inconsistent with existing energy standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. Preempt future energy development or future energy conservation, or inhibit the future use of renewable energy or energy storage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- 1-4. The additional demand on water supply, and other utility infrastructure capacity does not exceed the anticipated build-out scenario for the *McInnes Ranch Specific Plan* or the 2030 General Plan. The project has a “will serve” letter from the City of Oxnard who will provide the project with water. The occupant has implemented waste management and recycling programs at its other facilities that will also be implemented at this facility resulting in a significant decrease in wastewater and solid waste. In reviewing this project in comparison to other facilities, the City expects that this project can be served without significantly impacting existing services.
- 5-8. The proposed project will be compliant with Title 24 energy efficiency standards and has designated space on the roof for future installation of a photovoltaic electric system. The facility will be able to meet power needs with existing infrastructure.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

Q. CUMULATIVE IMPACT	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the cumulative impact of the project in combination with the impacts of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects exceed a City significance threshold?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. If so, would the project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact be cumulatively considerable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

1-2. The McInnes *Ranch Specific Plan* and the initial study for the specific plan that resulted in a mitigated negative declaration anticipated that each lot in the specific plan would in time be developed. Proposed mitigation for the specific plan included construction of infrastructure designed to serve the specific plan area. The infrastructure plan to mitigate the future projects is 100% complete. This project and foreseeable future projects in the Specific Plan area will not exceed any significant City thresholds as the Specific Plan area was designed for projects like the one proposed.

Mitigation: Based on the discussion provided above, no significant impacts are expected to occur as a result of this project, therefore no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

**SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES
INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT**

No mitigations measures beyond standard review practices and conditions of approval are required for this project.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

1. California, State of, Air Resources Board, CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2.
2. California, State of, Governor's Office, Office of Planning and Research, Office of Permit Assistance, *Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites - List Pursuant to AB 3750*, current edition.
3. California, State of, Office of Planning and Research, *California Environmental Quality Act Statutes*, Sacramento, California: January 1, 2002.
4. California, State of, Office of Planning and Research, *Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act*, Sacramento, California: February 1, 2001.
5. California, State of, Office of Planning and Research, *Planning, Zoning and Development Laws*, November 2000.
6. City of Oxnard, *The Municipal Code of the City of Oxnard - Zoning Ordinance*, current edition.
7. City of Oxnard, Development Services Department, Planning Division, *Coastal Zoning Regulations and Zone Maps*, current edition.
8. City of Oxnard, Development Services Department, Planning Division, *Coastal Land Use Plan*, current edition.
9. City of Oxnard, Community Development Department, Planning Division, *Zone Maps*, current edition.
10. City of Oxnard, Fire Department, *Fire Protection Planning Guide*, January 1990.
11. FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Search By Address. (n.d.) Retrieved February 01, 2018, from [https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=3000 camino del sol Oxnard%2C+CA#searchresultsanchor](https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=3000+camino+del+sol+Oxnard%2C+CA#searchresultsanchor). Map panel 06111C0910E, effective on 01/20/2010
12. City of Oxnard, Public Works Department, *Master Sewer Plan*, current edition.
13. City of Oxnard, Public Works Department, *Master Drainage Plan*, current edition.
14. City of Oxnard, Public Works Department, *Master Water Plan*, current edition.
15. Merrill, J. C. (2017). *Traffic Impact Analysis, Proposed MWS Manufacturing Building Project*(pp. 1-37, Tech.). Tustin, CA: LIN Consulting, Inc.
16. Sustainability. (n.d.). Retrieved February 01, 2018, from <http://mwswire.com/sustainability/>
17. Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, *Air Quality Management Plan*, current edition.
18. Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, *Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines*, October 2003.

Environmental Impact Reports

19. City of Oxnard, 2030 *General Plan EIR*, (Oct. 2011)
20. City of Oxnard, *General Plan Background report*, (April 2006)

Specific Plans

21. City of Oxnard, *McInnes Ranch Business Park Specific Plan*, December 20, 1988.