

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

2.1.1 AUTHORITY

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, *et seq.*) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations tit 14, §§ 15000, *et seq.*). This EIR assesses the potential impacts associated with the proposed East Area 1 Specific Plan (proposed project). The City of Santa Paula is the Lead Agency for the proposed project pursuant to CEQA.

As stated in Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR is an informational document which will inform decision-makers, public agencies and the general public about the potential significant environmental effects of a proposed project. It also identifies possible ways to minimize the significant adverse effects of the project and addresses reasonable alternatives to the project. CEQA requires that an EIR contain, at a minimum, the following elements:

- Executive Summary
- Project Description
- Environmental Settings, Impacts and Mitigation Measures
- Alternatives to the Proposed Project
- Growth Inducing Impacts
- Cumulative Impacts
- List of Preparers and Persons Consulted

2.1.2 PREPARATION OF THE EIR

This EIR was prepared pursuant to Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines which states that a project EIR

“...examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. This type of EIR should focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project. The EIR shall examine all the phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation.”

The Santa Paula East Area 1 Specific Plan EIR analyzes the reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences anticipated to occur from the construction and operation of this proposed project.

2.1.3 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

Various technical studies, analyses and reports were used in the preparation of this EIR and are incorporated by reference in accordance with Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines. Information from these documents which have been incorporated by reference is briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s) of this EIR. The documents and other sources used in preparation of this EIR are identified in Section 12.0 (References). In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(b), the location of where the public may obtain or review these referenced documents is also identified in Section 12.0.

2.1.4 INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

The EIR process is specifically designed to facilitate an objective evaluation of the significance of a project's direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the environment; provide an analysis of project alternatives; identify measures that would mitigate significant adverse impacts of a project; and provide implementation methods for such mitigation measures. Simply because the EIR addresses a particular issue does not mean that the issue causes a significant adverse impact to the environment. Impacts from the project may not have a significant effect on the environment, but analysis regarding such matters is included to support the conclusions set forth in this EIR.

Because approval and implementation of the proposed project would result in potentially significant adverse impacts on the environment, this EIR was prepared in conjunction with the project plan. This was done to identify the potential significant adverse project impacts and to identify what measures could be incorporated into the project to minimize or eliminate these impacts.

Before the City Council certifies a Final EIR, a Draft EIR will be circulated for a 45-day public review period. All interested persons and/or agencies wishing to comment on the information contained in the EIR must do so within the 45-day public review period.

The City of Santa Paula is responsible for reviewing the proposed project to ensure that it meets the requirements of the Santa Paula General Plan, the Santa Paula Municipal Code, and all other requirements of applicable law. The Santa Paula City Council is responsible for certifying the Final EIR.

2.1.5 AGENCIES HAVING JURISDICTION/POTENTIAL DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

The principal agency having jurisdiction over the proposed project is the City of Santa Paula because the project site is located within a City-designated Expansion Area (i.e., East Area 1) and is proposed for annexation to the City before development. Land identified for development in the proposed project is currently located in unincorporated Ventura County. To be developed in accordance with the proposal, would require annexation to the City through a reorganization approved by the Ventura County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).

In addition to the City of Santa Paula and LAFCO, other public agencies that may also have oversight over the project or may be responsible for issuing subsequent permits necessary to implement the proposed project are identified in Table 2-1.

2.1.6 AVAILABILITY OF THE EIR

Agencies, organizations and individuals wishing to comment on the information presented in this EIR may do so during the 45-day public review period. All written comments on the EIR will be addressed in the Responses to Comments Report. The Responses to Comments Report will be part of the Final EIR and will be presented to the City Council for its consideration of the EIR and the proposed project. Copies of the EIR and relevant technical studies are available for review during regular business hours at the following locations:

City of Santa Paula
Planning Department
200 South Tenth Street
Santa Paula, CA 93060

Ventura County Clerk's Office
800 S. Victoria Avenue
Ventura, CA 93009-1210

Blanchard Community Library
119 N. 8th Street
Santa Paula, CA 93060

**TABLE 2-1
LIST OF POTENTIAL RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES**

AGENCY	APPROVAL/PERMIT
Federal Agencies	
United States Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)	Section 404 permit
State Agencies	
California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)	Streambed Alteration Agreement
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	Encroachment Permit and Cooperative Agreement
Regional Water Quality Control Board – Los Angeles Region	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit Section 401 Water Quality Certificate Dewatering permit
Regional Agencies	
Ventura County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	Sphere of Influence Amendment and Reorganization (including annexation and detachment)
County Agencies	
Ventura County Air Pollution Control District	Air Emissions Permit
Ventura County Watershed Protection District	Issuance of stormwater and water quality related permits
Local Agencies	
City of Santa Paula	Certification of the Final EIR, amendment to CURB, General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Specific Plan, Development Agreement, and approval of subdivision map(s), Conditional Use Permit(s) and various other development-related permits (e.g., grading, building plan, certificate of occupancy, etc.)

Source: P&D Consultants, 2007.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

Each environmental parameter discussed in Section 4.0 of the EIR is organized and analyzed as discussed below.

2.2.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

This section describes the existing environmental conditions in the vicinity of the proposed project, as they existed at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) was published. The environmental setting constitutes the baseline physical conditions against which the Lead Agency (the City of Santa Paula) determines whether an impact is considered significant and adverse.

2.2.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Thresholds of significance which are the basis for determining the significance of project impacts are presented in this section of the EIR. These thresholds are derived from local, state and/or federal policies and programs that may apply; and other accepted standards determined to be appropriate by the Lead Agency pursuant to Section 15064.7 of the CEQA Guidelines. This analysis is intended to be consistent with the Guidelines as revised following the decision in *Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency*, 103 Cal. App. 4th 98 (2002).

2.2.3 METHODOLOGY RELATED TO EACH ENVIRONMENTAL PARAMETER

The procedures and rules used to analyze impacts of the proposed project on each environmental parameter are presented in this section of the EIR.

2.2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

The environmental analysis for each environmental parameter for which the proposed project may or would result in potentially significant adverse impacts is contained in this section of the EIR. These environmental parameters (land use and planning, agricultural resources, mineral resources, transportation and circulation, air quality, noise, biological resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, hazardous and hazardous materials, aesthetics, cultural and historic resources, public services, recreation, utilities and service systems, and population and housing) were based on the CEQA Guidelines Checklist.

2.2.5 MITIGATION MEASURES

If the analysis contained in the environmental impacts section concludes that the proposed project will cause significant adverse impacts on the environment, mitigation measures are identified in this section to minimize or eliminate the significant adverse impacts.

2.2.6 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

This section identifies unavoidable significant adverse impacts which cannot be mitigated or that remain significant even after mitigation is incorporated in the proposed project. If significant unavoidable adverse impacts are identified, the City Council must determine if the benefits from implementing the proposed project outweigh and override the unavoidable adverse effects created by the proposed project. If so, the Council must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations in order to approve the project.

2.3 BACKGROUND

2.3.1 NOTICE OF PREPARATION

As required by CEQA, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the proposed project was prepared by the City of Santa Paula. The NOP was released on July 28, 2006, for a 30-day public review period which concluded on August 28, 2006. In addition, the NOP was published in the Santa Paula Times on Friday, July 28, 2006. It should be noted that the City of Santa Paula decided to extend the NOP public review period to September 23, 2006. A copy of the NOP and a copy of the notice extending the review period are included in Appendix A of this EIR. The NOP and the extension notice were distributed to the State Clearinghouse (SCH) Office of Planning and Research, public agencies, interested parties, libraries and service providers. The distribution list for the NOP and the extension notice are provided in Appendix B of this EIR.

The City of Santa Paula received fourteen (14) written responses to the NOP. Copies of these comment letters are provided in Appendix B of this EIR. Table 2-2 summarizes the comment letters and indicates where in the EIR each specific issue raised in these comment letters is located.

**TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NOP**

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	WHERE COMMENT IS ADDRESSED IN THE EIR
<p>California Department of Transportation, District 7, Regional Planning</p>	<p>Provide a traffic study in advance of the Draft EIR to analyze the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumptions and methods used to develop trip generation, trip distribution, choice of travel mode, assignments of trips to State Route 126. • Consistency of project travel modeling with other regional and local modeling forecasts and with data travel. • Analysis of ADT, A.M., and P.M. peak-hour volumes for both existing and future conditions (freeways, interchanges, intersections, HOV facilities). • Suggested analysis scenarios include: existing + project + other projects + regional growth. • Mitigation measures. • Specification of developer’s percent share of the cost. 	<p>Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation), Section 7.0 (Cumulative Impacts) and Traffic Study in Appendix D.</p>
	<p>The Department as a commenting agency under CEQA has jurisdiction superceding that of MTA in identifying the freeway analysis needed for this project.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>State Routes and its facilities must be analyzed per the Department’s Traffic Impact Study Guidelines.</p>	<p>Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation) and Traffic Study in Appendix D.</p>
<p>Jennifer Dumas</p>	<p>Concerned with the lack of notification to the general public regarding the project scoping meeting. If the City is interested in public feedback on the project, then the scoping meeting should be rescheduled for another later date.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Section 2.0 (Introduction).</p>
<p>Governor’s Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse</p>	<p>Confirmed the filing of the NOP and identified the review period.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Southern California Association of Governments</p>	<p>Indicates that the proposed project is regionally significant per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Section 15206).</p>	<p>Comment noted. Section 4.5 (Air Quality).</p>

**TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NOP**

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	WHERE COMMENT IS ADDRESSED IN THE EIR
	Policies of SCAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, Regional Transportation Plan and Compass Growth Vision which may be applicable to the project should be addressed in the EIR.	Section 3.0 (Project Description) and Section 4.0 (Existing Conditions, Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Level of Significance After Mitigation).
California Department of Conservation	The DEIR should describe the project setting in terms of actual and potential agricultural productivity of the land. Ventura County Important Farmland Division may be used for this purpose.	Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources).
	Include current and past agricultural use of the project area. Include data on the types of crops grown, and crop yields and sales values.	Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources) and Agricultural Resources Study in Appendix C.
	Recommend the use of economic multipliers to assess the total contribution of the site’s potential or actual agricultural production.	Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources) and Agricultural Resources Study in Appendix C.
	Identify the type, amount and location of farmland conversion resulting directly and indirectly from the project.	Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources) and Section 7.0 (Cumulative Impacts).
	Impacts on agricultural resources may also be quantified and qualified by the use of established thresholds of significance. The Division has developed a California version of the USDA Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) model, a semi-quantitative rating system for establishing the environmental significance of project specific impacts on farmland.	Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources).
	The DEIR should provide a detailed map (acre, location, land type) identifying Williamson Act Contracts. In addition, the DEIR should discuss potential impacts to Williamson Act Contracts.	Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources).
	If Williamson Act Contracts are cancelled, a discussion of the findings must be included in the DEIR. A notice of the hearing to approve the tentative cancellation and a copy of the landowner’s petition must be mailed to the Department of Conversation ten days working days before the hearing.	Comment noted.

**TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NOP**

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	WHERE COMMENT IS ADDRESSED IN THE EIR
	Recommend that the DEIR discuss any proposed general plan designation or zoning within agricultural preserves affected by the project.	Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources).
	If the City annexes land under a Williamson Act contract, the City must succeed to all rights, duties, and powers of the County under the contract unless conditions in §51243.5 apply to give the City the option to not succeed to the contract.	Comment noted.
	The DEIR should consider mitigation measures and feasible alternatives to the proposed project.	Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources), Section 5.0 (Alternatives to the Proposed Project), and Section 10.0 (Inventory of Mitigation Measures).
	The Division recommends the purchase of agricultural conservation easements on land at of at least equal quality and size as partial compensation for the direct loss of agricultural land.	Comment noted. Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources) and Section 10.0 (Inventory of Mitigation Measures).
	Information about conservation easements is available on the Division’s website or by contacting the Division.	Comment noted.
	<p>The following are other forms of mitigation that could be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase home density to allow greater portion of development to remain in agricultural production. • Protecting nearby farmland from premature conversion through the use of less than permanent long-term restrictions on use such as 20-years Farmland Security Zone contracts or 10-year Williamson Act contracts. • Establish buffers (setback, berms, greenbelts, and open space areas) to separate farmland from incompatible urban uses. • Invest in the commercial viability of the remaining agricultural land in the project area through a mitigation bank which invests in agricultural infrastructure, water supplies and marketing. 	Comment noted. Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources) and Section 10.0 (Inventory of Mitigation Measures).

**TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NOP**

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	WHERE COMMENT IS ADDRESSED IN THE EIR
California Department of Fish and Game	Include a complete assessment of flora and fauna within and adjacent to the project area, with emphasis upon identifying endangered, threatened, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats. The assessment should follow the Department’s Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Rare Plants and Rare Natural Communities.	Section 4.7 (Biological Resources).
	Include a thorough discussion of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources, with specific feasible mitigation measures to offset such impacts. This discussion should focus on maximizing avoidance and minimizing impacts.	Section 4.7 (Biological Resources), Section 7.0 (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 10.0 (Inventory of Mitigation Measures).
	A range of alternatives should be analyzed to ensure that alternatives to the proposed project are fully considered and evaluated.	Section 5.0 (Alternatives to the Proposed Project).
	A California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Permit must be obtained if the project has the potential to result in “take” of species of plants or animals listed under CESA, either during construction or over the life of the project.	Comment noted.
	The biological mitigation monitoring and reporting proposal should be sufficient in detail and resolution to satisfy the requirements for a CESA permit.	Comment noted. This comment will be addressed when the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is completed and submitted when the EIR is certified.
	A Department approved Mitigation Agreement and Mitigation Plan are required for plants listed as rare under the Native Plant Projection Act.	Comment noted.
	The Department requires a streambed alteration agreement pursuant to Section 1600 et. seq. of the Fish and Game Code, with the applicant before any direct or indirect impact to a lake or streambed, bank, or channel or associated riparian resources.	Comment noted.
	The Department suggests a pre-project or early consultation to avoid or reduce impacts to fish and wildlife resources.	Comment noted.

**TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NOP**

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	WHERE COMMENT IS ADDRESSED IN THE EIR
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse	Confirmed the extension of the review period for the East Area 1 Specific Plan EIR (September 22, 2006).	Comment noted.
California Public Utilities Commission	Any development planned adjacent to or near the Fillmore & Western Railway Company right-of-way needs to be planned with the safety of the rail corridor in mind since new development may increase traffic volumes (streets, intersections, and at-grade highway-rail crossings).	Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).
	Safety factors to consider include, but not limited to, the planning for grade separations of major thoroughfares, improvements to existing at-grade highway-rail crossings due to increase in traffic volumes and appropriate fencing to limit the access to trespassers onto the railroad right-of-way.	Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation) and Section 4.15 (Utilities and Services).
	The safety improvements mentioned should be considered when approval is sought for new development.	Comment noted.
County of Ventura Resource Management Agency	Forwarding comment letters that were received during the intra-county review of the East Area 1 Specific Plan EIR.	Comment noted.
County of Ventura Office of Agricultural Commissioner	The Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines for Agricultural Resources contain four sections: 7a soils, 7b water, 7c air quality/microclimate, 7d pests/diseases and 7e land use incompatibility.	Comment noted.
	The building density of the proposed project is such that the local CEQA thresholds for the permanent conversion of agricultural soils will be exceeded. Ventura County holds that conversion of farmland soil cannot be fully mitigated and requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations in addition to any less than full mitigation measures that the jurisdiction may employ.	Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources).
	The Draft EIR should address and mitigate the drainage or runoff from the proposed site onto adjacent County agricultural lands.	Section 4.9 (Hydrology and Water Quality).

**TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NOP**

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	WHERE COMMENT IS ADDRESSED IN THE EIR
	<p>The Draft EIR should identify the water source to be used for the proposed project, identify contractual agreements that lessen the availability of agricultural water to surrounding County agricultural properties (if any), and address and mitigate the drainage or runoff from the proposed project site onto adjacent County agricultural lands that would affect Total Dissolved Solids measurements in the groundwater.</p>	<p>Section 4.9 (Hydrology and Water Quality).</p>
	<p>The Draft EIR should identify and mitigate impacts from known or allowable uses on the proposed site that would create dust or other emissions to County agriculture within one-half mile: disclose and mitigate through setbacks the heights of proposed structures that could decrease access to sunlight on adjacent County agricultural properties; disclose and mitigate any proposal to remove a tree row currently protecting adjacent County agriculture; and disclose and mitigate any other use that may cause a substantial adverse change in the air quality or microclimate of a County agricultural property within one-half mile.</p>	<p>Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources) and Section 4.5 (Air Quality).</p>
	<p>Even though there are no specific thresholds regarding biological pest or diseases, according to the County guidelines any non-agricultural project within one-half mile of land currently in or suitable for agriculture is presumed to have some impact agricultural uses.</p>	<p>Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources) and Section 4.7 (Biological Resources).</p>
	<p>The County guidelines state that any proposed non-agricultural project within one-half mile of land currently in or suitable for agriculture is presumed to have some impact related land use compatibility.</p>	<p>Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources) and Section 4.1 (Land Use and Planning).</p>
	<p>The Ventura County Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee approved the Agricultural/Urban Buffer Policy which recommends setbacks between non-farming development such as houses and playgrounds and the property boundary lines adjacent to farmland (only where the off-site adjacent farmland to be protected is outside a city sphere of influence). Purpose of the buffer is</p>	<p>Section 4.1 (Land Use and Planning) and Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources).</p>

**TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NOP**

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	WHERE COMMENT IS ADDRESSED IN THE EIR
	to lessen the public exposure to agricultural chemicals, dust, noise, and odors and protect agricultural operations from vandalism, pilferage, trespassing and complaints against lawful farming practices.	
County of Ventura Public Works Agency Transportation Department	The Draft EIR should include project specific impacts and mitigation measures for the impacts of additional traffic on local roads and intersection, in particular, South Mountain Road.	Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).
	The Draft EIR should address and mitigate the cumulative impact of this project to the Regional Road Network. The project should be conditioned to pay a Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee to the County, which was specifically developed to provide a methodology for mitigation of cumulative traffic impacts.	Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation) and Section 7.0 (Cumulative Impacts).
	The Draft EIR should identify if the project trip generation demands additional transit service and include mitigation where necessary (bus turnouts, shelters, benches).	Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).
	The Draft EIR should incorporate the Transportation Vision adopted by the Board on January 24, 2006, in particular, the Bicycle Vision.	Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).
	Truck routes for the construction of this project should also be identified in the Draft EIR.	Section 4.4 (Transportation and Circulation).
Ventura County Air Pollution Control District	Recommends that an air quality section of the Draft EIR be prepared in accordance with the Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines (2003 Guidelines).	Section 4.5 (Air Quality).
	Recommend that the Draft EIR evaluate potential impacts to regional ozone levels (reactive organic compound and nitrogen oxide emissions from all project related motor vehicles and construction equipment).	Section 4.5 (Air Quality).
	Recommend that the latest version of URBEMIS model be used to generate emission estimates for this project.	Section 4.5 (Air Quality).

**TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NOP**

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	WHERE COMMENT IS ADDRESSED IN THE EIR
	<p>Recommend that potential particulate matter, including fugitive dust, impacts associated with project construction activities, especially grading operations, be assessed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The qualitatively assessment should use an appropriate air dispersion model.</p>	<p>Section 4.5 (Air Quality).</p>
	<p>A carbon monoxide screening analysis should be conducted for any impacted roadway intersection that are currently operating or that are expected to operate at LOS D, E, or F or at any project impacted roadway intersection that may be a CO hotspot. If a CO hotspot is identified, the District recommends that a complete CALINES or CALINE4 carbon monoxide analysis be conducted for that intersection.</p>	<p>Section 4.5 (Air Quality).</p>
	<p>Recommend that a formal health risk assessment be conducted for the project. Mitigation measures should be identified if the assessment indicates a potential significant risk.</p>	<p>Section 4.5 (Air Quality).</p>
	<p>The Draft EIR should identify feasible mitigation measures and/or design features that mitigate air quality impacts.</p>	<p>Section 4.5 (Air Quality).</p>
<p>Ventura County Watershed Protection District</p>	<p>The Draft EIR should address the increase in the peak runoff rate and total volume, if there is any, due to the increase in impervious surfaces. In addition, mitigation measures should be provided in the Draft EIR.</p>	<p>Section 4.9 (Hydrology and Water Quality).</p>
<p>Ventura County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)</p>	<p>The actions to be taken by LAFCO should be described in the Draft EIR as a sphere of influence amendment and “reorganization”, which will entail annexation of territory to the City of Santa Paula and detachment of the same territory from the Ventura County Resource Conservation District and from the Ventura County Fire Protection District.</p>	<p>Section 3.0 (Project Description) and Section 4.1 (Land Use and Planning).</p>
	<p>LAFCO encourages the City of Santa Paula to revise the project description to include a reorganization boundary to avoid the creation of islands of unincorporated territories.</p>	<p>Section 3.0 (Project Description) and Section 4.1 (Land Use and Planning).</p>

**TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NOP**

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	WHERE COMMENT IS ADDRESSED IN THE EIR
	LAFCO must consider the factors identified in Government Code Section 56668. Each of these factors should be fully discussed in the appropriate section of the Draft EIR.	Section 4.0 (Existing Conditions, Impacts, Mitigation Measures And Level of Significance After Mitigation).
	LAFCO must comply with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 definition of prime agriculture to determine agricultural impacts. The USDA rating and storie class of the site should be addressed in the Draft EIR or at the time of the reorganization application.	Section 3.0 (Project Description) and Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources).
	A discussion about consistency with Ventura LAFCO local policies (Ventura LAFCO Commissioner’s Handbook) and any resulting environmental impacts should be included in the Draft EIR.	Section 3.0 (Project Description), Section 4.1 (Land Use and Planning), Section 4.2 (Agricultural Resources) and Section 4.13 (Public Services).
	LAFCO will consider adoption of draft agricultural mitigation policies as early as December of 2006 to ensure that LAFCO expectation regarding lead agency compliance with CEQA are clear with respect to disclosure of potentially feasible mitigation measures for boundary change proposals that involve conversion of prime agriculture land to urban uses.	Comment Noted.

2.3.2 PUBLIC SCOPING AND CITIZEN CONCERNS

A public scoping meeting was held on August 9, 2006 to solicit input on the content and issues to be analyzed in this EIR. The meeting was held in the City Council Chambers at the Santa Paula City Hall, located at 970 Ventura Street. The scoping meeting was recorded on audiotape. The attendees present at the scoping meeting included City staff, the City’s consultants, and one member from the general public. A brief summary of the purpose of the meeting was given by City staff. The presentation included information on how the public might provide comments on the content and focus of the Draft EIR and the location of the NOP made available for public review. City staff then provided an overview of the purpose of the project, summarized the project components, and provided an overview of the purpose of the NOP as well as the timing for preparation and circulation of the Draft EIR and anticipated certification of the Final EIR by the Santa Paula City Council. A summary of the meeting is available from the City’s Planning Department.

Based on the information provided in the scoping meeting and the issues expressed in the responses to the NOP, this EIR was prepared.