DRAFT

INITIAL STUDY
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

MCGRATH OIL SPILL RESTORATION PLAN PROJECT

March 2005

State of California
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT: **MCGRATH OIL SPILL RESTORATION PLAN PROJECT**

LEAD AGENCY: California Department of Parks and Recreation

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS:
The Initial Study for this Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for review at:

- Channel Coast District Headquarters
  California Department of Parks & Recreation
  911 San Pedro Street
  Ventura, California 93001

- McGrath State Beach
  Ventura Sector Headquarters
  910 San Pedro Street
  Ventura, California 93001

- Foster Library
  651 East Main Street
  Ventura, California 93001

- City of Oxnard
  Main Library
  251 South A Street
  Oxnard, California 93030

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project consists of the adoption of the McGrath State Beach Area Berry Petroleum Oil Spill Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment (Restoration Plan/EA) by the state trustee agencies (California Department of Parks & Recreation and California Department of Fish & Game). The Restoration Plan/EA describes actions to be taken to compensate for damage to natural resources caused by an oil spill in the McGrath Lake area in late 1993. These actions include the acquisition of land or conservation easements, habitat enhancement, and public education projects.

A copy of the Initial Study and the Restoration Plan/EA is attached. Questions or comments regarding the environmental documentation contained in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration or in the Restoration Plan/EA may be addressed to:

Barbara Fosbrink – Valerie Watt
California Department of Parks & Recreation
911 San Pedro Street
Ventura, California 93001

Fax (805) 585-1857

Submissions must be in writing and received no later than April 29, 2005. The originals of any faxed or e-mailed document must be received by regular mail within ten working days following the deadline for comments, along with proof of successful fax transmission. Faxed submissions must include full name and address of sender.

Pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act, the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has independently reviewed and analyzed the Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the proposed project and finds that these documents reflect the independent judgment of DPR. DPR, as lead agency, also confirms that the project mitigation measures detailed in these documents are feasible and will be implemented as stated in the Negative Declaration.

Original signed by Richard A. Rojas *Signed on 3-29-05*

District Superintendent Date

Original signed by Barbara Fosbrink *Signed on 3-29-05*

Environmental Coordinator Date

TABLE of CONTENTS

Chapter/Section **Page**

1 INTRODUCTION…….. 1

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION…….. 4

3 Environmental Checklist……. 6

I. Aesthetics……. 9
II. Agricultural Resources……. 9
III. Air Quality……... 10
IV. Biological Resources……. 11
V. Cultural Resources……. 13
VI. Geology and Soils……. 14
VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials……. 15
VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality…….. 16
IX. Land Use and Planning……. 18
X. Mineral Resources……. 18
XI. Noise……. 19
XII. Population and Housing……. 19
XIII. Public Services……. 20
XIV. Recreation……. 21
XV. Transportation/Traffic……... 21
XVI. Utilities and Service Systems……. 22

4 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE..... 24

5 SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES…….. 25

6 REFERENCES……..29

7 REPORT PREPARATION..... 30

Appendices

A **ACRONYMS**…….. 31

B **CNDDB** Record Search…… 33

(FOR MAPS, TABLES, AND CHARTS SEE ATTACHED "**MCGRATH STATE BEACH BERRY PETROLEUM OIL SPILL 1993 FINAL RESTORATION PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**")

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed McGrath Oil Spill Restoration Plan Project at McGrath State Beach, Ventura County, California. This document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code §21000 *et seq*., and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR) §15000 *et seq*.

An Initial Study (IS) is conducted by a lead agency to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment [CEQA Guidelines §15063(a)]. If there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15064(a). However, if the lead agency determines that revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant mitigate the potentially significant effects to a less-than-significant level, a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared instead of an EIR [CEQA Guidelines §15070(b)]. The lead agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons a proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, why an EIR need not be prepared. This IS/MND conforms to the content requirements under CEQA Guidelines §15071.

1.2 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary approval authority over the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15051(b)(1), "the lead agency will normally be an agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose." The lead agency for the proposed project is DPR. The contact person for the lead agency is:

Valerie Watt, Park and Recreation Specialist
(805) 585-1852

All inquiries regarding environmental compliance for this project, including comments on this environmental document, should be addressed to:

Barbara Fosbrink – Valerie Watt
California Department of Parks and Recreation
Channel Coast District
911 San Pedro Street
Ventura, CA 93001 Fax (805) 585-1857

Submissions must be in writing and received no later than April 29, 2005. The originals of any faxed or e-mailed document must be received by regular mail within ten working days following the deadline for comments, along with proof of successful fax transmission. Faxed submissions must include full name and address of sender.

1.3 PURPOSE AND DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

The purpose of this document is to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed McGrath Oil Spill Restoration Plan Project at McGrath State Beach in Ventura County, California. Mitigation measures have also been incorporated into the project to eliminate any potentially significant impacts or reduce them to a less-than-significant level.

This document is organized as follows:

- Chapter 1 - Introduction.
  This chapter provides an introduction to the project and describes the purpose and organization of this document.

- Chapter 2 - Project Description.
  This chapter describes the reasons for the project, scope of the project, and project objectives.

- Chapter 3 - Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.
  This chapter identifies the significance of potential environmental impacts, explains the environmental setting for each environmental issue, and evaluates the potential impacts identified in the CEQA Environmental (Initial Study) Checklist. Mitigation measures are incorporated, where appropriate, to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- Chapter 4 - Mandatory Findings of Significance
  This chapter identifies and summarizes the overall significance of any potential impacts to natural and cultural resources, cumulative impacts, and impact to humans, as identified in the Initial Study.

- Chapter 5 - Summary of Mitigation Measures.
  This chapter summarizes the mitigation measures incorporated into the project as a result of the Initial Study.

- Chapter 6 - References.
  This chapter identifies the references and sources used in the preparation of this IS/MND. It also provides a list of those involved in the preparation of this document.

- Chapter 7 - Report Preparation

This chapter provides a list of those involved in the preparation of this document.

1.4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Chapter 3 of this document contains the Environmental (Initial Study) Checklist that identifies the potential environmental impacts (by environmental issue) and a brief discussion of each impact resulting from implementation of the proposed project. Based on the Initial Study (IS), the attached Restoration Plan/EA, and supporting environmental analysis provided in this document, the proposed McGrath Oil Spill Restoration Plan Project would result in less-than-significant impacts for the following issues: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems.

In accordance with §15064(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, a MND shall be prepared if the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment after the inclusion of mitigation measures in the project. Based on the available project information and the environmental analysis presented in this document, there is no substantial evidence that, after the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment. It is proposed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines.

CHAPTER 2
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed McGrath Oil Spill Restoration Plan Project at McGrath State Beach, located in the City of Oxnard, Ventura County, California.

This project consists of the adoption of the attached McGrath State Beach Area Berry Petroleum Oil Spill Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment (Restoration Plan/EA) by the state trustee agencies (California Department of Parks & Recreation and California Department of Fish & Game). The Restoration Plan/EA describes actions to be taken to compensate for damage to natural resources caused by an oil spill in the McGrath Lake area in late 1993. These actions, which include the acquisition of land or conservation easements, habitat enhancement, and public education projects, are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Preferred Alternatives

Alternative	Habitat Type	Cost
LAND ACQUISITION Fee Title or Conservation Easements	Riparian/Wetland Sand Dunes Lake/Wetland	$500,000
HABITAT ENHANCEMENT		
5.3.1 Early Restoration Projects	Riparian/Wetland	
5.3.1.A Riparian Corridor Interim Stabilization	Riparian/Wetland/Dune	$ 60, 869
5.3.1.B Arundo Control		$151,131
5.3.2 Sand Dunes		$450,000
5.3.2.A Power Plant to Lake Outfall	Sand Dune	
5.3.2.B Lake Outfall to Natural Preserve	Sand Dune	
5.3.2.C Mixed Dune/Scrub	Dune/Riparian/Wetland	
5.3.3 Mandalay Beach Habitat Enhancement	Dune/Riparian/Wetland	(If trust funds remain)

5.4 PUBLIC INFORMATION/EDUCATION		
5.4.1 Interpretive Signs	Riparian/Dune/Lake/Wetland	$ 20,000
5.4.2 Visitor Center Relocation	Riparian/Dune/Lake/Wetland	$ 50,000
5.4.3 Outreach-Recovery Coordinator	Sand Dune	$ 83,000
	Total	$1,315,000

The project description, location, background, need, objectives, and implementation are addressed in the attached Restoration Plan/EA. The Restoration Plan/EA is consistent with the General Plans and policies for McGrath State Beach, Ventura County and the City of Oxnard, and with the Local Coastal Plan and policies for the Project area. Project implementation may require the following discretionary approvals and/or consultations: Coastal Development permit, State & Federal Endangered Species consultation, and the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) 404 permit. Other resource protection/restoration actions taking place within McGrath State Beach include exotics removal and “volunteer” trail decommissioning in the Santa Clara River Estuary Natural Preserve and Western snowy plover and California least tern protection activities along McGrath beach and foredunes.

CHAPTER 3
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title:	McGrath Oil Spill Restoration Plan
2. Lead Agency Name & Address:	California Department of Parks and Recreation
3. Contact Person & Phone Number:	Valerie Watt (805) 585-1852
4. Project Location:	McGrath State Beach, Ventura County California
5. Project Sponsor Name & Address:	California Department of Parks and Recreation Channel Coast District 911 San Pedro St. Ventura, CA 93001
6. General Plan Designation:	Open Space
7. Zoning:	Open Space

8. Description of Project: This project consists of the adoption of the attached McGrath State Beach Area Berry Petroleum Oil Spill Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment (Restoration Plan/EA) by the state trustee agencies (California Department of Parks & Recreation and California Department of Fish & Game). The Restoration Plan/EA describes actions to be taken to compensate for damage to natural resources caused by an oil spill in the McGrath Lake area in late 1993. These actions include the acquisition of land or conservation easements, habitat enhancement, and public education projects. (See Chapter 2 Section 2.1 of this document.)

9. Surrounding Land Uses & Setting:	Refer to Chapter 3 of this document (Section IX, Land Use Planning)
10. Approval Required from Other Public Agencies	Refer to Chapter 2, Section 2.9

1. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agricultural Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use/Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population/Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Utilities/Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	☒ None

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

I find that, although the original scope of the proposed project **COULD** have had a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect because revisions/mitigations to the project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. X

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** or its functional equivalent will be prepared. ☐

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment. However, at least one impact has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described in the report's attachments. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the impacts not sufficiently addressed in previous documents. ☐

I find that, although the proposed project could have had a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, pursuant to applicable standards, and have been avoided or mitigated, pursuant to an earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, all impacts have been avoided or mitigated to a less-than-significant level and no further action is required. ☐

Original signature on file

_____ _____

Barbara Fosbrink
Environmental Coordinator

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact", that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact does not apply to the project being evaluated (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on general or project-specific factors (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must consider the whole of the project-related effects, both direct and indirect, including off-site, cumulative, construction, and operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate when there is sufficient evidence that a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change may occur in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4. A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" (Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated) applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures, prior to declaration of project approval, has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR (including a General Plan) or Negative Declaration [CCR, Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, § 15063(c)(3)(D)]. References to an earlier analysis should:

   a) Identify the earlier analysis and state where it is available for review.

   b) Indicate which effects from the environmental checklist were adequately analyzed in the earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether these effects were adequately addressed by mitigation measures included in that analysis.

   c) Describe the mitigation measures in this document that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and indicate to what extent they address site-specific conditions for this project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist or appendix (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, biological assessments). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include an indication of the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. A source list should be appended to this document. Sources used or individuals contacted should be listed in the source list and cited in the discussion.

8. Explanation(s) of each issue should identify:
   a) the criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate the significance of the impact addressed by each question **and**
   b) the mitigation measures, if any, prescribed to reduce the impact below the level of significance.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

I. AESTHETICS.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

See Restoration Plan/EA Sections 2.0 and 5.0.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION

With the exception of Interpretive Panels, the proposed restoration actions will not change the visual landscape of the project area. The interpretive panels proposed for the McGrath Lake area will be visible only to pedestrians using the lake area, and will be of an appropriate scale that will not detract from the natural view shed.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

See Restoration Plan/EA Section 2.0.

WOULD THE PROJECT*:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	X

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	X

* In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model for use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland.

DISCUSSION

McGrath State Beach does not contain any Class I agricultural soil resources. The proposed restoration actions (habitat restoration, land acquisition/conservation easements and public education) would have no effect on adjacent agricultural resources.

III. AIR QUALITY.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project is located in the South Coast Air Quality Basin within Ventura County.

WOULD THE PROJECT*:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or regulation?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., children, the elderly, individuals with compromised respiratory or immune systems)?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	X

* Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make these determinations.

DISCUSSION

The proposed restoration actions do not include the use of motorized equipment or other significant source of pollution. The potential for significant dust generation from any surficial ground disturbance is considered insignificant because most of the work will be done by hand and only small areas of soil would be disturbed at any given time.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

See Restoration Plan/EA Sections 2.0, 5.0 and 6.0.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a sensitive, candidate, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	X	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	X	☐	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	X	☐	☐
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	X	☐	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Land Acquisition--No potential for significant adverse effects is anticipated in association with land acquisition.

Habitat Enhancement--Control of invasive, non-native plant species in the dune, wetland and/or riparian habitats may be achieved using hand or mechanical removal, plastic tarps, herbicides or other techniques. Any of these methods may cause some degree of temporary,

incidental disturbance to native plants and wildlife found in close association with the invasive exotics in the treatment area. The degree of disturbance will vary depending upon site conditions, methods used, season/timing, etc. To a lesser extent, planting, seeding, and/or monitoring activities may also result in short-term, incidental disturbance to native species in the treatment area.

Low-impact techniques and mitigation measures will be identified in each zone-specific habitat enhancement/restoration plan that will be used to minimize the potential for adverse impacts. Such techniques or mitigation measures shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

Arundo *(Arundo donax)* Control

- Cut-and-paint herbicide application, not foliar spray, will be used in dense Arundo stands where native plants are commingled
- If/when herbicides are to be used, only those herbicides and surfactants approved for aquatic ecosystems (such as Rodeo) will be utilized
- Arundo will be cut using hand tools only
- All cut stems, roots, and Arundo debris will be collected and disposed of off-site at an approved location where the plant material will not become established in native ecosystems
- All work will be performed under the direction and guidance of a State Park resource specialist
- Before any work begins, all workers to perform Arundo control activities will receive instruction from the resource specialist on the identification of sensitive plant and animal species that occur in the area, and ways to avoid disturbance to those species

Dune Enhancement/Restoration

- Where native and exotic plant species are intermixed, exotics will be removed by hand to minimize disturbance to native species and disposed of off-site at an approved location to prevent resprouting and seed spread.
- Where “pure” stands of exotic species such as hottentot fig (*Carpobrotus edulis)* are found, the exotics may be removed by hand or treated in place.
- Where appropriate, treated plant material will be left in place to prevent erosion and preserve limited wildlife habitat.
- All work will be performed under the direction and guidance of a State Park resource specialist.
- Before any work begins, all workers to perform restoration/enhancement activities will receive instruction from a resource specialist on the identification of sensitive plant and animal species that occur in the area, and ways to avoid disturbance to those species.

Specific protection measures for sensitive bird species (California least tern, western snowy plover) will be identified in each zone-specific habitat restoration plan following consultation with the USFWS. These measures may include:

- Avoidance of restoration activities during the nesting season, and/or
- Monitoring of sensitive bird species by a qualified biologist, and/or

- Identification of restoration/enhancement “exclusion zones” around core nesting areas

By incorporating these low-impact techniques and mitigation measures, any incidental disturbance to native species is expected to be minor and/or temporary.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

A partial inventory of cultural resources has been carried out at McGrath State Beach and no cultural resources have been identified. There is a possibility that as yet unrecorded resources exist in the park unit. Such resources may be exposed with natural or man-made changes in the landform. Natural changes would include the movement of dunes or erosion.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in §15064.5?	☐	X	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	X	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	X	☐	☐

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Land acquisition/conservation easements would not result in ground disturbance and therefore have no potential to impact cultural resources. Habitat enhancement/restoration activities are proposed that involve only superficial ground disturbance (hand removal of relatively shallow-rooted exotic vegetation such as ice plant, Arundo, etc.). Of the Educational activities proposed, only the installation of Interpretive Panels would result in ground disturbance.

Before any ground disturbance takes place, a zone-specific habitat restoration plan and interpretive panel installation plan will be submitted to a DPR Archeologist for review, recommendations and approval. Based on information in the zone-specific habitat restoration and interpretive panel installation plans (including a map of specific work locations, depth of disturbance, etc.) the DPR Archeologist will determine the need for an on-site survey prior to commencing work. The on-site survey of the proposed work locations would determine whether or not cultural resources are likely to be present and serve as the basis for recommendations that may include limited scope augering or test excavations, monitoring of excavations by a qualified archaeologist, and avoidance of resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

See Restoration Plan Section 2.0.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	☐	X	☐	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	X	☐	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	X
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable, as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems, where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION MEASURES

a) The only structures that could be affected by seismic activity are proposed Interpretive Panels. Given the low level of visitor use in the area of the proposed panels, the potential threat of human injury from falling panels is considered less than significant. The potential for property damage is also considered less than significant due to the low cost of the individual panels.

b) Low-impact techniques and mitigation measures will be identified in each zone-specific habitat enhancement/restoration plan to minimize the potential for soil erosion. Such techniques or mitigation measures will include, but not be limited to, the following: Where appropriate, treated plant material will be left in place to prevent erosion and preserve limited wildlife habitat.

c) Habitat Restoration activities are proposed in unstable, actively-building sand dune formations. No adverse impacts (landslide, lateral spreading, etc.) are associated with the dune-building dynamics of this coastal fore dune complex.

d) No expansive soils are located onsite.

e) Sanitary facilities are not a part of this project.

f) No paleontological resources are known to exist onsite. The unique coastal sand dune formations will be protected during habitat restoration activities, per item (b) above.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project is not located within one mile of any school, airport or private airstrip. Existing and prior land uses in the Project vicinity include agricultural production, petroleum extraction and electrical power generation, which all include the use of potentially hazardous materials. The Project site is not on any list of Hazardous materials sites, per Government Code Section 65962.5. See Restoration Plan/EA Section 4.0 for a discussion of water quality issues at McGrath Lake.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	X	☐	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste into the environment?	☐	X	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	☐	☐	☐	X

e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Some habitat enhancement activities may include the use of herbicides and surfactants for exotic plant control. The danger of exposure to the public from an accidental spill is considered less than significant due to the remoteness of the project area, low level of visitor activity at the site and requirement for a Health & Safety plan for pesticide application. The use of a licensed pesticide applicator will reduce the risk of accidental exposure of workers to an insignificant level. Only pesticides/surfactants approved for use in aquatic environments will be allowed.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

See Restoration Plan/EA Sections 2.0 and 4.0. The areas within McGrath State Beach where specific Restoration Actions are proposed are outside the 100-year flood plain.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) 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 that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which	☐	☐	☐	X

	would result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?				
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in on- or off-site flooding?	☐	☐	☐	X
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	X
f)	Substantially degrade water quality?	☐	X	☐	☐
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	X
h)	Place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area?	☐	☐	☐	X
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	X
j)	Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The proposed restoration actions will not change runoff or drainage patterns or result in the discharge of wastewater. No construction is proposed within a 100-year floodplain. The only structures proposed for construction/installation, which could be subject to tsunamis inundation, are Interpretive Panels. The use of herbicides/surfactants for exotics control around McGrath Lake creates the potential for water quality degradation. This potential will be reduced to an insignificant level by requiring the use of pesticides/surfactants approved for use in aquatic environments, the use of a licensed pesticide applicator, and the preparation of a Health and Safety Plan for the prevention and control of accidental exposure/spills.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

See Restoration Plan/EA Sections 2.0 and 5.0.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Conflict with the applicable land use plan, policy,	☐	☐	☐	X

or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The project would not divide any human community, is consistent with local, state and federal land use plans and policies, and supports natural resources conservation plans and policies.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Petroleum extraction facilities are located adjacent to the project area.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is or would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Lands under consideration for acquisition/conservation easements are currently leased for oil and gas extraction. No restoration actions are contemplated that would potentially interrupt or interfere with those lease activities.

XI. NOISE.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

See Restoration Plan/EA Sections 2.0 and 5.0. There are no significant sources of noise located on the project site and the site is not within two miles of any airport or private airstrip.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT

a) Generate or expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project (above levels without the project)?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, in excess of noise levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) Be in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The Restoration Plan proposes Land Acquisition, Habitat Enhancement and Public Education activities. The use of motorized equipment is not contemplated at this time. These activities would therefore not generate significant levels of noise or expose users to high noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Restoration Plan proposes activities in an open space area that is void of housing units. Nearby land uses consist of oil and gas extraction facilities, power generation, and row crop agriculture.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	X	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION

The proposed activities would not create or remove residential, commercial or industrial land uses, therefore there is no effect on population growth or housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed Project is located within a Public Park (McGrath State Beach). Public Services (Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, Schools, etc.) are provided by the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the County of Ventura and the City of Oxnard.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Result in significant environmental impacts from construction associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	☐	☐	☐	x
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	X
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	X
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	X
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	X
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION

The proposed Restoration Actions would support and enhance natural resource conservation, provided on behalf of the public, at McGrath State Beach but would not create a new need for public services.

XIV. RECREATION.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed Project is located within McGrath State Beach, which provides camping, picnicking, wildlife viewing, hiking and beach/ocean oriented recreation to the public.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	X	☐

DISCUSSION AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The project would not generate or remove any recreational resources. Public access through the habitat enhancement areas may be managed or redirected during Plan implementation to protect restoration efforts. An alternate public access route to the beach/ocean will be maintained throughout the implementation process.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Access to the project site is from Harbor Boulevard, which is within the jurisdiction of the County of Ventura.

WOULD THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Cause a substantial increase in traffic, in relation to existing traffic and the capacity of the street system (i.e., a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Exceed, individually or cumulatively, the level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in	☐	☐	☐	X

location, that results in substantial safety risks?				
d) Contain a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) that would substantially increase hazards?	☐	☐	☐	X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION

The proposed restoration activities (land acquisition, habitat restoration, public education) would not generate a significant volume of traffic nor impact transportation patterns or systems.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Electrical power and telephone service systems are located along Harbor Boulevard. No water or sanitation facilities are located at the southern end of McGrath State Beach.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment restrictions or standards of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	☐	☐	☐	X
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	X
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	☐	☐	☐	X
Would the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	X	☐
e) Result in a determination, by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project, that it	☐	☐	☐	X

	has adequate capacity to service the project's anticipated demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	X	☐
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	X

DISCUSSION

Proposed habitat enhancement actions may include the construction of a temporary irrigation system to aid in the establishment of native plants. Water for any such irrigation would be provided from off-site. The volume of irrigation water would be less than significant relative to available supplies.

Exotics control for habitat enhancement may require the disposal of non-native plant material at an approved disposal location. Where appropriate, treated plant material, such as iceplant, will be left in place to prevent erosion and preserve limited wildlife habitat. The volume of non-native plant material requiring off-site disposal is considered to be less than significant.

CHAPTER 4
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WOULD THE PROJECT:				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal?	☐	X	☐	☐
b) Have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	X	☐
c) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probably future projects?)	☐	☐	☐	X
d) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly?	☐	X	☐	☐

DISCUSSION

a) The Project proposes land acquisition, habitat enhancement and public education activities that will preserve and protect plant and wildlife communities. Mitigation measures are included in the Project to assure that habitat enhancement/restoration activities will be carried out in a manner that will not have a significant adverse impact on these natural resources.

b) No historical or prehistorical resources are known to exist in the Project area. Mitigation measures are included in the project that will insure the identification and protection of any cultural resources that may exist prior to the commencement of any ground disturbance.

c) There are no known projects—past, present or future—that would contribute to a significant cumulative adverse impact on the environment when considered in conjunction with this project.

d) Exotics control for Habitat Enhancement/Restoration may include the use of pesticides and surfactants. Exposure to such chemicals is potentially harmful to human beings. Mitigation measures are incorporated into the project that would reduce the risk of exposure, for workers and the public, to a less than significant level.

CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures would be implemented by DPR as part of the McGrath Oil Spill Restoration Plan Project.

AESTHETICS

MITIGATION MEASURES AESTHETICS-1

- No impact—None required

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

MITIGATION MEASURES AG-1

- No impact—None required

AIR QUALITY

MITIGATION MEASURES AIR-1

- No impact—None required

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

MITIGATION MEASURES BIO-1

Land Acquisition— No impact - None required.

Habitat Enhancement—Specific low-impact techniques and mitigation measures will be identified in each zone-specific habitat enhancement/restoration plan that will be used to minimize the potential for adverse impacts. Such techniques or mitigation measures will include the following:

Arundo *(Arundo donax)* Control

- Cut-and-paint herbicide application, not foliar spray, will be used in dense Arundo stands where native plants are commingled
- If/when herbicides are to be used, only those herbicides and surfactants approved for aquatic ecosystems (such as Rodeo) will be utilized
- Arundo will be cut using hand tools only
- All cut stems, roots, and Arundo debris will be collected and disposed of off-site at an approved location where the plant material will not become established in native ecosystems
- All work will be performed under the direction and guidance of a State Park resource specialist
- Before any work begins, all workers to perform Arundo control activities will receive instruction from the resource specialist on the identification of sensitive plant and animal species that occur in the area, and ways to avoid disturbance to those species

Dune Enhancement/Restoration

- Where native and exotic plant species are intermixed, exotics will be removed by hand to

minimize disturbance to native species and disposed of off-site at an approved location to prevent resprouting and seed spread.

- Where "pure" stands of exotic species such as hottentot fig (*Carpobrotus edulis)* are found, the exotics may be removed by hand or treated in place.
- Where appropriate, treated plant material will be left in place to prevent erosion and preserve limited wildlife habitat.
- All work will be performed under the direction and guidance of a State Park resource specialist.
- Before any work begins, all workers to perform restoration/enhancement activities will receive instruction from a resource specialist on the identification of sensitive plant and animal species that occur in the area, and ways to avoid disturbance to those species.

Specific protection measures for sensitive bird species (California least tern, western snowy plover) will be identified in each zone-specific habitat restoration plan following consultation with the USFWS. These measures may include:

- Avoidance of restoration activities during the nesting season, and/or
- Monitoring of sensitive bird species by a qualified biologist, and/or
- Identification of restoration/enhancement "exclusion zones" around core nesting areas

CULTURAL RESOURCES

MITIGATION MEASURES CULT-1

- A zone-specific habitat restoration plan and interpretive panel installation plan will be submitted to a DPR Archeologist for review, recommendations and approval. Based on information in the zone-specific habitat restoration and interpretive panel installation plans (including a map of specific work locations, depth of disturbance, etc.) the DPR Archeologist will determine the need for an on-site survey prior to commencing work. An on-site survey of the proposed work locations would determine whether or not cultural resources are likely to be present and serve as the basis for recommendations that may include limited scope augering or test excavations, monitoring of excavations by a qualified archaeologist, and avoidance of resources.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

MITIGATION MEASURES GEO-1

- Low-impact techniques and mitigation measures will be identified in each zone-specific habitat enhancement/restoration plan to minimize the potential for soil erosion. Such techniques or mitigation measures will include, but not be limited to, the following: Where appropriate, treated plant material will be left in place to prevent erosion and preserve limited wildlife habitat.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

MITIGATION MEASURES HAZMAT-1

- Habitat enhancement may include the use of herbicides and surfactants to exotic plant species. The risk to workers, park visitors and the environment will be minimized by requiring the use of a licensed pesticide applicator, preparation of a Health and Safety Plan

for the prevention and control of accidental spills, and use of pesticides/surfactants approved for aquatic environments.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

MITIGATION MEASURES HYDRO-1

- The use of herbicides/surfactants for exotics control around McGrath Lake creates the potential for water quality degradation. This potential will be reduced to an insignificant level by requiring: pesticides/surfactants approved for use in an aquatic environment, the use of a licensed pesticide applicator, and the preparation of a Health and Safety Plan for the prevention and control of accidental exposure/spills.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

MITIGATION MEASURES LAND-1

- No impact—None required

MINERAL RESOURCES

MITIGATION MEASURES MINERAL-1

- No impact—None required

NOISE

MITIGATION MEASURES NOISE-1

- No impact—None required

POPULATION AND HOUSING

MITIGATION MEASURES POP-1

- No impact—None required

PUBLIC SERVICES

MITIGATION MEASURES SERVICE-1

- No impact—None required

RECREATION

MITIGATION MEASURES REC-1

- The project would not generate or remove any recreational resources. Public access through the habitat enhancement areas may be managed or redirected during Plan implementation to protect restoration efforts. An alternate public access route to the beach/ocean will be maintained throughout the implementation process.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

MITIGATION MEASURES TRANS-1

- No impact—None required

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

MITIGATION MEASURES AIR-1

- No impact—None required

CHAPTER 6
REFERENCES

California Department of Parks and Recreation. 1979. *General Plan for McGrath State Beach*. The Resources Agency Sacramento, California.

California Department of Parks and Recreation. 2003*. McGrath State Beach Natural Resources Management Plan.* Environmental Science Associates.

Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. 1994. *Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region* (Basin Plan). State Water Resources Control Board. Sacramento, California.

County of Ventura Planning Department. 2004. *Ventura County General Plan*. Ventura, California.

City of Oxnard Planning Department. 2004. *City of Oxnard 2020 General Plan.* Oxnard, California.

McGrath State Beach Area Berry Petroleum Oil Spill Trustee Council. 2005. *McGrath State Beach Area Berry Petroleum Oil Spill 1993 Final Restoration Plan.* California Department of Parks and Recreation, California Department of Fish and Game, United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Ventura, California

Chapter 7
Report Preparation

INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Prepared by:
California Department of Parks and Recreation
Channel Coast District

Valerie Watt, Park & Recreation Specialist

Other Persons Consulted:
California Department of Parks and Recreation
Southern Service Center

Marla Mealey, Archeologist
Tina Robinson, Environmental Coordinator