

**Environmental Assessment  
Determinations and Compliance Findings  
for HUD-assisted Projects  
24 CFR Part 58**

**Project Information**

**Project Name:** City-of-Moorpark-Public-Library

**HEROS Number:** 900000010371710

**Responsible Entity (RE):** City of Moorpark, 799 Moorpark Avenue Moorpark CA,

**RE Preparer:** Psomas

**State / Local Identifier:**

**Certifying Officer:** Douglas Spondello

**Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):**

**Point of Contact:**

**Consultant (if applicable):** Psomas

**Point of Contact:** Sean Noonan

**Project Location:** 83 W High St, Moorpark, CA 93021

**Additional Location Information:**

N/A

**Direct Comments to:**

**Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:**

The Project includes the replacement of a city library with an outdoor plaza on the north side of High Street in the City of Moorpark (City). The existing city library would ultimately be demolished. No acquisition would be required as part of the Project, as the Project site is already owned by the City. The Project would require ground disturbance as well as demolition of an existing asphalt parking lot to accommodate the new library building. This Project is being undertaken by the City as a component of the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project. The City approved that project in 2023.

**Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:**

The purpose of the Project is to redevelop the Project Site to create an updated City Library to serve current and future Moorpark residents. This Project is needed to replace the outdated library and provide a library that is accessible to all Moorpark residents.

**Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]:**

The Project site contains the existing City of Moorpark Library and an asphalt surface parking lot. The Project Site is surrounded by development including commercial, office, institutional, and residential uses. The Project site is within the larger project site for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan.

**Maps, photographs, and other documentation of project location and description:**

**Determination:**

✓	Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.13] The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of human environment
	Finding of Significant Impact

**Approval Documents:**

**7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer**  
on:

**7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer**  
on:

**Funding Information**

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name	Funding Amount
B-23-CP-CA-0089	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Project Funding (CPF) Grants	\$750,000.00

**Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount:** \$750,000.00

**Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]:** \$25,000,000.00

**Compliance with 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5 and §58.6 Laws and Authorities**

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
<b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 &amp; § 58.6</b>		
<b>Airport Hazards</b> Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	According to a review of the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics California Public Use Airports and Federal Airfields Map, the nearest civilian airport is Santa Paula Airport, and the nearest military airfield is the Point Mugu Airfield. The Santa Paula Airport is located approximately 58,300 ft (11) miles northwest of the Project site. Additionally, the nearest military airport is located approximately 93,300 ft southwest of the Project. No portions of the Project are located within a Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) for either airport. The Project would not result in any direct impacts to the airport. Given that the Project would not involve any highly-reflective materials or water quality basins the Project would not result in any substantial hazard to aircraft. Due to the distance between the Project site and the nearest airfields, the Project would not increase

		<p>the number of people or vehicles within the airport zone that would be exposed to airport hazards. Likewise, airport noise would not be a substantial hazard to construction employees. See Map below.</p>
<p><b>Coastal Barrier Resources Act</b> Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.</p>
<p><b>Flood Insurance</b> Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.</p>
<p><b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 &amp; § 58.5</b></p>		
<p><b>Air Quality</b> Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) &amp; (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>US EPA De Minimis thresholds were used to evaluate the Project's criteria impact pollutant impacts (<a href="https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables">https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables</a>). Ozone - EPA De Minimis Threshold for Serious Nonattainment: 50 Tons/Year Maximum Ozone precursor emissions for the proposed Project would be as follows: Construction: NOx = 1.07 tons/year, VOC = 0.13 tons/year, Total = 1.20 tons/year of ozone precursors Operational: NOx = 1.24 tons/year, VOC = 1.92 tons/year, Total = 3.16 tons/year of ozone precursors PM10 - EPA De Minimis Threshold for Moderate Nonattainment: 100 Tons/Year Maximum PM10 emissions for the proposed Project would be as follows: Construction: PM10 = 0.08 tons/year Operational: PM10 = 1.68 tons/year Ventura County is in a nonattainment area for both state and federal ozone</p>

		<p>standards; additionally, the County is in a nonattainment area for state PM10 standards. Environmental impacts associated with the proposed project were evaluated as part of the Moorpark Civic Center Mater Plan Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The construction emissions provided above are specific to the construction of the proposed Library, while the operational emissions above are conservatively representative of the proposed Library in addition to all other elements of the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan at full buildout. Anticipated emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Library would be well beneath De Minimis thresholds, even with this conservative approach, as demonstrated above. This project does not exceed de minimis emissions levels or the screening level established by the state or air quality management district for the pollutant(s) identified above. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.</p>
<p><b>Coastal Zone Management Act</b> Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) &amp; (d)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The Project site is located approximately 16.5 miles from the Pacific Ocean and 11.5 miles from the nearest Coastal Zone Boundary as defined by the California Coastal Commission (CCC). Therefore, the Project is not located within the coastal zone and would not affect coastal resources. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.</p>
<p><b>Contamination and Toxic Substances</b> 24 CFR 50.3(i) &amp; 58.5(i)(2)]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The Project would result in the on-site handling of materials that are common in similar developments, such as commercial cleansers, solvents and other janitorial or industrial use materials; paints; and landscape fertilizers/pesticides. Site contamination was evaluated as follows: review of records of historic releases of hazardous materials. On-site or nearby toxic,</p>

		<p>hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.</p>
<p><b>Endangered Species Act</b> Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Based on a review of the United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) Critical Habitat Mapper, there is no critical habitat within the Project site for any federally-listed species (USFWS 2023a). The nearest critical habitat to the Project site is located approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the Project site (USFWS 2023); see map below. Furthermore, the Project's roadway segments are urbanized and all Project activities would be limited to the existing right-of-way areas. Therefore, no direct impacts to vegetation and/or biological resources would result from the Project. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.</p>
<p><b>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</b> Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>During construction, explosive and flammable materials would be utilized within the Project site such as gasoline. These activities are normal on construction sites and any usage of explosive or flammable materials would be conducted in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.</p>
<p><b>Farmlands Protection</b> Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The entire Project site is zoned as Mixed Use Medium by the City of Moorpark (City of Moorpark 2023). Additionally, the Project would not acquire or impact any agricultural land. Based on a review of the California Important Farmland Finder maintained by the California</p>

		<p>Department of Conservation, there is no farmland of local or statewide importance within or in the vicinity of to the Project site (DOC 2023a). This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.</p>
<p><b>Floodplain Management</b> Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The following exception applies, so the project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988: 55.12(c)(8), HUD's approval of financial assistance for a project on any site in a floodplain for which FEMA has issued: (i) A final Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) or final Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) that removed the property from a FEMA-designated floodplain location; or (ii) A conditional LOMA or conditional LOMR if the HUD approval is subject to the requirements and conditions of the conditional LOMA or conditional LOMR.</p>
<p><b>Historic Preservation</b> National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The Cultural Resources section of the Draft EIR that was prepared for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project covered the proposed library improvements. This section of the Draft EIR addresses the potential impacts to cultural resources that could result from implementation of the Project. Information in this section is derived from a Historical Resource Assessment Report (Historical Resource Assessment) prepared for the Project Site by South Environmental; an archaeological records search conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) on May 11, 2022; and the Sacred Lands File search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) received on May 16, 2022. Also, Native American consultation was conducted for the Project pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18. One</p>

		<p>historical resource was identified near the Project Site: the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)-listed Tanner Corner Building located at 601 Moorpark Avenue. The Project would construct a library building adjacent to the north and west elevations of the Tanner Corner Building. As determined by the City in the EIR prepared for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan, the Project has avoided the potential for cultural resource impacts through the implementation of the following conditions of approval and mitigation measures. * Condition of Approval CUL-1 * Condition of Approval CUL-2 * Condition of Approval CUL-3 * CEQA Mitigation Measure MM CUL-1 * CEQA Mitigation Measure MM NOI-2 See the attached Cultural Resource section from the Environmental Impact Report and a Historic Report that were prepared for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project.</p>
<p><b>Noise Abatement and Control</b> Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The Project would result in temporary construction noise; however, such activities would be conducted between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm in accordance with the City's noise ordinance. During operation of the Project, no additional noise is expected to result from the Project roadways since the Project does not involve any improvements that would increase vehicle speeds or traffic volumes. Therefore, no noise abatement measures are required as part of the Project. Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulation. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.</p>
<p><b>Sole Source Aquifers</b> Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.</p>

<p><b>Wetlands Protection</b> Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>There is a drainage channel adjacent to the Project site, which is referred to as the Walnut Canyon drainage channel. The channel is a concrete-lined open channel that runs along the western boundary of the site and becomes an underground concrete box north of West High Street. The channel remains underground running west beneath West High Street, until it reverts back to an open concrete-lined channel towards the west. This drainage is likely subject to the jurisdiction of the Regional Water Quality Board, CDFW, and United States (U.S.) Army Corps of Engineers. However, the Project would not impact this feature. The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.</p>
<p><b>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act</b> Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.</p>
<p><b>HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS</b></p>		
<p><b>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</b></p>		
<p><b>Environmental Justice</b> Executive Order 12898</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.</p>

**Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27]**

**Impact Codes:** An impact code from the following list has been used to make the determination of impact for each factor.

- (1) Minor beneficial impact
- (2) No impact anticipated
- (3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation
- (4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
<b>LAND DEVELOPMENT</b>			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	1	<p>The project is in conformance with the City of Moorpark General Plan and zoning ordinances. Conformance with Plans The Project is being implemented as part of the larger Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan. As such, Project development would directly support the community's comprehensive plan for this area of the City. The Project would not conflict with any of the goals or policies in the comprehensive plan. Likewise, none of the reasonably foreseeable aspects of the Project would conflict with the community's vision for its future. Rather, Project implementation would directly support the community's vision for its future by developing the first portion of the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan. Land Use and Zoning The current zoning of the Project site is Mixed Use Medium. The Project would comply with the existing zoning regulations. The existing land use at the project site is Downtown Specific Plan. The Project would be consistent with the existing land use at the Project site, and would compliment both the existing Civic Center and the planned Civic Center. The location of the proposed Project would not contribute to urban sprawl as the Project does not propose</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>the development of low-density residential uses and would not increase the community's reliance on single occupancy vehicle; rather the Project would be located less than 0.5 mile from the existing Moorpark Station, which provides Metrolink and Amtrak services, thus increasing the likelihood that patrons would utilize transit to access the new library. The Project site would not place the proposed Project at an increased environmental risk compared to the community as a whole. Scale and Urban Design The Project would not significantly alter any landform, since the Project consists of a new City Library in place of the existing City Library. The Project would conform with the existing height, density, and FAR restrictions placed on the site by the City's development code. While the proposed library building would have a larger building footprint than the existing Moorpark Library which it would replace, the proposed library building is part of the approved Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan and its height, scale, and density were considered when designing the overall Master Plan and would be appropriate compared to the surrounding structures; additionally, the Project would conform with all locally adopted</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		design guidelines within the City's municipal code.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	2	<p>Soil Suitability A geotechnical report was prepared for the Project. The Project Site is not located within an area of known ground subsidence or soil expansion. The Project Site is prone to liquefaction, which would be mitigated through the implementation of the foundation design, grading, and ground improvement recommendations contained in the Project's geotechnical report. In summary, the Project's geotechnical report determined that the soil on site is suitable for the proposed library. Slope The Project Site's topography slopes gently to the south. The ground surface at the Project Site slopes southward at an approximate 2.2 percent slope. According to the Slope Suitability for Urban Development: Slopes Suitable for Development by Land Use Type chart provided by HUD, the Project site has a slight slope. No slope failure, landslides, settlement, or subsidence have occurred at the Project Site in the past. The Project's geotechnical report found that the Project is geotechnically feasible with implementation of grading and foundation recommendations contained in the reports. Erosion, Drainage/Stormwater Runoff The Project would result</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>in the addition of impervious surfaces. Project construction would disturb soil and would require the hauling of soil off-site, which could result in soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. Construction activities shall be conducted in compliance with the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with the Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board on July 17, 2012. In compliance with the NPDES permit, erosion potential during construction of the Project would be managed with Best Management Practices (BMPs) implemented on the Project Site as part of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan during construction activities in accordance with NPDES requirements. Implementation of the BMPs would ensure that construction related erosion impacts would be less than significant. The Project would result in a minor increase in the amount of impervious surface in the Project Site, which would result in increased storm water runoff generated on the Project Site. Operational water quality BMPs have been incorporated for the proposed library that would reduce the potential for erosion and the transport of sediment off site.</p> <p>Drainage/Stormwater Runoff</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>The Project would result in the addition of impervious surfaces. Project construction would disturb soil and would require the hauling of soil off-site, which could result in soil erosion and the loss of topsoil. Construction activities shall be conducted in compliance with the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with the Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board on July 17, 2012. In compliance with the NPDES permit, erosion potential during construction of the Project would be managed with Best Management Practices (BMPs) implemented on the Project Site as part of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan during construction activities in accordance with NPDES requirements. Implementation of the BMPs would ensure that construction related erosion impacts would be less than significant. The Project would result in a minor increase in the amount of impervious surface in the Project Site, which would result in increased storm water runoff generated on the Project Site. Operational water quality BMPs have been incorporated for the proposed library that would reduce the potential for erosion and the transport of sediment off site. The Project would not cause or substantially</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		contribute to off-site pollution by stormwater runoff, leaching of chemicals, or other pollutants.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	<p>Earthquake Faults and Earthquake Potential - The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. - Verified by: California Department of Conservation Regulatory map. With adherence to applicable California Building Code Requirements, the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of geologic hazards including earthquakes, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides. Hazardous Materials - It is possible that lead-based paints (LBPs), asbestos-containing materials (ACMs), and/or other common hazardous building materials may be encountered during demolition. Demolition of buildings/structures and facilities containing LBPs, polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing lighting ballasts, and mercury-containing thermostats or fluorescent light tubes that have not been properly abated would cause a danger from inhalation, direct absorption through the skin, and ingestion of impacted soils. To minimize potential effects, applicable</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>federal and State regulations governing testing and abatement of ACM, LBPs, PCB-containing lighting ballasts, and/or mercury containing materials would be implemented. According to a review of the DTSC's ENVIROSTOR database, which consists of a search of selected government databases for potential environmental concerns in the vicinity of the Project Site, no Cortese List properties or other potential hazardous waste sites occur within or near the Project Site.</p> <p>Wildland Fire Potential - The Project Site is located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) and is partially developed with buildings and other development and contains scattered ornamental vegetation. As such, there exists a potential for wildfire risk to future users and structures within the Project Site. However, the Project would be built in compliance with the latest California Fire Code as well as the California Building Code, which contain regulations for safeguarding life and property from fire. Also, during the final design of the Project's buildings, fuel modification zones would also be established to protect the new library from potential wildfire effects.</p> <p>Noise - The project would temporarily increase noise levels during</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>construction. The construction noise would be heard above existing ambient noise at residences close to Moorpark Avenue and at a nearby school and may create temporary annoyances to some individuals. However, the noise levels would be below the ranges considered typical and acceptable for construction. During the operation of the Project, the library would not result in any substantial increases in noise levels when compared to existing conditions. Emergency Response &amp; Access The Project would not conflict with any of the applicable emergency response or evacuation plans.</p>	
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC</b>			
Employment and Income Patterns	1	<p>The Project would not displace any jobs as a result of Project development. Additionally, the Project would generate a small number of temporary construction jobs during project construction and may create additional library jobs, as needed.</p>	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	<p>The proposed Project would not reduce or alter the racial, ethnic, or income segregation of the area's housing as it does not propose any housing and is not expected to generate new residents. The proposed Project would The Project Site does not contain existing housing; therefore, implementation of the Project would not displace any existing housing or</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>residents. The proposed Project at this site would not create a concentration of low-income or disadvantaged people in violation of HUD site and neighborhood standards. Likewise, the environmental impacts of the proposed Project would not affect low- and moderate-income or minority persons or communities more significantly than the general public. As previously stated, the Project Site does not contain existing housing; therefore, implementation of the Project would not displace any existing housing or residents. Likewise, the Project would not destroy or relocate existing jobs, community facilities, or business establishments, nor would it affect identifiable groups, such as older persons, females, single-parent households, racial/ethnic groups, income groups, or minority group members. As such, replacement facilities or housing units would not be required within the community or in nearby neighborhoods. Similarly, the Project would not result in probable indirect displacement.</p>	
Environmental Justice EA Factor	2	<p>The Project would have no adverse environmental impacts. As discussed previously, the Project is not located in a low income and/or minority community. Therefore, the Project has no potential to</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		result in environmental justice impacts.	
<b>COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES</b>			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	1	The Project proposes a new library, which would not increase demand for schools or cultural facilities. Moreover, the Project would provide a new and improved educational facility (library). As such, the Project would result in a minor beneficial impact related to educational and cultural facilities.	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	The Project does not propose commercial facilities nor would the Project increase demand for these facilities.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	2	The Project consists of a library; as there would be no permanent or temporary inhabitants of the library, demand for Health Care and Social Services facilities would not be affected.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Solid waste collection and disposal is provided for the City through private haulers. Waste Management serves the Project Site. After the waste is collected, it is separated into recyclable material, household hazardous waste, and other solid waste. The solid waste is then processed and consolidated for delivery to the Simi Valley Landfill and Recycling Center (SVLRC). The Project would generate solid waste during construction and operation. Simi Valley Landfill, which is permitted to receive	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>3,000 tons per day (tpd) and has an average daily tonnage of approximately 2,500 tons, would be utilized to meet the Project's operational solid waste disposal demand. The landfill has a design capacity of 43.5 million cubic yards (cy), and the estimated closure date of the landfill is 2063. The Project involves demolition of an existing building and paved surfaces within the Project Site, which would generate debris that would need to be removed from the Project Site. Prior to issuance of a building permit for each Project phase, the applicant shall submit a Construction and Demolition Materials Management Plan Estimate for the review and approval of the City's Solid Waste Management staff and Building and Safety Division for recycling of waste materials consistent with City and state requirements. Additionally, the Project would also be required to implement organic waste recycling programs consistent with the requirements of AB 1826 and SB 1383. Therefore, the Project would not affect the City's ability to collect or recycle solid waste</p>	
<p>Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The VCWWD No. 1 provides wastewater treatment and collection services to Moorpark and the surrounding areas, including the Project Site. VCWWD No. 1 operates and</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>maintains local sewer collection pipelines and trunk sewers that feed into the Moorpark Wastewater Treatment Plant. It owns, operates and maintains the Moorpark Wastewater Treatment Plant (MWTP) located at 9550 Los Angeles Avenue in Moorpark. Existing development on the Project Site is served by an 18-inch sewer main south of the Project Site in Poindexter Avenue to High Street; an 8-inch sewer main east of the Project Site in Moorpark Avenue, between High Street and Charles Street; and a 10-inch sewer main through the existing Moorpark Civic Center Campus, located near the intersection of Moorpark Avenue and Wicks Road, all of which convey wastewater to the Moorpark Wastewater Treatment Plant. While it is not expected that wastewater would increase significantly from the proposed Project, prior to issuance of a building permit for the Library, the applicant would be required to obtain a will-serve letter or equivalent from VCWWD No. 1 demonstrating their capacity to serve the Project for water and wastewater services. As such, the project will neither exceed wastewater treatment requirements as established by the Regional Water Quality Control Board nor require the</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		construction of additional facilities.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	<p>Water services are provided to the Project Site by VCWWD No. 1. While it is not expected that water demand would increase significantly as a result of the Project, as stated previously, prior to issuance of a building permit for the Library, the applicant would be required to obtain a will-serve letter or equivalent from VCWWD No. 1 demonstrating their capacity to serve the Project for water and wastewater services.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed library is not expected to consume a significant amount of potable water. There are 78 sole source aquifers established by the Environmental Protection Agency. The Project site is not located within or near any sole source aquifers. According to a web mapper maintained by the USEPA, the nearest sole source aquifers are north of the Project site in Fresno and south of the site near San Diego at the US-Mexico border (EPA 2023a). as such, the project would not affect a sole source or other aquifer. As such, the City has sufficient water supply to serve the Project and the Project would not substantially impact the City's water supply.</p>	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	Police The Ventura County Sheriff's Office (VCSO) provides law enforcement services to a service area that encompasses	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>1,882 square miles and serves unincorporated Ventura County and the Cities of Camarillo, Fillmore, Ojai, Moorpark, and Thousand Oaks (VCSO 2022). The VCSO operates stations throughout Ventura County, including the Moorpark Station located at 610 Spring Street less than one mile from the Project Site. Law enforcement services for the City are provided on a contract basis. From the Moorpark Station, the VCSO serves the City of Moorpark as well as the unincorporated areas of the Santa Rosa Valley and Simi Valley. Fire The Ventura County Fire Department (VCFD) is responsible for providing fire protection services to the Cities of Moorpark, Camarillo, Ojai, Port Hueneme, Simi Valley, Thousand Oaks, Santa Paula, and unincorporated areas of Ventura County. VCFD's response area is approximately 848 square miles and serves more than 800,000 persons in unincorporated areas of Ventura County and the Cities of Ojai, Port Hueneme, Moorpark, Camarillo, Santa Paula, Simi Valley, and Thousand Oaks (VCFD 2022a). The Project Site is served by Fire Station 42, located approximately 0.02 miles away. As verified by the CEQA EIR, is not expected that construction of the new library would increase demand for</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>either police or fire services. In the event that demand was increased, necessitating additional employees, facilities, or equipment, the Project as well as other future development in the City would be required to pay typical City Development Impact Fees (DIF) that would be used exclusively for future facility improvements necessary to ensure contribution of its fair share of the cost of facilities and equipment. Emergency response plans that are applicable to the Project include the County's Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, the County's Emergency Operations Plan, and the City's Emergency Operations Plan. The Project would be consistent with all of these plans. The Project would comply with fire protection design standards, which would ensure that the Project would not inhibit the ability of fire protection or paramedic crews to respond at optimum levels. According to the Fire Hazard Severity Zones Viewer maintained by CAL FIRE, the Project Site and much of the City is located within a VHFHSZ (CAL FIRE 2010, CAL FIRE 2022). There are no steep slopes on or near the Project Site, and no major topographic changes are proposed as part of the Project that would exacerbate existing fire risks. Additionally, according</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>to a review of meteorological data, prevailing winds in Moorpark generally blow from the south and southwest (Willy Weather 2022). South and southwest of the Project Site are developed sites; therefore, it is unlikely that the development of the Project would be affected more than in existing conditions by wildfire smoke. The Project would be constructed in compliance with the latest California Fire Code as well as the California Building Code, which contain regulations for safeguarding life and property from fire (ICC 2019; CBSC 2018). During design of Project structures, the establishing and ongoing maintenance of fuel modification zones may be required to minimize wildfire risk to the Project site.</p> <p>Emergency Medical Services The proposed Project is not expected to significantly increase demand for emergency medical services as the Project would construct a library.</p>	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	<p>The Project involves the development of a City Library, which is characterized as a cultural resource by HUD. As such, the proposed Project would increase the supply of cultural facilities in the City. The Project would be located at the existing Moorpark Civic Center, which contains the existing Moorpark Active Adult Center</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		(ACC). As such, the Project would be provide a cultural facility within walking distance of the ACC. Similarly, the Project would be located less than 0.5 mile from the existing Moorpark Station, which provides Metrolink and Amtrak services. The Project's location near Moorpark Station would allow patrons to access the site via public transit, improving access for the elderly and people with disabilities.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	Based on the Traffic Study prepared for the Project, the Project would not result in any major congestion. The Project Site is less than 0.5 mile from the existing Moorpark Station, which provides Metrolink and Amtrak services. Therefore, people can access the Project Site by train. There is an existing Class II bike facility along E High Street, providing bicycle access to the Project site. Also, the Project would provide internal sidewalks and pedestrian paths that would be ADA compliant and that would be accessible by the elderly and those with disabilities.	
<b>NATURAL FEATURES</b>			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	Unique Natural Features Upon a review of the unique natural features defined by HUD, there are no unique natural features within or near the Project site, with the exception of a few special status plant and wildlife species. No endemic plant or	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>animal species are present at or within the vicinity of the Project site. Water Resources The Project would not result in the withdrawal of groundwater. Water would be supplied to the Project site by Ventura County Waterworks District #1. The Project would not involve the installation or use of a septic system. The Project would be constructed in accordance with SWPPP. Also, operational BMPs will be identified for each Project to reduce the potential for erosion and the transport of sediment off site. Long term, the Project's contribution to erosion of channels downstream is expected to be less than significant because the stormwater runoff volume with the Project would be similar to existing conditions and would be mitigated through implementation of BMPs. Therefore, impacts related to soil erosion due to construction and operation of the Project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are either required or recommended.</p>	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	3	Vegetation The location where the library would be constructed is previously disturbed and there is no potential for any special status plant species in this area of the Project Site. Ornamental trees would need to be removed to accommodate the library;	MM BIO-2: Per the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012), the applicant shall retain a qualified Biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for the burrowing owl between 14 and 30 days prior to the initial

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>however, trees would be replanted as part of the Project's landscape plan. The Project would not introduce non-native or invasive species of vegetation to the Project site. Wildlife Burrowing owl (<i>Athene cunicularia</i>) is a special status wildlife species that may occur on the western portion of the City of Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan project site, outside of the Project footprint. Burrowing owl is a California Species of Special Concern and can occupy burrows or similar structures in open, disturbed habitats such as the Mediterranean grass grassland that occurs on the western portion of the Project Site. If present, Project impacts have potential to be significant. However, a preconstruction burrowing owl survey shall be conducted and passive relocation shall be implemented in consultation with the resource agencies if any burrowing owl are encountered. With implementation of this measure, the Project would have no substantial effect on burrowing owl. White tailed kite (<i>Elanus leucurus</i>) is a California Fully Protected species and has potential to nest in the trees adjacent to the western portion of the Civic Center Master Plan project site, outside of the footprint of the Project. Indirect impacts</p>	<p>ground disturbance on the western portion of the Project Site. The pre-construction survey shall include the area of proposed disturbance plus a 500-foot buffer (if access is available and habitat is present). If an active burrow is observed outside the breeding season (September 1 to January 31) and it cannot be avoided, the burrowing owl shall be passively excluded from the burrow following methods described in California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 2012. Prior to any burrowing owl exclusion efforts, an exclusion plan will be prepared and submitted to CDFW for review and approval. The plan will include all details on passive relocation including that one-way doors shall be used to exclude owls from the burrows; doors shall be left in place for at least 48 hours. Once the burrow is determined to be unoccupied, the burrow shall be closed by a qualified Biologist who shall excavate the burrow using hand tools. Prior to excluding an owl from an active burrow, a receptor</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>associated with construction activities, such as noise and vibration, have potential to impact nesting activities of this species, if nesting is occurring in the immediate vicinity. A preconstruction nesting bird survey shall be conducted. If any white tailed kite are observed then Project activities that could be harmful to this species would be halted and California Department of Fish and Wildlife would be consulted. With implementation of this approach, the Project would have no substantial effect on white tailed kite. Although not considered special status, nesting activities of most bird species are protected by State and federal regulations. Migratory birds are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and state regulations. The Project would require the removal of ornamental vegetation and trees that could contain nesting birds. Therefore, prior to vegetation removal during the bird breeding season a biologist shall conduct a preconstruction nesting bird survey. Any active nests would be avoided until after the nesting attempt is finished. With implementation of this approach, the Project would have no substantial effects on migratory or nesting birds.</p>	<p>burrow survey shall be conducted to confirm that at least two potentially suitable unoccupied burrows are within approximately 688 feet prior to installation of the one-way door. If two natural receptor burrows are not located, one artificial burrow shall be created for every burrow that would be closed. If an active burrow is observed outside the breeding season (September 1 to January 31) and it can be avoided, the Biologist shall determine an appropriate protective buffer for the burrow based on CDFW guidelines. The buffer shall range from 160 feet to 1,640 feet depending on the level of impact and the time of year. The designated buffer will be clearly marked in the field and will be mapped as an environmentally sensitive area (ESA) on construction plans. If an active burrow is observed during the breeding season (February 1 to August 31), the active burrow shall be protected until nesting activity has ended (i.e., all young have fledged from the burrow). The Biologist shall determine the appropriate protective buffer for the</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
			burrow based on CDFW guidelines. The buffer shall range from 650 to 1,640 feet depending on the level of impact and the time of year. The designated buffer will be clearly marked in the field and will be mapped as an ESA on construction plans. Construction shall be allowed to proceed when the qualified Biologist has determined that all fledglings have left the nest.
Other Factors 1			
Other Factors 2			
<b>CLIMATE AND ENERGY</b>			
Climate Change	1	The Project is being built in accordance with all applicable building codes; this would result in a library that would be more resilient to temperature changes, and extreme weather events associated with climate change.	
Energy Efficiency	2	Location and Siting The Project would be located less than 0.5 mile from the existing Moorpark Station, which provides Metrolink and Amtrak services, thus increasing the likelihood that patrons would utilize transit to access the new library. Energy and Water Use The estimated operational natural gas and electricity energy consumption attributable to the Project as calculated by CalEEMod is show below: Natural Gas 767,695 kBTU/year	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>Electricity: 167,381 kWh/year                      The Project would comply with the latest Building Energy Efficiency Standards. The Project Site is currently provided with electricity, natural gas, and telecommunication services. A will serve letter from dry utility providers will be provided to the City's Community Development Department prior to construction. As calculated in CalEEMod, upon buildout of the library, operational greenhouse gas emissions would be approximately 1,924 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year. This value does not take into account the replacement of existing GHG emissions from the existing library; even so, emissions would be below the SCAQMD Tier 3 screening threshold (recommended by the VCAPCD) of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year. The Project is required to comply with the requirements established under the Title 24 development standards.</p>	

**Supporting documentation**

- [ex\\_WildScenicRivers\\_20230511.pdf](#)
- [ex\\_SurfaceWaters\\_Wetlands\\_20230511.pdf](#)
- [ex\\_SSA\\_20230511.pdf](#)
- [ex\\_NearestAirports\\_20230511.pdf](#)
- [ex\\_Nearest\\_Critical\\_Habitat\\_20230511.pdf](#)
- [ex\\_Nearest\\_CCC\\_Zone\\_20230511.pdf](#)
- [ex\\_FEMA\\_FP\\_LOMR\\_Area\\_20230511.pdf](#)
- [ex\\_FEMA\\_FloodHazards\\_20230509.pdf](#)

**Additional Studies Performed:**

**Field Inspection [Optional]:** Date and completed

by:

Sean Noonan

5/23/2022 12:00:00 AM

**List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:**

Moorpark, City of 2023 (May). Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project. <https://moorparkca.gov/1094/Civic-Center-Master-Plan> Airport Hazards - 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D - Google Maps - Google Earth Coastal Barrier Resources - Not applicable in California Flood Insurance - FIRM map 06111C0818E 6017C0775E dated January 20, 2010 Clean Air - CEQA EIR for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project (May 2023) - EPA Greenbook "Currently Designated Nonattainment Areas for all Criteria Pollutants at <https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/ancl.html#CALIFORNIA> Coastal Zone Management Act - California Coastal Zone Map downloaded from <https://www.coastal.ca.gov/maps/czb/> Contamination and Toxic Substances EDR Radius Map Report with GeoCheck, dated May 19 2022 Endangered Species Act - CEQA EIR, dated May 2023 - USFWS - Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species; <https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77#!> Explosive and Flammable Hazards - CEQA EIR for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project (May 2023) - CalEPA Database: <https://siteportal.calepa.ca.gov/nsite/map/help> - Google Earth Farmlands Protection - CEQA EIR for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project (May 2023) - USDA, CALDOC FMMP Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program (ca.gov) Floodplain Management - FIRM map 06111C0818E 6017C0775E dated January 20, 2010 Historic Preservation - CEQA EIR for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project (May 2023) - California Historical Resources Information System - Native American Heritage Commission - South Central Coastal Information Center. 2022 (May 11). Re: Records Search Results for the Psomas Project 3MOO010100. Fullerton, CA: SCCIC. - National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Records Search - Google Aerial Photos Noise Abatement and Control - CEQA EIR for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project (May 2023) - Google Earth Sole Source Aquifers - EPA Region 9 Sole Source Aquifers Map downloaded from <https://epa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9ebb047ba3ec41ada1877155fe31356b> Wetlands Protection - Wetlands Map downloaded from <https://fws.gov/wetlands> on 4.17.20 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act - Wild and Scenic Rivers list downloaded from <https://www.rivers.gov/river-app/index.html?state=CA> 26 Environmental Justice The Project would have no substantial environmental effects. Therefore, the Project has no potential to result in environmental justice

impacts. Environmental Assessment Factors - CEQA EIR for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project (May 2023) - California Department of Conservation regulatory maps viewed or downloaded from:

<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps> - California Emergency Management Agency - Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning - Cal Fire - Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA & LRA - Google Earth - Google Maps

**List of Permits Obtained:**

The new City Library will require a Conditional Use Permit No. CD-CUP-2023-0013. The application review is underway and is tentatively scheduled for the Planning Commission in early 2024. No other permits other than standard construction-related permits are required.

**Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:**

A detailed description of public outreach conducted by the City regarding the Library project can be found here: <https://www.moorparkca.gov/992/New-City-Library> \*

On June 1, 2022 the Moorpark City Council received a presentation by the Library Architect regarding two potential architectural styles for the New City Library. The presentation detailed both an Agrarian Inspired design, and an Industrial Inspired design. The City Council also considered community input collected from the May 16th community workshop and the online survey. Ultimately the City Council supported the preference indicated by the community input and selected the Agrarian Inspired design for the New City Library \*

\* An online survey collected public input on the Library Architecture options in May ahead of the discussion with the Moorpark City Council on June 1st. \*

\* On May 16, 2022 the City's held an in-person community workshop to showcase two new design proposals for the new library architecture, one inspired by agrarian architecture, and one inspired by industrial architecture. \*

\* On March 24, 2021 the City's design team updated the City Council on the progress to date and received guidance on the floorplan layout and exterior design. \*

\* On March 3, 2021 the Moorpark Teen Council hosted a discussion between the City's planning team and teens from the Moorpark community to discuss features planned for the teen space in the new Library. The meeting provided feedback and ideas for the teen area. \*

\* On February 24, 2021 the City held its second community workshop for the New City Library. This virtual event provided updates on the development process and collected input on the children's space, teen space and preliminary architectural considerations. A total of 23 participants logged in to the event. \*

\* On Wednesday, December 9, 2021 the City held its first community workshop for the New City Library. This virtual event provided updates on the

development process and collected input on various aspects of the Library. A total of 22 participants logged in to the event. \* In 2018 a survey was distributed to collect feedback about what features the community wished to see in the new facility. A total of 756 responses were collected. This feedback is being used by the library consultant in planning the new facility.

**Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:**

No factors were found to be significant on a stand-alone basis; there are no other actions requiring aggregation with this action; and, there are no cumulative impacts when considering all factors as a whole that would result in the Finding being other than No Significant Impact.

**Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]**

Build Alternative (Project) No Action Alternative (below)

**No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]**

There are few benefits to be obtained by not developing the site as proposed. The project will provide City residents with an updated educational facility, and would replace an outdated structure with a new structure built in accordance with the latest building codes. Additionally, should the Project not be built, the existing library would continue operating without ADA compliant infrastructure, limiting library accessibility.

**Summary of Findings and Conclusions:**

MM BIO-2: Per the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012), the applicant shall retain a qualified Biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for the burrowing owl between 14 and 30 days prior to the initial ground disturbance on the western portion of the Project Site. The pre-construction survey shall include the area of proposed disturbance plus a 500-foot buffer (if access is available and habitat is present). If an active burrow is observed outside the breeding season (September 1 to January 31) and it cannot be avoided, the burrowing owl shall be passively excluded from the burrow following methods described in California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 2012. Prior to any burrowing owl exclusion efforts, an exclusion plan will be prepared and submitted to CDFW for review and approval. The plan will include all details on passive relocation including that one-way doors shall be used to exclude owls from the burrows; doors shall be left in place for at least 48 hours. Once the burrow is determined to be unoccupied, the burrow shall be closed by a qualified Biologist who shall excavate the burrow using hand tools. Prior to excluding an owl from an active burrow, a receptor burrow survey shall be conducted to confirm that at least two potentially suitable unoccupied burrows are within approximately 688 feet prior to installation of the one-way door. If two natural receptor burrows are not located, one artificial burrow shall be created for every burrow that would be closed. If an active burrow is observed outside the breeding season (September 1 to January

31) and it can be avoided, the Biologist shall determine an appropriate protective buffer for the burrow based on CDFW guidelines. The buffer shall range from 160 feet to 1,640 feet depending on the level of impact and the time of year. The designated buffer will be clearly marked in the field and will be mapped as an environmentally sensitive area (ESA) on construction plans. If an active burrow is observed during the breeding season (February 1 to August 31), the active burrow shall be protected until nesting activity has ended (i.e., all young have fledged from the burrow). The Biologist shall determine the appropriate protective buffer for the burrow based on CDFW guidelines. The buffer shall range from 650 to 1,640 feet depending on the level of impact and the time of year. The designated buffer will be clearly marked in the field and will be mapped as an ESA on construction plans. Construction shall be allowed to proceed when the qualified Biologist has determined that all fledglings have left the nest.

**Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:**

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Mitigation Plan	Complete
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	MM BIO-2: Per the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012), the applicant shall retain a qualified Biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for the burrowing owl between 14 and 30 days prior to the initial ground disturbance on the western portion of the Project Site. The pre-construction survey shall include the area of proposed disturbance plus a 500-foot buffer (if access is available and habitat is present). If an active burrow is observed outside the breeding season (September 1 to January 31) and it cannot be avoided, the burrowing owl shall	N/A	See attached MMRP.	

	<p>be passively excluded from the burrow following methods described in California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 2012. Prior to any burrowing owl exclusion efforts, an exclusion plan will be prepared and submitted to CDFW for review and approval. The plan will include all details on passive relocation including that one-way doors shall be used to exclude owls from the burrows; doors shall be left in place for at least 48 hours. Once the burrow is determined to be unoccupied, the burrow shall be closed by a qualified Biologist who shall excavate the burrow using hand tools. Prior to excluding an owl from an active burrow, a receptor burrow survey shall be conducted to confirm that at least two potentially suitable unoccupied burrows are within approximately 688 feet prior to installation of the one-way door. If two natural receptor burrows are not located, one artificial burrow shall be created for every burrow that would be closed. If an active burrow is observed outside the breeding season (September 1 to January 31) and it can be avoided, the Biologist shall determine an appropriate protective buffer for the burrow based on CDFW guidelines. The buffer shall range from 160 feet to 1,640 feet depending on the level of impact and the time of year. The designated buffer will be clearly marked in the field and will be mapped as an environmentally sensitive area (ESA) on construction plans. If an</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>active burrow is observed during the breeding season (February 1 to August 31), the active burrow shall be protected until nesting activity has ended (i.e., all young have fledged from the burrow). The Biologist shall determine the appropriate protective buffer for the burrow based on CDFW guidelines. The buffer shall range from 650 to 1,640 feet depending on the level of impact and the time of year. The designated buffer will be clearly marked in the field and will be mapped as an ESA on construction plans. Construction shall be allowed to proceed when the qualified Biologist has determined that all fledglings have left the nest.</p>			
<p>Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)</p>	<p>* CEQA Mitigation Measure MM CUL-1: Prior to the start of Project phases that involve work within 75 feet of the Tanner Building, protection measures shall be developed in a formal plan for the adjacent Tanner Corner Building at 601 Moorpark Avenue. Protection measures shall include at a minimum: (1) clear denotation in the project construction plans that the project is located directly adjacent to an historical resource, marking the location of the Tanner Corner Building; (2) a protocol for informing all construction workers of the presence of the historical resource and making them aware of the protocol to avoid and protect it; (3) a list of approved construction equipment/distances in consideration of any identified groundborne vibration impacts;</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>See attached MMRP.</p>	

	<p>(4) recommendations for specific protective fencing and signage to be implemented during construction; and (5) if determined appropriate based on the results of the groundborne vibration analysis, recommendations for construction monitoring (pre-, post-, and during construction). The protection plan shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian/historic preservation professional, clearly identify all responsible parties with their contact information, and be appended to the final set of construction plans.</p>			
<p>Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)</p>	<p>* Condition of Approval CUL-1: If any archaeological, paleontological, or historical finds are uncovered during grading or excavation operations, all grading or excavation shall immediately cease in the immediate area and the find must be left untouched. The applicant, in consultation with the project paleontologist or archeologist, shall assure the preservation of the site and immediately contact the Community Development Director by phone, in writing by email or hand delivered correspondence informing the Director of the find. In the absence of the Director, the applicant shall so inform the City Manager and Planning Manager. The applicant shall be required to obtain the services of a qualified paleontologist or archeologist, whichever is appropriate to recommend disposition of the site. The paleontologist or archeologist selected must be</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>See attached MMRP.</p>	

	approved in writing by the Community Development Director. The applicant shall pay for all costs associated with the investigation and disposition of the find.			
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)	* CEQA Mitigation Measure MM NOI-2: During construction activities, the Project applicant will ensure that ongoing vibration monitoring is conducted for Project activities within 75 feet of the Tanner Corner Building as specified below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Whenever vibratory replacement activities occur within 75 feet of the Tanner Corner Building.</li> <li>o Whenever Deep Soil Mixing activities occur within 50 feet of the Tanner Corner Building.</li> <li>o Whenever general construction equipment is utilized within 25 feet of the Tanner Corner Building. If vibration levels at the Tanner Corner Building reach or exceed 0.25 ppv, there is a potential for building damage and an immediate stop work order will be issued. Alternative construction methods or vibration reduction measures will then be determined that keep vibration exposure levels below 0.25 ppv.</li> </ul>	N/A	See attached MMRP.	
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)	* Condition of Approval CUL-2: In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the County Coroner shall be notified within 24 hours of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has	N/A	See attached MMRP.	

	<p>determined, within two working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are or are believed to be Native American, s/he shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 48 hours. In accordance with Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. The descendants shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative shall then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.</p>			
<p>Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)</p>	<p>* Condition of Approval CUL-3: Prior to any ground disturbing activity, construction personnel associated with earth moving equipment, drilling, grading, and excavating, shall be provided with basic training conducted by a qualified archaeologist. Issues that shall be included in the basic training will be geared toward training the applicable construction crews in the identification of archaeological deposits, further described below. Training will include written notification of the restrictions regarding disturbance and/or removal of any portion of archaeological, paleontological,</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>See attached MMRP.</p>	

	or historical deposits and the procedures to follow should a resource be identified. The construction contractor, or its designee, shall be responsible for implementation of this measure. A tribal monitor shall be provided an opportunity to attend the preconstruction briefing if requested.			
--	--	--	--	--

**Project Mitigation Plan**

See attached MMRP.

[NEPA MMRP.docx](#)

**Supporting documentation on completed measures**

## APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities

### Airport Hazards

General policy	Legislation	Regulation
It is HUD’s policy to apply standards to prevent incompatible development around civil airports and military airfields.		24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D

1. To ensure compatible land use development, you must determine your site’s proximity to civil and military airports. Is your project within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport?

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload the map showing that the site is not within the applicable distances to a military or civilian airport below

Yes

### Screen Summary

#### Compliance Determination

According to a review of the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics California Public Use Airports and Federal Airfields Map, the nearest civilian airport is Santa Paula Airport, and the nearest military airfield is the Point Mugu Airfield. The Santa Paula Airport is located approximately 58,300 ft (11) miles northwest of the Project site. Additionally, the nearest military airport is located approximately 93,300 ft southwest of the Project. No portions of the Project are located within a Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) for either airport. The Project would not result in any direct impacts to the airport. Given that the Project would not involve any highly-reflective materials or water quality basins the Project would not result in any substantial hazard to aircraft. Due to the distance between the Project site and the nearest airfields, the Project would not increase the number of people or vehicles within the airport zone that would be exposed to airport hazards. Likewise, airport noise would not be a substantial hazard to construction employees. See Map below.

#### Supporting documentation

[Moorpark\\_Airport.png](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

### Coastal Barrier Resources

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD financial assistance may not be used for most activities in units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS). See 16 USC 3504 for limitations on federal expenditures affecting the CBRS.	Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) of 1982, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 USC 3501)	

**This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRA units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.**

#### Compliance Determination

This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

#### Supporting documentation

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Flood Insurance

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Certain types of federal financial assistance may not be used in floodplains unless the community participates in National Flood Insurance Program and flood insurance is both obtained and maintained.	Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 as amended (42 USC 4001-4128)	24 CFR 50.4(b)(1) and 24 CFR 58.6(a) and (b); 24 CFR 55.1(b).

**1. Does this project involve financial assistance for construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of a mobile home, building, or insurable personal property?**

No. This project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance.

Yes

**2. Upload a FEMA/FIRM map showing the site here:**

[Moorpark FI1.png](#)

[Moorpark FI2.png](#)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The [FEMA Map Service Center](#) provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use the best available information to determine floodplain information. Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site. Provide FEMA/FIRM floodplain zone designation, panel number, and date within your documentation.

**Is the structure, part of the structure, or insurable property located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area?**

No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes

**4. While flood insurance is not mandatory for this project, HUD strongly recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Will flood insurance be required as a mitigation measure or condition?**

Yes

✓ No

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.

**Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

### Air Quality

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Clean Air Act is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which sets national standards on ambient pollutants. In addition, the Clean Air Act is administered by States, which must develop State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to regulate their state air quality. Projects funded by HUD must demonstrate that they conform to the appropriate SIP.	Clean Air Act (42 USC 7401 et seq.) as amended particularly Section 176(c) and (d) (42 USC 7506(c) and (d))	40 CFR Parts 6, 51 and 93

**1. Does your project include new construction or conversion of land use facilitating the development of public, commercial, or industrial facilities OR five or more dwelling units?**

Yes

No

#### Air Quality Attainment Status of Project's County or Air Quality Management District

**2. Is your project's air quality management district or county in non-attainment or maintenance status for any criteria pollutants?**

No, project's county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants.

Yes, project's management district or county is in non-attainment or maintenance status for the following criteria pollutants (check all that apply):

Carbon Monoxide

Lead

Nitrogen dioxide

Sulfur dioxide

- ✓ Ozone
- Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns
- ✓ Particulate Matter, <10 microns

**3. What are the *de minimis* emissions levels (40 CFR 93.153) or screening levels for the non-attainment or maintenance level pollutants indicated above**

Ozone	ppb (parts per million)
Particulate Matter, <10 microns	µg/m3 (micrograms per cubic meter of air)

**Provide your source used to determine levels here:**

US EPA De Minimis thresholds were used to evaluate the Project's criteria impact pollutant impacts (<https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables>). Ozone - EPA De Minimis Threshold for Serious Nonattainment: 50 Tons/Year Maximum Ozone precursor emissions for the proposed Project would be as follows: Construction: NOx = 1.07 tons/year, VOC = 0.13 tons/year, Total = 1.20 tons/year of ozone precursors Operational: NOx = 1.24 tons/year, VOC = 1.92 tons/year, Total = 3.16 tons/year of ozone precursors PM10 - EPA De Minimis Threshold for Moderate Nonattainment: 100 Tons/Year Maximum PM10 emissions for the proposed Project would be as follows: Construction: PM10 = 0.08 tons/year Operational: PM10 = 1.68 tons/year

**4. Determine the estimated emissions levels of your project. Will your project exceed any of the de minimis or threshold emissions levels of non-attainment and maintenance level pollutants or exceed the screening levels established by the state or air quality management district?**

- ✓ No, the project will not exceed *de minimis* or threshold emissions levels or screening levels.

**Enter the estimate emission levels:**

Ozone	ppb (parts per million)
Particulate Matter, <10 microns	µg/m3 (micrograms per cubic meter of air)

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes, the project exceeds *de minimis* emissions levels or screening levels.

### **Screen Summary**

#### **Compliance Determination**

US EPA De Minimis thresholds were used to evaluate the Project's criteria impact pollutant impacts (<https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables>).  
Ozone - EPA De Minimis Threshold for Serious Nonattainment: 50 Tons/Year  
Maximum Ozone precursor emissions for the proposed Project would be as follows:  
Construction: NOx = 1.07 tons/year, VOC = 0.13 tons/year, Total = 1.20 tons/year of ozone precursors  
Operational: NOx = 1.24 tons/year, VOC = 1.92 tons/year, Total = 3.16 tons/year of ozone precursors  
PM10 - EPA De Minimis Threshold for Moderate Nonattainment: 100 Tons/Year  
Maximum PM10 emissions for the proposed Project would be as follows: Construction: PM10 = 0.08 tons/year  
Operational: PM10 = 1.68 tons/year  
Ventura County is in a nonattainment area for both state and federal ozone standards; additionally, the County is in a nonattainment area for state PM10 standards. Environmental impacts associated with the proposed project were evaluated as part of the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The construction emissions provided above are specific to the construction of the proposed Library, while the operational emissions above are conservatively representative of the proposed Library in addition to all other elements of the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan at full buildout. Anticipated emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Library would be well beneath De Minimis thresholds, even with this conservative approach, as demonstrated above. This project does not exceed de minimis emissions levels or the screening level established by the state or air quality management district for the pollutant(s) identified above. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[Moorpark Library Construction Detailed Report.pdf](#)

[Moorpark Civic Center Operational Buildout Detailed Report.pdf](#)

#### **Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

### Coastal Zone Management Act

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Federal assistance to applicant agencies for activities affecting any coastal use or resource is granted only when such activities are consistent with federally approved State Coastal Zone Management Act Plans.	Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC 1451-1464), particularly section 307(c) and (d) (16 USC 1456(c) and (d))	15 CFR Part 930

**1. Is the project located in, or does it affect, a Coastal Zone as defined in your state Coastal Management Plan?**

Yes

No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

#### Screen Summary

##### **Compliance Determination**

The Project site is located approximately 16.5 miles from the Pacific Ocean and 11.5 miles from the nearest Coastal Zone Boundary as defined by the California Coastal Commission (CCC). Therefore, the Project is not located within the coastal zone and would not affect coastal resources. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

##### **Supporting documentation**

[Moorpark CZ.png](#)

##### **Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

### Contamination and Toxic Substances

General requirements	Legislation	Regulations
It is HUD policy that all properties that are being proposed for use in HUD programs be free of hazardous materials, contamination, toxic chemicals and gases, and radioactive substances, where a hazard could affect the health and safety of the occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property.		24 CFR 58.5(i)(2) 24 CFR 50.3(i)

**1. How was site contamination evaluated? Select all that apply. Document and upload documentation and reports and evaluation explanation of site contamination below.**

- American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)
- ASTM Phase II ESA
- Remediation or clean-up plan
- ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening

None of the Above

**2. Were any on-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property? (Were any recognized environmental conditions or RECs identified in a Phase I ESA and confirmed in a Phase II ESA?)**

No

**Explain:**

Records of historic releases of hazardous materials were reviewed using online database records available through EnviroStor, which is maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control. There were no records identified within the project site that would represent a recognized environmental condition (REC) for the project.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

The Project would result in the on-site handling of materials that are common in similar developments, such as commercial cleansers, solvents and other janitorial or industrial use materials; paints; and landscape fertilizers/pesticides. Site contamination was evaluated as follows: review of records of historic releases of hazardous materials. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.

**Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

**Endangered Species**

General requirements	ESA Legislation	Regulations
Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) mandates that federal agencies ensure that actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out shall not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed plants and animals or result in the adverse modification or destruction of designated critical habitat. Where their actions may affect resources protected by the ESA, agencies must consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service (“FWS” and “NMFS” or “the Services”).	The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 <i>et seq.</i> ); particularly section 7 (16 USC 1536).	50 CFR Part 402

**1. Does the project involve any activities that have the potential to affect species or habitats?**

- ✓ No, the project will have No Effect due to the nature of the activities involved in the project.

This selection is only appropriate if none of the activities involved in the project have potential to affect species or habitats. Examples of actions without potential to affect listed species may include: purchasing existing buildings, completing interior renovations to existing buildings, and replacing exterior paint or siding on existing buildings.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

No, the project will have No Effect based on a letter of understanding, memorandum of agreement, programmatic agreement, or checklist provided by local HUD office

Yes, the activities involved in the project have the potential to affect species and/or habitats.

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

Based on a review of the United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) Critical Habitat Mapper, there is no critical habitat within the Project site for any federally-listed species (USFWS 2023a). The nearest critical habitat to the Project site is located approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the Project site (USFWS 2023); see map below.

Furthermore, the Project's roadway segments are urbanized and all Project activities would be limited to the existing right-of-way areas. Therefore, no direct impacts to vegetation and/or biological resources would result from the Project. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

**Supporting documentation**

[ES Moorpark.png](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

### Explosive and Flammable Hazards

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD-assisted projects must meet Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) requirements to protect them from explosive and flammable hazards.	N/A	24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C

**1. Is the proposed HUD-assisted project itself the development of a hazardous facility (a facility that mainly stores, handles or processes flammable or combustible chemicals such as bulk fuel storage facilities and refineries)?**

No

Yes

**2. Does this project include any of the following activities: development, construction, rehabilitation that will increase residential densities, or conversion?**

No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

During construction, explosive and flammable materials would be utilized within the Project site such as gasoline. These activities are normal on construction sites and any usage of explosive or flammable materials would be conducted in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.

#### **Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

City-of-Moorpark-Public-  
Library

Moorpark, CA

900000010371710

✓ No

**Farmlands Protection**

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) discourages federal activities that would convert farmland to nonagricultural purposes.	Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.)	<a href="#">7 CFR Part 658</a>

**1. Does your project include any activities, including new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, that could convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use?**

Yes

✓ No

If your project includes new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, explain how you determined that agricultural land would not be converted:

The entire Project site is zoned as Mixed Use Medium by the City of Moorpark (City of Moorpark 2023). Additionally, the Project would not acquire or impact any agricultural land. Based on a review of the California Important Farmland Finder maintained by the California Department of Conservation, there is no farmland of local or statewide importance within or in the vicinity of to the Project site (DOC 2023a).

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

The entire Project site is zoned as Mixed Use Medium by the City of Moorpark (City of Moorpark 2023). Additionally, the Project would not acquire or impact any agricultural land. Based on a review of the California Important Farmland Finder maintained by the California Department of Conservation, there is no farmland of local or statewide importance within or in the vicinity of to the Project site (DOC 2023a). This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

**Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

## Floodplain Management

General Requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, requires federal activities to avoid impacts to floodplains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development to the extent practicable.	Executive Order 11988	24 CFR 55

1. Do any of the following exemptions apply? Select the applicable citation? [only one selection possible]

- 55.12(c)(3)
- 55.12(c)(4)
- 55.12(c)(5)
- 55.12(c)(6)
- 55.12(c)(7)
- ✓ 55.12(c)(8)
- 55.12(c)(9)
- 55.12(c)(10)
- 55.12(c)(11)
- None of the above

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

The following exception applies, so the project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988: 55.12(c)(8), HUD's approval of financial assistance for a project on any site in a floodplain for which FEMA has issued: (i) A final Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) or final Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) that removed the property from a FEMA-designated floodplain location; or (ii) A conditional LOMA or conditional LOMR if the HUD approval is subject to the requirements and conditions of the conditional LOMA or conditional LOMR.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[Moorpark LOMR.png](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

**Historic Preservation**

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Regulations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) require a consultative process to identify historic properties, assess project impacts on them, and avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)	36 CFR 800 “Protection of Historic Properties” <a href="https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol3-part800.pdf">https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol3-part800.pdf</a>

**Threshold**

**Is Section 106 review required for your project?**

- No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA ). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)
- ✓ No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].
- Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect).

**Threshold (b). Document and upload the memo or explanation/justification of the other determination below:**

See attached.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

The Cultural Resources section of the Draft EIR that was prepared for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project covered the proposed library improvements. This section of the Draft EIR addresses the potential impacts to cultural resources that could result from implementation of the Project. Information in this section is derived from a Historical Resource Assessment Report (Historical Resource Assessment) prepared for the Project Site by South Environmental; an archaeological records search conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) on May 11,

2022; and the Sacred Lands File search conducted by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) received on May 16, 2022. Also, Native American consultation was conducted for the Project pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18. One historical resource was identified near the Project Site: the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)-listed Tanner Corner Building located at 601 Moorpark Avenue. The Project would construct a library building adjacent to the north and west elevations of the Tanner Corner Building. As determined by the City in the EIR prepared for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan, the Project has avoided the potential for cultural resource impacts through the implementation of the following conditions of approval and mitigation measures. \* Condition of Approval CUL-1 \* Condition of Approval CUL-2 \* Condition of Approval CUL-3 \* CEQA Mitigation Measure MM CUL-1 \* CEQA Mitigation Measure MM NOI-2 See the attached Cultural Resource section from the Environmental Impact Report and a Historic Report that were prepared for the Moorpark Civic Center Master Plan Project.

**Supporting documentation**

[CulturalSection.pdf](#)

[Historic-Preservation-Worksheet\\_20231212.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

### Noise Abatement and Control

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD’s noise regulations protect residential properties from excessive noise exposure. HUD encourages mitigation as appropriate.	Noise Control Act of 1972  General Services Administration Federal Management Circular 75-2: “Compatible Land Uses at Federal Airfields”	Title 24 CFR 51 Subpart B

**1. What activities does your project involve? Check all that apply:**

New construction for residential use

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

A research demonstration project which does not result in new construction or reconstruction

An interstate land sales registration

Any timely emergency assistance under disaster assistance provision or appropriations which are provided to save lives, protect property, protect public health and safety, remove debris and wreckage, or assistance that has the effect of restoring facilities substantially as they existed prior to the disaster

✓ None of the above

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

The Project would result in temporary construction noise; however, such activities would be conducted between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm in accordance with the City's noise ordinance. During operation of the Project, no additional noise is expected to result from the Project roadways since the Project does not involve any improvements that would increase vehicle speeds or traffic volumes. Therefore, no noise abatement measures are required as part of the Project. Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulation. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.

**Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

**Sole Source Aquifers**

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
<p><b>The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 protects drinking water systems which are the sole or principal drinking water source for an area and which, if contaminated, would create a significant hazard to public health.</b></p>	<p>Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 201, 300f et seq., and 21 U.S.C. 349)</p>	<p>40 CFR Part 149</p>

1. Does the project consist solely of acquisition, leasing, or rehabilitation of an existing building(s)?

- Yes
- ✓ No

2. Is the project located on a sole source aquifer (SSA)?

A sole source aquifer is defined as an aquifer that supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water consumed in the area overlying the aquifer. This includes streamflow source areas, which are upstream areas of losing streams that flow into the recharge area.

- ✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload documentation used to make your determination, such as a map of your project (or jurisdiction, if appropriate) in relation to the nearest SSA and its source area, below.

Yes

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.

**Supporting documentation**

[Moorpark SSA.png](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

### Wetlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11990 discourages direct or indirect support of new construction impacting wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. The Fish and Wildlife Service’s National Wetlands Inventory can be used as a primary screening tool, but observed or known wetlands not indicated on NWI maps must also be processed Off-site impacts that result in draining, impounding, or destroying wetlands must also be processed.	Executive Order 11990	24 CFR 55.20 can be used for general guidance regarding the 8 Step Process.

**1. Does this project involve new construction as defined in Executive Order 11990, expansion of a building’s footprint, or ground disturbance? The term "new construction" shall include draining, dredging, channelizing, filling, diking, impounding, and related activities and any structures or facilities begun or authorized after the effective date of the Order**

No

✓ Yes

**2. Will the new construction or other ground disturbance impact an on- or off-site wetland? The term "wetlands" means those areas that are inundated by surface or ground water with a frequency sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances does or would support, a prevalence of vegetative or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas such as sloughs, potholes, wet meadows, river overflows, mud flats, and natural ponds.**

**"Wetlands under E.O. 11990 include isolated and non-jurisdictional wetlands."**

✓ No, a wetland will not be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990’s definition of new construction.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload a map or any other relevant documentation below which explains your determination

Yes, there is a wetland that be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990’s definition of new construction.

### Screen Summary

**Compliance Determination**

There is a drainage channel adjacent to the Project site, which is referred to as the Walnut Canyon drainage channel. The channel is a concrete-lined open channel that runs along the western boundary of the site and becomes an underground concrete box north of West High Street. The channel remains underground running west beneath West High Street, until it reverts back to an open concrete-lined channel towards the west. This drainage is likely subject to the jurisdiction of the Regional Water Quality Board, CDFW, and United States (U.S.) Army Corps of Engineers. However, the Project would not impact this feature. The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.

**Supporting documentation**

[Moorpark Wetlands.png](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

### Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act provides federal protection for certain free-flowing, wild, scenic and recreational rivers designated as components or potential components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS) from the effects of construction or development.	The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287), particularly section 7(b) and (c) (16 U.S.C. 1278(b) and (c))	36 CFR Part 297

**1. Is your project within proximity of a NWSRS river?**

No

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Designated Wild and Scenic River or Study Wild and Scenic River.

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) River.

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

**Supporting documentation**

[Moorpark WSR.png](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

### Environmental Justice

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Determine if the project creates adverse environmental impacts upon a low-income or minority community. If it does, engage the community in meaningful participation about mitigating the impacts or move the project.	Executive Order 12898	

**HUD strongly encourages starting the Environmental Justice analysis only after all other laws and authorities, including Environmental Assessment factors if necessary, have been completed.**

**1. Were any adverse environmental impacts identified in any other compliance review portion of this project's total environmental review?**

Yes

No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

#### **Screen Summary**

##### **Compliance Determination**

No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

##### **Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No