

**DRAFT INITIAL STUDY MITIGATED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE NORTH
RANCH RESIDENTIAL PROJECT
MOORPARK, CA**

Prepared for:

CITY OF MOORPARK
799 Moorpark Avenue
Moorpark, California 93021

Prepared by:

CHAMBERS GROUP, INC.
600 West Broadway, Suite 350
Glendale, California 91204

September 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SECTION 1.0 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING	1
1.1 PROJECT PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
1.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SITE CHARACTERISTICS	1
1.2.1 Location.....	1
1.2.2 Site Characteristics.....	1
1.2.3 Site Access and Circulation	1
1.2.4 General Plan Designation/Zoning	4
1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	4
1.3.1 Construction.....	6
1.3.2 Site Development and Construction Measures	7
1.3.3 Operations and Maintenance	10
1.4 PERMITS AND AGREEMENTS	10
SECTION 2.0 – ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION	13
2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:	13
2.2 DETERMINATION	13
SECTION 3.0 – EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	14
SECTION 4.0 – CHECKLIST OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	16
4.1 AESTHETICS.....	16
4.1.1 Impact Analysis	16
4.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES	17
4.2.1 Impact Analysis	18
4.3 AIR QUALITY.....	19
4.3.1 Environmental Analysis.....	19
4.3.2 Impact Analysis	21
4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	26
4.4.1 Environmental Setting	27
4.4.2 Impact Analysis	27
4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES	36
4.5.1 Environmental Setting	36
4.5.2 Impact Analysis	36
4.6 ENERGY	38
4.6.1 Environmental Setting	38
4.6.2 Impact Analysis	39
4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS	41
4.7.1 Environmental Setting	42
4.7.2 Impact Analysis	42

4.8	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	46
4.8.1	Environmental Setting	46
4.8.2	Impact Analysis	46
4.9	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	48
4.9.1	Impact Analysis	48
4.10	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....	51
4.10.1	Environmental Setting	52
4.10.2	Impact Analysis	52
4.11	LAND USE AND PLANNING	56
4.11.1	Impact Analysis	56
4.12	MINERAL RESOURCES	57
4.12.1	Impact Analysis	58
4.13	NOISE	58
4.13.1	Environmental Setting	58
4.13.2	Impact Analysis	59
4.14	POPULATION AND HOUSING	60
4.14.1	Impact Analysis	60
4.15	PUBLIC SERVICES.....	62
4.15.1	Impact Analysis	62
4.16	RECREATION	65
4.16.1	Impact Analysis	65
4.17	TRANSPORTATION	66
4.17.1	Environmental Setting	66
4.17.2	Impact Analysis	66
4.18	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	69
4.18.1	Impact Analysis	69
4.19	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	71
4.19.1	Impact Analysis	71
4.20	WILDFIRE.....	74
4.20.1	Impact Analysis	74
4.21	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	76
4.21.1	Impact Analysis	76
SECTION 5.0 – REFERENCES		79

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A – Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Study
- APPENDIX B – Biological Studies
- APPENDIX C – Tree Report
- APPENDIX D – Jurisdictional Delineation
- APPENDIX E – Focused Coastal California Gnatcatcher Survey
- APPENDIX F – Cultural Resources Phase I Assessment Report
- APPENDIX G – Geotechnical Investigation Report
- APPENDIX H – Drainage Report
- APPENDIX I – Traffic Impact Analysis
- APPENDIX J – Noise Study
- APPENDIX K – VMT Analysis
- APPENDIX L – Sewer Area Study
- APPENDIX M – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1: General Plan / Zoning/ Existing Land Use	4
Table 2: Project Phasing.....	10
Table 3: VCAPCD Attainment Designations	21
Table 4: Construction-Related Maximum Daily Criteria Pollutant Emissions.....	22
Table 5: Operations-Related Maximum Daily Criteria Pollutant Emissions.....	24
Table 6: Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Proposed Project	46
Table 7: Levels of Service in the Project Vicinity AM and PM Peak Hours	57

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>Page</u>
Figure 1 – Project Vicinity Map.....	3
Figure 2 – Site Plan.....	8
Figure 3 – Landscape Plan.....	9
Figure 4 – Existing Land Use and Zoning.....	11
Figure 5 – Proposed Land Use and Zoning.....	12

SECTION 1.0 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

1.1 PROJECT PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

West Point Homes (Applicant) proposes to provide 134 single-family homes and five future single family homes on estate lots in a new residential planned development (Project) that includes new streets, landscaping, trails, and related on- and off-site improvements on an approximately 68-acre property consisting of two lots (APNs 5110190285 & 5110190305) located at 5979 Gabbert Road (Figure 1). The purpose of the development is to provide the City of Moorpark (City) a new planned residential development with single-family homes (Figure 2). Through the negotiated development agreement, 15% of the units would be reserved as affordable

The City is the lead agency for the Proposed Project. This Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] §21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations [CCR], §15000 et seq.) and has determined that preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration would be appropriate under CEQA.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SITE CHARACTERISTICS

1.2.1 Location

The Project site is located at 5979 Gabbert Road in the northwestern portion of the City and is bounded by Gabbert Road to the east and residential uses to the north. The Project site is north of the Union Pacific railroad tracks and west of the intersection of Gabbert Road and Elwin Lane. The Project site includes two different parcels for a combined acreage of approximately 68 acres (Assessor Parcel Numbers [APNs] 5110-190-285 and 5110-190-305). Lands to the west and south are undeveloped. The Project site is surrounded by vacant land and rural residential properties to the north and east, vacant land and railroad tracks to the south, and agricultural lands to the west. The Project site is located approximately 2,000 feet south of the Moorpark Golf Course and an unnamed residential neighborhood, and approximately 2,000 feet north of the Southern California Edison (SCE) Moorpark Substation. The Project site is approximately 21 miles east of the Pacific Ocean.

1.2.2 Site Characteristics

The Project site comprises approximately 68 acres with a portion of the site that includes several structures that are still present onsite: a trailer/mobile home current used as an office, a garage in the northeast corner, and a large storage shed in the northwest section. Two concrete foundations, gardens, a tennis court, , and concrete driveway, along with an access road and undeveloped land are also found on the site. The Project site consists of different types of grasslands, landscaped areas, and developed areas within the foothills of the City. The topography of the project site is defined by three rolling, broad-topped ridges that trend from northwest to southeast, the basins in between, and a relatively flat area in the southwest corner. There are coastal sage scrub, ruderal grassland, and landscaping elements that occur together in various degrees.

1.2.3 Site Access and Circulation

During construction, access to the site will be via an existing paved driveway off Gabbert Road. After the development is completed, new access will be provided via construction of North Hills Parkway along the southerly property boundary to Gabbert Road. North Hills Parkway will terminate as a cul-de-sac towards

the middle of the site, along the southern property line. A separate fire lane access would extend from northwest Thoroughbred Drive down to Los Angeles Drive. A separate 30-foot-wide fire access road to the planned development will occur from the eastern side of the development from Gabbert Road.

affordable housing. The Project entails demolishing the existing remaining structures onsite and grading the land for the building of the single-family housing development.

Improved Access

The Project will include construction of North Hills Parkway with two lanes of traffic and a center median between the two lanes across the southerly property boundary to Gabbert Road. The proposed North Hills Parkway will terminate as a cul-de-sac around the middle of the south property line. The new intersection at North Hills Parkway and Gabbert Road will be controlled by a stop sign on North Hills Parkway.

The Applicant will complete the construction of North Village Drive from North Hills Parkway to A Street (Thoroughbred Drive). North Hills Parkway would terminate in a cul-de-sac at the middle portion of the site with separate emergency fire lane road access to Los Angeles Avenue. All community streets are planned to be public streets and will be dedicated to the City with the record map.

Circulation and access will occur on the planned residential development through various community streets. Thoroughbred Drive will provide east and west access through the northern portion of the site, Tennessee Walker Drive will stretch east and west through the southern portion of the site. Other community streets such as Quarter Horse Way, Thoroughbred Drive, North Ranch Drive, Morgan Way, Appaloosa Way, and Shetland Way will provide additional access through the planned residential development.

Recreation and Landscaping

The community landscaping/recreation improvements will include sloped landscape, railed fencing, and a multi-use trail system along North Hills Parkway (Figure 3). Landscaping, such as shrubs and trees, will be provided along slopes, within medians, and along the border of the residential development. The landscaping will be irrigated with an automatic drip irrigation system that complies with Assembly Bill (AB) 1881 and the City standards. The community landscaping will be maintained by the Homeowners Association (HOA). Landscaping associated with the Proposed Project would comply with the City Landscaping Manual and include a fuel modification plan and defensible space as required by Public Resources Code Section 4291(a) and (b). All plants included in the landscaping would be drought tolerant in order to comply with landscaping requirements for Very Fire Hazard Severity Zones.

The residential community will provide one community park, two dog parks located on Lot 4 and Lot D, with a decomposed granite, multi-use trail along North Hills Parkway for community members to use. The parks would be provided for public use and will be maintained by the HOA.

General Plan Amendment/Zone Change

The General Plan designation of the Project Site is RL and zoning is AE. In addition to the development of the residential community, the Project includes an amendment to the General Plan designation from RL to H, RL, and OS. and an a zoning amendment from AE to RE-5AC, Residential Planned Development (RPD), and OS (Figures 4 and 5). The City's General Plan designates the Project site as Rural Low Density Residential (RL), which allows for one dwelling unit per 5 acres. The RL designation is intended to allow limited development of residential estate lots on minimum 5-acre lots, or using clustering techniques for areas characterized by significant site constraints (e.g., rugged topography, steep slopes, lack of services, limited access), or areas of important visual or natural resources. The conversion from RL to H (High

1.3.3 Operations and Maintenance

The Project is anticipated to be completed phases as shown below in Table 2.

Table 2: Project Phasing

Phase #	Description	Lot #
1	Grading, Streets, and Underground Utilities	–
2	Construction of Models	77-79
3	Building Phase 1	6-17
4	Building Phase 2	18-24, 135-139
5	Building Phase 3	33-48
6	Building Phase 4	25-32, 49-56
7	Building Phase 5	57-60, 89-95, 132-134
8	Building Phase 6	117-131
9	Building Phase 7	96-104, 115-116
10	Building Phase 8	105-114
11	Building Phase 9	61-66, 83-88
12	Building Phase 10	67-76, 80-82
To Be Decided	Estate Lots	1-5

Maintenance within the community will be coordinated by the HOA and will include ongoing landscaping, as well as improvements to public spaces, park, and trails.


1.4 **PERMITS AND AGREEMENTS**

As required by CEQA Guidelines, this section provides, to the extent the information is known, a list of permits and other approvals required to implement the Project.

The following approvals and permits may be required for the Project:

- Residential Planned Development RPD 2016-02
- General Plan Amendment (GPA) GPA 2016-02
- Zone Change (ZC) ZC 2016-02
- Development Agreement DA 2016-02
- Tentative Map TTM 5847
- City Grading and Building Permits
- Ventura County Fire Department Approval
- Ventura County Waterworks District (VCWWD) No. 1 Approval

Figure 5 – Proposed Land Use and Zoning



SECTION 2.0 – ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would potentially be affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact,” as indicated by the checklists on the following pages. For each of the potentially affected factors, mitigation measures are recommended that would reduce the impacts to less than significant levels.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology /Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities /Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

2.2 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



September 20, 2022

Signature

Date

Douglas Spondello, AICP

Name

Deputy Community Development Director

Title

SECTION 3.0 – EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if substantial evidence exists that an effect may be significant. If one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries are marked when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

*Note: Instructions may be omitted from final document.

SECTION 4.0 – CHECKLIST OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

4.1 AESTHETICS

1.	AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c)	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.1.1 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

No Impact. The Project site is not located within any of the City-designated scenic corridors. The designated scenic corridors include portions of the Arroyo Simi, Los Angeles Avenue, Tierra Rejada Road, and State Route (SR) 23 (Moorpark Freeway; City 1986). The designated Tierra Rejada Road and Los Angeles Avenue scenic vistas are approximately 0.65 mile southwest and 2.1 miles east of the Project, respectively. SR 23 and Arroyo Simi Creek are approximately 2.4 miles east and one-mile south of the Project site, respectively (Google 2022). The Project site is surrounded by residential and rural land uses. Additionally, none of the nearby parks or trail systems have designated scenic viewpoints overlooking the Project site, and the Project site is not located within any of the scenic viewsheds designated in the City’s General Plan (City 1986). Therefore, the Project construction and operation would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista and impacts would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

No Impact. The Project is not located within a State scenic highway. No officially designated State scenic highways are in the vicinity of the Project site. SR 118, which is an eligible State scenic highway, is located more than 2 miles east of the Project site (California Department of Transportation 2019). Further, construction of the Project would not damage rock outcroppings or historic buildings because none are present at the Project site. Trees that will be removed are not within a State scenic highway. No impacts to scenic resources within a State scenic highway would occur.

- c) *Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site is located within a non-urbanized area of the City with industrial uses to the south and residential uses to the north, east, and west of the Project site. The Project site is located within an existing, non-urbanized area and north of Arroyo Simi, but not within any scenic corridors. No scenic viewpoints are overlooking the Project site and due to the varied terrain, views from publicly accessible areas would be limited. The Project will be designed to comply with the City’s Landscape Design Standards and Guidelines (City 2012) to be compatible with the City’s development standards. Landscaping associated with the Proposed Project would also include a fuel modification plan and defensible space as required by Public Resources Code Section 4291(a) and (b). All plants included in the landscaping would be drought tolerant in order to comply with landscaping requirements for Very Fire Hazard Severity Zones. The inclusion of landscaping will ensure that public views and the visual character are maintained. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would construct 139 new single-family homes which would include lighting as part of the design features. All lighting would be constructed in compliance with the lighting regulations set forth in the City’s Zoning Code, including using shielded lamps directed away from adjacent properties and streets; not exceeding seven foot-candles on 95 percent or more of the grid points, light poles not exceeding 25 feet in height, and curbed planters around all light poles (Moorpark Municipal Code 17.30.065). Compliance with these regulations would ensure that impacts associated with the Project’s lighting would be less than significant.

4.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES

2.	<p>AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES. (In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----	---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

(a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.2.1 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

No Impact. The Project site is currently zoned AE and designated by the General Plan as RL; therefore, it has been designated for rural low density residential uses by the City (City 2020a, 2020b). Based on mapping data provided by the California Department of Conservation’s Important Farmland Finder, the Project site does not encompass any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (California Department of Conservation [DOC] 2018). Classification provided by the DOC lists the land as grazing land and Farmland of Local Importance. No impact would occur.

b) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

No Impact. The Project site is zoned AE and designated by the General Plan as RL (City 2020a, 2020b). Although the site is zoned for agriculture, no agricultural uses exist onsite and the site has previously been used for rural housing. Additionally, a map of agricultural preserves produced for the County of Ventura’s (County) 2040 General Plan Update shows no lands under Williamson Act contracts are within the Project site (County 2020). No impact would occur.

c) *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?*

No Impact. The Project site is zoned AE and designated by the General Plan as RL; no land is designated as forest land or timberland within the Project site (City 2022a, 2022b). No impact would occur.

d) *Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

No Impact. The Project site is zoned AE and designated by the General Plan as RL; no land is designated as forest land or timberland within the Project site (City 2022a, 2022b). No impact would occur.

e) *Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

No Impact. The land is currently zoned AE and designated by the General Plan as RL and has therefore been designated for rural low density uses by the City (City 2022a, 2022b). The Project site does not encompass Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance and does not contain land currently under a Williamson Act contract (DOC 2022a; County 2020). Further, no designated forest land is within the Project site. No impacts would occur.

4.3 AIR QUALITY

3.	AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.3.1 Environmental Analysis

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Study was produced by Rincon Consultants, Inc. in January 2022 to determine the air quality and GHG emissions impacts associated with the Project (Appendix A). The criteria air pollution impacts created by the Project were analyzed through use of California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2020.4.0, a computer model published for estimating air pollutant emissions. Results from this analysis have been summarized and incorporated below. For more details regarding methods and results, see Appendix A.

Atmospheric Setting

Air quality is a function of both the rate and location of pollutant emissions under the influence of meteorological conditions and topographical features. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients interact with physical features of the landscape to determine their movement and dispersal and, consequently, their effect on air quality.

The regional climate within the Air Basin is dominated by the intensity and location of the semi-permanent Pacific high pressure zone, which, from spring to fall, induces regional subsidence and temperature inversion layers. The region is characterized by warm summers, mild winters, infrequent seasonal rainfall, and moderate humidity, with the predominate wind patterns follow a diurnal land/sea breeze cycle, with typical daytime winds from the west. The diurnal land/sea breeze pattern is a common occurrence in the Air Basin, and it recirculates air contaminants. Air pollutants are pushed toward the ocean during the early morning by the land breeze and toward the east during the afternoon by the sea breeze. This creates a “sloshing” effect, causing pollutants to remain in the area for several days. This pollutant “sloshing” effect happens most predominately from May through October, which is the “smog” season for the Air Basin.

The City is located within southeastern Ventura County, which is part of the inland portion of the Oxnard Plain Airshed, approximately 18 miles from the coast of the Pacific Ocean. The City experiences a mild Mediterranean climate, typical of Southern California. Average temperatures for the Thousand Oaks 1 SW Monitoring Station (WRCC 2016), which is the nearest monitoring station with historical data, range from an average low of 43 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) in January to an average high of 86 °F in July. Rainfall averages approximately 10.49 inches a year.

Regulatory Setting

National Ambient Air Quality Standards and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) have been established for the following criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O₃), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), inhalable particulate matter with diameters 10 micrometers and smaller (PM₁₀), fine particulate matter with diameters 2.5 micrometers and smaller (PM_{2.5}), and lead. The CAAQS also set standards for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, and visibility.

Both the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and California Air Resources Board (CARB) utilize ambient air quality monitoring to designate areas according to their attainment status for criteria air pollutants. The three basic designation categories are nonattainment, attainment, and unclassified. A “nonattainment” designation signifies that the measured pollutant concentrations exceeded the established standards. An “attainment” designation signifies that pollutant concentration did not exceed the established standard. Finally, an “unclassified” designation indicates that insufficient data exists to determine attainment or nonattainment; however, “unclassified” is usually assumed to be “attainment,” since if preliminary data found a potential for an exceedance to occur, more data would have been collected in order to determine if the pollutant meets the “nonattainment” designation.

As shown in Table 3, the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) has been designated by EPA for the national standards as a nonattainment area for O₃. Currently, the VCAPCD is in attainment with the national ambient air quality standards for PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, CO, SO₂, and NO₂. The VCAPCD has been designated by CARB as a nonattainment area for O₃ and PM₁₀ because the CAAQS are more stringent than the national ambient air quality standards. The VCAPCD is required to adopt plans on a triennial basis that show progress toward meeting the State O₃ and PM₁₀ standards. The County is considered to be in attainment or unclassified under State standards for all other pollutants.

Table 3: VCAPCD Attainment Designations

Pollutant	Federal Designations	State Designation
Ozone (O ₃)	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	Unclassified/Attainment	Nonattainment
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	Unclassified/Attainment	Unclassified
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Attainment	Attainment
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	Unclassified/Attainment	Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	Unclassified/Attainment	Attainment
Lead	Attainment	Attainment
Particulate Sulfate	– ¹	Unclassified
Hydrogen Sulfide	– ¹	Unclassified
Visibility Reducing Particles	– ¹	Unclassified

¹ No Federal Standard

Source: http://www.vcapcd.org/air_quality_standards.htm

4.3.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Ventura County Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The *Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines* (VCAPCD 2003) provides procedures for determining a project’s consistency with the AQMP. Figure 4-1 of the VCAPCD Guidelines shows that the Project site is located in Growth Area 06, which covers the City. For growth areas, the VCAPCD Guidelines detail that if the population growth created by the project is within the growth forecasts and conforms to the applicable General Plan designation, the project is determined to be consistent with the AQMP.

The Ventura County 2020 population was estimated at 886,359 in the 2016 AQMP, with an estimated population of 905,574 by 2025 (Project buildout). This represents an approximate 2 percent growth from 2020 and an 8.4 percent increase from 2012 (baseline for AQMP of 835,400) (Appendix A). The Project involves the development of 139 single-family residential units. Using an average household size of 3.23 persons, the Project would add approximately 449 residents to the City of Moorpark. The addition of 449 new residents would increase Ventura County’s population to 906,023 residents, which falls within the population growth forecast for the County. The Project would account for approximately 2.34 percent of Ventura County’s forecast population growth through 2025. Therefore, the Project would not generate growth that would exceed the VCAPCD’s projected population growth forecast and would be consistent with the growth assumptions in the VCAPCD AQMP.

Based on the discussion above, the Proposed Project will not result in an inconsistency with the AQMP. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

- b) *Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard. As shown above in Table 3, the Proposed Project area is designated as a federal and/or State nonattainment area for O₃ and PM₁₀. To estimate if the Proposed Project may adversely affect the air quality in the region, the VCAPCD has prepared the VCAPCD Guidelines, which details that a proposed project’s criteria pollutant emissions would be considered significant if it would generate daily operational emissions exceeding 25 pounds of reactive organic gas (ROG) or nitrogen oxide (NOx) . These thresholds are not intended to be applied to construction emissions because such emissions are temporary.

The VCAPCD has not established quantitative thresholds for particulate matter for either operation or construction. However, the VCAPCD indicates that a project that may generate fugitive dust emissions in such quantities as to cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons, or which may endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such person, or which may cause or have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property would have a significant air quality impact. This threshold is particularly applicable to the generation of fugitive dust during construction grading operations. To determine whether a regional air quality impact would occur, the project-generated emissions are compared to the VCAPCD’s recommended thresholds for operational emissions.

Construction Emissions

Construction of the Proposed Project would create air emissions primarily from equipment exhaust and fugitive dust. The air emissions from the Proposed Project were analyzed using CalEEMod (Appendix A). Construction activities for the Proposed Project are expected to begin in Spring 2023 and continue until Fall 2024. The construction activities would include site preparation and grading of the Project site, building construction, paving, and application of architectural coatings.

Table 4 shows the maximum daily emissions that would be created from construction of the Proposed Project based on the default construction equipment assumptions provided by CalEEMod.

Table 4: Construction-Related Maximum Daily Criteria Pollutant Emissions

Construction Season	Pollutant Emissions (Pounds/Day)		
	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀
<i>Unmitigated Construction Emissions</i>			
2022 Maximum	13	124	6
2023 Maximum	38	26	1
2023 Maximum	38	25	1
Maximum Emissions	38	124	6
VCAPCD Thresholds	25	25	N/A

Construction Season	Pollutant Emissions (Pounds/Day)		
	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀
Threshold Exceeded	Yes	Yes	No
Mitigated Construction Emissions			
2022 Maximum	3	12	14
2023 Maximum	19	5	1
2023 Maximum	19	5	1
Maximum Emissions	19	12	14
VCAPCD Thresholds	25	25	N/A
Threshold Exceeded	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0.

As detailed in the VCAPCD Guidelines, the VCAPCD has not established quantitative thresholds for particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}); and the 25 pounds per day thresholds for ROG and NOx do not apply to construction emissions because the emissions are temporary. The VCAPCD indicates, however, that a project that may generate fugitive dust emissions in such quantities as to cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons, or which may endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such person, or which may cause or have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property would have a significant air quality impact.

In order to reduce air quality impacts from construction activities, the VCAPCD requires that all projects minimize construction emissions through adherence to the VCAPCD Rule 55 fugitive dust control measures and minimize ROG through adherence to the VCAPCD Rule 74.2 architectural coating volatile organic compound (VOC) content limits. Compliance with VCAPCD Rules 55 and 74.2 would ensure that construction emissions would not be generated in such quantities as to cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons, or that may endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such person or the public. As shown in Table 4, the Project would exceed ROG and NOx emissions while complying with VCAPCD regulations; therefore, Mitigation Measures (MM)-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, with mitigation, a less than significant air quality impact would occur from construction of the Proposed Project.

- MM-AQ-1** The developer shall ensure that all onsite vehicles and equipment with horsepower greater than 50 shall meet, at a minimum, EPA Tier IV final engine certification requirements. If Tier IV final equipment is not available, the contractor may apply other technologies available for construction equipment such that it would achieve a reduction in NOx and particulate matter emissions comparable to that of Tier IV final construction equipment. Where alternatives to EPA Tier IV are utilized, the contractor shall be required to provide evidence that these alternative technologies would achieve comparable emissions reductions. Certifications or alternative reduction strategies shall be required prior to receiving a construction permit.

MM-AQ-2 The developer shall ensure that the architectural coating activities shall be phased such that they extend for a minimum of 150 days over the duration of the Project construction.

Operational Emissions

The Proposed Project consists of the development and operation of a residential development that may generate air emissions from mobile sources that are created from vehicular emissions, area sources, and energy usage. Table 5 shows the estimated worst-case summer or winter daily emissions from operation of the Proposed Project.

Table 5: Operations-Related Maximum Daily Criteria Pollutant Emissions

Activity	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)				
	ROG	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area Sources ¹	7	<1	12	<1	<1
Energy Usage ²	<1	1	<1	<1	<1
Mobile Sources ³	4	4	36	8	2
Total Worst-Case Project Emissions⁴	11	5	48	8	2
VCAPCD Thresholds	25	25	N/A⁴	N/A⁴	N/A⁴
Exceed Thresholds?	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A

Notes:

¹ Area sources consist of emissions from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscape equipment.

² Energy usage consists of emissions from onsite natural gas usage.

³ Mobile sources consist of emissions from vehicles and road dust.

⁴ Based on worst-case between summer and winter mobile source emissions.

Source: CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0.

As shown in Table 5, operations-related emissions would not exceed the VCAPCD threshold for ROG or NO_x. Therefore, a less than significant air quality impact would occur from operation of the Proposed Project. Accordingly, the Proposed Project would not result in a cumulative considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

c) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project has the potential to expose nearby sensitive receptors to criteria pollutants, including fugitive dust, toxic air contaminants (TACs), and San Joaquin Valley Fever. The nearest sensitive receptors are single-family homes adjacent to the northern and eastern sides of the Project site.

Fugitive Dust Emissions

Construction activities are a source of fugitive dust (i.e., PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) emissions that may have a substantial, although temporary, impact on local air quality. In addition, fugitive dust may be a nuisance to those living and working in the immediate vicinity of the proposed construction activities. Fugitive dust emissions from the Proposed Project would be created during onsite earth-moving activities. The anticipated onsite worst-case PM₁₀ emissions for each phase of construction have been provided above in Table 4. However, it should be noted that fugitive dust emissions vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level and type of activity and weather conditions. Additionally, most PM₁₀ emissions from onsite construction activities are from inert silicates rather than complex organic particles released from combustion sources, which are more harmful to health.

Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would be required to implement emissions control measures detailed in VCAPCD Rule 55 fugitive dust control measures. With implementation of VCAPCD's Rule 55, the Proposed Project would not exceed the VCAPCD standards for fugitive dust. Fugitive dust emissions would be less than significant for construction activities; no fugitive dust emissions are anticipated to occur from operational activities.

Construction-Related TAC Emissions

Construction of the Proposed Project would generate TAC emissions from the onsite operation of diesel-powered equipment in the form of diesel particulate matter. Given the relatively limited number of heavy-duty construction equipment, the varying distances to the nearby sensitive receptors that construction equipment would operate, and the short-term construction schedule, the Proposed Project would not result in a long-term (i.e., 70 years) substantial source of TAC emissions and corresponding individual cancer risk. In addition, CCR Title 13, Article 4.8, Chapter 9, Section 2449 regulates emissions from off-road diesel equipment in California. This regulation limits idling of equipment to no longer than five minutes and requires equipment operators to label each piece of equipment and provide annual reports to CARB of their fleet's usage and emissions. This regulation also requires systematic upgrading of the emission tier level of each fleet; currently, no commercial operator is allowed to purchase Tier 0 or Tier 1 equipment; by January 2023, no commercial operator is allowed to purchase Tier 2 equipment. In addition to the purchase restrictions, equipment operators need to meet fleet average emissions targets that become more stringent each year between years 2014 and 2023. Therefore, less than significant, short-term TAC impacts would occur during construction of the Proposed Project.

Operations-Related TAC Emissions

The Proposed Project consists of a residential development. Due to the nominal number of diesel truck trips anticipated to be generated by the ongoing operation of the Proposed Project, a less-than-significant TAC impact would occur during the ongoing operations of the Proposed Project; no mitigation would be required.

In addition, the Proposed Project would not site sensitive receptors within 500 feet of a freeway or an urban road with 100,000 vehicles/day or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles/day, and the Proposed Project would not create a human health hazard by exposing sensitive receptors to substantial

pollutant concentrations (Appendix A). Implementation of the Proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and impacts would be less than significant.

d) *Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

Less than Significant Impact. According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses typically producing objectionable odors include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Proposed Project includes residential uses, which are not listed by the SCAQMD as a land use that produces objectionable odors. Other odors, including the smells of oil or diesel fuels, would be limited to Project construction. All off-road construction equipment would be covered by the CARB anti-idling rule (SS2449(d)(2)), which limits idling to five minutes. Project construction would be temporary and would not produce odors long-term. Therefore, a less-than-significant odor impact would occur; no mitigation would be required.

4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.4.1 Environmental Setting

Multiple biological resource surveys were conducted by both LDC Environmental and Envicom at the Project site; the first survey was conducted in 2009 and the subsequent surveys were conducted in June and July 2021 (Appendix B). The surveys were performed by slowly walking transects across the Study Area and investigating particular areas that support the habitat requirements specific to these species. Additionally, a Tree Report was prepared by L. Newman Design Group and is provided as Appendix C. A Jurisdictional Delineation Report was also prepared for the Project by Envicom Corporation in August 2021, to determine areas under jurisdiction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and Army Corps of Engineers (Appendix D). A focused Coastal California Gnatcatcher survey was conducted by TW Biological Services in June 2022 to detect the absence or presence of the gnatcatcher onsite (Appendix E).

4.4.2 Impact Analysis

- a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Database searches resulted in a list of nine federally and/or State-listed threatened, endangered, or otherwise special status plant species documented to historically occur within the vicinity of the Project site. Three species, White rabbit-tobacco, Ojai Navarretia, and Gerry's curly-leaved monardella, listed as Rare, Threatened, or Endangered by the State or Federal Governments were found to potentially occur within the Project site. White rabbit-tobacco is growing in the northwestern corner of the Study Area, approximately 300 feet outside the anticipated development footprint. No other special-status plant species were found within the Study Area. As previously discussed in the potential for occurrence analysis for special-status plant species, many of the special-status species known to occur in the region are presumed to be absent from the site due to lack of suitable habitat or confirmation via appropriately timed springtime rare plant surveys.

Database searches resulted in a list of 10 federally and/or State-listed threatened, endangered, California State Species of Special Concern (SSC), or otherwise special status wildlife species that have the potential to occur within the Project site (Appendix B). These wildlife species include:

- Western spadefoot
- California glossy snake
- Coast horned lizard
- Coast patch-nosed snake
- Coastal whiptail
- Coastal California Gnatcatcher
- Golden eagle
- White-tailed kite
- Pallid bat

- Western mastiff bat

These species may occur on the Project site as transients that venture onto the property to forage. The site contains potentially suitable habitat for the coastal California Gnatcatcher, and the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) reports several observations within close proximity of the study area which consists of the Project boundary and areas outside the property where grading activities will occur. A focused survey for coastal whiptail and coast horned lizard was performed on July 14, 2021. Also, due to the presence of suitable habitat, the focused survey was expanded to include the California glossy snake and the coast patch-nosed snake. This survey focused on recording the presence and absence of these species as determined by visual observation and potential burrows as well as the availability of the food and microhabitat requirements of these four special-status species. During the survey, habitat and food resources required by these species were documented; however, none of the special-status species were observed.

A focused Coastal California Gnatcatcher survey was conducted between April 3 and May 23, 2022. The survey consisted of six presence/absence surveys within suitable habitat on the property. Areas of coastal sage scrub vegetation were visited during each survey, and a tape of recorded vocalizations was used, as necessary, to elicit responses from the species. No Coastal California Gnatcatchers were detected onsite (Appendix E).

Many of the special-status wildlife species that may potentially occur at the site (e.g., non-nesting birds and foraging bats) are capable of escaping harm during Project development, while others are vulnerable to direct impacts, including injury and mortality. Special-status species that could be directly impacted include potentially occurring terrestrial animals, including the California glossy snake (*Arizona elegans occidentalis*; SSC), coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*; SSC), coast patch-nosed snake (*Salvadora hexalepis virgulata*; SSC), coastal whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri*; SSC), burrowing western spadefoot (*Spea hammondi*; SSC) species, and the two bat species, pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*; SSC), and western mastiff bat (*Eumops perotis californicus*; SSC), which could roost in trees at the site. Although there is potential for several individuals of these species to be impacted, if present, the habitat loss associated with the Project would not significantly impact a population of these species, given the acreage of habitat that would be affected and the amount of remaining suitable habitat in the surrounding area.

To minimize potential impacts to nesting birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), construction activities should take place outside nesting season (i.e., February 1 to August 31) to the greatest extent practicable. MM-BIO-1 would reduce impacts to nesting birds to a less-than-significant level. In addition, to avoid impacts to general wildlife and their associated habitats, MM BIO-2 through MM BIO-6 would be implemented to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

- MM-BIO-1** If it is feasible, the clearing of vegetation and construction activities will be conducted between August 31st and February 1st, which is outside of the typical breeding/fledging season for the sensitive bird species and migratory birds that may nest on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site.

If clearing of vegetation and construction activities within the selected projects are planned between February 1st and August 31st, then breeding bird surveys will be conducted by qualified biologists at a maximum of two (2) weeks prior to

the commencement of activities. Nests and birds exhibiting breeding behavior will be identified within 500 feet of the area to be impacted and efforts will be made (including the creation of appropriate buffers around the nests and areas used by breeding birds, rerouting vehicular traffic, limiting the number of vehicles, the use of non-mechanized tools, etc.) to limit disturbances to the nests. A qualified biologist will monitor the identified nests and birds exhibiting breeding behavior during the duration of the work or until successful fledging occurs, whichever comes first. If the monitor notes that identified birds and nests are being negatively affected by the construction activity, then the buffers will be increased to an appropriate distance to ensure fledging is successful. After the completion of the construction activities or the completion of onsite breeding activities, a letter report summarizing the work and its effect on the breeding birds will be produced and submitted to the CDFW.

MM-BIO-2 Prior to the commencement of ground disturbance or vegetation removal activities, including but not limited to grubbing, grading, and fuel modification, two preconstruction surveys for special-status wildlife species, including coast horned lizard, coastal western whiptail, California glossy snake (*Arizona elegans occidentalis*), Coast patch-nosed snake, and western spadefoot, by a qualified biologist(s) to determine presence/absence of these species at the site. The first survey shall be conducted within 14 days and the second survey shall be conducted within three days of commencement of ground or vegetation disturbing activities. These surveys should coincide with weather conditions that are conducive for each species; sunny late-spring or summer days with above-average temperatures for, coast horned lizard, coastal western whiptail California glossy snake and the Coast patchnosed snake spadefoot. If the any of the four species are found to occur onsite during the additional surveys, then Mitigation Measure BIO-3 shall be instituted.

MM-BIO-3 If any individual of the four species are found during the survey, then a salvage program will be initiated for the site. The salvage program will consist of the capture of individuals from the area to be impacted by the Project implementation and their relocation to a predetermined offsite location, which has CDFW's approval, with appropriate habitat that will not be impacted by the Project activities or other construction activities in the vicinity. Time allowed for the salvage program will be determined by the size of the Project site and the abundance of the species that are found onsite. The salvage program will continue with the monitoring of the initial ground disturbance construction activities. The salvage program will conclude when all of the ground within the grading limits has been affected by construction activities. After the completion of the salvage program a letter report summarizing the surveys and salvage opportunities will be prepared and submitted to the CDFW.

MM-BIO-4 Prior to the initiation of any grading and during initial grubbing and topsoil salvage, biologists shall attempt to capture and relocate all reptiles within the impact area. Other ground dwelling wildlife, i.e. amphibians and mammals, shall be relocated if the opportunity presents itself. Wildlife shall be relocated to

preserved areas of the site when appropriate or to nearby (in the same watershed) permanent open space areas. It is assumed that a two-person team can adequately salvage the reptiles on the entire site in half a day.

MM-BIO-5 To reduce impacts resulting from construction vehicle traffic, routes and trips shall be restricted to a minimum number. Earth-moving equipment shall be confined to the narrowest possible corridor during construction. Earth-moving and other construction equipment shall be confined to the Project footprint and shall not operate or maneuver in areas outside the Project footprint. The entire edge of grading shall be fenced with brightly colored “snow fence” or similar material. This shall serve to alert equipment operators of the grading limits. All vehicle access shall be via areas within the impact zone. No temporary access roads shall be made through portions of the site that shall be preserved as natural open space.

MM-BIO-6 The construction of litter barriers (i.e.: walls or small mesh-chain link fence) around the Project site shall be accomplished in order to limit the progression of litter into the open spaces of the Project area or surrounding areas. Continuous deflective separation units shall be installed in the storm drain inlets to remove gross pollutants from storm water.

b) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) is found on 5.6 acres of the Project site, and 2.11 acres would be impacted through Project development. Mule fat scrub is present on 0.15 acre of the Project with within the northern and southern portion of the channelized drainage, and all 0.15 acre would be impacted. Southern alluvial fan scrub is present on 0.26 acres of the Project site, confined to the northwest corner of the wash in the unnamed blue line stream; however, none of this habitat would be impacted. Grading for the Proposed Project would result in the removal of approximately 0.71 acre of California Brittle Bush Scrub Alliance, which is considered a sensitive natural community by CDFW. Also, fuel modification for the Proposed Project would potentially impact approximately 0.03 acre of the California Brittle Bush Scrub Alliance, depending on site-specific fuel modification requirements, which are to the discretion of the Ventura County Fire Department (VCFD). Grading of the California Brittle Bush Scrub Alliance would be a significant, but mitigable impact. With implementation of MM BIO-7 through MM BIO-11, impacts to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities would occur.

MM-BIO-7 In order for any remaining unmodified natural open space within or adjacent to the Project site to continue to function as a natural part of the regional ecosystem to the greatest extent possible, the applicant shall develop a management plan for the protection and maintenance of remaining onsite open space areas. The plan shall be incorporated into the CC & R's for the tract and shall contain at least the following elements:

- Goals and Objectives
- Permitted and Prohibited Uses

- Exotic Plant and Animal Management
- Litter Management
- Responsible Parties
- Funding
- Enforcement and Penalties
- Trespass Remediation
- Contingencies

The Project's Homeowners Association is expected to be the long-term owner of the remaining unmodified natural open space and would be responsible for any necessary maintenance.

MM-BIO-8 To reduce coastal sage scrub loss resulting from fuel modification, a fuel modification zone shall be developed to restrict brush clearance to the minimum distance specified by the Ventura County Fire Department. Clearance distances shall take into account the presence of any block walls used between developable areas and the adjacent native habitat areas.

MM-BIO-9 Any coastal sage scrub that is remaining after full Project development will be preserved and enhanced. Any natural open space areas (excluding areas of mule fat scrub and southern alluvial fan scrub) and not affected by fuel modification requirements will be used for the creation of coastal sage scrub. Details of the proposed restoration and creation efforts and success criteria shall be described in a Mitigation and Monitoring Plan that is to be approved by CDFW prior to implementation.

MM-BIO-10 Grading and fuel modification impacts to the California brittle bush scrub plant community shall be compensated by restoration of in-kind habitat in an area(s) to be preserved as permanent open space. To the extent possible, this shall be accomplished by the on-site restoration of disturbed habitats (e.g., non-native grassland) in-kind habitats. Restoration should be implemented only where suitable conditions exist to support viable in-kind habitats. If on-site restoration is not possible, compensation for the loss or modification of the California brittle bush scrub communities may be accomplished by off-site restoration of in-kind habitat or by a contribution to an in-lieu fee program approved by the City of Moorpark.

A Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall be developed by a qualified biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist, and approved by the City of Moorpark prior to issuance of the grading permit for the Project. In broad terms, the plan shall at a minimum include:

- Description of the project/impact and mitigation sites
- Specific objectives
- Success criteria

- Plant palettes
- Implementation plan
- Maintenance activities
- Monitoring plan

Contingency measures/adaptive management Success criteria shall at a minimum be evaluated based on percent cover of planted native species, as well as control of invasive plant species within the restoration area. The performance standards for the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall be at a minimum the following:

- Within five years after introducing the native plants to the mitigation site, the acreage of restored California brittle bush scrub shall be no less than the acreage lost to project construction.
- Within five years after introducing the native plants to the mitigation site, the absolute cover of native species shall be no less than 80% within the restoration area.
- Non-native species in the treated area shall be less than 15% relative cover by the end of the third year of treatment and less than 5% relative cover by the end of the fifth year of treatment; and,
- Restoration will be considered successful after the success criteria have been met for a period of at least 2 years without any maintenance or remediation activities other than invasive species control.

The restoration project shall be initiated prior to development of the Project, and shall be implemented over a five-year period. The restoration project shall incorporate an iterative process of annual monitoring and evaluation of progress, and allow for adjustments to the restoration plan, as necessary, to achieve desired outcomes and meet success criteria. Annual reports discussing the implementation, monitoring, and management of the restoration project shall be submitted to the City of Moorpark. Five years after Project start, a final report shall be submitted to the City, which shall at a minimum discuss the implementation, monitoring, and management of the restoration project over the five-year period, and indicate whether the restoration project has been successful based on established success criteria. The annual reports and the final report shall include as-built plans submitted as an appendix to the report. The project shall be extended if success criteria have not been met at the end of the five-year period to the satisfaction of the City.

If impacts to the California brittle bush scrub are to be mitigated by a contribution of an in-lieu fee, the applicant shall provide evidence of payment of the in-lieu fee prior to issuance of the grading permit. The fee shall be based on the cost per

acre to restore or create in-kind habitat and the acreage of the plant community impacted. In-lieu fees shall be used for the restoration of in-kind habitat.

MM-BIO-11 To eliminate potential unapproved or offsite grading incidents earth-moving equipment shall be confined to within the approved limits of grading during construction. The limits of grading shall be fenced so that construction equipment does not impact areas outside the approved limits of grading.

c) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Jurisdictional features are found in the northwest corner of the site, along with a creek running north to south in the middle of the site. These jurisdictional features are located within CDFW and RWQCB boundaries; however, no impacts are anticipated to occur at the northwestern area. The limits of grading are inclusive of all proposed ground and vegetation disturbance areas associated with development of the Project, as well as the fuel modification impacts that are anticipated to remain within the proposed grading footprint. A map of impacts to jurisdictional features are provided in Appendix D.

Approximately 0.24 acre of the 0.28 acre of Mulefat scrub comprising the RWQCB Waters of the State/CDFW Streambed within the ephemeral drainage are proposed to be permanently impacted by development. The 0.24 acre of RWQCB Waters of the State/CDFW Streambed that would be removed by Project development is located within the ephemeral drainage and primarily comprises Mulefat scrub. Potential fuel modification clearing activities will occur within the limits of grading; therefore, no additional impacts to jurisdictional habitat from fuel modification activities are anticipated. The proposed limits of grading and anticipated fuel modification activities based on the standard Ventura County requirements of at least 100 feet from structures are shown overlaid in the report (Appendix D). To reduce impacts on wetlands, MM-BIO-12 and MM-BIO-13 would be implemented in order to reduce impacts to a level less than significant.

MM-BIO-12 Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the Applicant shall prepare and submit a Streambed Alteration Notification package to the CDFW for alterations to CDFW jurisdictional streambed and habitat. A Streambed Alteration Agreement shall be entered into with the CDFW under Section 1602 of the California Fish and Game Code, and the Applicant shall comply with the associated conditions. Prior to issuance of the grading permit, the Applicant shall also consult with RWQCB and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to determine if permits are required from those agencies. If required, the appropriate permits shall be obtained from the RWQCB and/or USACE, and the Applicant shall comply the permit conditions. The Applicant shall provide evidence to City of Moorpark Planning Division that the required permits have been obtained prior to issuance of a grading permit. Mitigation for unavoidable impacts to jurisdictional waters and habitat shall be provided through implementation of the Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan as required by MM-BIO-13.

MM-BIO-13 A habitat mitigation and monitoring plan shall be developed prior to issuance of any building or grading permit. The plan shall mitigate for permanent grading impacts to 0.24 acre (1,155 linear feet) of RWQCB waters of the State/CDFW streambed at a 2:1 ratio. The Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall mitigate for the permanent impacts to jurisdictional areas via an acceptable mitigation approach that involves one or a combination of the onsite or offsite enhancement of degraded in-kind habitats subject to the approval of the City of Moorpark, CDFW, and RWQCB (if applicable). The preferred mitigation approach is enhancement of on-site or off-site habitats within the ephemeral drainage, including plantings of appropriate native species and weed removals. The final Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall be developed by a qualified biologist, restoration ecologist or resource specialist and submitted to and approved by the City of Moorpark, CDFW, and RWQCB prior to issuance of a grading permit for the Project. In broad terms, this Program shall at a minimum include:

- Description of the Project/impact and mitigation sites;
- Specific objectives;
- Success criteria;
- Plant palette;
- Implementation plan;
- Maintenance activities;
- Monitoring plan; and
- Contingency measures.

Success criteria shall at a minimum be evaluated based on appropriate survival rates and percent cover of planted native species, which shall be determined by examining reference sites, as well as eradication and control of invasive species within the restoration or enhancement area.

The target species and native plant palette, as well as the specific methods for evaluating whether the Project has been successful at meeting the above-mentioned success criteria shall be determined by the qualified biologist, restoration ecologist, or resource specialist and included in the mitigation plan.

The mitigation project shall be initiated prior to development of the Project. The mitigation project shall be implemented over a five-year period and shall incorporate an iterative process of annual monitoring and evaluation of progress and allow for adjustments to the program, as necessary, to achieve desired outcomes and meet success criteria. Annual reports discussing the implementation, monitoring, and management of the mitigation project shall be submitted to the City of Moorpark, RWQCB, and CDFW. Five years after Project start, a final report shall be submitted to the City of Moorpark, RWQCB, and CDFW, which shall at a minimum discuss the implementation, monitoring, and management of the mitigation project over the five-year period and indicate

whether the mitigation project has been successful based on established success criteria. The annual reports and the final report shall include as-built plans submitted as an appendix to the report. Restoration or enhancement will be considered successful after the success criteria have been met for a period of at least 2 years without any maintenance or remediation activities other than invasive species control. The mitigation project shall be extended if success criteria have not been met at the end of the five-year period to the satisfaction of the City of Moorpark, RWQCB, and CDFW.

- d) *Would the project Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The Proposed Project area has been drastically altered due to the establishment of agricultural businesses and residential communities that have fragmented the landscape. This has created a disjunction between the undeveloped portions of Oak Ridge in the north and the Las Posas Hills in the south; the largest remaining open spaces in the immediate area. The wash of the unnamed blue-line stream that runs through the northwest corner of the Project site could potentially be used by wildlife, but the stream's southern terminus (where it flows into a concrete channel) is just south of the site and does not connect to an open space area (Appendix B). The Project site is not located within the Ventura County's Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors overlay zones (County 2019). While there are no designated wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites located within the vicinity of the Project site, given the rural nature of the area, there may be potential impacts to wildlife, such as nesting birds protected under the MBTA. Therefore, the Proposed Project will implement MM-BIO-1 to address impacts should construction activities take place during the nesting season. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

- e) *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

Less than Significant Impact. According to the City's Municipal Code Chapter 12.12 Historic Trees, Native Oak Trees, and Mature Trees, tree removal permits are required to remove, cut down, or destroy a native oak tree, historic tree, or other mature tree. Prior to issuance of a tree removal permit, a site inspection and tree appraisal must be performed (City 2022). In June 2021, Certified Arborist John Oblinger of L. Newman Design Group produced a Tree Report that details the trees on and around the Project site, appraises the value of trees on site, and offers recommendations to limit Project-related impacts (Appendix C).

A total of 188 mature trees are found onsite, with 142 trees being proposed for removal. The site includes 200 to 300 young multiple-trunk trees, with most trees on site showing damage from a fire within the past 10 years. Three oak trees were found on the site, and only one is proposed to be removed. Species proposed for removal include: Carrotwood, Blue Gum, Ash tree, Silk Oak, Canary Island Pine, Aleppo Pine, Stone Pine, Coast Live Oak, Elderberry, Peruvian Pepper Tree, Queen Palm, and Mexican Fan Palm. The total appraised values of all trees recorded in the updated tree inventory and proposed to be removed during construction are provided in Appendix C. As part of the City's

condition of approval, the City will require that the value of the trees to be removed will be used to upsize and increase landscaping at the Project site.

Through obtaining tree removal permits required from the City, the Project will comply with Chapter 12.12 of the City’s Municipal Code – Impacts to Historic Trees, Native Oak Trees, and Mature Trees. The City has no other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. With compliance with the City’s Municipal Code, including the replacement of trees onsite, impacts would be less than significant.

f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservancy Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

No Impact. The Project site is not located in an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved conservation plans. Therefore, no impact would occur.

4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

5.	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.5.1 Environmental Setting

A Cultural Resources Phase I Assessment Report was prepared by Envicom Corporation in July 2021; an addendum was prepared in February 2022. This investigation covered 67.96 acres on APNs 5110-190-285 and 5110-190-305. This report included the results of the records search conducted by the South Coast Central Information Center for archaeological resources, and Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County for paleontological resources. The complete report and addendum are provided as Appendix F.

4.5.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

Less than Significant Impact. As a result of the records search review and archival research, no previously recorded resources or any other listed or potentially significant properties are located within the Project site (Appendix F). No historic resources, points of historical interest, historical landmarks, or listings on the California Register of Historical Resources or National Register of Historic

Places were identified within the Project site or within a 0.5-mile radius of the Project site. Three foundations from previous modern buildings are located onsite, along with a tennis court. These foundations are not considered culturally significant. Impacts would be less than significant in relation to historic resources.

- b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The records search review and archival research found that no previously recorded resources or any other listed or potentially significant properties are located within the Project site. However, there is potential for discovery of unidentified resources during grading or construction activities. Work would cease in the area of the find until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the find in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in PRC Section 21083.2. The required compliance would ensure any found deposits are treated in accordance with federal, State, and local guidelines, including those set forth in PRC Section 21083.2. From the records search conducted, a previously identified site within a half mile discovered prehistoric lithic scatter was recorded as part of the excavation work onsite. It is recommended from the Geotechnical Report that alluvial sediments are removed up to 70 feet below the ground surface, and during this removal there is a chance of discovery for these alluvial deposits. In the event of discovery disruption of the site could result in significant impacts without mitigation. With implementation of MM- CUL-1, impacts would be less than significant.

MM-CUL-1 A qualified archaeological monitor will periodically spot-check monitor Project ground disturbance activities to ensure that sensitive archaeological artifacts, features, or deposits are not being encountered. Spot-check monitoring will take place three (3) times a week for the duration of the Project grading and subsurface disturbance within native soils. Daily monitoring reports will be generated and submitted to the City at the end of ground disturbance as proof of compliance. If prehistoric or older historic (pre-1950s) archaeological material or features are discovered, either by the archaeological monitor or by the construction team when the monitor is not present, then a project “discovery” protocol will be followed. The discovery of material will also trigger the increasing of monitoring to full-time until no more cultural material is being encountered by the construction team, at which point spot-check monitoring will resume.

In addition, the applicant would comply with City established standard condition of approval (CA) under its police power and land use authority to address any inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources, which would be imposed on the Project as part of its land use approvals. The standard condition of approval reads:

CA 1: If any archeological 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. 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 approved in writing by the Community Development Director. The applicant shall pay for all costs associated with the investigation and disposition of the find.

With implementation of the City condition of approval and mitigation measure noted above, less-than-significant impacts would occur to archaeological resources.

c) *Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Cultural Resources Phase I Assessment, no traditional burial sites have been previously recorded on or within 0.5 mile of the Project site (Appendix F). Thus, the disturbance of human remains is not expected in conjunction with Project grading and excavation activities. While no formal cemeteries, other places of human internment, or burial grounds sites are known to occur within the immediate Project site area, human remains could possibly be encountered during construction. Should human remains be encountered unexpectedly during grading or construction activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. No further excavation or disturbance of the Project site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined, within two working days of notification of the discovery, if the remains are human. In the event human remains are discovered, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

4.6 ENERGY

6.	ENERGY Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.6.1 Environmental Setting

Energy conservation management in the State was initiated by the 1974 Warren-Alquist State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Act that created the California Energy Resource Conservation and Development Commission (currently named California Energy Commission [CEC]), which was originally tasked with certifying new electric generating plants based on the need for the plant and the suitability of the site of the plant. In 1976 the Warren-Alquist Act was expanded to include new restrictions on nuclear generating plants that effectively resulted in a moratorium of any new nuclear generating plants in the State. The following lists specific regulations adopted by the State in order to reduce the consumption of energy.

- CCR Title 20 – Regulations for appliance efficiency standards
- CCR Title 24 Part 6 – Energy efficiency standards for residential and nonresidential buildings
- CCR Title 24 Part 11 – California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen)
- Senate Bill (SB) 100 – Regulations for retail sales of electricity
- Executive Order N-79-20 – Requires all new passenger vehicles and trucks to be zero-emission by the year 2035
- AB 1109 – Requires the use of high-efficiency lighting in new structures

4.6.2 Impact Analysis

- a) *Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*

Less than Significant Impact.

Construction Energy

The Project would consume energy resources during construction in three general forms:

1. Petroleum-based fuels used to power off-road construction vehicles and equipment on the Project site, construction worker travel to and from the Project site, as well as delivery and haul truck trips (e.g., hauling demolition material to offsite reuse and disposal facilities)
2. Electricity associated with the conveyance of water that would be used during Project construction for dust control (supply and conveyance) and electricity to power any necessary lighting during construction, electronic equipment, or other construction activities necessitating electrical power
3. Energy used in the production of construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass

Electricity, a consumptive utility, is a human-made resource. The production of electricity requires the consumption or conversion of energy resources, including water, wind, oil, gas, coal, solar, geothermal, and nuclear resources, into energy. The delivery of electricity involves a number of system components, including substations and transformers that lower transmission line power (voltage) to a level appropriate for onsite distribution and use. The electricity generated is distributed through a network of transmission and distribution lines commonly called a power grid. Conveyance of electricity through transmission lines is typically responsive to market demands. In 2020, SCE, which provides electricity to the Project vicinity, provided 83,533 gigawatt-hours per year of electricity (CEC 2020).

Natural gas is a combustible mixture of simple hydrocarbon compounds (primarily methane) that is used as a fuel source. Natural gas consumed in California is obtained from naturally occurring reservoirs, mainly located outside the State, and delivered through high-pressure transmission pipelines. The natural gas transportation system is a nationwide network; and, therefore, resource availability is typically not an issue. Natural gas satisfies almost one-third of the State's total energy

requirements and is used in electricity generation, space heating, cooking, water heating, industrial processes, and as a transportation fuel. Natural gas is measured in terms of cubic feet. In 2020, Ventura County consumed 180.18 Million Therms of natural gas.

Petroleum-based fuels currently account for a majority of the California's transportation energy sources and primarily consist of diesel and gasoline types of fuels. However, the State has been working on developing strategies to reduce petroleum use. Over the last decade California has implemented several policies, rules, and regulations to improve vehicle efficiency, increase the development and use of alternative fuels, reduce air pollutants and GHG emissions from the transportation sector, and reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). Accordingly, petroleum-based fuel consumption in California has declined. According to the CEC, in 2017, 338 million gallons of gasoline and 36 million gallons of diesel was sold in Ventura County (CEC 2018).

Development of the Project would not result in the need to manufacture construction materials or create new building material facilities specifically to supply the Project. It is difficult to measure the energy used in the production of construction materials such as asphalt, steel, and concrete because it will be provided by the contractors; therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the production of building materials such as concrete, steel, etc., would employ all reasonable energy conservation practices in the interest of minimizing the cost of doing business. Substantial reductions in energy usage may also be accomplished by selecting building materials composed of recycled materials that require less energy to produce.

Construction activities associated with the Project would be required to adhere to all State and County regulations for off-road equipment and on-road trucks, which provide minimum fuel efficiency standards. As such, construction activities for the Proposed Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts regarding construction energy would be less than significant.

Operational Energy

The ongoing operation of the Project would require the use of energy resources for multiple purposes including, but not limited to, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), refrigeration, lighting, appliances, and electronics. Energy would also be consumed during operations related to water usage, solid waste disposal, landscape equipment, and vehicle trips.

The Project will be required to meet the 2019 Title 24, Part 6 building energy efficiency standards that have been developed to meet the State's goal of zero-net-energy use for new homes. The zero net energy use will be achieved through a variety of measures to make new homes more energy efficient and by also requiring installation of photovoltaic (PV) systems of adequate size to generate enough electricity to meet the zero-net energy use standard. According to the Project applicant, the Project will include 12 PV panels that are each rated at 300 watts and would result in a 3.6 Kilowatts system. It is anticipated the Project will be designed and built to meet the required energy efficiency standards and requirements, as noted in the 2019 Residential Compliance Manual under Title 24, and existing and planned energy capacity and suppliers will be sufficient to support the Project's energy demand. Thus, impacts with regard to the operational use of the Project would be less than significant; no mitigation measures would be required.

b) *Would the project Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. The applicable plan for the Proposed Project is the *City of Moorpark General Plan Open Space, Conservation and Recreation Elements*, adopted August 4, 1986, which provides policies that promote renewable energy and energy efficiency. The Proposed Project would be required to meet the Title 24, Part 6 building energy efficiency requirements that require incorporation of several energy efficiency measures into the design of the proposed structures, including installation of rooftop PV systems, use of light-emitting diode (LED) lighting, enhanced insulation and windows, and high-efficiency ventilation and appliances. In addition, the Proposed Project would be required to meet the Part 11 of CalGreen, which provides minimum requirements for bicycle parking, carpool/vanpool/electric vehicle (EV) parking spaces, use of water-efficient plumbing and landscaping fixtures, recycling, and use of recycled materials in building products. Specific CalGreen requirements that are applicable to the Proposed Project include requiring that a minimum of 65 percent of construction waste be diverted from landfills, providing bicycle parking spaces, and providing EV charging stations. Through implementation of the above programs, regulations, and policies, the Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

7.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.7.1 Environmental Setting

In June 2016, RMA GeoScience prepared a Geotechnical Investigation to investigate geologic and geotechnical conditions onsite. Additional updates based on peer review of the Geotechnical Investigation were provided in January 2021 (Appendix G).

4.7.2 Impact Analysis

a) i) *Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*

Less Than Significant Impact. The City is located in a region with several active faults and, therefore, is subject to the risk and hazards associated with earthquakes. Local faults are found to the north and south of the Project site. The Project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone but is approximately 2.5 miles southeast of the San Gorgonio Pass fault (Appendix G). The Project would conform to current seismic safety standards, and ground disturbance required for the Project would not reach depths that could exacerbate the risk of rupturing a known earthquake fault. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant

ii) *Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is subject to potential ground shaking due to faults in the region, however, local faults near the Project site were found to pose no ground rupture hazard (Appendix G). Construction activities occurring on site will include demolition of existing foundations, tree removal and preservation, grading, and excavation throughout the site; however, ground disturbance required for the Project would not reach depths that could exacerbate the risk of ground shaking. Additionally, the Project would be designed and constructed in accordance with State and local building codes to reduce the potential for exposure of people or structures to seismic risks to the maximum extent possible. The Project would be required to comply with the seismic safety requirements in the International Building Code, the California Building Code, and the City’s Municipal Code. Compliance with such requirements would reduce seismic ground shaking impacts to the

maximum extent practicable with current engineering practices. Therefore, implementation of the Project would result in a less-than-significant impact associated with strong seismic ground shaking.

iii) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The potential for liquefaction is dependent upon the occurrence of a significant earthquake; sufficient groundwater to cause high pore pressures; and on the grain, size, relative density, and confining pressures of the soil at a given site. As part of the Geotechnical Report, RMA GeoScience investigated liquefaction potential at the Project site. Results showed that the materials below the assumed design groundwater elevation have very low risk of potential to liquefy during a design-level earthquake. The potential settlement due to an earthquake on site is anticipated to be around 1.75 inches (Appendix G). To address the possible impacts of liquefaction, MM-GEO-1 will be implemented as recommended in the Geotechnical Report. The mitigation measure recommends an update of the seismic settlement analysis once a 40-scale grading plan is available.

MM-GEO-1: Fill soils shall be compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction. In area of fill exceeding 40 feet in vertical thickness, all tests achieve a minimum relative compaction of 95 percent. An updated seismic settlement analyses shall be completed once the 40-scale grading plan is available. Removal of the upper 10 feet of Alluvium shall occur prior to placement or fill regardless if any overlying artificial fill is planned within areas of planned structures.

iv) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact. The site is not located in a seismic hazard zone of required investigation for earthquake-induced landslides. No potential for landslides were encountered during the field investigation and no evidence of landslides were seen on historic aerial photographs (Appendix G). The closest area prone to landslide is the Simi Valley West landslide zone approximately 0.5 mile north of the Project site (DOC 2022b). The majority of the site is generally not susceptible to landslides due to its low gradient. Soils along and adjacent to some drainage courses have been eroded by water and there have been some failures of channel banks. The California Division of Mines and Geology 2000 Seismic Hazard Zones Map does show two relatively small potential Earthquake – Induced Landslide Areas on site within the center narrow most drainage area along the steeper sides of the drainage. These areas are slated to be graded such that the drainage side walls will be removed by cut and the drainage area filled creating a relatively flat surface eliminating the existing steep east- and west-facing slopes. Required grading would remove a portion of the existing channels and would not exacerbate risk of landslide at the Project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities associated with the Project include demolition, grading, and excavation throughout the site. Considering the Project related soil disturbance, and the development would introduce new impervious surface to the Project site in excess of 1 acre, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be written and implemented. The SWPPP will

identify BMPs to further reduce soil erosion during construction. Any BMPs employed at the Project site would be consistent with the Ventura County Technical Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Control Measures (County 2011). The identification and implementation of construction BMPs would include but are not limited to watering soil, covering soil in inactive areas, and placing gravel bags and fiber rolls to minimize the potential impacts. Therefore, implementation of the Project would result in less than significant impacts associated with soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

- c) *Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The Project site is not within an active fault zone. According to the Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix G), liquefaction could occur onsite. To mitigate potential impacts from geologic instability on site, the Project would implement MM-GEO-1 to minimize impacts related to liquefaction. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Expansive soils are certain types of clay soils that expand when saturated and shrink when dried. The Project site is underlain by alluvium, Saugus formation Bedrock, and undocumented artificial fill. Alluvium consists of predominantly fine- to coarse-grained silty sand with infrequent lenses and strata of gravelly sand, clayey sand, silt, and clay. Saugus formation bedrock contains gravelly sand to sandy silt with minor clay in various levels. The undocumented artificial fill encompasses most of the site and consists of tan to brown sand in a dry and medium dense condition. Further expansion index tests were conducted, with results showing the majority of the materials having medium expansion potential (Appendix G). The medium expansion potential does have the potential to create significant impacts, however with incorporation of MM-GEO-1, impacts would be less than significant.

- e) *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?*

No Impact. The Project would connect to the City's existing sewer infrastructure in Gabbert Road; therefore, the Project would not require the installation of new septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur.

- f) *Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Results from the records search with the Natural History Museum were provided on June 3, 2021 and confirmed the Project is located near areas considered to be sensitive for paleontological resources. Due to the sensitivity of the Project site and the surrounding area to produce paleontological resources during ground-disturbing activities, mitigation measures that are in line with standards set by the City will be implemented to reduce potential impacts associated with ground disturbance. In addition, following the County of Ventura's

goals pertaining to paleontological resources outlined in Sections 1.8.1 & 1.8.2 of the Resources element of the County of Ventura General Plan, these mitigation measures will be implemented to ensure that the Guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology and the Guidelines of the State Office of Historic Preservation are fulfilled and will be performed in consultation with professional archaeologists and paleontologists. The following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to a less than significant level.

MM-PALEO-1 Prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for a grading permit, the applicant shall be required to obtain the services of a qualified project paleontologist to remain on-call for the duration of the proposed ground disturbing construction activity. The paleontologist selected must be approved in writing by the Community Development Director. Upon approval or request by the Community Development Director, a paleontological mitigation plan (PMP) outlining procedures for paleontological data recovery shall be prepared for the Proposed Project and submitted to the Community Development Director for review and approval. The development and implementation of the PMP shall include consultations with the Applicant's engineering geologist as well as a requirement that the curation of all specimens recovered under any scenario shall be through the Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History. All specimens become the property of the City of Moorpark unless the City chooses otherwise. If the City accepts ownership, the curation location may be revised. The PMP shall include developing a multilevel ranking system, or Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC), as a tool to demonstrate the potential yield of fossils within a given stratigraphic unit. The PMP shall outline the monitoring and salvage protocols to address paleontological resources encountered during ground disturbing activities. As well as the appropriate recording, collection, and processing protocols to appropriately address any resources discovered. The cost of data recovery is limited to the discovery of a reasonable sample of available material. The interpretation of reasonableness rests with the Community Development Director.

MM-PALEO-2 At the completion of all ground-disturbing activities, the project paleontologist shall prepare a final paleontological mitigation report summarizing all monitoring efforts and observations, as performed in line with the PMP, and all paleontological resources encountered, if any. As well as providing follow-up reports of any specific discovery, if necessary.

4.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

8.	GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.8.1 Environmental Setting

An Air Quality and GHG Study was completed for the Project by Rincon Consultants in January 2022. This study provided an analysis of air quality and greenhouse gas impacts associated with the Project for both daily and annual emission. The Study is provided as Appendix A.

4.8.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

Less than Significant Impact. The CalEEMod model used above to calculate the criteria pollutant emissions was also utilized to calculate the GHG emissions associated with construction and operation of the Proposed Project (see Appendix A). The CalEEMod model calculated GHG emissions generated from both construction and operation of the Proposed Project. Per the analysis methodology presented in the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Working Group meetings, the construction emissions were amortized over 30 years. Table 6 shows the estimated GHG emissions that would be predicted from development of the Proposed Project.

Table 6: Annual Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Proposed Project

Sector	Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MtCO ₂ e per year)
Area Sources	2
Energy Uses	385
Mobile Sources	1,210
Solid Waste	96
Water and Wastewater	41
Construction ¹	38
Total GHG Emissions	1,772
Threshold of Significance	3,000

Sector	Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MtCO ₂ e per year)
Exceed Threshold?	No
Notes:	
¹ Construction emissions amortized over 30 years as recommended in the SCAQMD GHG Working Group on November 19, 2009.	
Source: CalEEMod Version 2020.4.0 (see Appendix A).	

As shown in Table 6, the Proposed Project would generate 1,772 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MtCO₂e) per year, which is within the 3,000 MtCO₂e per year threshold that is described above. It should also be noted that the proposed structures will be required to meet the 2019 Title 24 Part 6 building standards that require all new structures to install solar PV systems and enhanced insulation as well as energy-efficient lighting and appliances. The County also requires all new developments to institute the water conservation measures that are detailed in the California Green Building Code. For these reasons, a less than significant generation of greenhouse gas emissions would occur from construction and operation of the Proposed Project.

b) *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Neither the City nor the VCAPCD has adopted a Climate Action Plan or other qualified GHG reduction plan. SCAG has incorporated a sustainable community strategy into its 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) plan, which is designed to help the region achieve its SB 375 GHG emissions reduction targets. The SCAG’s 2016-2040 RTP/SCS demonstrates that the SCAG region would achieve its regional emissions reduction targets for the 2020 and 2035 target years. The Proposed Project would not alter the basic population projections used in the plan and would be consistent with the City’s General Plan land use designation for the Project site.

The Proposed Project would be required to comply with existing State regulations for reducing GHG emissions, which include Title 24 Part 6 and Part 11 energy efficiency requirements. As such, since there are no applicable local GHG reduction plans and the Proposed Project would comply with all regional (SCAG) and State regulations intended to reduce GHG emissions, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the applicable plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

9.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g)	Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.9.1 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would involve the construction of a 134-unit detached single family development and the future construction of five additional single-family detached units on the estate lots. Construction activities include excavation and grading operations, utility work, surface paving operations, and landscaping. Operational activities on site will be residential in nature. Potentially hazardous materials, including, but not limited to, gasoline, oil, solvents, cleaners, paint, pesticides, and fertilizer may be used during construction and operation of the Project. Nonetheless, all construction and operational activities would be required to adhere to local standards set forth by the City, as well as State and federal health and safety requirements that are intended to minimize risk to the public from hazardous materials, such as California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) requirements, the Hazardous Waste Control Act, the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) Program, and the California Health and Safety Code.

As a result, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, construction and operational impacts for these issues would be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would involve the construction of a 134-unit detached single family development and the future construction of five additional single-family detached units on the estate lots. Construction requires excavation and grading, demolition, utility work, surface paving operations, and landscaping. Due to the lack of structures onsite but remaining foundations, there is the chance the existing foundations onsite contain asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP). Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would require compliance with federal and State law that regulate construction activities which might involve interaction with ACM or LBP. Regulations require that, prior to demolition, alteration, or renovation, (1) proper notification is given to the VCAPCD (who regulates airborne pollutants) and the local Cal/OSHA office; (2) the Construction Contractor will certify that ACM's have been removed or mitigated by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor certified by the State of California Contractors Licensing Board; and (3) the Construction Contractor will institute an operations and maintenance (O&M) program so that ACM that are not damaged or LBP that will remain in place are properly managed to prevent exposure to hazardous materials. These permitting requirements automatically apply to all development associated with the Proposed Project and are considered standard conditions for approval of the Proposed Project.

Operations on site will be residential in nature and will not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Potentially hazardous materials, including, but not limited to, gasoline, oil, solvents, cleaners, paint, pesticides, and fertilizer may be used during construction and operation of the Project. Nonetheless, all construction and operational activities would be required to adhere to local standards set forth by the City, as well as State and federal health and safety requirements that are intended to minimize risk to the public from hazardous materials, such as Cal/OSHA requirements, the Hazardous Waste Control Act, the CalARP Program, and the California Health and Safety Code.

As a result, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. Therefore, construction and operational impacts for these issues would be less than significant.

- c) *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Project construction would involve the use of heavy equipment and other gas- or diesel-powered equipment that would generate emissions associated with internal combustion engines (i.e., diesel and gasoline). As described in impacts 4.9.1 a) and b) above, construction would also require temporary transport of potentially hazardous commercial materials, including, but not limited to, gasoline, oil, solvents, cleaners, paint, pesticides, and fertilizer.

Considering the Project is a 139-unit detached single family development, operations on site will be residential in nature and will not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

The Project site is not within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. Heavy equipment and vehicles which may be transporting or emitting hazardous materials during Project construction would travel along Los Angeles Avenue. Main construction access to the Project site would also be from Los Angeles Avenue, as this route provides access from SR 118. Furthermore, Project operations would be consistent with local regulations and standards set forth by the City, State, and federal governments. Therefore, construction and operational impacts for these issues would be less than significant.

- d) *Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

Less Than Significant Impact. A review of federal and State standard and supplemental databases indicated that the Project site is not located within an identified hazardous material site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The closest hazardous material clean-up site is Prudential Overall Supply on Gabbert Road, which is closed, and is located approximately 0.5 mile northwest of the Project site. Nonetheless, the site has been deemed closed since July 30, 2002 (State Water Resources Control Board 2022; Department of Toxic Substances Control 2022). Considering the absence of active hazard cases in the vicinity of the Project site, impacts would be less than significant.

- e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact. The Project site is located approximately 9.7 miles southeast of Santa Paula Airport and 11.5 miles northeast of Camarillo Airport (Google 2022). The Project site is not within the Airport Influence Area for either of these airports (Ventura County Airport Land Use Commission 2000). No impact would occur.

- f) *Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Safety Element of the City's General Plan, the City has developed an Emergency Services Program to maintain a responsible level of emergency preparedness. This program includes City staff receiving training in emergency preparedness, management, and mitigation; the City maintaining the Emergency Operations Center (EOC); the City organizing and training a Disaster Assistant Response Team composed of volunteers; and the City promoting emergency planning, training, public awareness, and education (City 2001). The EOC is the focal point for coordination of the City's emergency planning, training, response, and recovery efforts for emergencies and major disasters (County 2020).

Additionally, the County's Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (MHMP) includes an overview of the risk assessment process and identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan identifies goals, objectives, and actions for each jurisdiction in the

County, including participating cities (such as Moorpark) and the County unincorporated areas (City 2015). The Project would not interfere with the City’s Emergency Services Program or the MHMP because it would not prohibit subsequent programs or plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. The Project site is located in the vicinity of a Critical Facility for emergency response, Moorpark High School, which is approximately 1.3 miles south of the Project site (County 2015). However, the Project would not prevent access to this Critical Facility during an emergency.

After the development is completed, new access will be provided via construction of North Hills Parkway along the southerly property boundary to Gabbert Road. North Hills Parkway will terminate as a cul-de-sac around the middle of the southern property line. A separate fire lane access would extend from northwest Thoroughbred Drive down to Los Angeles Drive. A separate 30-foot-wide fire access road to the planned development will occur from the eastern side of the development from Gabbert Road. In addition, CA-2 will ensure that landscaping introduced to the Project site will not increase hazards associated with wildland fires:

CA 2: Landscaping shall be in compliance with fire landscaping requirements in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and shall also consist of drought tolerant landscaping.

Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

- g) *Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?*

Less Than Significant Impact. While the Project is located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) within the Local Responsibility Area (LRA), the Project would comply with the City’s Building Code Section 15.08.060 Fire Hazard Zone Requirements and the County’s Fire Protection Ordinance. Operations on site would be residential in nature and would not exacerbate the risk of wildland fire. Further, no roads would be permanently closed as a result of the construction or operation of the Project, and no structures would be developed that could potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. In addition, the Ventura County Fire Department would review the Project to ensure adequate emergency accesses are present. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

10.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

10.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
	i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flood on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.10.1 Environmental Setting

A Drainage report was prepared by Delane Engineering in October 2015 for the Project site (Appendix H). The existing site can be divided into four drainage subareas: the eastern side of the site where it abuts Gabbert Road and labeled as sub-area A1 (7.65 acres) is mostly grassy hillside terrain, is the location where the only occupied existing residence exists and the location of the towers for the existing High Voltage Transmission Lines; Sub-areas B1 and B2 drains towards Walnut Canyon Drain via natural valleys; Sub-Area C1 drains via natural valleys and Gabbert Drain which begins at the southwest corner of the site and is the discharge line to the Gabbert Road Debris Basin.

4.10.2 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?*

Less Than Significant Impact. Project construction would require temporary disturbance of surface soils and removal of vegetative cover through grading and excavation for the proposed residential development and associated structures. Grading activities therefore could potentially result in erosion and sedimentation on site, which may alter the existing drainage pattern. As discussed above, there are four distinct subareas within the Project site that would be altered from Project-related activities.

The Project would be required to obtain coverage under a Construction General Permit to comply with Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. Compliance with the Construction General Permit would require the development and implementation of a SWPPP and associated BMPs. The BMPs would include measures that would be

implemented to prevent discharge of eroded soils from the construction site and sedimentation of surface waters off site. With implementation of the required SWPPP, construction of the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

The Project would include infiltration basins and biofiltration BMPs to treat flows from the Project site, including those from landscaping associated with the Project. The proposed biofiltration BMPs would be located near the inlets at North Hills Parkway and North Village Drive. The site and shall treat all stormwater within each subarea prior to leaving the site via the infiltration basin located at the entrance of the Project site. With implementation of these design features, Project operations would not substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*

Less Than Significant Impact. VCWWD provides domestic water to the City and will be the water purveyor to the Project site. VCWWD receives its water from three sources. Approximately 71 percent of its supply is imported potable water from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) of Southern California through Calleguas Municipal Water District (CMWD), a local wholesaler. The imported water is primarily State Water Project water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta in Northern California that has been treated at MWD's Joseph Jensen Filtration Plant. The second largest supply (approximately 20 percent) comes from local groundwater production. Groundwater is pumped from the East Las Posas Subbasin via the four active wells owned and operated by the District. The East Las Posas Subbasin is managed and protected by Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA). Finally, reclaimed water brings in approximately 9 percent of all supply through the Moorpark Water Reclamation Facility (MWRF), which is owned and operated by VCWWD and has been in operation since 2003 (County 2020).

During the 2020 Fiscal Year, VCWWD was allocated 2,195 acre-feet (AF) of groundwater from the Las Posas Basin by FCGMA. Using the City's average number of persons per household and target gallons per capita per day, calculations determined that the Project would require approximately 97.57 AF per year (AFY) for residential operations. Using an average household size of 3.23 persons, the Project would add approximately 449 residents to the City of Moorpark (City 2020c). Thus, for 139 units, the number of persons anticipated to be living at the Project site during operations would be 449 people. According to the Ventura County Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the County's target per capita water usage for 2020 was 194 gallons per capita per day. For the Project's predicted residents, this results in 87,106 gallons per day, or approximately 97.57 AFY. Thus, in the highly unlikely scenario that the Project would be served using solely the City's available groundwater supply, the Project would require a nominal 4.44 percent of the groundwater allocated in 2020.

In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the permanent water conservation measures contained in Part 1 – Section L of the Districts' Rules and Regulations for District Nos. 1, 16, 17, 19, and 38. These measures include installing water-saving devices and limiting landscape irrigation (VCWWD 2021). The Project proposes landscaping throughout the site; nonetheless, compliance with the District's rules and all provisions of the City's water efficient landscape ordinance would ensure minimal impacts to the City's groundwater availability. In addition, the Project will be

required to comply with the California Department of Water Resources Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELo). The MWELo is also referenced by Title 24, Part 11, Chapters 4 and 5 Cal Green Building Code. The MWELo purpose is not only to increase water efficiency but also to improve environmental conditions. All plants included in the landscaping would be drought tolerant in order to comply with landscaping requirements. Thus, Project operations are not anticipated to decrease groundwater supplies.

As discussed in Section 4.7, Geology and Soils, although the Project proposes grading activities, grading would not require excavation of 65 feet or more of soil where groundwater could be impacted. Therefore, the Project would have a less-than-significant impact related to the depletion of groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge.

- c) *Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:*
- i) *result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;*

Less Than Significant Impact. Project construction would require temporary disturbance of surface soils and removal of vegetative cover through grading and excavation. Grading activities could potentially result in erosion and sedimentation. Compliance with the Construction General Permit would require the development and implementation of a SWPPP and associated BMPs, reducing erosion and sedimentation during construction. The Project would also include a storm drain system with catch basin filters to remove trash, oils, pollutants and then into an underground capture and infiltration system to release the flows back into the ground and groundwater. With implementation of BMPs and design features, Project construction and operations would not result in substantial erosion siltation, flooding, runoff, or polluted runoff, therefore impacts would be less than significant.

- ii) *substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;*

Less Than Significant Impact. Landscaping of the Project site would help reduce offsite flows and reduce runoff volumes and rates. Furthermore, a catch basin will be installed at the site; and a storm drain system will convey runoff to one of the underground infiltration systems and on grade detention basin. The function of the underground infiltration system is to return the stormwater to the groundwater and the detention basin reduces the volume and velocity of stormwater runoff so that the completed Project will not increase the runoff from the current existing conditions. With implementation of BMPs and design features, project construction and operations would not result in substantial erosion siltation, flooding, runoff, or polluted runoff, therefore impacts would be less than significant.

- iii) *create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources or polluted runoff; or*

Less Than Significant Impact. Operation of the Project would increase the amount of runoff on site, with total of 17 acres of impervious surfaces, which would result in an increase of 7 acres of impervious surfaces from the existing condition. Landscaping of the Project site would help

reduce offsite flows and reduce runoff volumes and rates. Furthermore, a catch basin will be installed at the site; and a storm drain system will convey runoff to an underground infiltration system and on grade detention basin (Appendix H). With implementation of BMPs and design features, project construction and operations would not result in substantial erosion siltation, flooding, runoff, or polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. Per the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map No. 06111C0816E and No. 06111C0817E, the Project site is within a flood Zone X. Zone X signifies areas of minimal flood hazard. Thus, the Project site is not located within the 100-year and would not impede or redirect flood flows, resulting in less-than-significant impacts.

d) Would the project in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Less Than Significant Impact. As previously mentioned, the Project is not located within the FEMA 100-year floodplain (Appendix H). The Project is also over 22 miles east of the Pacific Ocean and is not in the vicinity of any waterbodies that have potential to produce a seiche (Google 2022). Impacts would be less than significant

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located within the Los Angeles Coastal Watershed and subject to the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) Basin Plan. The LARWQCB Basin Plan contains the Region's water quality regulations and programs to implement the regulations (LARWQCB 2014). The Project site is also located within the boundaries of FCGMA's Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) for the Las Posas Valley Basin. The Las Posas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (FCGMA 2022) sets a long-term horizon for groundwater sustainability agencies to achieve their basin's sustainability goals. The sustainability goal for the Basin is "to maintain a sufficient volume of groundwater in storage in each management area so that there is no significant and unreasonable net decline in groundwater elevation or storage over wet and dry climatic cycles." The GSP projects future water demands based on historic water availability and demand, as well as buildout of the General Plan.

The Project would apply for a NPDES permit and prepare a SWPPP. Implementation of the SWPPP would reduce polluted stormwater runoff from the Project site and ensure compliance with the LARWQCB Basin Plan. Since the Project includes a request for a GPA from the City to change the Land Use Designation to allow for higher density uses, the Project would increase the intensity of use on site and could affect projected groundwater demands in the GSP. However, as discussed in Section 4.10 b), the Project's 449 predicted residents would require approximately 97.57 AFY of water. In the highly unlikely scenario that the Project would be served using solely groundwater, the Project would require a nominal 4.47 percent of the City's 2020 allocated groundwater supply (VCWWD 2021). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct the LARWQCB's Basin Plan or Las Posas Valley Basin GSP; and impacts would be less than significant.

4.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

11.	LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.11.1 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project physically divide an established community?*

No Impact. The Project would redevelop existing parcels west of Gabbert Road to create 139 new dwelling units. Construction and site development would require grading and demolition of existing foundations. During construction, temporary road blockages may occur due to heavy equipment use and material deliveries to the Project site. However, no long-term road blockages or changes to the surrounding traffic patterns are proposed. The Project includes a request for GPA, ZC, and RPD for the construction of 139 single-family detached residences. Additionally, the Project does not include features that would preclude mobility across the Project site. Construction and Operation of the Project would not physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.

b) *Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project is located in the western portion of the City, north of Los Angeles Avenue, along Gabbert Road. The Project site’s General Plan designation is Rural Low Density Residential (L) which allows the development of one DUAC. To allow higher density uses, the Project includes submittal of a GPA and ZC which would result in the Project to be consistent with the City’s land use policies.

To analyze the Project’s compliance with the City General Plan Circulation Element, K2 Traffic Engineering Inc. (KTE) prepared a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA; Appendix I) that covers the high density changes and implemented the Intersection Capacity Utilization method to determine volume-to-capacity ratios and corresponding Levels of Service (LOS) at five study intersections (determined in consultation with City staff). LOS varies from LOS A (free flow) to LOS F (jammed condition). According to Policy 2.1 of the Circulation Element, LOS of C is the performance objective for traffic volumes on the City’s circulation system. For facilities already operating at LOS C, the system performance objective is to maintain or improve the current LOS. The City’s “Guidelines for Preparing Traffic and Circulation Studies” states that if a LOS degradation of one LOS or greater is attributable to a project, it will be considered significant enough to require mitigation measures.

As depicted in below, both study intersections are presently operating at LOS C or better during the morning (AM) and evening (PM) peak hours. In order to determine the operating conditions of the

street system with implementation of the Project, traffic generated by the Project was added to the existing traffic conditions.

Based on the modeling from Appendix I, Project-related traffic is not expected to exceed the traffic operations criteria at any of the six study intersections. Project-related traffic is not expected to exceed the traffic operations criteria since the LOS does not degrade by one level or greater from existing conditions (Table 7).

Table 7: Levels of Service in the Project Vicinity AM and PM Peak Hours

No.	Intersection	Peak Hour	2021 Existing	Opening Year Plus Project	Significant Impact
1	Gabbert Road at Poindexter Avenue	AM	A	A	No
		PM	A	A	No
2	Gabbert Road/Tierra Rejada Road at Los Angeles Avenue	AM	C	D	No
		PM	B	C	No
3	Moorpark Avenue at High Street	AM	A	B	No
		PM	A	C	No
4	Moorpark Avenue at Poindexter Avenue /First Street	AM	B	D	No
		PM	B	D	No
5	Moorpark Avenue at Los Angeles Avenue	AM	B	D	No
		PM	B	D	No
6	Gabbert Road at North Hills Parkway	AM	-	A	No
		PM	-	A	No

Source: Appendix I

LOS delays at the six intersections would not increase by more than 0.10, this increase would not result in a significant delay at any of the listed intersections (Appendix I). Additionally, the Applicant would pay all applicable fees required by the City’s Municipal Code, including the traffic systems management fee, the citywide traffic fee, and the county traffic impact mitigation fee. Thus, implementation of the Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system; and impacts would be less than significant.

4.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

12.	MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

4.12.1 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

No Impact. According to the City’s General Plan, no known mineral resources of statewide significance are within the City’s limits. West and northwest of the City there are mineral resource zones designated Mineral Resource Zone 2, which refers to areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists (City 1986), although these areas are outside the City limits and therefore do not encompass the Project site. Moreover, two active open-pit sand and gravel mines are approximately 4 miles north of the Project site, but no mines are reported within the Project site (DOC 2022c). No impact would occur.

b) *Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

No Impact. The City’s General Plan does not designate any locally important mineral resource recovery sites within the City boundaries (City 1986). Two active open-pit sand and gravel mines are approximately 3.5 miles north of the Project site, but no mines are reported within the Project site (DOC 2022c). No impact would occur.

4.13 NOISE

13.	NOISE Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.13.1 Environmental Setting

A Noise Study was produced for the Project by Rincon Consultants, Inc. in January 2022 to determine the noise impacts associated with the Project (Appendix J). The criteria noise impacts created by the Project

were analyzed through use of Road Construction Noise Model, which is a computer model published for estimating noise levels. Results from this analysis have been summarized and incorporated below. Refer to Appendix J for methods and model data.

4.13.2 Impact Analysis

- a) *Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Noise Element of the City's General Plan implements goals and policies to maintain acceptable environmental noise levels to protect City residents from excessive noise. The Noise Element establishes noise standards for single-family and multiple-family residential land uses as 65 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) for the exterior environment, 55 CNEL for the interior environment with windows open, and 45 CNEL for the interior environment with windows closed (City 1998).

Background noise, or ambient noise, is the noise level of normal and existing noise levels of a given area. In the City, the four major sources of noise are traffic on SR 118 and SR 23; traffic on arterials and local collector roadways; rail traffic on the east/west rail line bisecting the City; and commercial, industrial, and recreational activities adjacent to residential locations (City 1998). The Project is located within an underdeveloped portion of the City. The existing immediate sources of ambient noise come from Gabbert Road and the rail line. PM Peak hour trips on Gabbert Road were determined to be 473 trips (Appendix J). The Project's addition of 143 PM peak hour trips would increase noise levels by 30 percent, which would result in an approximate noise increase of 1 dBA. This would not exceed the significance threshold of a greater than 3 dBA increase over existing noise levels. The proposed improvements on the Project site include two new roadways. North Hills Parkway, along the southern boundary of the site, would align east/west and give access to the Project site from Gabbert Road. North Village Drive, along the western boundary of the site, would align north/south, and connect to North Hills Parkway at the southwestern corner of the Project site. The nearest Project residences would be located approximately 100 feet from North Hills Parkway, 200 feet from North Village Drive, and 300 feet from Gabbert Road. the closest Project residences to each roadway would be exposed to noise levels of 55 CNEL, 52 CNEL, and 61 CNEL, respectively. Therefore, noise levels at exterior use areas of the Project would not exceed the City's 65 CNEL normally acceptable exterior noise standard for residential uses and would not conflict with the City General Plan. The Project would introduce a new ambient noise source that would result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels, however the increase would be within the standards set by the City; therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

Section 17.53.070.F of the City Municipal Code prohibits the operation of any tools or equipment used in construction, drilling, repair, alteration, or demolition work so as to violate the noise standards between weekday (Saturdays and legal holidays observed by the City included) hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., or at any time on Sundays. During operations, Section 17.53.070.E of the Municipal Code prohibits the loading, unloading, opening, closing or other handling of boxes, crates, containers, building materials, garbage cans, or similar objects between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. any day of the week in such a manner as to cause a noise disturbance across a residential property line or at any time to violate the provisions of Section 17.53.050.

Construction of the Project would result in a temporary increase of construction noises. Modeled noise levels will reach up to 67 dBA at the closest sensitive receptor location, to the east of the Project boundary (Appendix J). Proposed construction activities would be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday to avoid violation of noise standards set by the City Municipal Code. HVAC units that would be installed as part of the housing units would have a sound power of 72 dBA and have a noise level of 31 dBA at a distance of 150 feet, which is lower than ambient noise levels in the area (54.7 dBA) (Appendix J). Impacts would be less than significant.

b) *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The greatest anticipated source of vibration during general Project construction activities would be from a vibratory roller during paving, which may be used within 150 feet of the nearest off-site residence. A vibratory roller creates approximately 0.210 inches per second peak particle velocity (PPV) at a distance of 25 feet (Appendix J). This would attenuate to a vibration level of 0.029 inches per second PPV at a distance of 150 feet. This vibration level is lower than the human annoyance threshold of 0.24 inches per second PPV. Therefore, vibration impacts associated with construction would be less than significant.

c) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact. The closest public and public use airports to the Project site are the Santa Paula Airport, which is approximately 9.7 miles northwest of the Project site, and the Camarillo Airport, which is approximately 11.4 miles southwest of the Project site. The Project site is not located within an airport influence area or an airport runway protection zone. There are no nearby private airstrips within the vicinity of the Project site. Therefore, no impact related to airport and airstrip noise would occur.

4.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

14.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

4.14.1 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project would not introduce substantial unplanned population growth, as the Project would create 139 housing units. As part of the Project, an amendment to the General Plan and ZC are proposed for a General Plan designation as H and a zoning of RPD. Therefore, the Project would fulfill an existing need for housing in the City. The construction of the Project would help the City achieve housing goals in support of the Housing Element of the General Plan (City 2014). Therefore, the Project would fulfill an existing need for housing in the City and would not induce unplanned population growth. The City's adopted Housing Element 2014-2021 estimated a 10.9 percent growth in the population between 2014 and 2021, with a total housing growth of 1,164 units (City 2014). The 2019 SCAG Local Profile Report for the City identified the City's population in 2020 at 36,278 with an annual growth rate of 0.7 percent, which is below the estimated growth. With the average household size in the City at 3.3, the Proposed Project can expect the population to increase by 459 persons (SCAG 2019).

The City is in the process of adopting its updated Housing Element, which anticipates an 11 percent increase in population between 2020 and 2030 with the continued residential development for the remaining vacant lots and underperforming nonresidential areas and in specific plan areas. The Proposed Project's increase of 139 units for single-family homes would not result in a significant and substantial population growth because the population increases have been accounted in the SCAG Local Profile and General Plan Housing Element. In addition, the Proposed Project will be meeting an existing housing need which has been identified in the General Plan Housing Element. Impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of the Project would also result in the generation of temporary construction jobs and a limited number of permanent jobs. Nonetheless, the additional jobs are expected to be filled by nearby residents. Therefore, jobs resulting from the Project would not lead to relocation of any population. The Project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth during construction or operation; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

No Impact. The Project site is underdeveloped and vacant with building foundations from a previous development. The Project would add 139 new housing units for local residents. The Project would not displace existing people or housing that require construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts would occur.

4.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

15.	PUBLIC SERVICES.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	i) Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Police Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.15.1 Impact Analysis

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection?

Less than Significant Impact. The Project consists of 139 dwelling units and an estimated 449 residents within the development, along with an open space/recreational portion allowing for greenspace as part of the development. Ventura County Fire Station 42 is located approximately 1.45 miles south or approximately a 5-minute drive of the Project site (Google 2022). Construction activities would increase traffic adjacent to the Project site during working hours because commuting construction workers, trucks, and other large construction vehicles would temporarily be added to normal traffic. Construction traffic delays along local roadways may reduce optimal traffic flows on these roadways and could delay emergency vehicles or contribute to a vehicle accident. Nonetheless, potential fire protection impacts would be minimal due to the temporary nature of construction traffic.

During the Project’s operational phase, the frequency of emergency calls may incrementally increase because residential uses would be introduced to the partially vacant site. For a residential project, the majority of calls are likely to be emergency medical and rescue. The Project would be required to conform to the California Fire Code and follow requirements in the Moorpark Municipal Code, which requires integration of fire safety features such as fire sprinklers, fire hydrants, and water service infrastructure capable of delivering the required fire flows rates. Furthermore, given the proximity of the fire station, and implementation of fire safety features, the Project is not expected to significantly delay response times.

The Project would fulfill an existing need for housing in the City. Therefore, the housing and job opportunities generated by the Project are expected to be filled by residents who currently live in the area. Considering the Project would not induce unplanned population growth, the Project is not expected to increase the demand for fire protection or require new facilities. Impacts to fire services would be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for police protection?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Ventura County Sheriff's Department is approximately 1.65 miles southeast of the Project site or approximately a six-minute drive (Google 2022). Construction activity would increase traffic adjacent to the Project site during working hours because commuting construction workers, trucks, and other large construction vehicles would temporarily be added to normal traffic. Slow-moving construction traffic along local roadways may reduce optimal traffic flows on these roadways and could delay emergency vehicles or contribute to a vehicle accident. Nonetheless, potential impacts would be minimal due to the temporary nature of construction traffic.

During the Project's operational phase, the frequency of emergency calls may incrementally increase because residential uses would be introduced to the currently vacant site. However, the Project would fulfill an existing need for housing in the City. The City's Housing Element anticipates that the City will be experiencing a population growth via development in undeveloped and underutilized lots in the City. Therefore, the population increase has been accounted in the General Plan. Considering the Project would not induce unplanned population growth, The Proposed Project is not expected to create a significant increase in the demand for police protection or require new facilities. Impacts to police services would be less than significant.

- c) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for schools?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project site is located near five schools in the City, including: Moorpark High School 1.2 miles south of the Project site; Chaparral Middle School 1 mile southeast of the Project site; Mountain Meadows School 1.5 miles southeast of the Project site; Walnut Canyon School and Union High School 1 mile east of the Project site; Flory Academy of Sciences and Technology and the ACCESS School 1.4 miles east of the Project site. The Project would fulfill an existing need for housing in the City. Therefore, the housing and job opportunities generated by the Project are expected to be filled by residents who currently live in the area. The Proposed Project may result in a population increase. However, as discussed, the Proposed Project would fill an existing need for housing.

Moorpark Unified School District (District) prepared a Residential and Commercial/Industrial Development School Fee Justification Study on June 2, 2022, to determine the projected student enrollment growth and future facility needs and fees necessary to maintain and provide schooling to existing and future students (Cooperative Strategies 2022).

The student enrollment growth, based on anticipated increase in single and multi-family units, is projected to be 921 students. The existing capacity for elementary, middle, and high school levels are 7,426 students. Current enrollment is at 5,845 students as of the 2021/2022 estimates, thereby having an excess of 1,581 seats.

With the projected increase in residents to the area (an estimated 449 persons), it is not expected for all 449 persons to be of schooling age. As a result, the Proposed Project will not result in significant deterioration of service of public schools as a result of the Proposed Project.

The City's Housing Element includes a residential development fee burden within the City and includes school impact fees for residential units based on square footage and development type. Impacts to schools would be less than significant.

- d) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for parks?*

Less Than Significant Impact. As mentioned above, the Project would fulfill an existing need for housing in the City and would not induce unplanned population growth. Additional jobs generated by the Project are expected to be filled by residents who currently live in the area and would not result in the relocation of any population. In addition, the development includes open space/recreational areas thereby providing outdoor use for the residents. Thus, the Project is not expected to increase the demand for parks or require new facilities. The Project would create additional open space and recreational facilities. In addition, the Development Agreement includes fees to offset additional projected demand at community parks. Thus, the Project would not increase the use of the existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would be accelerated. Impacts to parks would be less than significant.

- e) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for other public facilities?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project consists of 139 dwellings, along with an open space/recreational portion allowing for greenspace as part of the development. The Project would not induce growth requiring the extension of existing or creation of other public facilities. The Project would not increase the demand for other public facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.16 RECREATION

16.	RECREATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.16.1 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

Less than Significant Impact. The City offers 19 miniature, neighborhood, and community parks designed to meet the varied needs of residents. Two parks are within a 1-mile radius of the Project site. Glenwood Park is located 0.87 mile southeast of the Project site and Moorpark Skate Park is located 0.9 mile southeast of the Project site (Google 2022). Open space and recreation areas within the City occupy 2,240 acres and account for 28 percent of the City’s land. Of this open space area, the City has a total of 188 acres of developed park land within the City, and an estimated 5.1 acres of existing park land per 1,000 people (City 2020c).

The Project proposes construction of a 134-unit detached single family development and the future construction of five additional single-family detached units on the estate lots; however, the Project would fulfill an existing need for housing in the City and would not induce unplanned population growth. The Proposed Project provides a community park and multi-use trail system.

The Project would create additional open space and recreational facilities. In addition, the Development Agreement includes fees to offset additional projected demand at community parks. Thus, the Project would not increase the use of the existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would be accelerated. Impacts to recreational facilities would be less than significant.

b) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Proposed Project will provide one community park (open space) with decomposed granite and a multi-use trail along North Hills Parkway. The additional recreation area will provide open space access for public use and will be maintained by the HOA. The park and multi-use trail will be an addition to the community. These additions will not interfere with any nearby recreational areas because the Project site is currently undeveloped. The Project does not involve

construction or expansion of offsite, public recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Additionally, Park and Recreation Fees will be paid by the Applicant in compliance with the City’s Municipal Code to offset any impacts associated with the proposed development. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.17 TRANSPORTATION

17.	TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e. g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.17.1 Environmental Setting

A TIA was prepared for the Project by KTE on December 17, 2021 (Appendix I). A Trip Generation and VMT Analysis was prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers on May 20, 2022 and peer reviewed by Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers on June 22, 2022 (Appendix K).

The TIA and VMT Analysis follows the City’s current traffic study guidelines, “Guidelines for Preparing Traffic and Circulation Studies” prepared in 1993. However, in September 2013, the Governor’s Office signed SB 743, starting a process that fundamentally changes the way transportation impact analysis is conducted under CEQA. Within the State’s CEQA Guidelines, these changes include the elimination of auto delay, LOS, and similar measurements of vehicular roadway capacity and traffic congestion as the basis for determining significant traffic impacts. SB 743 identifies VMT as the most appropriate CEQA transportation metric. The City is in the process of developing new traffic study guidelines to identify VMT as the primary metric for evaluating a project’s transportation impacts. Until City-specific thresholds are developed, the VMT analysis was developed using the VMT data presented in the recently updated Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) traffic model for Ventura County and the guidance provided in the Technical Advisory published by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research in December 2018 for purposes of evaluating the potential VMT impacts of development projects, which evaluates based on a 15 percent reduction target.

4.17.2 Impact Analysis

- a) *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The VCTC traffic model provided home based VMT per capita data for the City as well as the various Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) within the City, including the TAZ that encompasses the Project site. Traffic model data was used to establish the home-based VMT per capita thresholds for the City and to estimate the home-based VMT per capita for the Project. Based on the trip generation analysis including consideration of the effects of telework on the Project VMT and post-pandemic levels of telework in the Southern California region, the Proposed Project's VMT is measured at 21.07 VMT per capita which is above the City's significance threshold of 18.33 VMT per capita. Therefore, the Proposed Project requires a reduction of approximately 13 percent to be below the threshold. The implementation of affordable and below market rate housing would provide approximately 4.29 percent VMT reduction based on supporting literature. The estimated amount of affordable or below market rate housing units is 15 percent of the total units, which is 20.1 out of 134 initial units. The Proposed Project is proposing to set aside 20 units of affordable housing to meet the VMT reduction requirements.

Additional measures to be included as part of the Proposed Project to reduce the Project's VMT include providing EV charging stations for each unit (MM-TRA-1), providing bicycle storage lockers at the Metrolink station (MM-TRA-2), and install on-site sidewalks and provide connection to the existing/future off-site pedestrian network (MM-TRA-3). Implementation of these mitigation measures would result in less-than-significant impacts with regards to VMT by the Proposed Project.

- MM-TRA-1:** Electric Vehicle Charging/Parking Spaces: The Project would install electric vehicle charging and parking stations in each unit. The charging and parking stations would be part of Neighborhood Electric Vehicle Network for the future development of the area east of Moorpark Avenue.
- MM-TRA-2:** Metrolink Incentives: The Project shall provide incentives for the Project residents and other potential users of the station to utilize the public transit system. The Proposed Project shall include enhanced features at the Metrolink station such as bicycle storage lockers to supplement the existing bike racks at the station.
- MM-TRA-3:** Pedestrian Connectivity. The Project shall install on-site sidewalks and provide connections to the existing/future off-site pedestrian network.

When taken together, the provision of affordable housing as well as the mitigation measures are calculated to result in a reduction in the adjacent Project VMT by approximately 15.43 percent. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

b) *Would the project Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Section 15064.3(b) of the CEQA Guidelines describes criteria for analyzing transportation impacts. Depending on the type of project, different thresholds of significance are applicable. Section 15064.3(b)(1) applies to land use projects, including the Project:

“Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less

than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.”

The Proposed Project is approximately 1.6 miles from the nearest transit station by walking path (i.e., not by direct-line or radius). Further, the Metrolink Ventura Line does not provide service with less than 15-minute headways.

As discussed in 4.17.2 a), the daily VMT per capita for the Project was determined to be above the City’s threshold by 13 percent. The addition of affordable housing units of 15 percent, and implementation of MM- TRA-1, MM-TRA-2 and MM-TRA-3 would result in a measurable decrease of the VMT per capita resulting in meeting the City’s threshold. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation measures MM TRA-1, MM TRA-2, and MM TRA-3 incorporated.

- c) *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project does not propose any hazardous design features such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections. The site design will include new driveways and pedestrian facilities; however, they would be consistent with typical residential driveway designs. The Project is compatible with surrounding uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project’s circulation system will be reviewed by the City’s emergency response personnel and the City’s Public Works Department to ensure that ingress and egress widths are sufficient and that the proposed circulation system would not interfere with an emergency response access route. Level of Service at study intersections would maintain acceptable levels of service including during opening year and cumulative conditions. After the development is completed, new access will be provided via construction of North Hills Parkway along the southerly property boundary to Gabbert Road. North Hills Parkway will terminate as a cul-de-sac around the middle of the southern property line. A separate fire lane access would extend from northwest Thoroughbred Drive down to Los Angeles Drive. A separate 30-foot-wide fire access road to the planned development will occur from the eastern side of the development from Gabbert Road. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

18.	TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.18.1 Impact Analysis

- a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?*

- b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The City submitted a request to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in April 2022 to conduct a search of its Sacred Lands file to determine if cultural resources significant to Native Americans have been recorded in the Proposed Project footprint and/or buffer area. As discussed in Section 4.5 of this document, and based on the response received from the NAHC, the record search resulted in no previously recorded resources or other listed or potentially significant properties located within the Project site.

AB 52 mandates early tribal circulation prior to and during CEQA review with a requirement to formally conclude consultation. AB 52 established a new category of tribal cultural resources for which only tribes are experts. The mandate requires CEQA documents to incorporate findings, not just in terms of mitigation measures, but also in terms of which type of CEQA document is appropriate. SB 18, signed into law in 2004, requires notification and consult with Native American Tribes on proposed land use decisions for the purpose of protecting potential tribal cultural sites.

AB 52 and SB 18 consultation letters were sent on (April 7, 2022), to tribal parties on the list provided by the City and the NAHC. These tribal parties were the Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians, Chumash Council of Bakersfield, Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation, Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, Gabrielino /Tongva Nation, Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe, Northern Chumash Tribal Council, San Luis Obispo County, Chumash Council, and the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians. To date, no responses have been received from any of the above tribes.

Although tribal consultation did not result in formal comments the location of the Project in the vicinity of land previously occupied by native tribes may require that additional caution be considered to ensure that if unknown buried resources are discovered during grading activities, impacts to such resources would be limited. A Condition of Approval (COA) would be implemented for Project work as noted below.

- COA TCR-1** In the event that Project site excavation and construction activities expose tribal cultural resources (i.e., sites, features, or artifacts) encountered during construction activities for the Project, the temporary halting of construction activities near the encounter and notification of the City and any Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the Project would be required. If the City determines that the potential resource appears to be a tribal cultural resource (as defined by PRC Section 21074), the City will provide any affected tribe a reasonable period of time to conduct a site visit and make recommendations regarding the monitoring of future ground disturbance activities, as well as the treatment and disposition of any discovered tribal cultural resources. The Applicant will then implement the tribe's recommendations if a qualified archaeologist reasonably concludes that the tribe's recommendations are reasonable and feasible. The recommendations would then be incorporated into a tribal cultural resource monitoring plan; and, once the plan is approved by the City, ground disturbance activities could resume. In accordance with this mitigation which shall become a condition of approval, all activities would be conducted in accordance with regulatory requirements.

4.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

19.	UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid wastes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.19.1 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or expansion of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

Less Than Significant Impact. VCWWD provides domestic water services to the City and wastewater services via the MWRf. Electricity is provided to the City by SCE, and natural gas service is provided by SoCalGas. Telecommunications services in the City are provided by Time Warner Cable and Spectrum. The existing sewer main is proposed to be extended from Gabbert Road and Poindexter Avenue and will run up Gabbert Road, west on North Hills Parkway, and to the western end of the Project to connect to the existing onsite sewer system. Gas, electricity, and telecommunication services will connect to existing service areas off North Hills Parkway. While the Project site is vacant, there are existing developments surrounding the Project site. The Project would not result in significant environmental effects due to relocation or construction of new utility connections because it is proposed to connect to existing service areas.

b) *Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal dry and multiple dry years?*

Less Than Significant Impact. VCWWD receives its water from three sources. Approximately 71 percent of its supply is imported potable water from the MWD of Southern California through

CMWD, a local wholesaler. The imported water is primarily State Water Project water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta in Northern California that has been treated at MWD's Joseph Jensen Filtration Plant. The second largest supply (approximately 20 percent) comes from local groundwater production. Groundwater is pumped from the East Las Posas Subbasin via the four active wells owned and operated by the District. The East Las Posas Subbasin is managed and protected by FCGMA. Finally, reclaimed water brings in approximately 9 percent of all supply through the MWRF, which is owned and operated by VCWWD and has been in operation since 2003 (County 2020).

Every urban water supplier must include, as part of its UWMP, an assessment of the reliability of its water service to its customers during normal, dry, and multiple dry water years. The District's UWMP predicts that water supplies during normal, single dry year, and five consecutive dry year scenarios between 2025 and 2045 would meet all projected demands. In fact, the UWMP predicts a surplus of water available during all years under the single dry year and five dry year scenarios (VCWWD 2021). To help meet future potable water demands, VCWWD is also planning two projects. The Stockton Reservoir Project will increase water storage capacity by constructing an additional reservoir along with infrastructure. The Moorpark Desalter Project aims to lower the dependence on imported water through a groundwater production and treatment system that is estimated to provide up to 5,000 AFY of potable water for customers in the District's water service area. Further, VCWWD is planning to increase (non-potable) recycled water use to 2,200 AFY by 2040 but will need to update the current permit (VCWWD 2021).

Using the City's average number of persons per household and target gallons per capita per day, calculations determined that the Project would require approximately 97.57 AFY for residential operations. This analysis accounts for the initial 134 single family units as well as the future development of the five single-family units on the estate lots. The UWMP predicts that by the year 2025, VCWWD will have 11,102 AFY of available water supply under normal conditions; 13,367 AFY with a single dry year; and 13,535 AFY following five consecutive dry years (VCWWD 2021). The Project therefore requires 0.88 percent and 0.72 percent of the projected water available under these conditions, respectively. Further, the Project would be required to comply with the permanent water conservation measures contained in Part 1 – Section L of the Districts' Rules and Regulations for District Nos. 1, 16, 17, 19, and 38. These measures include installing water-saving devices and limiting landscape irrigation (VCWWD 2021). The Project would also be required to comply with all provisions of the City's water efficient landscape ordinance (Moorpark Municipal Code 15.23.010). Compliance with VCWWD rules and Moorpark Municipal Code would ensure irrigation required for the Project's landscaping would have minimal impact on water availability. The Project would have sufficient water supplies available during normal, dry, and multiple dry years; and impacts would be less than significant.

- c) *Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Ventura County Water and Sanitation Department operates and maintains water and wastewater infrastructure for the City, which is located in VCWWD No. 1. The MWRF, located along SR 118 just west of the City, serves the Project site. The MWRF currently receives an average of 2.0 million gallons per day (MGD), or 2,206 AFY, and is designed to treat up to 5 MGD

(VCWWD 2021). Therefore, the MWRF has an available surplus capacity of approximately 3 MGD , or 3,360 AFY.

Based off information provided in the Sewer Area Study (Appendix L), there is an existing 8-inch sewer main within Gabbert Road at the eastern side of the Proposed Project from VCWWD No. 1. The existing sewer system in Gabbert Road consists of 8-inch pipe with gravity flow at 0.075 percent slope and connects to 27-inch sewer main located in Arroyo Simi Flood control channel. Peak flows within the 8-inch pipe, showed a maximum of 0.14 MGD. The Project's residential operations would generate approximately 31.7 AFY of wastewater or a nominal 0.5 percent of the MWRF's available capacity; thus, the MWRF has sufficient capacity to support the Project; and impacts would be less than significant.

- d) *Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project proposes to construct a 139-unit detached single family development on currently undeveloped land with some foundations from previous buildings; therefore, only limited demolition is required. In accordance with Moorpark Municipal Code Section 8.36, the Project would prepare a construction and demolition materials management plan that details how the Project will divert or recycle at least 65 percent of construction materials. Construction waste generated by the Project would be taken to a facility approved by the City for the diversion of construction and demolition materials within the County.

Solid waste resulting from the Project would be taken to the Simi Valley Landfill & Recycling Center (SVLRC) by a licensed contractor. According to the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), SVLRC has a permitted daily throughput of 9,244 tons per day and a remaining capacity of 82,954,873 cubic yards (CalRecycle 2022). This is sufficient capacity for solid waste generated by the Project. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

- e) *Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project consists of some minimal demolition of existing foundations onsite, addition of utilities within the area, and construction of 139 new single family detached dwelling units. In accordance with Moorpark Municipal Code Section 8.36, the Project would prepare a construction and demolition materials management plan that details how the Project will divert or recycle at least 65 percent of construction and demolition material. Construction and demolition waste generated by the Project would be taken to a facility approved by the City for the diversion of construction and demolition materials within the County. Compliance with this Section of the Municipal Code would align the Project with goals set forth in AB 939 and AB 341, which state the City must divert at least 50 percent of its annual waste and set a 75-percent recycling goal for California by 2020. Solid waste resulting from the Project would be taken to SVLRC. This is sufficient capacity for solid waste generated by the Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.20 WILDFIRE

20.	WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.20.1 Impact Analysis

a) *Would the project impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Less than Significant Impact. The Project is located within the LRA VHFSZ (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2022). As mentioned in Section 4.9 above, the City has developed an Emergency Services Program that includes City staff receiving training in emergency preparedness, management, and mitigation; the City maintaining the EOC; the City organizing and training a Disaster Assistant Response Team composed of volunteers; and the City promoting emergency planning, training, public awareness, and education (City 2001). Additionally, the County’s MHMP includes an overview of the risk assessment process and identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives, and actions for each jurisdiction in the County, including participating cities (such as Moorpark) and the County unincorporated areas (County 2015).

No roads would be permanently closed as a result of the construction or operation of the Project, and no structures would be developed that could potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Proposed Project would be accessed via North Hills Parkway as well as an access road that would provide access to Gabbert Road. The proposed roadways and access road would provide sufficient ingress/egress for the Project site. The Project would not prohibit subsequent programs or plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. In addition, the Project will require review and approval by the Ventura County Fire Department to ensure that the Project site will have adequate access to emergency services.

The Project would not interfere with the City's Emergency Services Program or the MHMP because it would not prohibit subsequent programs or plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. The Project is located more than 1 mile north from the closest Critical Facility for emergency response, Moorpark High School (City 2001).

After the development is completed, new access will be provided via construction of North Hills Parkway along the southerly property boundary to Gabbert Road. North Hills Parkway will terminate as a cul-de-sac around the middle of the southern property line. A separate fire lane access would extend from northwest Thoroughbred Drive down to Los Angeles Drive. A separate 30-foot-wide fire access road to the planned development will occur from the eastern side of the development from Gabbert Road. The Project operations would not prevent access to this Critical Facility during an emergency. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) *Would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*

Less than Significant Impact. Although the Project site is within the LRA VHFSZ, the Project is in an area with elevation changes and gradual slopes. Santa Ana Wind Events tend to occur in the months of August, September, and October; but typically winds in the area are relatively low (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration 1998). The Project site contains dry vegetation that would be prone to spread fires during fire events. However, building code fire safety requirements, as well General Plan policies, and approval by the Ventura County Fire Department would require the provision of fire suppression and payment of fire protection facility fees, which would aid in preventing the spread of wildfires. Landscaping associated with the Proposed Project would comply with the City Landscaping Manual and include a fuel modification plan and defensible space as required by Public Resources Code Section 4291(a) and (b). As noted in CA 2, in Section 4.9 above, all plants included in the landscaping would be drought tolerant in order to comply with landscaping requirements for Very Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Therefore, compliance with these policies would result in less-than-significant impacts.

- c) *Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

Less than Significant Impact. Although the Project is located within the LRA VHFSZ, the Project is located within a non-urbanized area and would involve the development of the majority of the Project site with structures. Fuel breaks and brush clearance are expected to be required as part of the Project. Construction BMPs, such as ensuring equipment has spark arresters installed, would ensure temporary construction does not exacerbate fire risks in the area. This impact would be less than significant.

- d) *Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability or drainage changes?*

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project is located within the LRA VHFSZ and would introduce new residents into the area. As discussed in Section 4.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, development of

the Project would introduce more impervious surfaces, which would increase the volume of stormwater runoff from the site. This increase in runoff volume could also increase the rate of surface runoff and flooding on or off site. However, landscaping of the Project area would help reduce offsite flows and reduce runoff volumes and rates. Furthermore, the Project would comply with all NPDES requirements, Ventura County’s Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit, and the City’s runoff requirements and would therefore not significantly increase the rate of surface runoff and flooding on or off site. The Project site is varied but does not contain any slopes that pose a risk of landslide or slope instability. The Project site is located gently sloped hills in the north of the City; therefore, post-fire slope instability resulting in landslides or flooding would not be likely to result in impacts to development on the Project site. The Project site does not face a risk of flooding from upstream flooding or landslides; the Project is located in Zone X by FEMA and has minimal risk of flooding. Risk of downslope or downstream flooding at the Project site is low. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

21.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a)	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4.21.1 Impact Analysis

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. This Initial Study has analyzed the impacts to biological and cultural resources in the previous sections and have noted the potential direct and

indirect impacts, from no impact to less than significant with mitigation incorporated, from the Proposed Project.

Biological surveys were conducted on the Project site and determined that due to the lack of suitable habitat and lack in presence of special status wildlife species, impacts will be less than significant for native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species and impacts will be less than significant with mitigation incorporated for impacts to nesting birds (MM-BIO-1). Jurisdictional features were found in the northwest corner of the site and were within the CDFW and RWQCB boundaries. Mulefat scrub within the ephemeral drainage were proposed to be impacted by the development of the Project. Impacts to protected wetlands would result in less-than-significant impacts with implementation of MM-BIO-2 and MM-BIO-3.

A record search was conducted for the Project. Based on the results of the record search, no previously recorded resources or any other listed or potentially significant properties were located within the Project site. As with most development activities requiring excavation, there is potential for discovery of unidentified resources. Implementation of MM-CUL-1, MM-PALEO-1, MM-PALEO-2, in addition to the standard condition of approval for archaeological or historical finds, would result in impacts to be less than significant.

- b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The Project would result in less than significant, or less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated with respect to cumulatively considerable impacts. The Project is located in an area that is designated as rural residential low density under the General Plan and zoned as agricultural. Submittal of the GPA and ZC would permit the Project site for higher density occupancy, thereby being consistent with the City’s land use policies.

The cumulative effects of a full build out have been previously analyzed in the City’s General Plan. Furthermore, the City is currently updating their General Plan and Housing Element to account for future population growth. The Project would not exceed significance thresholds for air quality and greenhouse gas impacts during construction and operation of the Project. Standard conditions and MM-AQ-1 and MM-AQ-2 have been implemented to ensure impacts would be less than significant.

Cumulative projects were also analyzed in the TIA and the results indicate that the Project will not require mitigation measures as there is no significant degradation to the study intersections. The Project will also be subjected to its fair share of development impact fees to be paid by the Project Applicant. Impacts therefore would be less than significant.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Environmental effects that may cause substantial adverse effects on humans typically result from impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas, noise, hazardous materials, ground shaking, hazardous design features regarding transportation and

roadway designs and wildfire. The analysis of this document indicates that impacts would be less than significant to the environmental areas mentioned above. In addition, incorporation of mitigation measures to address impacts related to air quality, VOCs, and seismic settlement (MM-AQ-1, MM-AQ-2, MM-GEO-1) would result in less-than-significant impacts and, therefore, would not cause substantial adverse impacts to human beings.

SECTION 5.0 – REFERENCES

The following is a list of references used in the preparation of this document.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection

2022 Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Accessed January 25, 2022 at: <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>

California Department of Conservation (DOC)

2022a Important Farmland Finder. Accessed March 24, 2022 at:
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>

2022b Earthquake Zones. Accessed March 24, 2022 at:
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/>

2022c Mines Online. Accessed March 24, 2022 at:
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mol/index.html>.

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle)

2022 SWIS Facility/Site Activity Details: Simi Valley Landfill & Recycling Center (56-AA-0007).
Accessed March 24, 2022 at:
<https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/608?siteID=3954>.

California Energy Commission (CEC)

2018 California Retail Fuel Outlet Annual Reporting Results. Available online at:
<https://www.energy.ca.gov/data-reports/energy-almanac/transportation-energy/california-retail-fuel-outlet-annual-reporting>.

2020 Energy Consumption by Entity. Available online at:
<http://www.ecdms.energy.ca.gov/elecbyutil.aspx>

California Department of Transportation

2019 California State Scenic Highway System Map. Accessed March 24, 2022 at:
<https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>

City of Moorpark (City)

1986 General Plan: Open Space, Conservation & Recreation Element. Accessed March 24, 2022 at: <https://moorparkca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/172/OSCAR-Element?bidId=>

1998 General Plan: Noise Element. Accessed March 24, 2022 at:
<https://moorparkca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/171/Noise-Element?bidId=>

2001 General Plan: Safety Element. Accessed January 25, 2022 at:
<https://moorparkca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/173/Safety-Element?bidId=>

2012 Landscape Design Standards and Guidelines. Accessed March 24, 2022 at:
<https://moorparkca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/46/Landscape-Standards-and-Guidelines?bidId=>.

- 2014 Housing Element. Accessed March 23, 2022 at:
<https://moorparkca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/169/Housing-Element?bidId=>
- 2015 Ventura County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. Available online at:
https://s29710.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/ventura-hmp_main-body_september-2015.pdf. September 2015.
- 2020a Zoning Map. Accessed March 24, 2022 at: <https://www.moorparkca.gov/215/Zoning-Map>
- 2020b General Plan Map. Accessed March 24, 2022 at: <https://moorparkca.gov/212/General-Plan>
- 2020c An Examination of the City's Existing Conditions. December 2020. Available online at:
<https://www.moorparkca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/11380/GPU-Existing-Conditions-Report?bidId=>.
- 2022 Municipal Code. Accessed March 24, 2022. Available online at:
<https://qcode.us/codes/moorpark/>.

Cooperative Strategies

- 2022 Residential and Commercial/Industrial Development School Fee Justification Study. Moorpark Unified School District. June 2, 2022.

County of Ventura (County)

- 2011 Technical Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Measures. Accessed January 26, 2022 at: <https://www.vcstormwater.org/publications/manuals/tech-guide-manual>
- 2015 Ventura County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan. Accessed March 24, 2022 at:
<https://moorparkca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7344/Multi-Hazard-Mitigation-Plan-RES-CC-2016-3556-2016-1116?bidId=>.
- 2019 Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Corridors Map. Accessed July 15, 2022 at:
https://docs.vcrma.org/images/pdf/planning/HWCW/HWCW_map.pdf
- 2020 Ventura County 2040 General Plan Update: Background Report. Accessed March 24, 2022 at: https://vc2040.org/images/Draft_Background_Report_-_Jan._2020/PRDBR-AllChapters_Jan2020_compressed_VCGPUweb.pdf.

Department of Toxic Substances Control

- 2022 Envirostor Database. Accessed April 19, 2022 at:
<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=moorpark%2C+ca>

Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency (FCGMA)

- 2022 Las Posas Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Plan. January 2022.

Google

- 2022 Google Earth Pro. Accessed March 24, 2022 at: <https://earth.google.com/web/>

Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB)

- 2014 LARWQCB Basin Plan. Available online at:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

- 1998 Annual Global Climate Report. National Centers for Environmental Information.
Accessed January 25, 2022 at: <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/sotc/global/199813>

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

- 2019 Local Profiles Report. Available online at https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/moorpark_localprofile.pdf?1606015228

- 2020 Demographics and Growth Forecast. Available at:
https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/0903fconnectsocial_demographics-and-growth-forecast.pdf?1606001579

State Water Resources Control Board

- 2022 Geotracker database. Accessed April 19, 2022 at:
<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=moorpark%2C+ca>

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD)

- 2003 Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines. Available at:
<http://www.vcapcd.org/pubs/Planning/VCAQGuidelines.pdf>

Ventura County Airport Land Use Commission

- 2000 Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan Update for Ventura County. Accessed April 19, 2022 at: <https://www.goventura.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/2000-airport-land-use-for-ventura-county.pdf>

Ventura County Waterworks District (VCWWD) No. 1

- 2021 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. Accessed March 24, 2022 at:
https://wuedata.water.ca.gov/public/uwmp_attachments/9460813224/VCWWD1_%20UWMP_Final_2020.pdf

Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC)

- 2016 Period of Monthly Climate Summary for Thousand Oaks 1 SW, California (048904).
Available online at: <https://wrcc.dri.edu/cgi-bin/cliMAIN.pl?ca8904>