

## Appendix C

### ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW

---

An analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with proposed airport projects is an essential consideration in the ALP narrative report process. The primary purpose of this discussion is to review the preferred development concept (**Exhibit 4E**) and associated capital program at the airport to determine whether projects identified in the ALP narrative report could, individually or collectively, significantly impact existing environmental resources. Information contained in this section was obtained from previous studies, official internet websites, and analysis by the consultant.

The *FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018* (Act) changed how the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) historically operates with respect to airport oversight. Section 163 of the Act limits the FAA's approval authority over certain projects. Pursuant to Section 163, when an airport sponsor submits a change to the airport layout plan (ALP) for a project that would not be federally funded, requests a change in land use from aeronautical to non-aeronautical, or requests to dispose of airport-owned land, the FAA must determine if the proposal would be subject to the agency's approval authority. This approval is a two-step process. The FAA exercises its regulatory authority consistent with the Act and separately examines whether it has ALP approval authority under Section 163 of the Act. The second step is to determine how the land was acquired and if land release obligations are required. Projects depicted on the ALP that were approved prior to the Act must be evaluated to determine whether the FAA retains its approval authority.

If the FAA retains approval authority over a project, the project is typically subject to the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA). For projects not categorically excluded under FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, compliance with NEPA is generally satisfied through the preparation of an environmental assessment (EA). In instances where significant environmental impacts are expected, an environmental impact statement (EIS) may be required.

The following portion of the study is not designed to satisfy the NEPA requirements for a specific development project, but it provides a preliminary review of environmental issues that may need to be considered in more detail within the environmental review processes. It is important to note that the FAA is ultimately responsible for determining the level of environmental documentation required for airport actions.

This section provides an overview of potential impacts to existing resources that could result from implementation of the planned improvements outlined on the preferred development concept.

**Table A** summarizes potential environmental concerns associated with implementation of the preferred development concept for Camarillo Airport. Analysis under NEPA includes effects or impacts a proposed action or alternative may have on the human environment (see Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] §1508.1).

<b>TABLE A   Summary of Potential Environmental Concerns</b>	
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>	
<b>FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</b>	<i>The action would cause pollutant concentrations to exceed one or more of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), as established by the United States (U.S.) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Clean Air Act, for any of the time periods analyzed, or to increase the frequency or severity of any such existing violations.</i>
<b>Potential Environmental Concerns</b>	<p><b>Potential Impact.</b> Ventura County is a non-attainment area for the 2008 and 2018 eight-hour (serious) ozone NAAQS.<sup>1</sup> The development concept would not change operations at the airport. The Runway 8-26 shortening and narrowing project will need to be reviewed; however, pavement marking projects are presumed to conform according to the federal actions found in 72 FR 41565, 07/30/2007, which states: "Federal actions that alter airport use through new pavement markings are not routine maintenance but are presumed to conform if such actions do not increase airport capacity or introduce a larger class of aircraft at the airport." Minor taxiway geometry pavement projects included in the development concept would be considered non-runway pavement work and also presumed to conform, since they are "limited to improvements of existing taxiways that will not affect runway use, increase capacity, enable new aircraft types, or change existing airfield operations when complete."</p> <p>Determination of impacts from redevelopment of aging infrastructure, new hangar development, and other aeronautical and non-aeronautical development will be evaluated on an individual basis. For construction emissions, a qualitative or quantitative emissions inventory under NEPA may be required, depending on the type of environmental review needed for specific projects shown on the development plan concept (<b>Exhibit 4E</b>).</p>
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (including fish, wildlife, and plants)</b>	
<b>FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</b>	<p><i>The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) determines that the action would be likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a federally listed threatened or endangered species or would result in the destruction or adverse modification of federally designated critical habitat.</i></p> <p><i>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for non-listed species; however, factors to consider include whether an action would have the potential for:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Long-term or permanent loss of non-listed plant or wildlife species;</li> <li>- Adverse impacts to special status species or their habitats;</li> <li>- Substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species' habitats or their populations; or</li> <li>- Adverse impacts on a species' reproductive rates, non-natural mortality, or ability to sustain the minimum population levels required for population maintenance.</li> </ul>
<i>Continues on next page</i>	

<sup>1</sup> U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Green Book, California Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year for All Criteria Pollutants ([https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo\\_ca.html](https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo_ca.html))

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (including fish, wildlife, and plants) - Continued	
Potential Environmental Concerns	<p><b>Federally Protected Species</b>  <b>No Impact.</b> According to the U.S. FWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) report, there are twelve endangered and/or threatened species listed (or identified as candidates for listing) under the <i>Endangered Species Act</i> known to occur within the vicinity of the airport.<sup>2</sup> These species are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California condor (endangered, bird)</li> <li>• Coastal California gnatcatcher (threatened, bird)</li> <li>• Least bell's vireo (endangered, bird)</li> <li>• Marbled murrelet (threatened, bird)</li> <li>• Yellow-billed cuckoo (threatened, bird)</li> <li>• Monarch butterfly (candidate, insect)</li> <li>• Riverside fairy shrimp (endangered, crustacean)</li> <li>• Vernal pool fairy shrimp (threatened, crustacean)</li> <li>• California Orcutt grass (endangered, flowering plant)</li> <li>• Gamble's watercress (endangered, flowering plant)</li> <li>• Marsh sandwort (endangered, flowering plant)</li> <li>• Spreading navarretia (threatened, flowering plant)</li> </ul> <p>According to a biological resources assessment conducted by SWCA Environmental Consultants in January 2023, no federally listed species or designated critical habitat are known to occur on airport property, and none were observed during the field surveys.</p> <p><b>Designated Critical Habitat</b>  <b>No Impact.</b> There are no designated critical habitats within airport boundaries.</p> <p><b>Non-Listed Species</b>  <b>Potential Impact.</b> Non-listed species of concern include those protected by the <i>Migratory Bird Treaty Act</i> (MBTA) and the <i>Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act</i>. According to the <i>January 2023 Biological Resources Assessment</i> conducted by SWCA Environmental Consultants<sup>3</sup>, suitable habitat for golden eagles was not observed within airport boundaries. Habitats on airport property do provide nesting opportunities for birds nesting in burrows (e.g. burrowing owl) or grassland habitat (e.g. California horned lark), and burrowing owl was observed on airport property. Ground disturbance could have direct impacts on active nests and construction movement could have indirect impacts on nearby nests, which could result in nest abandonment. Pre-disturbance nesting bird surveys are recommended to avoid impacts to nesting migratory birds. To the extent possible, construction activities should be conducted outside of nesting season. As a result of previous studies, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) has also requested that the following measures be implemented by the airport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require all personnel to attend a worker education training program prior to grading/and or construction activities;</li> <li>• Conduct habitat assessment for burrowing owl for future projects, in accordance with <i>Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation</i> (CDFW 2012); and</li> <li>• Implement a wildlife hazard management plan (WHMP) for wildlife strikes.</li> </ul>
<b>CLIMATE</b>	
FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider	<b>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Climate. Refer to FAA Order 1050.1F Desk Reference and/or the most recent FAA Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook for the most up-to-date methodology for examining impacts associated with climate change.</b>
Potential Environmental Concerns	<b>Unknown.</b> An increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions could occur over the next five to 10 years, which is the planning horizon of this ALP update. A project-specific analysis may be required per FAA Order 1050.1F, <i>Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures</i> , based on the parameters of the individual projects; however, at this time, the FAA does not have an impact threshold to use to determine significance under NEPA.
<b>COASTAL RESOURCES</b>	
FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider	<b>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Coastal Resources. Factors to consider include whether an action would have the potential to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Be inconsistent with the relevant state coastal zone management plan(s);</b></li> <li>• <b>Impact a coastal barrier resources system unit;</b></li> <li>• <b>Pose an impact on coral reef ecosystems;</b></li> <li>• <b>Cause an unacceptable risk to human safety or property; or</b></li> <li>• <b>Cause adverse impacts on the coastal environment that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated.</b></li> </ul>
Potential Environmental Concerns	<b>No Impact.</b> Camarillo Airport is not within the California Coastal Zone, which is five miles to the west. The airport is seven miles from the Pacific Ocean at its closest point. The closest National Marine Sanctuary is Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, located 13 miles west of the airport.
<b>Continues on next page</b>	

<sup>2</sup> U.S. FWS, IPaC Information for Planning and Consultation (<https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/location/index>)

<sup>3</sup> SWCA Environmental Consultants, Biological Resources Assessment for the Camarillo Airport Layout Plan, Camarillo, Ventura County, California, January 2023).

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT, SECTION 4(f) (NOW CODIFIED IN 49 UNITED STATES CODE [U.S.C.] § 303)	
FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider	<i>The action involves more than a minimal physical use of a Section 4(f) resource or constitutes a “constructive use” based on an FAA determination that the aviation project would substantially impair the Section 4(f) resource. Resources that are protected by Section 4(f) are publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance; and publicly or privately owned land from a historic site of national, state, or local significance. Substantial impairment occurs when the activities, features, or attributes of the resource that contribute to its significance or enjoyment are substantially diminished.</i>
Potential Environmental Concerns	<b>Potential Impact.</b> There are no historic resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) within or near the airport. Also, based on a cultural resources record search and on-ground survey, no archaeological resources were identified at the airport. <sup>4</sup> Additionally, no waterfowl or wildlife refuge areas or national parks or recreation areas are near the airport. One local public park (Freedom Park) is located immediately adjacent to airport property to the south. The preferred development concept designates land use adjacent to Freedom Park for aeronautical reserve and non-aeronautical reserve. Section 4(f) evaluation may be required for development of these areas.
FARMLANDS	
FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider	<b>The total combined score on Form AD-1006, Farmland Conversion Impact Rating, ranges between 200 and 260. (Form AD-1006 is used by the U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS] to assess impacts under the Farmland Protection Policy Act [FPPA].)</b>  <i>The FPPA applies when airport activities meet one of the following conditions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal funds are involved;</li> <li>• The action involves the potential for the irreversible conversion of important farmlands to non-agricultural uses. Important farmlands include pastureland, cropland, and forest considered to be prime, unique, or statewide or locally important land; or</li> <li>• None of the exemptions to the FPPA apply. These exemptions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ When land is not considered “farmland” under the FPPA, such as land that is already developed or already irreversibly converted. These instances include when land is designated as an urban area by the U.S. Census Bureau or the existing footprint includes rights-of-way;</li> <li>○ When land is already committed to urban development;</li> <li>○ When land is committed to water storage;</li> <li>○ The construction of non-farm structures that are necessary to support farming operations; and</li> <li>○ Construction/land development for national defense purposes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Potential Environmental Concerns	<b>No Impact.</b> According to the NRCS Web Soil Survey (WSS), soils on the airport are identified as farmland of statewide importance and prime farmland if irrigated <sup>5</sup> ; however, the California Department of Conservation’s California Important Farmland Finder website shows the airport as urban and built-up land, while the U.S. Census identifies the City of Camarillo, including the airport, as an urbanized area. Therefore, the FPPA is not applicable to the airport property.
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SOLID WASTE, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION	
FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider	<b>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention; however, factors to consider include whether an action would have the potential to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Violate applicable federal, state, tribal, or local laws or regulations regarding hazardous materials and/or solid waste management;</li> <li>• Involve a contaminated site;</li> <li>• Produce an appreciably different quantity or type of hazardous waste;</li> <li>• Generate an appreciably different quantity or type of solid waste, or use a different method of collection or disposal and/or would exceed local capacity; or</li> <li>• Adversely affect human health and the environment.</li> </ul>
<i>Continues on next page</i>	

<sup>4</sup> SWCA Archaeological Survey Report for the Camarillo Airport ALP Update/Narrative Report, August 2022

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Department of Agriculture, NRCS, (<https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>)

**HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SOLID WASTE, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION - Continued**

<p><b>Potential Environmental Concerns</b></p>	<p><b>Potential Impact.</b> There are no documented Superfund sites or brownfields on existing or future airport property; however, the airport is a formerly used defense facility. A voluntary cleanup was completed under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP).</p> <p>The airport has two fuel farms with aboveground fuel tanks on airport property and provides aircraft maintenance activities that could involve fossil fuels or other types of hazardous materials or wastes. These operations are regulated and monitored by the appropriate regulatory agencies, such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and the Ventura County Resource Management Agency. The airport’s fuel farms are required to maintain a spill prevention, control, and countermeasure (SPCC) Plan. Other than some surface contamination on surrounding pavement, the potential for exposure of aviation fuel to stormwater runoff is low at the airport.</p> <p>The preferred development concept does not include land uses that would produce an appreciably different quantity or type of hazardous waste; however, should a substantially different type of land use be proposed, further NEPA review and/or permitting would be required.</p> <p>The construction of planned developments would temporarily increase solid waste. Any construction and demolition waste, along with all other types of non-hazardous solid waste, would be hauled to a facility that accepts construction waste. Solid waste in Camarillo is generally collected and disposed of via the Gold Coast Recycling and Transfer Station in Ventura, approximately nine miles from the airport. Refuse that is incapable of being recycled is then hauled to Simi Valley Landfill and Recycling Center or Toland Road Sanitary Landfill. No impacts related to solid waste disposal are expected.</p> <p>Prior to the acquisition of land, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment would be required; however, no land acquisition is contemplated in the preferred development concept.</p>
--	---

**HISTORICAL, ARCHITECTURAL, ARCHAEOLOGICAL, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

<p><b>FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</b></p> <p><b>Potential Environmental Concerns</b></p>	<p><b>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources. Factors to consider include whether an action would result in a finding of “adverse effect” through the Section 106 process; however, an adverse effect finding does not automatically trigger the preparation of an EIS (i.e., a significant impact).</b></p> <p><b>Potential Impact.</b> The closest resource listed on the NRHP is the is the Camarillo Ranch House, located 3.0 miles east of the airport; the closest proposed development is the addition of buildings northeast of Runway 26.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, an airport-wide cultural resources survey was completed in August 2022. No prehistoric archaeological resources were identified during either the record search or pedestrian survey; however, the airport’s “as built” environment includes buildings or structures that may be more than 50 years in age, making them potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Development in the aging infrastructure, aeronautical, and non-aeronautical reserve areas should be reviewed to determine the presence of historic built environment resources and/or the potential for a future project to affect such resources.</p>
--	---

**LAND USE**

<p><b>FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</b></p> <p><b>Potential Environmental Concerns</b></p>	<p><b>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Land Use and there are no specific independent factors to consider. The determination that significant impacts exist is normally dependent on the significance of other impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Potential Impact.</b> Proposed airport improvements include shortening the runway by 13 feet; maintaining the current instrument approaches; reconstructing Taxiways B, C, and D and reorienting Taxiway E to meet current design standards; redesigning aircraft hold bays to meet current design standards; adding a new taxiway parallel to Taxiway G1; development of additional aeronautical facilities (e.g. hangars) on aeronautical reserve areas; redevelopment of aging infrastructure; and other non-aeronautical development (<b>Exhibit 4E</b>). No change in airport operations would occur as a result of the proposed improvements.</p> <p>Although the current and future RPZs extend off airport property, no land acquisition is contemplated in the preferred development concept.</p>
--	--

**NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY SUPPLY**

<p><b>FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</b></p> <p><b>Potential Environmental Concerns</b></p>	<p><b>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Natural Resources and Energy Supply; however, factors to consider include whether the action would have the potential to cause demand to exceed available or future supplies of these resources.</b></p> <p><b>No Impact.</b> Planned development projects (i.e., new hangar development) at the airport could increase demands on energy utilities, water supplies and treatment, and other natural resources during construction; however, significant long-term impacts are not anticipated. Should long-term impacts be a concern, coordination with local service providers is recommended.</p>
--	---

*Continues on next page*

**NOISE AND NOISE-COMPATIBLE LAND USE**

<p>FAA Order 1050.1F, <i>Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</i></p>	<p><i>The action would increase noise by day-night average sound level (DNL) 1.5 decibel (dB) or more for a noise-sensitive area that is exposed to noise at or above the DNL 65 dB noise exposure level, or that will be exposed at or above the DNL 65 dB level due to a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase when compared to the no action alternative for the same timeframe.</i></p> <p><i>Another factor to consider is that special consideration should be given to the evaluation of the significance of noise impacts on noise-sensitive areas within Section 4(f) properties where the land use compatibility guidelines in 14 CFR Part 150 are not relevant to the value, significance, and enjoyment of the area in question.</i></p>
<p>Potential Environmental Concerns</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> CNEL (Community Noise Equivalent Level) noise contours were produced as part of the ongoing Part 150 study for Camarillo Airport. CNEL is the noise metric currently specified in California’s State Aeronautics Code for evaluation of noise impacts at airports in California. The FAA has adopted 65 CNEL as the threshold of significant noise exposure. In the ongoing Part 150 study, it was determined that the 65 CNEL contour extends off airport property to the north and southeast. The 70 CNEL and 75 CNEL contours remain on airport property. Based on the forecasts in Chapter 2 of this study, the 65 CNEL future noise contours are anticipated to further expand off airport property to the north and southeast. There are existing noise-sensitive land uses (schools) to the southeast, adjacent to the airport’s mixed-use development, that fall within the 65 CNEL existing and future contours. There are no residential land uses in the existing or future noise contours.</p> <p>Development at the airport is not expected to change airport operations or the overall noise environment. It is important to note that operational growth, unless tied to a specific project, will not result in noise impacts under FAA Order 1050.1F. Impacts to noise-sensitive land uses are usually identified through NEPA documentation for specific projects or through the voluntary Part 150 process.</p>

**SOCIOECONOMICS, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND CHILDREN’S ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY RISKS**

**Socioeconomics**

<p>FAA Order 1050.1F, <i>Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</i></p>	<p><i>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Socioeconomics; however, factors to consider include whether an action would have the potential to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Induce substantial economic growth in an area, either directly or indirectly (e.g., through establishing projects in an undeveloped area);</i></li> <li>• <i>Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community;</i></li> <li>• <i>Cause extensive relocation when sufficient replacement housing is unavailable;</i></li> <li>• <i>Cause extensive relocation of community businesses that would cause severe economic hardship for affected communities;</i></li> <li>• <i>Disrupt local traffic patterns and substantially reduce the levels of service of roads serving the airport and its surrounding communities; or</i></li> <li>• <i>Produce a substantial change in the community tax base.</i></li> </ul>
<p>Potential Environmental Concerns</p>	<p><b>Potential Impact.</b> Development occurring in areas outlined on the preferred development concept could potentially encourage economic growth for the region. Potential results include new construction jobs, new jobs for the airport and other commercial uses, and an increase in the local tax base. The preferred development concept would not relocate or disrupt any nearby residential units. Redevelopment of areas designated as aging infrastructure, aeronautical reserve, and non-aeronautical reserve could disrupt local businesses during redevelopment. Further review and analysis of potential impacts to displaced business may be required; however, most of the land designated for redevelopment consists of aircraft storage hangars.</p> <p>Development projects on airport property may result in temporary disruption of local traffic patterns during construction. Projects that could disrupt local traffic patterns would be primarily landside developments on areas designated as aeronautical reserve and non-aeronautical reserve (Exhibit 4E).</p>

*Continues on next page*

Environmental Justice	
<p><b>FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</b></p>	<p><i>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Environmental Justice; however, factors to consider include whether an action would have the potential to lead to a disproportionately high and adverse impact to an environmental justice population (i.e., a low-income or minority population) due to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Significant impacts in other environmental impact categories; or</i></li> <li>• <i>Impacts on the physical or natural environment that affect an environmental justice population in a way the FAA determines is unique to the environmental justice population and significant to that population.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Potential Environmental Concerns</b></p>	<p><b>Potential Impact.</b> Low-income and minority populations have been identified in the vicinity of the airport. Within a one-mile radius, 17 percent of the population is low-income and 53 percent are people of color.<sup>6</sup> The nearest residential area is 0.3 miles away to the north and is separated from the airport by Ventura Freeway (US-101). It is unlikely that implementation of the proposed improvements outlined in the development concept plan would affect these populations in a disproportionate or adverse manner. No residences would be displaced due to the preferred development concept.</p> <p>Executive Order (E.O.) 12898, <i>Federal Action to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations</i>, the accompanying presidential memorandum, and Department of Transportation (DOT) Order 5610.2, <i>Environmental Justice</i>, require the FAA to provide meaningful public involvement for minority and low-income populations, as well as analysis that identifies and addresses potential impacts on these populations that may be disproportionately high and adverse. Environmental justice impacts may be avoided or minimized through early and consistent communication with the public and allowing ample time for public consideration; therefore, disclosure of ultimate airport development to potentially affected environmental justice populations near the airport as the projects are proposed is crucial. Materials produced by this study are available in both English and Spanish, including the ALP narrative report, associated website, and meeting announcements. In addition, Mixteco and Spanish interpretation services are provided at all public meetings related to this ALP update for Camarillo Airport.</p> <p>If disproportionately high or adverse impacts are noted, mitigation and enhancement measures and off-setting benefits can be taken into consideration.</p>
Children's Health and Safety Risks	
<p><b>FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</b></p>	<p><i>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks; however, factors to consider include whether an action would have the potential to lead to a disproportionate health or safety risk to children.</i></p>
<p><b>Potential Environmental Concerns</b></p>	<p><b>Potential Impact.</b> Per E.O. 13045, <i>Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks</i>, federal agencies are directed to identify and assess environmental health and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children. These risks include those attributable to products or substances that a child is likely to come in contact with or ingest, such as air, food, drinking water, recreational waters, soil, or products to which they may be exposed. Three schools have been identified within close proximity to the airport, as well as one public park (Freedom Park); the locations of the schools are labeled on <b>Exhibit 1L</b> in the Environmental Inventory. Best management practices should be implemented to decrease environmental health risks to children.</p> <p>During construction of the projects outlined in the preferred development concept, appropriate measures should be taken to prevent access by unauthorized persons to construction project areas.</p>
VISUAL EFFECTS (INCLUDING LIGHT EMISSIONS AND VISUAL RESOURCES/VISUAL CHARACTER)	
Light Emissions	
<p><b>FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</b></p>	<p><i>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Light Emissions; however, a factor to consider is the degree to which an action would have the potential to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Create annoyance or interfere with normal activities from light emissions; or</i></li> <li>• <i>Affect the nature of the visual character of the area due to light emissions, including the importance, uniqueness, and aesthetic value of the affected visual resources.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Potential Environmental Concerns</b></p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> Existing airfield lighting at the airport includes a rotating beacon, runway and taxiway edge lighting, a precision approach path indicator (PAPI) system along Runway 8-26, and runway end identifier lights (REILs) at both ends of Runway 8-26. In addition, the airport is equipped with pilot-controlled lighting which allows pilots to activate a lighting system along both runways through a series of clicks on their radio transmitters.</p> <p>Night lighting during construction phases associated with taxiway reconstruction is typically directed down to the construction work area to prevent light from spilling outside the airport boundaries. Other aeronautical and non-aeronautical developments could change the overall visual character of the airport with additional structures. Any new development at the airport will be consistent with the existing use and would not significantly change the amount of lighting seen from outside the airport.</p>
<p><i>Continues on next page</i></p>	

<sup>6</sup> U.S. EPA, EJSscreen website, EJSscreen Community Report (<https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen>)

Visual Resources/Visual Character	
<p>FAA Order 1050.1F, <i>Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</i></p>	<p><i>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Visual Resources/Visual Character; however, a factor to consider is the extent to which an action would have the potential to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Affect the nature of the visual character of the area, including the importance, uniqueness, and aesthetic value of the affected visual resources;</i></li> <li>• <i>Contrast with the visual resources and/or visual character in the study area; or</i></li> <li>• <i>Block or obstruct the views of the visual resources, including whether these resources would still be viewable from other locations.</i></li> </ul>
<p>Potential Environmental Concerns</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> Proposed ultimate building development would not significantly alter the surrounding airport environment. No nearby roadways have been classified as National Scenic Byways or All-American Roads by the U.S. Department of Transportation or the California Department of Transportation.<sup>7,8</sup> The City of Camarillo designates portions of U.S. Route 101 north of airport property and Las Posas Road east of airport property as scenic corridors.</p> <p>Development depicted on the preferred development concept could change the overall visual character of the airport with additional structures planned on-site; however, new development at the airport will be consistent with the existing use and visual impacts on surrounding property will be minimal.</p>
WATER RESOURCES (INCLUDING WETLANDS, FLOODPLAINS, SURFACE WATERS, GROUNDWATER, AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS)	
Wetlands	
<p>FAA Order 1050.1F, <i>Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</i></p>	<p><b>The action would:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Adversely affect a wetland’s function to protect the quality or quantity of municipal water supplies, including surface waters and sole source and other aquifers;</i></li> <li>2. <i>Substantially alter the hydrology needed to sustain the affected wetland system’s values and functions or those of a wetland to which it is connected;</i></li> <li>3. <i>Substantially reduce the affected wetland’s ability to retain floodwaters or storm runoff, thereby threatening public health, safety, or welfare (the term welfare includes cultural, recreational, and scientific resources or property important to the public);</i></li> <li>4. <i>Adversely affect the maintenance of natural systems supporting wildlife and fish habitat or economically important timber, food, or fiber resources of the affected or surrounding wetlands;</i></li> <li>5. <i>Promote the development of secondary activities or services that would cause the circumstances listed above to occur; or,</i></li> <li>6. <i>Be inconsistent with applicable state wetland strategies.</i></li> </ol>
<p>Potential Environmental Concerns</p>	<p><b>Potential Impact.</b> The airport conducted aquatic resources delineation surveys in the project area in January 2021 and June 2022. The surveys identified the presence of two on-airport drainage basins, on-airport drainage ditches, and the Camarillo Hills Drain.</p> <p>The Camarillo Hills Drain was determined to be Waters of the U.S. by the Army Corps of Engineers during the review of the Application for Programmatic Permit for the <i>Ventura County Watershed Protection District Routine Operation and Maintenance Program</i> in 2018. Findings of the 2021 and 2022 aquatic resources delineation surveys determined Camarillo Hills Drain likely meets the definition of a “tributary to a traditional navigable water (TNW)” under the current Revised Definition of ‘<i>Waters of the United States</i>’; <i>Conforming</i>. However, the surveys found that the on-airport drainage basins did not meet the criteria of a wetland or tributary to a TNW. The surveys also determined the on-airport drainage ditches lack jurisdictional waters indicators. Therefore, the on-airport draining basins and on-airport drainage ditches are not expected to be jurisdictional waters of the U.S.</p> <p>Based on these findings, it is unlikely that mitigation for impacts to wetlands or other jurisdictional waters would be required projects on airport property, unless the project would result in dredge or fill of Camarillo Hills Drain.</p>
<p><i>Continues on next page</i></p>	

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (<https://fhwaapps.fhwa.dot.gov/bywaysp/StateMaps/Show/byway/2456>)

<sup>8</sup> California State Scenic Highways (<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>)



Floodplains	
<b>FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</b>	<p><b>The action would cause notable adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values. Natural and beneficial floodplain values are defined in Paragraph 4.k of DOT Order 5650.2, Floodplain Management and Protection.</b></p>
<b>Potential Environmental Concerns</b>	<p><b>Potential Impact.</b> A review of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) (Panel Nos. 06111C0929F, eff. 1/7/2015 and 06111C0928E, eff. 1/20/2010), indicates that the majority of the airport is within Zone X (500-year flood area). A small portion in the southwest corner of airport property is designated Zone X (area with reduced flood risk due to levee). A Regulatory Floodway occurs where the Camarillo Hills Drain crosses airport property in the southwest corner and along the northern property line.</p> <p>E.O. 14030, <i>Climate-Related Financial Risk</i>, was established May 25, 2021. Section 5(e) of E.O. 14030 reinstates E.O. 13690<sup>9</sup>, amends E.O. 11988<sup>10</sup>, and mandates the creation of a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard (FFRMS). One of the primary purposes of the FFRMS is to expand the management of floodplains from a base flood evaluation to include a higher vertical elevation (and the corresponding floodplain) to protect against future flood risks for federally funded projects.</p> <p>Under E.O. 13690 and its guidelines, one of several approaches should be used to identify floodplains and their risks to critical or non-critical federally funded actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate-Informed Science Approach (CISA) – the elevation and flood hazard area (i.e., 100-year floodplain) using data that integrate climate science with an emphasis on possible future effects on critical actions;</li> <li>• Freeboard Value Approach – the elevation and flood hazard area and an additional two or three feet above the base flood elevation, depending on whether the proposed federal action is critical<sup>11</sup> or non-critical;</li> <li>• 500-Year Floodplain Approach – all areas subject to the 0.2 percent annual chance flood; or</li> <li>• Other methods resulting from updates to the FFRMS.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, public notice regarding potential improvements within the 500-year floodplain will be required in accordance with 44 CFR 9.8 for all development projects at the airport receiving federal funds.</p>
Surface Waters	
<b>FAA Order 1050.1F, Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</b>	<p><b>The action would:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Exceed water quality standards established by federal, state, local, and tribal regulatory agencies;</b></li> <li>or</li> <li>2. <b>Contaminate public drinking water supply such that public health may be adversely affected.</b></li> </ol>
<b>Potential Environmental Concerns</b>	<p><b>Potential Impact.</b> The airport is located within the Beardsley Wash subwatershed.<sup>12</sup> This watershed contains three impaired waterways: the Beardsley Channel (located northwest of the airport), the Revolon Slough (located west of the airport), and the Honda Barranca (located north of the airport).</p> <p>The county operates under the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Stormwater Permit No. CAS004002. In addition, the Ventura County Watershed Protection District (VCWPD) enforces Ordinance WP-2, which contains standards and permitting conditions related to new drainage connections within the VCWPD’s jurisdiction. Improvements to the airport will require a revised permit to be issued that addresses operation and structural source controls, treatment BMPs, and sediment and erosion control. FAA Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5370-10G, <i>Standards for Specifying Construction of Airports, Item P-156, Temporary Air and Water Pollution, Soil Erosion and Siltation Control</i>, should also be implemented during construction projects at the airport.</p>
<b>Continues on next page</b>	

<sup>9</sup> Establishing a Federal Flood Risk Management Standard and a Process for Further Soliciting and Considering Stakeholder Input (2015)

<sup>10</sup> Floodplain Management (May 1997)

<sup>11</sup> Critical action is defined in E.O. 13690 and the 2015 Guidelines for Implementing E.O. 11988 as any activity for which even a slight change of flooding is too great.

<sup>12</sup> U.S. EPA, How’s My Waterway (<https://mywaterway.epa.gov/community/camarillo%20airport/overview>)

Groundwater	
<p>FAA Order 1050.1F, <i>Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</i></p>	<p><b>The action would:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exceed groundwater quality standards established by federal, state, local, and tribal regulatory agencies; or</li> <li>2. Contaminate an aquifer used for public water supply such that public health may be adversely affected.</li> </ol> <p><b>Factors to consider include whether a project would have the potential to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adversely affect natural and beneficial groundwater values to a degree that substantially diminishes or destroys such values;</li> <li>• Adversely affect groundwater quantities such that the beneficial uses and values of such groundwater are appreciably diminished or can no longer be maintained, and such impairment cannot be avoided or satisfactorily mitigated; or</li> <li>• Present difficulties based on water quality impacts when obtaining a permit or authorization.</li> </ul>
<p>Potential Environmental Concerns</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> Preferred development plan projects would not substantially change the amount of water used by the airport. According to the U.S. EPA <i>Sole Source Aquifers for Drinking Water</i> website, the nearest sole source aquifer to Ventura County is the Fresno County sole source aquifer, located 155 miles north.<sup>13</sup></p>
Wild and Scenic Rivers	
<p>FAA Order 1050.1F, <i>Significance Threshold/Factors to Consider</i></p>	<p><b>The FAA has not established a significance threshold for Wild and Scenic Rivers. Factors to consider include whether an action would have an adverse impact on the values for which a river was designated (or considered for designation) through:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destroying or altering a river's free-flowing nature;</li> <li>• A direct and adverse effect on the values for which a river was designated (or is under study for designation);</li> <li>• Introducing a visual, audible, or another type of intrusion that is out of character with the river or would alter outstanding features of the river's setting;</li> <li>• Causing the river's water quality to deteriorate;</li> <li>• Allowing the transfer or sale of property interests without restrictions needed to protect the river or the river corridor; or</li> <li>• Any of the above impacts preventing a river on the <i>Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI)</i>, or a <i>Section 5(d) river</i> that is not included in the NRI, from being included in the <i>Wild and Scenic River System</i> or causing a downgrade in its classification (e.g., from wild to recreational).</li> </ul>
<p>Potential Environmental Concerns</p>	<p><b>No Impact.</b> The closest designated wild and scenic river to the airport is Sespe Creek, located more than 16 miles north.<sup>14</sup> The nearest creek or river listed on the NRI is Big Sycamore River, located six miles south.<sup>15</sup> Given the distance from the airport, the recommended airport projects will not have adverse effects on the river's outstanding remarkable values (i.e., scenery, recreation, geology, fish, wildlife, and history).</p>

Some projects identified in the preferred development concept are capital projects that will require environmental documentation. The level of documentation necessary for each project must be determined in consultation with the FAA and Caltrans. There are three major levels for environmental review to be considered under NEPA: categorical exclusions (CatEx), environmental assessments (EA), and environmental impact statements (EIS). Each level requires more time to complete and more detailed information. Guidance on what level of documentation is required for a specific project is provided in FAA Order 1050.1F, *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*. Projects occurring in the intermediate and long-term capital improvement project (CIP) will need to undergo further analysis to determine the level of environmental documentation that could be required.

**Table B** lists the future development projects and the recommended NEPA documentation that might be required by the FAA. Ultimately, the decision on the type of NEPA compliance document will be up to the FAA.

<sup>13</sup> Sole Source Aquifers (<https://epa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9ebb047ba3ec41ada1877155fe31356b>)

<sup>14</sup> National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (<https://www.rivers.gov/california.php>)

<sup>15</sup> National Park Service, Nationwide Rivers Inventory (<https://www.nps.gov/subjects/rivers/nationwide-rivers-inventory.htm>)

**TABLE B | Anticipated Environmental Review for Short-Term Development Projects  
Camarillo Airport ALP Update**

<b>Short-Term Program (0-5 years)</b>	
<b>Recommended Project</b>	<b>Initial NEPA Action</b>
Runway 8-26 Reconstruction	Documented Categorical Exclusion - Completed
Taxiways B, C, D, and E Reconfiguration	Documented Categorical Exclusion - Completed
Aircraft Hold Bay Redesign	Documented Categorical Exclusion
New Taxilane Construction	Documented Categorical Exclusion
New Hangar Development <sup>16</sup>	Environmental Assessment Revalidation
Redevelopment of Aging Infrastructure (e.g., hangars)	Documented Categorical Exclusion or Environmental Assessment
Non-Aeronautical Development	Documented Categorical Exclusion or Environmental Assessment

<sup>16</sup> These buildings would be the second phase of a hangar development that has already received environmental clearance under both NEPA and the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA); however, because an EA under NEPA is only applicable for three years, the EA may need to be revalidated prior to construction.