



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review for Activity/Project that is
Categorically Excluded Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.35(a)**

Project Information

Project Name: Greenfield-Walnut-Ave-Ped-Improvements

HEROS Number: 900000010324115

Responsible Entity (RE): MONTEREY COUNTY, CA, 1441 Schilling Place - 2nd Floor South
Salinas CA, 93901

State / Local Identifier: Default

RE Preparer: Dawn M Yonemitsu

Certifying Officer: Craig Spencer

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

Point of Contact:

Consultant (if applicable):

Point of Contact:

Project Location: , Greenfield, CA 93927

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Direct Comments to:

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

The project consists of widening Walnut Avenue beginning at the Walnut Avenue Interchange traversing westerly past Mary Chapa elementary and middle school frontage and terminating at El Camino Real. The project includes construction of one additional lane and sidewalk southerly of Walnut. The project is a necessary safety enhancement connecting 334 very low,

low, and farmworker housing units to the Mary Chapa school site and commercial uses. The project will facilitate safe pedestrian and vehicular movement between residential and commercial uses for approximately 1,000 low income (including H2A Visa) residents in Greenfield.

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

Level of Environmental Review Determination:

Categorically Excluded per 24 CFR 58.35(a), and subject to laws and authorities at 58.5:

Determination:

	This categorically excluded activity/project converts to EXEMPT per Section 58.34(a)(12), because it does not require any mitigation for compliance with any listed statutes or authorities, nor requires any formal permit or license; Funds may be committed and drawn down after certification of this part for this (now) EXEMPT project; OR
✓	This categorically excluded activity/project cannot convert to Exempt status because one or more statutes or authorities listed at Section 58.5 requires formal consultation or mitigation. Complete consultation/mitigation protocol requirements, publish NOI/RROF and obtain "Authority to Use Grant Funds" (HUD 7015.16) per Section 58.70 and 58.71 before committing or drawing down any funds; OR
	This project is not categorically excluded OR, if originally categorically excluded, is now subject to a full Environmental Assessment according to Part 58 Subpart E due to extraordinary circumstances (Section 58.35(c)).

Approval Documents:

7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer on:

7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer on:

Funding Information

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name
B-22-UC-06-0011	Other	CDBG

Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted \$1,293,985.00

or Insured Amount:

Estimated Total Project Cost:

\$4,000,000.00

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

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6		
Airport Hazards Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.
Coastal Barrier Resources Act Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with Flood Insurance requirements.
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5		
Air Quality Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under the Clean Air Act. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act. Per the EPA Greenbook, Monterey County has no Federal criteria pollutants classified as Nonattainment. Verified by

		<p>EPA Greenbook." Currently Designated Nonattainment Areas for all Criteria Pollutants at https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/ancl.html#CALIFORNIA (Accessed 5/9/2023).</p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Site contamination was evaluated as follows: None of the above. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.</p>
<p>Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project will have No Effect on listed species because there are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. Based on the official list of species, the species either fall under "Your location does not overlap the critical habitat" or "No critical habitat has been designated for this species". The project currently has infrastructure installed and will be partially removed and reinstalled. There is no vernal pool to meet the habitat requirements of the California Red-legged Frog.</p>
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. Construction of curbs, gutters, ADA access ramps and sidewalks within the area of potential effect will not result in increased residential density or results in properties being converted to</p>

		residential uses. The only hazards in the area of potential effect are chemical storage facility/hazardous waste generator. The businesses are Rite Aid, Rancho San Miguel, Autozone, and Greenfield Elementary School.
<p>Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. Although the site contains a listed soil, the site is located in an area committed to Urban uses and is therefore exempt. Verified through Web Soil Survey downloaded from the USDA, NRCS website at https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx (accessed 05-10-2023).</p>
<p>Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.</p>
<p>Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have No Adverse Effect on historic properties. Conditions: Other. Upon satisfactory implementation of the conditions, which should be monitored, the project is in compliance with Section 106.</p>
<p>Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulation. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. Construction of pedestrian improvements are located in the business district.</p>
<p>Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. Closest Sole Source Aquifer is the Santa Margarita Aquifer located approximately 66 miles away and the Fresno Streamflow Source Zone Aquifer located approximately 65 miles</p>

		away.
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The nearest designated river is the Big Sur. The Big Sur River and its watershed are on the western flanks of the Santa Lucia mountain range, approximately 53 miles west of the project location.
HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS		
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898. The proposed widening Walnut Avenue beginning at the Walnut Avenue Interchange traversing westerly past May Chapa elementary and middle school frontage and terminating at El Camino Real has no aggregate environmental justice issues identified by EPA EJSCREEN Report or this NEPA review. EJ data was collected for the Area of Potential Effect at 0.5, 0.75, and 1-mile radii. The isolated, rural nature of the APE is demonstrated by the values for pollution and sources AND socioeconomic indicators at the three distances are close to the same. The APE scores lower on all values than the state and USA averages. With respect to socioeconomic indicators, the APE's population is composed of greater percentages of persons of color; low-income; limited English-speaking households; with less than a high school education; and under 5 years of age than the state and USA average.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [40 CFR 1505.2(c)]:

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

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Mitigation Plan	Complete
Historic Preservation	If archeological or cultural resources are discovered, all work will stop until a qualified archeologist can evaluate the resource and develop/implement a plan to preserve or document the resources.	N/A	Stop work within 50 meters of find and consult qualified archeologists and/or County Coroner as appropriate.	

Project Mitigation Plan

In the event archeological resources are encountered during ground disturbing activities, contractor shall temporarily halt or divert excavations within 50 meters of the find until it can be evaluated. All potentially significant deposits shall be evaluated to demonstrate whether the resource is eligible for inclusion on the California Register of Historic Resources. If deposits are encountered, they will be evaluated and mitigated simultaneously in the timeliest manner practicable, allowing for recovery of materials and data by standard archaeological procedures. For prehistoric archaeological sites, this data recovery involves the hand excavated recovery and non-destructive analysis of a small sample of the deposit. Resources shall also be sampled through hand excavation, through architectural features may require careful mechanical exposure and hand excavation.

Supporting documentation on completed measures

APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities

Airport Hazards

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

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

No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Walnut Ave Airport Hazards.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Coastal Barrier Resources

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Flood Insurance

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

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

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

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

Yes

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

Yes

- ✓ No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with Flood Insurance requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Greenfield Flood Zone Map.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

- ✓ No

Air Quality

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

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

Yes

✓ No

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under the Clean Air Act. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act. Per the EPA Greenbook, Monterey County has no Federal criteria pollutants classified as Nonattainment. Verified by EPA Greenbook." Currently Designated Nonattainment Areas for all Criteria Pollutants at <https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/ancl.html#CALIFORNIA> (Accessed 5/9/2023).

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Zone Management Act

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

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

- Yes
- No

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Supporting documentation

[Monterey County Coastal Zone Map - Greenfield.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

- Yes
- No

Contamination and Toxic Substances

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

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

- American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)
- ASTM Phase II ESA
- Remediation or clean-up plan
- ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening
- None of the Above

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

No

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: None of the above. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.

Supporting documentation

- [Mary Chapa Brownfields Property Info.pdf](#)
- [Greenfield Cleanups in My Community Legend.pdf](#)

[Greenfield CA Contamination and Toxic Substances.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Endangered Species

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

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

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

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

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

2. Are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area?

- ✓ No, the project will have No Effect due to the absence of federally listed species and designated critical habitat

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below. Documentation may include letters from the Services, species lists from the Services’ websites, surveys or other documents and analysis showing that there are no species in the action area.

Yes, there are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area.

**Screen Summary
Compliance Determination**

This project will have No Effect on listed species because there are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. Based on the official list of species, the species either fall under "Your location does not overlap the critical habitat" or "No critical habitat has been designated for this species". The project currently has infrastructure installed and will be partially removed and reinstalled. There is no vernal pool to meet the habitat requirements of the California Red-legged Frog.

Supporting documentation

[Greenfield Walnut Ave Species List_ Ventura Fish And Wildlife Office.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Explosive and Flammable Hazards

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

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

- ✓ No
- Yes

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

- ✓ No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. Construction of curbs, gutters, ADA access ramps and sidewalks within the area of potential effect will not result in increased residential density or results in properties being converted to residential uses. The only hazards in the area of potential effect are chemical storage facility/hazardous waste generator. The businesses are Rite Aid, Rancho San Miguel, Autozone, and Greenfield Elementary School.

Supporting documentation

[Walnut Ave Ped Improvements Explosive Hazards.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Greenfield-Walnut-Ave-Ped-
Improvements

Greenfield, CA

900000010324115

Yes

✓ No

Farmlands Protection

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

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

Yes

No

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. Although the site contains a listed soil, the site is located in an area committed to Urban uses and is therefore exempt. Verified through Web Soil Survey downloaded from the USDA, NRCS website at <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx> (accessed 05-10-2023).

Supporting documentation

[Soil Resource - Greenfield.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Floodplain Management

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

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

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

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

[Greenfield Flood Zone Map\(1\).pdf](#)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The FEMA Map Service Center provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use **the best available information** to determine floodplain information. Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site.

Does your project occur in a floodplain?

- No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.

Supporting documentation

[Greenfield Flood Zone Map\(2\).pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Historic Preservation

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

Threshold

Is Section 106 review required for your project?

No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)

No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].

- ✓ Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect).

Step 1 – Initiate Consultation

Select all consulting parties below (check all that apply):

- ✓ State Historic Preservation Offer (SHPO) Completed

- ✓ Indian Tribes, including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) or Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs)
 - ✓ Amah Mutsun Tribal Band Response Period Elapsed
 - ✓ Amah Mutsun Tribal Band of San Juan Bautista Response Period Elapsed

- ✓ Esselen Tribe of Monterey County Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Indian Canyon Mutsun Band of Costanoan In progress
- ✓ Ohlone Costanoan Esselen Nation Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Rumsen Am a Tur ajaj Ohlone Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Salinan Tribe of Monterey In progress
- ✓ Wukashe Indian Tribe - Eshom Valley Band Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Xolon-Salinan Tribe Response Period Elapsed

Other Consulting Parties

Describe the process of selecting consulting parties and initiating consultation here:

The California Native American Heritage Commission was contacted for a sacred lands records search and to obtain a list of Native American Tribes that may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area.

Document and upload all correspondence, notices and notes (including comments and objections received below).

Was the Section 106 Lender Delegation Memo used for Section 106 consultation?

- Yes
- No

Step 2 – Identify and Evaluate Historic Properties

1. Define the Area of Potential Effect (APE), either by entering the address(es) or uploading a map depicting the APE below:

The Area of Potential Effect is the Community of Greenfield, roughly bounded by Highway 101, Walnut Avenue, and El Camino Real. The APE is approximately 11.35-acres.

In the chart below, list historic properties identified and evaluated in the APE. Every historic property that may be affected by the project should be included in the chart.

Upload the documentation (survey forms, Register nominations, concurrence(s) and/or objection(s), notes, and photos) that justify your National Register Status determination below.

Address / Location / District	National Register Status	SHPO Concurrence	Sensitive Information
-------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------	-----------------------

Additional Notes:

There are no documented archeological or cultural resources within the APE. The Indian Canyon Band of Costanoan Ohlone has indicated that there may be potential ancestral remains within the APE and has requested to be on-site during all soil disturbance activities. The Salinan Tribe also requesting to be on-site during all soil disturbance activities. If archeological or cultural resources are discovered, all work will cease until a qualified archeologist can be consulted and the resources documented or preserved.

2. Was a survey of historic buildings and/or archeological sites done as part of the project?

Yes

✓ No

Step 3 –Assess Effects of the Project on Historic Properties

Only properties that are listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places receive further consideration under Section 106. Assess the effect(s) of the project by applying the Criteria of Adverse Effect. (36 CFR 800.5)] Consider direct and indirect effects as applicable as per guidance on direct and indirect effects.

Choose one of the findings below - No Historic Properties Affected, No Adverse Effect, or Adverse Effect; and seek concurrence from consulting parties.

No Historic Properties Affected

✓ No Adverse Effect

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

Document reason for finding:

There are no documented archeological or cultural resources within the APE. The Indian Canyon Band of Costanoan Ohlone has indicated that there may be potential ancestral remains within the APE and has requested to be on-site during all soil disturbance activities. The Salinan Tribe also requesting to be on-site during all soil disturbance activities. If archeological or cultural resources are discovered, all work will cease until a qualified archeologist can be consulted and the resources documented or preserved.

Does the No Adverse Effect finding contain conditions?

Yes (check all that apply)

Avoidance

Modification of project

Other

Describe conditions here:

If archeological or cultural resources are discovered, all work will stop until a qualified archeologist can evaluate the resource and develop/implement a plan to preserve or document the resources.

No

Adverse Effect

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have No Adverse Effect on historic properties. Conditions: Other. Upon satisfactory implementation of the conditions, which should be monitored, the project is in compliance with Section 106.

Supporting documentation

[23-08-04 - SHPO Consultation Portfolio Greenfield Ave.pdf](#)
[RESPONSE 22-1830 City of Greenfield Project Results.pdf](#)
[NAHC Response 06-19-2023.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Noise Abatement and Control

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

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

New construction for residential use

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

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

An interstate land sales registration

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

None of the above

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulation. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. Construction of pedestrian improvements are located in the business district.

Supporting documentation

[South County Existing Noise Contours - Greenfield.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Greenfield-Walnut-Ave-Ped-Improvements

Greenfield, CA

900000010324115

Yes

✓ No

Sole Source Aquifers

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

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

Yes

No

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

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

No

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

Yes

3. Does your region have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or other working agreement with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for HUD projects impacting a sole source aquifer?

Yes

No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. Closest Sole Source Aquifer is the Santa Margarita Aquifer located approximately 66 miles away and the Fresno Streamflow Source Zone Aquifer located approximately 65 miles away.

Supporting documentation

[Scotts Valley Area Sole Source Aquifer - 66 miles.pdf](#)

[Fresno Area Sole Source Aquifer - 65 miles.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wetlands Protection

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

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

No

✓ Yes

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

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

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

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.

Supporting documentation

[Walnut Ave - Wetlands Map.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

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

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

No

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The nearest designated river is the Big Sur. The Big Sur River and its watershed are on the western flanks of the Santa Lucia mountain range, approximately 53 miles west of the project location.

Supporting documentation

[MC Wild and Scenic Rivers 2023 - Greenfield.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Environmental Justice

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

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

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

Yes

✓ No

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898. The proposed widening Walnut Avenue beginning at the Walnut Avenue Interchange traversing westerly past May Chapa elementary and middle school frontage and terminating at El Camino Real has no aggregate environmental justice issues identified by EPA EJSCREEN Report or this NEPA review. EJ data was collected for the Area of Potential Effect at 0.5, 0.75, and 1-mile radii. The isolated, rural nature of the APE is demonstrated by the values for pollution and sources AND socioeconomic indicators at the three distances are close to the same. The APE scores lower on all values than the state and USA averages. With respect to socioeconomic indicators, the APE's population is composed of greater percentages of persons of color; low-income; limited English-speaking households; with less than a high school education; and under 5 years of age than the state and USA average.

Supporting documentation

- [EJScreen Community Report - three quarter mile.pdf](#)
- [EJScreen Community Report - half mile.pdf](#)

[EJScreen Community Report - 1 mile.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No