

CALLEGUAS MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT -
LAS VIRGENES MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
INTERCONNECTION PROJECT

**ADDENDUM No. 2 TO THE
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Project No. 450
SCH No. 2018111008

Lead Agency:



Calleguas Municipal Water District
2100 Olsen Road
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Responsible Agency:



Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
4232 Las Virgenes Road
Calabasas, CA 91302

October 2023

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Project Description	1
	Project Location.....	1
	Project Description – Final EIR	1
	Project Construction Modifications.....	2
III.	Rationale for Addendum.....	3
IV.	Environmental Impact Analysis	4
	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Final EIR Section 4.1).....	5
	Construction and Operational Air Pollutant Emissions	5
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	6
	Water Resources (Final EIR Section 4.2)	8
	Biological Resources (Final EIR Section 4.3).....	9
	Noise and Vibration (Final EIR Section 4.4).....	10
	Cultural Resources (Final EIR Section 4.5)	12
	Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Final EIR Section 4.6).....	12
	Aesthetics (Final EIR Section 4.7)	13
	Transportation/Traffic (Final EIR Section 4.8.8)	14
	Other Impacts Not Considered Significant (Final EIR Section 4.8)	16
	Growth Inducement (Final EIR Section 6).....	18
V.	Conclusion.....	18
VI.	References	19

TABLES

Table 1	Ventura County Peak Day Construction Air Pollutant Emissions.....	6
Table 2	Total (Annual) Construction GHG Emissions	7
Table 3	Truck Trips for Produced Groundwater Discharge under Proposed Modifications.....	14
Table 4	Truck Route Evaluation for Project Modifications	15

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Exhibits

Attachment 2 Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Modeling Results for Proposed Modifications

I. INTRODUCTION

The Calleguas Municipal Water District – Las Virgenes Municipal Water District Interconnection Project (project) is a joint project between the Calleguas Municipal Water District (CMWD) and Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD) to improve regional system reliability. It is a cost-effective means of receiving potable water for customers of both agencies, if either agency experiences either a complete or partial supply outage not significantly affecting the supply of the other agency. The project includes over 11,000 feet of 30" diameter pipeline, a potable water pump and pressure regulating station, and associated appurtenances. It also includes over 2,000 feet of recycled water pipeline for LVMWD. CMWD, as lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH No. 2018111008) which was circulated for public review from June 28, 2019 to August 12, 2019. CMWD then prepared a Final EIR in August 2019. On September 19, 2019, the CMWD Board of Directors certified the Final EIR and approved the project (Resolution No. 1981). In September 2020, Addendum No. 1 was prepared for the project record to address minor design modifications that were made to several of the project components during final engineering and to comply with local jurisdiction permit requirements. The Final EIR and Addendum No. 1 can be found online at: <http://www.cmwd-lvmwdinterconnection.com/>

During construction of the North Interconnection Pipeline and, following significantly higher than normal rainfall in the project area during winter and spring 2023, high groundwater was discovered along a portion of the pipeline segment. Although the affected portion of pipeline was redesigned to be shallower, not all areas of high groundwater can be avoided and dewatering will be necessary to complete construction of this segment. CMWD, as lead agency, has reviewed the dewatering activities and groundwater disposal in the context of the project's Final EIR. Based on that review and pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15164, CMWD has determined that the modifications to the project construction activities do not require a supplemental or subsequent EIR as they do not result in any of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines §15162. This Addendum to the Final EIR has been prepared to assess the project modifications and document the reasons supporting this determination.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Location

The project includes several components, mostly located within or near Lindero Canyon Road between Thousand Oaks Boulevard and Kanan Road in eastern Ventura County and western Los Angeles County (see Figure 3-1 of the Final EIR). The North Interconnection Pipeline (excluding the tie-in to the pump station) is located within the public right-of-way (ROW) of roadways in the City of Thousand Oaks (see Figure 3-2 of the Final EIR). The North Interconnection Pipeline is the site of the dewatering activities that are the subject of this Addendum. All other project components remain the same as described in the FEIR and Addendum No. 1 (September 2020).

Project Description – Final EIR

The project was described in detail in Section 2.1.3 of the Final EIR, and consists of the following primary components:

- North Interconnection Pipeline with new turn-out (CMWD).
- South Interconnection Pipeline (LVMWD).
- Co-located pump station (PS) and pressure regulating station (PRS) (combined PS/PRS) (CMWD/LVMWD).
- Lindero Pump Station No. 1 reverse flow valve upgrade (CMWD).
- New or converted air/vacuum relief valves to address water pressure surge (CMWD).
- Yerba Buena recycled water pipeline extension (LVMWD).
- Canyon Oaks Park Lateral recycled water pipeline (LVMWD).

Project Construction Modifications

The following design modifications have been made to the North Interconnection Pipeline component because groundwater was unexpectedly encountered during pipeline installation near the Lindero Canyon Road/Bowfield Street intersection in Thousand Oaks (Figure 1 in Attachment 1). The affected segment extends from a point approximately 550 feet south of this intersection to a point approximately 90 feet north of this intersection. To complete installation of the remaining approximately 640-linear-foot pipeline, construction dewatering of the trench area would be required at an estimated rate of 100 to 500 gallons per minute for 24 hours a day, seven days a week for approximately three months. CMWD would require the contractor to deploy sound panels and blankets around the dewatering pumps to minimize noise levels. Groundwater produced during dewatering operations would either be utilized for beneficial reuse for dust control and/or irrigation on open-space areas or discharged to a local sanitary sewer or storm drain. Depending on volume of water produced, weather, cost, water quality requirements, and other factors, CMWD would utilize one or more of the following options for groundwater disposal:

- **Option A:** Discharge of groundwater to the Triunfo Water and Sanitation District (TWSD) sewer located immediately adjacent to the work area at Lindero Canyon Road and Bowfield Street. The quantity of groundwater disposed via this method would be limited to 270 gallons per minute and could potentially be suspended during or for a period of time following intense or long-duration precipitation events to avoid overwhelming the sewer pipeline or LVMWD's Tapia Wastewater Reclamation Facility. A desilting tank or tanks would be utilized prior to discharge to the sewer line to reduce total suspended solids (sediment) in the produced and discharged groundwater.
- **Option B:** Use of produced groundwater for spray irrigation of open spaces owned by Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District (RSRPD) located along Savoy Court, approximately 0.6 mile east of the Lindero Canyon Road and Bowfield Street intersection (Figure 2 in Attachment 1). Produced groundwater would be transported to open space areas via truck. Spray irrigation in this area would not occur during nighttime hours under this option.
- **Option C:** Use of produced groundwater for spray irrigation of the Calabasas Landfill for purposes of dust control. Produced groundwater would be transported to the Calabasas Landfill via truck.
- **Option D:** Use of produced groundwater for spray irrigation of open spaces around the Lake Bard perimeter (owned by CMWD, see Figure 3 in Attachment 1). Produced groundwater would be transported to Lake Bard via water truck. This method would require placement of sandbags along the Lake Bard perimeter road and near surface drainage conveyances and monitoring of spray areas

to avoid runoff into Lake Bard or off-site. This option may involve up to one acre of vegetation clearing, minor grading, and gravel application to provide water truck access to spray irrigation areas. In addition, several light plants would be installed around the northern and western perimeters of Lake Bard for vehicle safety during nighttime hours.

- **Option E:** Discharge of produced groundwater to a local storm drain adjacent to the work area at Lindero Canyon Road and Bowfield Street. This discharge would be subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Order No. R4-2018-0125, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System [NPDES] No. CAG994004, CI-10744), under which CMWD recently obtained coverage. To meet the permit's water quality requirements, produced groundwater would be treated prior to discharge.

It should be noted that some of the discharge options would require approval from one or more outside agencies and entities, and that such all authorizations have not yet been obtained. They are included to ensure that this Addendum is comprehensive and covers the possible discharge approaches. No discharge option will be implemented unless all of the necessary approvals have been obtained.

Trucking the groundwater off-site (Options B, C, and D) is estimated to require a total of two to seven truck trips per hour via water trucks with a capacity of 4,000 gallons, which would occur 24 hours a day, seven days a week during time periods when these options are being utilized. CMWD anticipates a combination of the disposal methods identified above may be used concurrently or at different times during the construction period. Therefore, it is likely that fewer than seven truck trips per hour would be dispatched to any one off-site disposal location at a time. However, this Addendum analyzes the effects of the maximum estimated truck traffic for each option in order to address the worst-case scenario for potential impacts of groundwater disposal during construction of the CMWD North Interconnection Pipeline.

III. RATIONALE FOR ADDENDUM

Section 15160 of the CEQA Guidelines describes the variations in EIRs that can be used to satisfy CEQA requirements for different situations and intended uses. For an approved project with a certified EIR, Section 15162 requires preparation of a Subsequent EIR if the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the lead agency to prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred. An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the Final EIR. The decision-making body must consider the addendum with the Final EIR prior to making a decision on the project. A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a Subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in the addendum, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

As required by CEQA Guidelines §15164, substantial evidence supporting the lead agency's decision not to prepare a Subsequent EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15162 is provided in Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis) of this Addendum. The analysis presented in Section IV evaluates the potential impacts of the modifications to the project design in relation to current conditions and in consideration of the environmental findings for the approved project.

As summarized in Section II (Project Description) and analyzed in Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis), the proposed changes are minor and would not result in any new significant environmental effects or result in a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Therefore, CMWD has elected to prepare this Addendum No. 2 to the certified EIR as the appropriate form of documentation to meet the statutory requirements of CEQA.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

This Addendum evaluates the potential for the minor project modifications described in Section II (Project Description) to result in new or substantially greater significant impacts compared to the impacts disclosed in the certified Calleguas MWD – Las Virgenes MWD Interconnection Project Final EIR. The following section provides a summary of the Final EIR impact analysis for each issue area along with an analysis of the potential impacts of the project modifications. The summary of the Final EIR impact analysis is focused on the change in project construction activities associated with the project modifications because no changes have been made to the planned operations and maintenance of the project since certification of the Final EIR.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Final EIR Section 4.1)

Final EIR Analysis. Construction of new facilities would generate air pollutant emissions, including exhaust emissions from heavy equipment, heavy-duty trucks, and worker vehicles. In addition, earthwork (excavation, trenching, stockpiling, loading earth material, etc.), vehicle operation on unpaved surfaces, and wind erosion of exposed soil and soil stockpiles would generate fugitive dust (see Table 4.1-3 of the Final EIR). Peak day construction emissions of particulate matter measuring 10 microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀) within Los Angeles County (South Coast Air Basin) would exceed the applicable Localized Significance Threshold and are therefore significant. Peak day construction emissions in Ventura County would not exceed thresholds of significance because Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (VCAPCD) does not apply quantitative emissions thresholds to construction activities. The portion of the project within Los Angeles County is subject to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403. The portion of the project within Ventura County is subject to relevant VCAPCD requirements. The Final EIR required implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which includes best available control measures from both jurisdictions to minimize fugitive dust. Implementation of this measure would reduce construction-phase air quality impacts to less than significant. (Impact AQ-1)

The proposed project would result in short-term greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with construction activities (see Table 4.1-5 of the Final EIR). Estimated GHG emissions associated with construction are approximately 1,870.8 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e), and approximately 62.4 MT of CO₂e if amortized over 30 years (presumed minimum life of the project) as recommended in the SCAQMD interim significance threshold guidance. Because construction-phase emissions for the project are less than the significance threshold of 10,000 MT of CO₂e per year, the Final EIR determined construction-phase GHG emissions are a less than significant impact to global climate change. (Impact AQ-3)

Analysis of Project Modifications. The project modifications are substantially similar in scope and magnitude to the activities analyzed in the Final EIR. The project modifications would be located within the jurisdiction of VCAPCD and would be subject to their requirements. Peak day construction air pollutant emissions and construction-related GHG emissions were estimated for the project modifications using California Emissions Estimator Model version 2022.1.1.19 and assuming the maximum number of hourly water truck trips (seven roundtrips per hour) and the maximum trip distance per trip for groundwater disposal (13 miles one-way from the dewatering site to Lake Bard).

Construction and Operational Air Pollutant Emissions

Air pollutant emissions generated by the project modifications are shown in Table 1 in comparison to the construction-phase air pollutant emissions estimated in the Final EIR for simultaneous installation of the North Interconnection Pipeline and construction of the PS/PRS in Ventura County. As shown therein, the project modifications would increase overall peak day construction emissions by approximately 0.7 pounds of reactive organic compounds, 12.5 pounds of nitrogen oxides, 5.3 pounds of carbon monoxide, and 3.3 pounds of PM₁₀. Due to the temporary, short-term nature of construction emissions, VCAPCD does not apply the quantitative emissions thresholds for reactive organic compounds and nitrogen oxides to construction activities. VCAPCD does require emission reduction measures to be

implemented during construction to reduce exhaust emissions and fugitive dust generation, which were included in the Final EIR as Mitigation Measure AQ-1. This mitigation measure would continue to apply to the modified project. Therefore, project modifications would not result in a new significant air quality impact or substantially increase the severity of air quality impacts as compared with the project as analyzed in the Final EIR, and the conclusions of the Final EIR remain valid.

Table 1 Ventura County Peak Day Construction Air Pollutant Emissions

Source	Emissions (pounds per peak day)			
	ROC	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀
Emissions Estimated in Final EIR¹				
Equipment exhaust	12.5	127.4	83.8	5.8
On-road vehicles	0.8	10.7	13.4	0.6
Fugitive dust	0.0	0.0	0.0	133.8
Total	13.3	138.1	97.2	140.2
Project Modifications Emissions²				
Equipment exhaust	0.3	1.9	1.3	0.1
On-road vehicles	0.4	10.6	4.0	3.2
Fugitive dust	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	0.7	12.5	5.3	3.3
Final EIR + Project Modifications				
Equipment exhaust	12.8	129.3	85.1	5.9
On-road vehicles	1.2	21.3	17.4	3.8
Fugitive dust	0.0	0.0	0.0	133.8
Total	14.0	150.6	102.5	143.5

ROC = reactive organic compounds; NO_x = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; PM₁₀ = particulate matter measuring 10 microns in diameter or less

¹ Source: Table 4.1-3 of Final EIR.

² Estimated in California Emissions Estimator Model version 2022.1.1.19. See output files in Attachment 2.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Short-term GHG emissions generated by the project modifications are shown in Table 2 in comparison to the GHG emissions estimated for the project in the Final EIR. As shown therein, the project modifications would increase estimated construction-phase GHG emissions by approximately 460.0 MT of CO₂e to a total of approximately 2,330.8 MT of CO₂e. When amortized over 30 years (presumed minimum life of the project) as recommended in the SCAQMD interim significance threshold guidance and consistent with the approach of the Final EIR, estimated GHG emissions associated with construction under the modified project would be approximately 77.7 MT of CO₂e per year. Therefore, the project modifications would not cause construction-phase emissions under the modified project to exceed GHG significance threshold of 10,000 MT of CO₂e per year used in the Final EIR, and impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change would remain less than significant. Therefore, project modifications would not result in a new significant impact related to GHG emissions and global climate change or substantially increase the severity of impacts related to GHG emissions and climate

change as compared with the project as analyzed in the Final EIR, and the conclusions of the Final EIR remain valid.

Table 2 Total (Annual) Construction GHG Emissions

Project Component	Emissions (Metric Tons)			
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Emissions Estimated in Final EIR¹				
North Interconnection Pipeline	612.10	0.01	0.02	615.97
Pump Station/Pressure Regulating Station	718.16	0.01	0.02	721.81
Air-vacuum Relief Valves	10.18	<0.01	<0.01	10.24
Lindero Pump Station No. 1 Reverse Flow Valve Upgrade	2.66	<0.01	<0.01	2.67
South Interconnection Pipeline	448.65	<0.01	0.02	451.20
Yerba Buena Recycled Water Pipeline Extension	54.76	<0.01	<0.01	55.03
Canyon Oaks Park Lateral Recycled Water Pipeline	13.78	<0.01	<0.01	13.87
Total	1,860.28	0.04	0.06	1,870.78
Project Modifications Emissions²				
Project Modifications	442.17	< 0.01	0.06	459.98
Final EIR + Project Modifications				
Total	2,302.45	0.04	0.12	2,330.76

CO₂ = carbon dioxide; CH₄ = methane; N₂O = nitrous oxide; CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent

¹ Source: Table 4.1-5 of Final EIR.

² Estimated in California Emissions Estimator Model version 2022.1.1.19. See output files in Attachment 2.

Water Resources (Final EIR Section 4.2)

Final EIR Analysis. Stormwater run-off from project construction sites may transport sediment and pollutants to nearby storm drains and Lindero Creek and degrade water quality. The Final EIR also anticipated some dewatering would be required at the PS/PRS. The project would be subject to the Statewide General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (2009-0009-DWQ, as amended), and best management practices required by this permit would be implemented during project construction as part of the required Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would be developed by qualified practitioners. The plans would include appropriate erosion control measures (e.g., mulching, hydroseeding, soil binders, geotextiles), sediment controls (e.g., fiber rolls, street sweeping, storm drain inlet controls), and wind erosion controls. The Final EIR determined impacts to water quality during construction would be less than significant with implementation of the required project-specific SWPPP, which would minimize stormwater run-off and reduce the potential for water quality degradation. (Impact WR-1)

The project would utilize potable water for construction (soil compaction, concrete/slurry mixing, dust control). Construction-related water use would average several thousand gallons per day over the roughly two-year construction period. This daily usage is equivalent to the water use of about 10 persons, based on 210 gallons per day per capita in Thousand Oaks (Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, 2016; as referenced in the Final EIR). The Final EIR determined the impact of construction-related water use to local water supplies would be less than significant because it would be comparable to the water use of less than 0.01 percent of the current population of Thousand Oaks. (Impact WR-2)

Analysis of Project Modifications. The project modifications are substantially similar in scope and magnitude to the activities analyzed in the Final EIR and would occur in the same general locations as analyzed in the Final EIR. As with the original project, to avoid groundwater or surface water contamination from construction activities, the SWPPP would be revised by qualified practitioners and implemented for the proposed project modifications. The revisions would incorporate appropriate erosion control measures (e.g., mulching, hydroseeding, soil binders, geotextiles), sediment controls (e.g., fiber rolls, street sweeping, storm drain inlet controls), and wind erosion controls.

However, unlike the project analyzed in the Final EIR, the project modifications would include dewatering during pipeline installation in a trench area near the intersection of Lindero Canyon Road and Bowfield Street at an estimated rate of 100 to 500 gallons per minute for 24 hours a day, seven days a week for approximately three months. This groundwater would be disposed of via a variety of methods (Options A through E), as outlined in Section II, *Project Description*, depending on volume of water produced, weather, cost, water quality requirements, and other factors.

Option A would involve discharging produced groundwater into the TWSD sewer system, and the produced groundwater would undergo treatment at LVMWD's Tapia Water Reclamation Facility, commingled with sewage from the area. Groundwater sampling and analysis identified sulfate, chloride, and total dissolved solids concentrations in excess of LVMWD's local limits. Based on communications with LVMWD and TWSD, LVMWD will be able to accept the produced groundwater at the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility without treatment of the constituents in excess of LVMWD's local limits due to dilution from the contribution of other sources. In addition, the project contractor would utilize desilting

tanks to settle out solids and a sock filter or other means prior to discharging produced groundwater to the TWSD sewer system to reduce the potential for issues with total suspended solids and sedimentation.

Options B, C, and D would involve utilizing the produced groundwater for spray irrigation of open spaces just east of the project area off of Savoy Court, for dust control at the Calabasas Landfill, and for spray irrigation of open spaces around Lake Bard, respectively. The beneficial reuse of produced groundwater for spray irrigation and dust control would be covered by Calleguas' existing coverage under the NPDES Construction General Permit and the project's SWPPP. In addition, the quality of produced groundwater would be sufficient for irrigation and dust control purposes. Furthermore, to prevent runoff into Lake Bard and safeguard surface water quality, preventive measures such as the placement of sandbags along the Lake Bard perimeter road and ongoing monitoring of spray areas would be implemented for Option D.

Option E would include the discharge of produced groundwater to a local storm drain adjacent to the work area at Lindero Canyon Road and Bowfield Street. This discharge for Option E would be subject to the requirements of the NPDES Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Order No. R4-2018-0125, NPDES No. CAG994004, CI-10744 [Order No. R4-2018-0125]), under which CMWD recently obtained coverage. Groundwater sampling and analysis identified cadmium and selenium concentrations in excess of Order No. R4-2018-0125 discharge screening levels. To meet the permit's water quality requirements, produced groundwater would be treated prior to discharge.

With implementation of the required project-specific SWPPP and compliance with applicable NPDES and Waste Discharge Requirements standards, the project modifications would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality (Impact WR-1). Therefore, project modifications would not result in a new significant water quality impact or substantially increase the severity of water quality impacts as compared with the project as analyzed in the Final EIR, and the conclusions of the Final EIR remain valid.

Project modifications would not result in increased water usage for dust control during construction but would temporarily decrease groundwater supplies in the underlying Russell Valley Groundwater Basin due to dewatering activities. However, groundwater supplies from the Russell Valley Groundwater Basin are not utilized by the City of Thousand Oaks, CMWD, or LVMWD (City of Thousand Oaks 2021; CMWD 2021; LVMWD 2021). In addition, the City of Thousand Oaks' Urban Water Management Plan assumes groundwater will not be relied on for potable use in the future. Therefore, project modifications would not result in a new significant impact from construction-related water use to local water supplies as compared with the project as analyzed in the Final EIR, and the conclusions of the Final EIR remain valid.

Biological Resources (Final EIR Section 4.3)

Final EIR Analysis. The Final EIR determined the overall project would have potentially significant impacts on western pond turtle and two-striped garter snake. However, construction of the North Interconnection Pipeline would not contribute to project impacts because the area does not contain

suitable habitat for special-status species. The Final EIR required implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 which requires focused pre-construction surveys for western pond turtle and two-striped garter snakes at the PS/PRS site. If any are found, exclusion fencing shall be installed along the eastern boundary of the temporary construction easement (nearest to Lindero Creek). The Final EIR concluded implementation of this measure would reduce impacts to less than significant. (Impact BIO-1)

No vegetation removal would occur at the North Interconnection Pipeline site and there would be no impacts to nesting birds as the result of this project component. Other project components would potentially impact nesting birds and would have potentially significant impacts. The Final EIR required implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, which involves avoiding construction around vegetation during nesting bird season, and if not possible, conducting pre-construction nesting bird surveys and establishing protective buffers around identified nests, to reduce impacts to less than significant. (Impact BIO-2)

The North Interconnection Pipeline would be constructed within an existing roadway and does not include sensitive vegetation or jurisdictional waters. The Final EIR determined no impacts to sensitive vegetation or jurisdictional waters would occur. Construction of the North Interconnection Pipeline also would not occur within any wildlife movement corridors and would not result in any impacts to wildlife movement corridors.

Analysis of Project Modifications. Project modifications would occur in the same general areas, would be similar in extent and magnitude, and would be of the same type of activities considered in the Final EIR. Most of the groundwater disposal options would not result in disturbance of additional, previously undisturbed or vegetated areas.

Under groundwater disposal Option D (use of produced groundwater for spray irrigation of open spaces around the Lake Bard perimeter), up to an acre of area around the Lake Bard perimeter may be disturbed (vegetation clearing, minor grading, and gravel application) to provide water truck access for spray irrigation. The optional road and dewatering area is dominated by upland mustards (*Brassica* sp., *Hirschfeldia* sp.) and non-native grasses (*Avena* sp., *Bromus* spp.), with scattered emergent native shrubs such as coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*) and blue elderberry (*Sambucus mexicana*). Based on the prevalence of non-native species, this habitat is marginal in quality and has a low potential to support special-status plant and wildlife species.

In addition, as discussed previously under *Water Resources*, the quality of produced groundwater would be sufficient for use for spray irrigation and thus would not adversely impact special-status plants and wildlife, sensitive natural communities, or jurisdictional waters. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would remain applicable to the project modifications. Therefore, project modifications would not result in a new significant biological resources impact or substantially increase the severity of biological resources impacts as compared with the project as analyzed in the Final EIR, and the conclusions of the Final EIR remain valid.

Noise and Vibration (Final EIR Section 4.4)

Final EIR Analysis. A peak day during construction was used to estimate construction noise at sensitive receptors in proximity to project-related construction activities. Construction noise analysis scenarios

are based on potential impacts to noise-sensitive receptors as defined in the Ventura County General Plan noise policies. The Cities of Thousand Oaks, Westlake Village, and Agoura Hills do not have construction-related noise standards other than municipal code prohibitions for nighttime construction work. Noise modeling indicates Ventura County General Plan construction noise policy thresholds would not be exceeded. The Final EIR determined nighttime construction work associated with installation of the Lindero Feeder No. 2 tie-in with the North Interconnection Pipeline would be very limited in duration and scope; however, noise levels would violate the municipal codes of the City of Thousand Oaks and the City of Westlake Village. Therefore, construction noise impacts were determined to be potentially significant. The Final EIR required implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1, which involves compliance with the applicable municipal codes restricting nighttime construction work through obtaining appropriate permits and approvals from local agencies, to ensure nighttime construction noise impacts to nearby residential receptors are reduced to less than significant. (Impact N-1)

Construction-related vibration was estimated using the Caltrans Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. The estimated vibration level is a peak particle velocity (PPV) of 0.060, based on operation of loaded heavy-duty trucks 30 feet from the structure. This value is slightly greater than the 0.04 PPV needed to be distinctly perceptible by humans, but much less than 0.1 PPV needed to be strongly perceptible to humans. The 0.060 PPV value is also much less than 0.3 PPV, which is the level at which vibration may cause damage to older residential structures. Therefore, the project-related increase in vibration associated with pipeline installation was determined to be less than significant. (Impact N-3)

Analysis of Project Modifications. Construction activities associated with the project modifications would be of the same type and magnitude and would not require any new or substantially louder equipment or techniques, as analyzed in the Final EIR. The loudest construction operations within the public right-of-way for the North Interconnection Pipeline, as evaluated in the Final EIR, include pavement saw cutting, pavement grinding, and utility potholing. Project modifications would require the use of dewatering pumps along the trench line 24 hours a day, seven days a week, which would generate lower noise levels than these activities. The Final EIR assumed nighttime construction activities would be required for the Lindero Feeder No. 2 tie-in with the North Interconnection Pipeline and included Mitigation Measure N-1 to reduce nighttime construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation measure would also apply to the project modifications to reduce nighttime construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. In addition, CMWD would require the contractor to deploy sound panels and blankets around the dewatering pumps to minimize noise levels.

Spray irrigation under Options B and D would occur in proximity to residential land uses. Spray activities are not expected to generate substantial noise levels. Option B would not include nighttime spray irrigation activities in order to avoid nighttime truck noise in the residential neighborhood adjacent to the open space area. Spray irrigation activities during nighttime hours at Lake Bard under Option D would be limited to the western half of the lake, approximately 0.4 mile east of residential land uses. Project modifications also would not introduce new construction-phase vibration sources beyond those analyzed in the Final EIR. Therefore, project modifications would not result in a new significant noise and

vibration impact or substantially increase the severity of noise and vibration impacts as compared with the project as analyzed in the Final EIR and the conclusions of the Final EIR remain valid.

Cultural Resources (Final EIR Section 4.5)

Final EIR Analysis. No cultural resources have been documented within or immediately adjacent to proposed pipeline alignments or facility sites. Due to the presence of existing development, which included paved streets, pedestrian walkways, commercial and residential structures, landscaping, and a golf course, the pedestrian survey was conducted only in areas where exposed native soils could potentially be observed. Surveyed areas did not include the North Interconnection Pipeline because it is located within public roadway rights-of-way. The Final EIR determined no impact to cultural resources would occur as a result of the North Interconnection Pipeline.

Construction of other project components would require extensive excavation and cultural resources (isolated artifacts, intact deposits, burials) may be encountered. Impacts are unknown but potentially significant. The Final EIR required implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1, which involves a worker cultural resources sensitivity program prior to any ground-disturbing activity. The Final EIR concluded that with implementation of mitigation, impacts related to unanticipated discovery of cultural resources would be less than significant. (Impact CR-1)

Analysis of Project Modifications. The project modifications comprise dewatering a portion of the North Interconnection Pipeline work area and disposal of the dewatered groundwater. The modifications do not include any new or more extensive excavations for the North Interconnection Pipeline than what was considered in the Final EIR. Project modifications would mostly not result in disturbance of additional, previously undisturbed areas.

Under groundwater disposal Option D (use of produced groundwater for spray irrigation of open spaces around the Lake Bard perimeter), up to an acre of area around the Lake Bard perimeter may be disturbed (vegetation clearing, minor grading, and gravel application) to provide water truck access for spray irrigation. These areas have been previously disturbed during the construction of Lake Bard, subsequent projects like Conejo Reservoir, and ongoing seasonal fire fuels abatement activities, and the work would only require minor surficial disturbance. As such, this option has low potential for impacts to archaeological resources.

Therefore, project modifications would have the same potential to encounter buried cultural resources as identified in the Final EIR and Mitigation Measure CR-1 would remain applicable. Project modifications would not result in a new significant cultural resources impact or substantially increase the severity of cultural resources impacts as compared with the project as analyzed in the Final EIR and the conclusions of the Final EIR remain valid.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Final EIR Section 4.6)

Final EIR Analysis. During construction, small quantities of hazardous materials (e.g., fuel, lubricating oils, hydraulic fluid, engine coolant) would be used at project construction sites and transported to and from these sites. Small quantities of these substances could be accidentally released and result in soil contamination. However, hazardous materials handling procedures and worker safety procedures would

be implemented, as required by applicable regulations. Due to the small amounts of hazardous materials used during construction activities and the implementation of standard spill avoidance measures, the Final EIR determined potential impacts associated with use of hazardous materials for project construction purposes would be less than significant. (Impact HAZ-1)

The belowground North Interconnection Pipeline would not be located within or adjacent to a previously contaminated site. The Final EIR determined the North Interconnection Pipeline would not contribute to the project's less-than-significant impacts related to exposure of the public and the environment to contaminated soil. (Impact HAZ-2)

The North Interconnection Pipeline would be constructed within a roadway surrounded by existing development on either side. It would not be constructed in an area supporting flammable annual grasses. As such, construction of the North Interconnection Pipeline would not contribute to project-related increase in the risk of wildland fire to adjacent developed areas. Overall, the Final EIR determined the project-related increase in the risk of wildland fire to adjacent developed areas is less than significant. (Impact HAZ-3)

Analysis of Project Modifications. The project modifications comprise dewatering a portion of the North Interconnection Pipeline work area and disposal of the dewatered groundwater. The modifications do not include any new or more extensive excavations for the North Interconnection Pipeline than what was considered in the Final EIR. Therefore, project modifications would disturb the same soils as analyzed in the Final EIR and there would be no new potential for encountering contaminated soils.

Construction of the project modifications would require additional truck trips for produced groundwater disposal, depending on the option(s) selected. The number of trips associated with the different options are shown in Table 3 in the *Transportation/Traffic* section. Options B, C, and D for produced groundwater disposal would utilize routes that are adjacent to open space areas that potentially contain flammable annual grasses. As such, construction of the project modifications would potentially contribute to the overall project-related increase in the risk of wildland fire if Options B, C, and/or D are utilized. However, impacts to wildland fire risk would be comparable to the impacts as analyzed in the Final EIR. Therefore, project modifications would not result in a new significant impact related to hazards and hazardous materials or substantially increase the severity of impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials as compared with the project as analyzed in the Final EIR and the conclusions of the Final EIR remain valid.

Aesthetics (Final EIR Section 4.7)

Final EIR Analysis. The proposed North Interconnection Pipeline would be located entirely below ground and would not be visible during operation. Therefore, the Final EIR determined project-related degradation of the visual condition resulting from the North Interconnection Pipeline would not occur and would not contribute to the overall project's less-than-significant impact.

Analysis of Project Modifications. No additional permanent aboveground elements would be installed as a result of the project modifications that could result in impacts to scenic resources. Temporary lighting at the trench dewatering area would be required during nighttime construction activities, but this lighting would be directed downwards and shielded to avoid light spillover onto nearby residential

properties. If Option D is utilized, approximately 11 temporary light plants would be installed during construction along the perimeter of the western half of Lake Bard for vehicle safety during nighttime hours. Safety lighting around Lake Bard would be directed downwards toward the perimeter road. Additionally, safety lighting would be temporary and only used during the construction phase of the project. Residential areas, excluding CMWD employee housing, are located on the eastern side of Lake Bard, opposite from where the lighting would be located, and would be shielded from the lighting by intervening topography and distance. As such, the use of nighttime lighting during construction would not constitute a new source of substantial light that would adversely affect nighttime views. Therefore, project modifications would not result in a new significant aesthetics impact or substantially increase the severity of aesthetics impacts as compared with the project as analyzed in the Final EIR and the conclusions of the Final EIR remain valid.

Transportation/Traffic (Final EIR Section 4.8.8)

Final EIR Analysis. The Final EIR concluded the project would generate a small number of construction-related vehicle trips that would mostly avoid the peak a.m. and p.m. hours. Pipeline installation within Lindero Canyon Road and Kanan Road would require temporary lane closures. However, these roadways operate at Level of Service (LOS) A or B, meaning that the roadways are operating efficiently. The Final EIR concluded that, with implementation of standard construction traffic management practices, project-related congestion is not anticipated and traffic impacts would be less than significant.

Analysis of Project Modifications.¹ Options B, C, and D included in the project modifications would result in an increase in truck trips for disposal of produced groundwater that would utilize local and regional roadways. The number of truck trips and the anticipated truck routes for each option are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Truck Trips for Produced Groundwater Discharge under Proposed Modifications

Option	Number of Hourly Truck Trips	Number of Daily Truck Trips	Anticipated Truck Route
A	0	0	N/A
B	2 to 7	48 to 168	Lindero Canyon Road, Kanan Road, Hawthorne Drive, Cremona Way, Savoy Court
C	2 to 7	48 to 168	Lindero Canyon Road, U.S. 101, Lost Hills Road
D	2 to 7	48 to 168	Lindero Canyon Road, U.S. 101, SR 23, Olsen Road, Calleguas Lane
E	0	0	N/A

N/A = not applicable; SR = State Route; U.S. 101 = United States Highway 101

¹ Although the CEQA Guidelines no longer require transportation and traffic impacts to be evaluated using Level of Service (LOS) as a metric, this analysis utilizes the LOS metric to provide a consistent comparison of the impacts of the proposed modifications with the Final EIR.

Under Options A and E, no truck trips would be required because groundwater would be disposed of locally via the existing sewer system or local storm drain, respectively. Therefore, no impact to roadway congestion would occur under Options A and E.

Under Options B, C, and D, approximately two to seven truck trips per hour would be required for disposal of produced groundwater, which would equate to one truck approximately every eight minutes. Table 4 summarizes the LOS and estimated peak hourly traffic on the main roadways that would be utilized as truck routes under these three options. Due to the current high LOS condition (LOS A/B) of these roadways and existing high volumes of traffic, the additional truck traffic under these three options would not be substantial enough to reduce LOS or otherwise substantially contribute to congestion.

Lost Hills Road serves as the primary access route to the Calabasas Landfill and experiences regular use by large trucks and traffic accessing the landfill. The addition of truck trips on this road under Option C would be consistent with existing conditions and would not introduce a notable increase in congestion.

Truck traffic on local roadways in residential neighborhoods, such as Hawthorne Drive, Cremona Way, and Savoy Court, would have a low potential to substantially contribute to congestion given the estimated hourly volume of truck trips and the existing low levels of traffic on these roadways. In addition, to minimize potential inconveniences to local residents and ensure the smooth flow of traffic, the project contractor(s) would implement standard construction traffic management practices.

Transportation and traffic impacts from these three options would be temporary and limited to the approximately three-month duration of dewatering activities for the North Interconnection Pipeline. The standard construction traffic management practices that would be employed during construction activities would ensure impacts from the project modifications remain less than significant. Therefore, project modifications would not result in a new significant transportation/traffic impact or substantially increase the severity of transportation/traffic impacts as compared with the project as analyzed in the Final EIR, and the conclusions of the Final EIR remain valid.

Table 4 Truck Route Evaluation for Project Modifications

Roadway	Level of Service	Estimated Peak Hourly Traffic ³	Contribution of Truck Traffic under Proposed Modifications
Lindero Canyon Road	A/B ²	N/A	N/A
Kanan Road	A/B ²	N/A	N/A
Olsen Road ⁴	N/A	2,000 to 2,500 vehicles	0.28% to 0.35%
SR 23	N/A	1,590 to 8,000 vehicles ⁵	0.09% to 0.44%
U.S. 101	N/A	16,400 vehicles ⁵	0.0001%

¹ Calculated based on industry standard assumption that peak hour traffic is typically 10 percent of average daily traffic.

² Source: Final EIR

³ Source: City of Westlake Village 2019

⁴ Source: City of Thousand Oaks 2020

⁵ Source: California Department of Transportation 2021

N/A = not available; SR = State Route; U.S. 101 = United States Highway 101

Other Impacts Not Considered Significant (Final EIR Section 4.8)

Section 4.8 of the Final EIR describes issue areas that would not be significantly affected from implementation of the project. The proposed modifications would not result in any new or substantially greater impacts to these issue areas, as described below.

- **Agricultural and Forestry Resources.** There is no farmland designed by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program or local zoning in the project area or the contemplated groundwater disposal areas, and the nearest forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220) or timberland is located within the Los Padres National Forest, at least 19 miles north of the proposed North Interconnection Pipeline alignment. Therefore, the proposed project modifications have no potential to impact agricultural or forestry resources.
- **Geology and Soils.** The proposed project would be designed to withstand site-specific geologic conditions, including expansive soils. The Final EIR concluded that, based on the lack of geological hazards associated with the project sites, implementation of the proposed project would not result in adverse geologic impacts to the public or nearby properties. The dewatering activities would occur within the same areas analyzed in the Final EIR and disposal of groundwater would not substantially disturb soils. Therefore, the conclusion that the project would not result in significant impacts with regard to geology and soils remains valid.
- **Paleontological Resources.** The Final EIR documented the results of a paleontological records search conducted for southeastern Ventura County and northwestern Los Angeles County; no fossils have been documented in the general project area. The Final EIR concluded that excavation required for pipeline installation and construction of the PS and PRS may encounter Monterey Formation and Lower Topanga Formation bedrock, which are considered to have moderate potential for paleontological resources. However, virtually all project-related excavation would occur within artificial fill and alluvium, such that the potential to disturb paleontological deposits is considered low. The dewatering activities would mostly occur within the same areas analyzed in the Final EIR and disposal of groundwater would not substantially disturb soils. Potential ground disturbance under Option D would be surficial, and located within previously disturbed areas. Therefore, the conclusion that the project would not result in significant impacts with regard to paleontological resources remains valid.
- **Land Use and Planning.** The Final EIR concluded that the project would be consistent with all applicable local plans and policies and would not require a change in zoning because water distribution facilities are not subject to local zoning ordinances. The proposed project modifications are minor changes to construction activities and would occur within the same general areas analyzed in the Final EIR. Temporary off-site groundwater disposal activities would not conflict with any applicable local plans or policies. Therefore, the project as modified would remain consistent with local plans and policies and would not require any zone changes.
- **Mineral Resources.** As described in the Final EIR, the only locally important mineral resource is aggregate (construction grade sand and gravel). However, all project elements are within areas mapped as MRZ-1 (no significant aggregate deposits) by the California Department of

Conservation. The proposed project modifications are minor changes to construction activities and would occur within the same general areas analyzed in the Final EIR. Temporary off-site groundwater disposal activities would not occur in any areas used for mineral resource extraction; therefore, the conclusion that the project would not result in impacts to mineral resources remains valid.

- **Population and Housing.** The proposed potable water system interconnection would increase the reliability and flexibility of both the CMWD and LVMWD systems to minimize potential supply disruptions due to natural disasters, infrastructure failure, or system maintenance. The project would not increase the water supply or extend water service to new areas or users. Therefore, the Final EIR concluded that the project is not expected to result in population growth beyond currently forecast levels. Because the proposed modifications are minor construction activity changes and would not change the capacity or function of the project as analyzed in the Final EIR, the conclusions of the Final EIR with regard to population and housing impacts remain valid.
- **Recreation.** As described in the Final EIR, the Wistful Vista Open Space is located near the pipeline alignment along Lindero Canyon Road; this open space area is used for passive recreation. Local residents appear to access the Wistful Vista Open Space from Lindero Canyon Road using two routes: one within the southern portion of the PS/PRS site and one immediately to the north. However, RSRPD has posted “Do Not Enter” signs just west of Lindero Creek because these routes are not recognized access points to the Wistful Vista Open Space. The proposed PS/PRS would displace the southern access route to the Wistful Vista Open Space. The northern access route is located within the temporary construction easement which would limit public access during the construction period. Since the PS/PRS site and vicinity is not a recognized access point to the Wistful Vista Open Space and authorized access points are nearby at Rockfield Street and Kanan Road, the Final EIR concluded that no loss of recreational use would occur.

The proposed project modifications are located along the North Interconnection Pipeline and would not affect the PS/PRS site. Option B for disposal of the dewatered groundwater would include spraying the excess groundwater as irrigation at open space owned by RSRPD east of Lindero Canyon Road. If this option is utilized, CMWD would coordinate with RSRPD to ensure spray areas do not interfere with authorized access points to the open space. Therefore, the Final EIR conclusions with regard to potential recreation impacts remain valid.

- **Energy.** As described in the Final EIR, the project would consume non-renewable energy in the form of fuels for vehicles and equipment used to construct proposed facilities. This energy use would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. The project would not conflict with any State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, including the Los Angeles County Community Climate Action Plan. The proposed project modifications are substantially similar in scope and magnitude to the activities analyzed in the Final EIR; therefore, the modified project would not introduce any new or substantially greater impacts than considered in the Final EIR and the conclusions remain valid.

Growth Inducement (Final EIR Section 6)

Final EIR Analysis. As described in the Final EIR, a project may foster economic or population growth in a geographic area if it would result in the urbanization of land in a remote location, creating an intervening area of open space which then experiences pressure to be developed; remove an impediment to growth through the establishment of an essential public service or the provision of new access to an area; encourage economic expansion, population growth or the construction of additional housing; or establish a precedent-setting action, such as a change in zoning or general plan amendment approval that makes it easier for future projects to gain approval. The proposed project would improve the flexibility of local water purveyors to meet the needs of their existing customers in case of infrastructure failure or natural disaster, but does not involve expanding service areas or increasing water supplies. Therefore, the project is not growth-inducing under any of the criteria listed in the State CEQA Guidelines.

Analysis of Project Modifications. The proposed project modifications are minor alternations to construction activities and are substantially similar in scope and magnitude to the activities analyzed in the Final EIR. The modifications would not change the capacity of the water distribution facilities as compared to the project as analyzed in the Final EIR. Therefore, the modified project would not create new or additional impacts to growth or change the analysis and conclusions provided in the Final EIR.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis presented in Section III (Rationale for Addendum) and Section IV (Environmental Impact Analysis), no substantive revisions of the Final EIR are needed because no new significant impacts or impacts of substantially greater severity would result from the modifications to the Calleguas MWD – Las Virgenes MWD Interconnection Project. There have been no changes in circumstances in the project areas that would result in new significant environmental impacts or substantially more severe impacts, and no new information has come to light that would indicate the potential for new significant impacts or substantially more severe impacts than were analyzed and disclosed in the Final EIR. For these reasons, no further evaluation is required, and a Subsequent EIR is not needed pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. This Addendum to the Final EIR has therefore been appropriately prepared, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(c), this Addendum No. 2 will be included in the public record file for the Calleguas MWD – Las Virgenes MWD Interconnection Project.

VI. REFERENCES

- California Department of Transportation. 2021. Traffic Volumes: Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT). <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/census> (accessed September 2023).
- Calleguas Municipal Water District (CMWD). 2021. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. June 2021. <https://www.calleguas.com/cmwdfinal2020uwmp.pdf> (accessed September 2023).
- Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). 2021. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan for Las Virgenes Municipal Water District. June 1, 2021. <https://www.lvmwd.com/home/showpublisheddocument/13459/637616788962730000> (accessed September 2023).
- Thousand Oaks, City of. 2020. Mobility Report. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5e3204de238f5a218cce2c5a/t/5eac98db7a8ae70aa32dfb5/1588369640463/TO+GPU+ECR+Mobility+Final+1-14-20.pdf> (accessed September 2023).
- _____. 2021. City of Thousand Oaks 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. June 2021. <https://www.toaks.org/home/showpublisheddocument/34615/637622911794430000> (accessed September 2023).
- Westlake Village, City of. 2019. General Plan CHAPTER TWO - Infrastructure and Community Service. <https://www.wlv.org/DocumentCenter/View/2522/General-Plan-Chapter-2-Infrastructure-and-Community-Service-2019-01?bidId=> (accessed September 2023).

Attachment 1

Exhibits

Figure 1. Project Modifications Location



Figure 2. Option C – Potential Spray Irrigation at Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District Open Space



Figure 3. Option E – Potential Spray Irrigation Around Lake Bard



Attachment 2

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Modeling Results for Proposed Modifications

Calleguas Lindero Canyon Rd Dewatering Custom Report

Table of Contents

1. Basic Project Information
 - 1.1. Basic Project Information
 - 1.2. Land Use Types
 - 1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector
2. Emissions Summary
 - 2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds
 - 2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated
3. Construction Emissions Details
 - 3.1. Dewatering (2023) - Unmitigated
 - 3.3. Dewatering (2024) - Unmitigated
5. Activity Data
 - 5.1. Construction Schedule
 - 5.2. Off-Road Equipment
 - 5.2.1. Unmitigated

5.3. Construction Vehicles

5.3.1. Unmitigated

5.4. Vehicles

5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

5.5. Architectural Coatings

5.6. Dust Mitigation

5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

5.7. Construction Paving

5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

5.18. Vegetation

5.18.1. Land Use Change

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

5.18.2. Sequestration

5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

8. User Changes to Default Data

1. Basic Project Information

1.1. Basic Project Information

Data Field	Value
Project Name	Calleguas Lindero Canyon Rd Dewatering
Construction Start Date	10/10/2023
Lead Agency	—
Land Use Scale	Project/site
Analysis Level for Defaults	County
Windspeed (m/s)	2.50
Precipitation (days)	1.80
Location	34.18092765841804, -118.78683505425337
County	Ventura
City	Thousand Oaks
Air District	Ventura County APCD
Air Basin	South Central Coast
TAZ	3509
EDFZ	8
Electric Utility	Southern California Edison
Gas Utility	Southern California Gas
App Version	2022.1.1.19

1.2. Land Use Types

Land Use Subtype	Size	Unit	Lot Acreage	Building Area (sq ft)	Landscape Area (sq ft)	Special Landscape Area (sq ft)	Population	Description
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	3.84	1000sqft	0.09	0.00	0.00	—	—	—

1.3. User-Selected Emission Reduction Measures by Emissions Sector

No measures selected

2. Emissions Summary

2.1. Construction Emissions Compared Against Thresholds

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Un/Mit.	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	CO2T	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	0.68	0.62	12.5	5.31	0.09	0.17	3.12	3.29	0.16	0.76	0.92	10,490	0.02	1.36	10,898
Average Daily (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	0.15	0.14	2.86	1.19	0.02	0.04	0.71	0.75	0.04	0.17	0.21	2,385	< 0.005	0.31	2,481
Annual (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Unmit.	0.03	0.03	0.52	0.22	< 0.005	0.01	0.13	0.14	0.01	0.03	0.04	395	< 0.005	0.05	411

2.2. Construction Emissions by Year, Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Year	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	CO2T	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Daily - Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily - Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2023	0.68	0.62	12.5	5.31	0.09	0.17	3.12	3.29	0.16	0.76	0.92	10,490	0.02	1.36	10,898
2024	0.67	0.52	11.7	4.79	0.09	0.17	3.12	3.28	0.16	0.76	0.92	10,419	0.02	1.36	10,827

Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2023	0.15	0.14	2.86	1.19	0.02	0.04	0.71	0.75	0.04	0.17	0.21	2,385	< 0.005	0.31	2,481
2024	0.02	0.01	0.32	0.13	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.09	0.09	< 0.005	0.02	0.03	285	< 0.005	0.04	297
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
2023	0.03	0.03	0.52	0.22	< 0.005	0.01	0.13	0.14	0.01	0.03	0.04	395	< 0.005	0.05	411
2024	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.06	0.02	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.02	0.02	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	47.3	< 0.005	0.01	49.2

3. Construction Emissions Details

3.1. Dewatering (2023) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	CO2T	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.31	0.25	1.89	1.30	< 0.005	0.08	—	0.08	0.08	—	0.08	245	0.01	< 0.005	246
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.07	0.06	0.43	0.30	< 0.005	0.02	—	0.02	0.02	—	0.02	55.7	< 0.005	< 0.005	55.8
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Off-Road Equipment	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.05	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	9.21	< 0.005	< 0.005	9.25
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.37	0.37	10.6	4.01	0.09	0.09	3.12	3.20	0.09	0.76	0.85	10,245	0.01	1.36	10,652
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.08	0.08	2.43	0.89	0.02	0.02	0.71	0.73	0.02	0.17	0.19	2,330	< 0.005	0.31	2,425
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.02	0.02	0.44	0.16	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.13	0.13	< 0.005	0.03	0.04	386	< 0.005	0.05	402

3.3. Dewatering (2024) - Unmitigated

Criteria Pollutants (lb/day for daily, ton/yr for annual) and GHGs (lb/day for daily, MT/yr for annual)

Location	TOG	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10E	PM10D	PM10T	PM2.5E	PM2.5D	PM2.5T	CO2T	CH4	N2O	CO2e
Onsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.30	0.25	1.88	1.30	< 0.005	0.08	—	0.08	0.07	—	0.07	245	0.01	< 0.005	246
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.04	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	6.71	< 0.005	< 0.005	6.73
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Off-Road Equipment	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.01	0.01	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	< 0.005	—	< 0.005	1.11	< 0.005	< 0.005	1.11
Onsite truck	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offsite	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Summer (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daily, Winter (Max)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.36	0.27	9.80	3.50	0.09	0.09	3.12	3.20	0.09	0.76	0.85	10,175	0.01	1.36	10,582
Average Daily	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Worker	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	0.01	0.01	0.27	0.09	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.09	0.09	< 0.005	0.02	0.02	279	< 0.005	0.04	290
Annual	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Worker	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Vendor	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hauling	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.05	0.02	< 0.005	< 0.005	0.02	0.02	< 0.005	< 0.005	< 0.005	46.1	< 0.005	0.01	48.1

5. Activity Data

5.1. Construction Schedule

Phase Name	Phase Type	Start Date	End Date	Days Per Week	Work Days per Phase	Phase Description
Dewatering	Trenching	10/10/2023	1/10/2024	7.00	93.0	—

5.2. Off-Road Equipment

5.2.1. Unmitigated

Phase Name	Equipment Type	Fuel Type	Engine Tier	Number per Day	Hours Per Day	Horsepower	Load Factor
Dewatering	Pumps	Diesel	Average	1.00	24.0	11.0	0.74

5.3. Construction Vehicles

5.3.1. Unmitigated

Phase Name	Trip Type	One-Way Trips per Day	Miles per Trip	Vehicle Mix
Dewatering	—	—	—	—
Dewatering	Worker	0.00	18.5	LDA,LDT1,LDT2
Dewatering	Vendor	—	10.2	HHDT,MHDT

Dewatering	Hauling	336	12.0	MHDT
Dewatering	Onsite truck	—	—	HHDT

5.4. Vehicles

5.4.1. Construction Vehicle Control Strategies

Non-applicable. No control strategies activated by user.

5.5. Architectural Coatings

Phase Name	Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft)	Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft)	Non-Residential Interior Area Coated (sq ft)	Non-Residential Exterior Area Coated (sq ft)	Parking Area Coated (sq ft)
------------	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------

5.6. Dust Mitigation

5.6.1. Construction Earthmoving Activities

Phase Name	Material Imported (cy)	Material Exported (cy)	Acres Graded (acres)	Material Demolished (sq. ft.)	Acres Paved (acres)
------------	------------------------	------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------

5.6.2. Construction Earthmoving Control Strategies

Non-applicable. No control strategies activated by user.

5.7. Construction Paving

Land Use	Area Paved (acres)	% Asphalt
Other Non-Asphalt Surfaces	0.09	0%

5.8. Construction Electricity Consumption and Emissions Factors

kWh per Year and Emission Factor (lb/MWh)

Year	kWh per Year	CO2	CH4	N2O
2023	0.00	532	0.03	< 0.005

2024	0.00	532	0.03	< 0.005
------	------	-----	------	---------

5.18. Vegetation

5.18.1. Land Use Change

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

Vegetation Land Use Type	Vegetation Soil Type	Initial Acres	Final Acres
--------------------------	----------------------	---------------	-------------

5.18.1. Biomass Cover Type

5.18.1.1. Unmitigated

Biomass Cover Type	Initial Acres	Final Acres
--------------------	---------------	-------------

5.18.2. Sequestration

5.18.2.1. Unmitigated

Tree Type	Number	Electricity Saved (kWh/year)	Natural Gas Saved (btu/year)
-----------	--------	------------------------------	------------------------------

8. User Changes to Default Data

Screen	Justification
Construction: Construction Phases	3-month schedule for dewatering, activities 7 days a week
Construction: Off-Road Equipment	4 pumps assumed for dewatering activities, 24 hours a day
Construction: Trips and VMT	Max hourly trips of 7 round trips of water trucks per hour for 24 hours a day, max trip distance to Lake Bard of 13 miles