CRESTVIEW MUTUAL WATER COMPANY
MODIFICATION NO. 2 TO CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 4858
CASE NO. PL19-0039

A. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Request: The applicant requests approval of a Minor Modification of Conditional Use Permit (CUP) No. 4858 for abandonment and replacement of a water production, storage, transmission, and distribution facility (Case No. PL19-0039).

2. Applicant: Robert Eranio, Crestview Mutual Water Company, 328 Valley Vista Drive, Camarillo 93010

3. Property Owner: Crestview Mutual Water Company, 328 Valley Vista Drive, Camarillo 93010

4. Decision-Making Authority: Pursuant to the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance (NCZO) (Section 8105-4 and Section 8111-1.2 et seq.), the Planning Director is the decision-maker for the requested modified CUP.

5. Project Site Size, Location, and Parcel Number: Well Site No. 5 is located at 602 North Valley Vista Drive, adjacent to the intersection of North Valley Vista Drive and Cerro Crest Drive, in the unincorporated area of Ventura County. The Tax Assessor’s parcel number for the property that comprises this site is 159-0-032-065. This parcel is approximately 0.25-acre in size (Exhibit 2).

Well Site No. 7 is located approximately one mile west of Well Site No. 5 at 191 Alviso Drive, adjacent to the intersection of Alviso Drive and La Patera Drive, in the unincorporated area of Ventura County. The Tax Assessor’s parcel number for the property that comprises this site is 152-0-341-065. This parcel is approximately 0.56 acres in size (Exhibit 3).

6. Project Site Land Use and Zoning Designations:

   Well Site No. 5 (Exhibit 2)

   a. Countywide General Plan Land Use Map Designation: Existing Community – Urban Reserve

   b. Zoning District: RE-20,000 square foot (sq. ft.) (Rural Exclusive 20,000 sq. ft. minimum lot area)
Well Site No. 7 (Exhibit 3)

a. Countywide General Plan Land Use Map Designation: Existing Community – Urban Reserve

b. Zoning District: RE-20,000 sq. ft.

7. Adjacent Zoning and Land Uses/Development:

Well Site No. 5 (Exhibit 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in Relation to the Project Site</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Uses/Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RE-1 ac. (Rural Exclusive – 1-acre minimum lot area) &amp; RE-20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RE-1 ac.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RE-20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RE-1 ac.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well Site No. 7 (Exhibit 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in Relation to the Project Site</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Uses/Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RE-20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RE-1 ac.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RE-20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RE-20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. History:

Crestview Mutual Water Company (CMWC) was formed in March 1950. Since that time, CMWC has drilled six water production wells throughout the service area and currently provides private water service to approximately 600 units.

Well Site No. 5:

On August 2, 1994, the Planning Director granted CUP 4858 authorizing the addition of a water filtration facility to an existing reservoir and pressure boost pump facility for a 10-year period (expiration date of August 2, 2004).
On October 13, 2004, the Planning Director approved Permit Adjustment Permit Case No. LU04-0142 authorizing the continuance of CUP 4858 for a 10-year period (new expiration date of August 2, 2014).

On April 25, 2006, the Planning Director approved Permit Adjustment Permit Case No. LU06-0044 authorizing the continuance of CUP 4858 for a 25-year period (new expiration date of August 2, 2039).

On October 28, 2014, the Planning Director approved a minor modification to CUP No. 4858 (Case No. PL14-0040) authorizing the continued operation and maintenance of an existing water filtration and pressure boost pump facility for a 40-year period (new expiration date of August 2, 2054).

Well Site No. 7:

In October 2015, this site was acquired by CMWC via private purchase.

This site is currently undeveloped and therefore, no building records or Planning permits exist for this site.

9. **Project Description:** The applicant requests that a modified CUP (Case No. PL19-0039) be granted to authorize decommissioning and abandonment of an existing water well (Well No. 5), located at 602 North Valley Vista Drive and construction of a replacement water well (Well No. 7), located at 191 Alviso Drive. Consistent with the Project plans (Exhibit 4) and the Ventura County NCZO, the following provides a detailed description of the proposed Project for both Project sites:

   **Well Site No. 5**

   For this component of the Project, the applicant is requesting authorization to decommission and abandon an existing water well (Well No. 5), which would include removal of the well head motor and pump. All other existing equipment (filtration system, tanks, etc.) would remain at the Project site.

   **Well Site No. 7**

   For this component of the Project, the applicant is requesting authorization to construct a replacement water well (Well No. 7) slightly southwest of the center of the subject property. The replacement well would be drilled at a depth of approximately 1,400 feet below ground surface (bgs) and include a cement grout sanitary seal to extend to a depth of approximately 900 feet bgs for the purpose of sealing poorer water quality zones.
The proposed well head design would include a 250-horsepower motor to drive a turbine pump and would be equipped with Variable Frequency Drive (VFD), which would produce potable water at the appropriate head pressure to Zone 2 and Zone 3 of the CMWC district.

- Zone 2 of the CMWC district supplies private potable water to units at an elevation of 435 feet bgs to 180 feet bgs; and,

- Zone 3 supplies private potable water to units at an elevation of 700 feet bgs to 435 feet bgs.

Should the modified CUP be granted, and once replacement Well No. 7 is online, water production from Well No. 7 would be placed in appropriate rotation with production from Well No. 4 (located at 6 Alviso Drive) and Well No. 6 (located at 241 Crestview Drive). Additionally, reporting requirements to the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency would require that water extraction from Well No. 7 shall not exceed existing allocations set fourth by the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency.

Additional Project improvements for this site would include:

- An approximately 1,000 sq. ft. roll-apart, prefabricated steel pump house structure. The proposed structure would fully enclose the well head and ancillary equipment associated with operation of the well head. The pump house would include the following design elements:
  - textured exterior wall panels painted in a neutral color scheme;
  - exterior doors with complimentary light fixtures;
  - covered porch area;
  - faux windows with decorative shutters;
  - faux Spanish tile roofing material;
  - rain gutters; and,
  - noise attenuating panels on interior walls.

- 2,000-gallon chlorine tank, which would be placed within a secondary 2,500-gallon precast concrete vault. Both tank and vault would be located within the pump house and fully shielded from public view;

- Discharge chamber located adjacent to the eastern elevation of the pump house. The chamber would be five feet wide by 10 feet long and four and a half feet in height. The chamber would receive a minor amount of excess extracted water and would gravity feed a proposed irrigation tank;
• 4,995-gallon water irrigation tank located to the rear of the subject site. The irrigation tank would receive water from the discharge chamber and be used to irrigate landscaping at the subject site;

• 300-kilowatt natural gasoline generator for emergency back-up purposes only. The generator would be sited to the north east of the pump house structure and located within a seven foot by 17-foot noise attenuating, weatherproof enclosure; and,

• Hardscape and landscape to include a concrete driveway, decomposed granite paths, and a mixture of bushes, shrubs, ground cover, and citrus trees.

Under separate permit, the Project also requires installation of lateral hook-ups in the County right-of-way on Alviso Drive. This installation may occur before any other phases of the Project due to scheduled resurfacing of Alviso Drive in July of 2020 by the County of Ventura Public Works Agency (PWA).

B. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code or Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq.), the proposed Project is subject to environmental review.

The State Legislature through the Secretary for Resources has found that certain classes of projects are exempt from CEQA environmental impact review because they do not have a significant effect on the environment. These projects are declared to be categorically exempt from the requirement for the preparation of environmental impact documents. County staff prepared a detailed CEQA Exemption Analysis document (Exhibit 5), which explains that the proposed Project qualifies for a Class 3 (Section 15303) and a Class 4 (Section 15304) categorical exemption.

Therefore, this Project is categorically exempt, pursuant to Sections 15303 and 15304 of the CEQA Guidelines.

C. CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN

The Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs (2015, page 4) states:

...in the unincorporated area of Ventura County, zoning and any permits issued thereunder, any subdivision of land, any public works project, any public (County, Special District, or Local Government) land acquisition or disposition, and any
specific plan, must be consistent with the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs, and where applicable, the adopted Area Plan.

Furthermore, the Ventura County NCZO (Section 8111-1.2.1.1.a) states that in order to be approved, a project must be found consistent with all applicable policies of the Ventura County General Plan.

Evaluated below is the consistency of the proposed Project with the applicable policies of the General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs.

1. **General Plan Resources Policy 1.1.2-1:** All General Plan amendments, zone changes and discretionary development shall be evaluated for their individual and cumulative impacts on resources in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

   As discussed in Section B (above) and in the CEQA Exemption Analysis document prepared for the proposed Project (Exhibit 5), the Project’s individual impacts and contribution to cumulative impacts on resources have been evaluated in compliance with CEQA.

   Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy 1.1.2-1 of the Ventura County General Plan.

2. **General Plan Water Resources Policy 1.3.2-2:** Discretionary development shall comply with all applicable County and State water regulations.

   **General Plan Water Resources Policy 1.3.2-4:** Discretionary development shall not significantly impact the quantity or quality of water resources within watersheds, groundwater recharge areas or groundwater basins.

   **General Plan Water Resources Policy 1.3.2-8:** All discretionary development shall be conditioned for the proper drilling and construction of new oil, gas and water wells and destruction of all abandoned wells on-site.

   **General Plan Water Supply Facilities Policy 4.3.2-1:** Development that requires potable water shall be provided a permanent potable water supply of adequate quantity and quality that complies with applicable County and State water regulations. Water systems operated by or receiving water from Casitas Municipal Water District, the Calleguas Municipal Water District or the United Water Conservation District will be considered permanent supplies unless an Urban Water Management Plan (prepared pursuant to Part 2.6 of Division 6 of the Water Code) or a water supply and demand assessment (prepared pursuant to Part 2.10 of Division 6 of the Water Code) demonstrates that there is insufficient water supply to serve cumulative development within the district’s service area. When the proposed water supply is to be drawn exclusively from wells in areas where groundwater supplies have been determined by the Environmental Health Division or the Public
Works Agency to be questionable or inadequate, the developer shall be required to demonstrate the availability of a permanent potable water supply for the life of the project.

The CMWC is a private water purveyor in the Las Posas Hills area of Ventura County and managed by the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency. CMWC provides water service to approximately 600 units and operates in conformance with State and County regulations. With the granting of this requested modified CUP, additional potable water would be available to the units served by CMWC and reliance on imported water into the CMWC would be less likely to occur.

On August 1, 2019, County staff provided the applicant a determination of application completeness. An advisory was included with the letter of completeness from the Resource Management Agency, Environmental Health Division. This advisory noted that pursuant to Appendix H of the Ventura County Building Code, a minimum 200-foot horizontal separation or setback is required between a water well and seepage pit. Records indicate neighboring seepage pits are located within this distance and, therefore, it was advised that supplemental treatment components may be required when said seepage pits needed repair/replacement. As a result of this advisory, the applicant retained Hopkins Groundwater Consultants, Inc.

On August 22, 2019 the applicant provided correspondence from Hopkins Groundwater Consultants, Inc. (Exhibit 7), which provided review of the Project, specifically for the design of Well No. 7 (191 Alviso Drive). This letter states that proposed Well No. 7, as re-designed (to include an approximately 900-foot cement grout sanitary seal), would provide sufficient protective measures to be equivalent to a County setback requirement of at least 200 feet (as required by Appendix H of the Ventura County Building Code).

On November 7, 2019, County staff received and accepted correspondence from California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), Division of Drinking Water (Attachment No. 2 of Exhibit 5). As described in the letter, the SWRCB agrees with Hopkins Groundwater Consultants, Inc. and finds that the approximately 900-foot cement grout sanitary seal provides the same level of public health protection as if the proposed replacement water well were 150 feet from a seepage pit and had only a 50-foot sanitary seal.

Further, conditions of approval (Exhibit 6) would be imposed for the Project to ensure all regulatory requirements are met and that the Project would not have the potential to adversely impact water resources.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policies 1.3.2-2, 1.3.2-4, 1.3.2-8, and 4.3.2-1 of the Ventura County General Plan.
3. **General Plan Biological Resources Policy 1.5.2-1:** *Discretionary development which could potentially impact biological resources shall be evaluated by a qualified biologist to assess impacts and, if necessary, develop mitigation measures.*

**General Plan Biological Resources Policy 1.5.2-3:** *Discretionary development that is proposed to be located within 300 feet of a marsh, small wash, intermittent lake, intermittent stream, spring, or perennial stream (as identified on the latest USGS 7½ minute quad map), shall be evaluated by a County approved biologist for potential impacts on wetland habitats. Discretionary development that would have a significant impact on significant wetland habitats shall be prohibited, unless mitigation measures are adopted that would reduce the impact to a less than significant level; or for lands designated "Urban" or "Existing Community", a statement of overriding considerations is adopted by the decision-making body.*

**General Plan Biological Resources Policy 1.5.2-4:** *Discretionary development shall be sited a minimum of 100 feet from significant wetland habitats to mitigate the potential impacts on said habitats. Buffer areas may be increased or decreased upon evaluation and recommendation by a qualified biologist and approval by the decision-making body. Factors to be used in determining adjustment of the 100-foot buffer include soil type, slope stability, drainage patterns, presence or absence of endangered, threatened or rare plants or animals, and compatibility of the proposed development with the wildlife use of the wetland habitat area. The requirement of a buffer (setback) shall not preclude the use of replacement as a mitigation when there is no other feasible alternative to allowing a permitted use, and if the replacement results in no net loss of wetland habitat. Such replacement shall be "in kind" (i.e. same type and acreage) and provide wetland habitat of comparable biological value. On-site replacement shall be preferred wherever possible. The replacement plan shall be developed in consultation with California Department of Fish and Game.*

On July 17, 2019, the Project case planner and County Biologist conducted a site visit to Well Site No. 7 (191 Alviso Drive) to assess the Project’s potential impacts to a blueline stream, located to the north of the subject site. County staff noted that the blueline stream in question is a very narrow incised channel, ephemeral, generally degraded, does not support high quality ecological characteristics, and is lined with non-native eucalyptus trees.

Based on the site evaluation, distance between the blueline stream and the proposed Project, County staff determined that granting of this modified CUP would not adversely affect wetlands on or near the subject site.

Additionally, a Biological Resources Assessment Report was included with the application (Attachment No. 1 of Exhibit 5). The Report recommended the Project be conditioned to avoid nesting birds. County staff agrees and included a standard condition to avoid potential disturbance of nesting birds (Exhibit 6, Condition of Approval No. 42). The Report concluded that the Project would not impact any
special-status species, sensitive communities/habitats, wildlife movement, or conflict with adopted plans or ordinances, including habitat conservation plans.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policies 1.5.2-1 and 1.5.2-3 of the Ventura County General Plan.

4. General Plan Scenic Resources Policy 1.7.2-1: Notwithstanding Policy 1.7.2-2, discretionary development which would significantly degrade visual resources or significantly alter or obscure public views of visual resources shall be prohibited unless no feasible mitigation measures are available, and the decision-making body determines there are overriding considerations.

Neither Project site is located within the Scenic Resource Protection overlay zone. However, one component of the Project would include construction of an approximately 1,000 sq. ft. pump house located at 191 Alviso Drive (Well No. 7). The proposed structure would be one-story in height and relatively small in comparison to neighboring homes. Therefore, the proposed Project would not significantly degrade visual resources or obscure public views of visual resources.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy 1.7.2-1 of the Ventura County General Plan.

5. General Plan Paleontological and Cultural Resources Policy 1.8.2-2: Discretionary development shall be designed or re-designed to avoid potential impacts to significant paleontological or cultural resources whenever possible. Unavoidable impacts, whenever possible, shall be reduced to a less than significant level and/or shall be mitigated by extracting maximum recoverable data. Determinations of impacts, significance and mitigation shall be made by qualified archaeological (in consultation with recognized local Native American groups), historical or paleontological consultants, depending on the type of resource in question.

The Project would involve the drilling a replacement water well (Well No. 7) and construction of an approximately 1,000 sq. ft. pump house, located at 191 Alviso Drive. The applicant submitted a Cultural Resources Assessment Report (Attachment No. 3 of Exhibit 5), which County staff accepted. As a result of a cultural resources records search, Native American outreach, local historic group consultation, and field survey, no prehistoric or historic cultural resources within the subject site were identified. Therefore, no significant impacts on paleontological or cultural resources are expected as a result of the Project. Further, the Project has been conditioned to stop work if any unanticipated paleontological or archaeological resources are encountered during drilling or construction activities (Exhibit 6, Condition Nos. 43 through 46).

Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy 1.8.2-2 of the Ventura County General Plan.
6. **General Plan Hazards Policy 2.1.2-1**: Applicants for land use and development permits shall provide all necessary information relative to identified hazards that may affect or be affected by their proposed project. Applicants shall also specify how they intend to mitigate identified hazards.

**General Plan Hazards Policy 2.1.2-2**: All geologic and soil engineering reports submitted with land use and development permit applications, including recommendations for measures to eliminate or mitigate possible hazards, shall be signed by qualified personnel registered and certified by the State in the appropriate discipline, such as Professional Engineers and/or Certified Engineering Geologists.

No hazards have been identified on either Project site. However, one component of the Project would include drilling and construction for installation of a replacement water well located at 191 Alviso Drive (Well No. 7), a Geotechnical Engineering Report (Exhibit 8) was submitted and accepted by the PWA, Development and Inspection Services Division (Geology and Grading Sections) on June 5, 2019. The Report concluded that the Project is suitable for the proposed improvements. Additionally, all recommendations provided in the Report have been incorporated as conditions of approval (Exhibit 6).

Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policies 2.1.2-1 and 2.1.2-2 of the Ventura County General Plan.

7. **General Plan Fault Rupture Hazards Policy 2.2.2-3**: All development projects involving construction within Earthquake Fault Hazard Zones (as depicted on the State of California, Earthquake Fault Hazards Map for County of Ventura; Figure 2), shall be reviewed by the Public Works Agency Certified Engineering Geologist in accordance with the requirements of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act and the policies and criteria established by the State pursuant to said Act.

**General Plan Fault Rupture Hazards Policy 2.2.2-5**: Roads, streets, highways, utility conduits, and oil and gas pipelines, shall be planned to avoid crossing active faults where feasible. When such location is unavoidable, the design shall include measures to reduce the effects of any fault movement as much as possible.

Neither Project site is located within an Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone. As depicted on the State of California, Earthquake Fault Hazards Map for County of Ventura, Figure 2, the nearest Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone is located approximately 1,500 linear feet to the south of Well Site No. 5 (602 North Valley Vista Drive) and approximately 2,700 linear feet to the south east of Well Site No. 5 (191 Alviso Drive). Additionally, as noted in Item 6 (above), a Geotechnical Engineering Report (Exhibit 8) was submitted and accepted by the PWA, Development and Inspection Services Division (Geology and Grading Sections) on June 5, 2019. Page 6 of the Geotechnical Report concurs that the Project sites are not located within a fault
hazard zone, and therefore, no adverse impacts to the Project are anticipated by these hazards.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policies 2.2.2-3 and 2.2.2-5 of the Ventura County General Plan.

8. **General Plan Expansive Soils Hazards Policy 2.8.2-1:** Construction must conform to established standards of the Ventura County Building Code, adopted from the California Building Code.

**General Plan Expansive Soils Hazards Policy 2.8.2-2:** A geotechnical report, prepared by a registered civil engineer and based upon adequate soil testing of the materials to be encountered at the sub-grade elevation, shall be submitted to the County Surveyor, Environmental Health Division, and Building and Safety for every applicable subdivision and Building Permit application (as required by the California Building Code).

As noted in Item 6 and 7 (above), a Geotechnical Engineering Report (Exhibit 8) was submitted to the PWA, Development and Inspection Services Division (Geology and Grading Sections) on June 5, 2019. The Report concludes that the site and soils are suitable for the proposed drilling and construction of Well No. 7, subject to implementation of the recommendations therein. PWA staff has accepted the recommendations and incorporated them as conditions of approval (Exhibit 6).

Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policies 2.8.2-1 and 2.8.2-2 of the Ventura County General Plan.

9. **General Plan Fire Hazards Policy 2.13.2-1:** All applicants for discretionary permits shall be required, as a condition of approval, to provide adequate water supply and access for fire protection and evacuation purposes.

**General Plan Fire Hazards Policy 2.13.2-2:** All discretionary permits in fire hazard areas shall be conditioned to include fire-resistant vegetation, cleared firebreaks, or a long-term comprehensive fuel management program as a condition of approval. Fire hazard reduction measures shall be incorporated into the design of any project in a fire hazard area.

**General Plan Fire Protection Public Resources and Services Policy 4.8.2-1:** Discretionary development shall be permitted only if adequate water supply, access and response time for fire protection can be made available.

**General Plan Fire Protection Public Resources and Services Policy 4.8.2-2:** Fire stations shall be sited in locations central to the area served and on or near arterial highways so as to minimize call response time.
The Ventura County Fire Protection District (VCFPD) reviewed the Project and determined that the applicant has demonstrated that the Project sites have adequate water supply and access for fire protection and evacuation purposes. The VCFPD has also determined that access and response time are adequate, as Fire Station No. 55 (403 Valley Vista Drive) is located approximately 0.4 miles to the west of Well Site No. 5 (602 North Valley Vista Drive) and approximately 0.5 miles to the east of Well Site No. 7 (191 Alviso Drive).

Well Site No. 5 (602 North Valley Vista Drive) is located within a high fire hazard area. The VCFPD has recommended conditions of approval that would ensure fire prevention on the Project site (Exhibit 6). The applicant would also be required to remove brush and vegetation annually within distance of 100 feet or to the property line if less than 100 feet. The applicant will also be required to remove all brush and vegetation within a distance of 10 feet on each side of all access road(s)/driveway(s) within the Project area (Exhibit 6, Condition of Approval No. 39).

Well Site No. 7 (191 Alviso Drive) is not located within a high fire hazard area; however, conditions of approval (Exhibit 6) which would be imposed on the Project as a whole will ensure this Project site is properly maintained with adequate fire protective measures.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policies 2.13.2-1, 2.13.2-2, 4.8.2-1, and 4.8.2-2 of the Ventura County General Plan.

10. General Plan Hazardous Materials and Waste Hazards Policy 2.15.2-2: Site plans for discretionary development that will generate hazardous wastes or utilize hazardous materials shall include details on hazardous waste reduction, recycling and storage.

General Plan Hazardous Materials and Waste Hazards Policy 2.15.2-5: Commercial or industrial uses which generate, store or handle hazardous waste and/or hazardous materials shall be located in compliance with the County Hazardous Waste Management Plan's siting criteria.

The Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Environmental Health Division (EHD) comments that the Project may include the use of hazardous materials typically associated with the operation and maintenance of the water wells and associated equipment. The applicant will be required to store, handle and dispose of hazardous materials and waste in compliance with applicable state and local regulations (Exhibit 6, Condition of Approval No. 48).

Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policies 2.15.2-2 and 2.15.2-5 of the Ventura County General Plan.
11. **General Plan Noise Hazards Policy 2.16.2-1:** All discretionary development shall be reviewed for noise compatibility with surrounding uses. Noise compatibility shall be determined from a consistent set of criteria based on the standards listed below. An acoustical analysis by a qualified acoustical engineer shall be required of discretionary developments involving noise exposure or noise generation in excess of the established standards. The analysis shall provide documentation of existing and projected noise levels at on-site and off-site receptors and shall recommend noise control measures for mitigating adverse impacts.

(1) Noise sensitive uses proposed to be located near highways, truck routes, heavy industrial activities and other relatively continuous noise sources shall incorporate noise control measures so that:

   a. Indoor noise levels in habitable rooms do not exceed CNEL 45.

   b. Outdoor noise levels do not exceed CNEL 60 or Leq1H of 65 dB(A) during any hour.

(2) Noise sensitive uses proposed to be located near railroads shall incorporate noise control measures so that:

   a. Guidelines (1)a. and (1)b. above are adhered to.

   b. Outdoor noise levels do not exceed L10 of 60 dB(A).

(3) Noise sensitive uses proposed to be located near airports:

   a. Shall be prohibited if they are in a CNEL 65 or greater, noise contour.

   b. Shall be permitted in the CNEL 60 to CNEL 65 noise contour area only if means will be taken to ensure interior noise levels of CNEL 45 or less.

(4) Noise generators, proposed to be located near any noise sensitive use, shall incorporate noise control measures so that ongoing outdoor noise levels received by the noise sensitive receptor, measured at the exterior wall of the building, does not exceed any of the following standards:

   a. Leq1H of 55dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

   b. Leq1H of 50dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.

   c. Leq1H of 45dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.
Section 2.16.2(4) is not applicable to increased traffic noise along any of the roads identified within the 2020 Regional Roadway Network (Figure 4.2.3) Public Facilities Appendix of the Ventura County General Plan (see 2.16.2-1(1)). In addition, State and Federal highways, all railroad line operations, aircraft in flight, and public utility facilities are noise generators having Federal and State regulations that preempt local regulations.

(5) Construction noise shall be evaluated and, if necessary, mitigated in accordance with the County Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan.

General Plan Noise Hazards Policy 2.16.2-3: The priorities for noise control shall be as follows:

(1) Reduction of noise emissions at the source.

(2) Attenuation of sound transmission along its path, using barriers, landforms modification, dense plantings, and the like.

(3) Rejection of noise at the reception point via noise control building construction, hearing protection or other means.

One component of the Project would include abandoning and removal of Well No. 5 (602 North Valley Vista Drive). Other than noise resulting from construction (demolition), which will be properly conditioned (Exhibit 6), no other noise is anticipated to arise from this site.

Another component of the Project would include drilling and construction of a replacement water well, located at 191 Alviso Drive (Well No. 7). The nearest sensitive receptors to this site are existing single-family dwellings to the north, east, and west of this site. As a result of sensitive receptors nearby, the applicant submitted, and County staff accepted, a Noise and Vibration Assessment (Exhibits 9 and 10) and addendum to the Assessments (Exhibit 11). The Reports recommended that with the inclusion of noise barriers strategically placed on this site during construction, noise would be minimized to meet regulatory requirements as established by the Ventura County General Plan. Additionally, conditions of approval would be imposed on the Project to ensure noise thresholds as established by the Ventura County General Plan are not exceeded (Exhibit 6, Condition of Approval Nos. 37 and 40).

Construction of replacement water Well No. 7 would be completed in three phases as follows:

- Phase 1 would include site development and grading. This phase would involve clearing, grading, and site development work and is expected to be completed after approximately one month;
• Phase 2 would include well drilling. This phase would involve drilling of the replacement water well and is expected to be completed after approximately one month; and,

• Phase 3 would include construction and paving. This phase would involve construction of the pump house, installation of associated equipment, and paving of the driveway. This phase is expected to be completed after approximately two and a half months.

Phase 2 (well drilling) would occur 24-hours per day to alleviate a risk of the well shaft collapsing. Noise generating activities for Phase 1 (site development and grading) and Phase 3 (construction and paving) would occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Saturday, Sunday, and State holidays.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed Project is consistent with Policies 2.16.2-1 and 2.16.2-3 of the Ventura County General Plan.

D. ZONING ORDINANCE COMPLIANCE

The proposed Project is subject to the requirements of the Ventura County NCZO.

Pursuant to the Ventura County NCZO (Section 8105-4), the proposed use is allowed in the Rural Exclusive zone district with the granting of a CUP. Upon the granting of the CUP, the proposed Project will comply with this requirement.

A component of the proposed Project includes the construction and use of structures that are subject to the development standards of the Ventura County NCZO (Section 8106-1.1) for Well Site No. 7 (191 Alviso Drive).

Table 1 lists the applicable development standards and a description of how the proposed Project complies with the development standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Requirement</th>
<th>Zoning Ordinance Requirement</th>
<th>Complies?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area (Gross)</td>
<td>20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Percentage of Building Coverage</td>
<td>29% (7,074 sq. ft.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. CUP FINDINGS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

The Planning Director must make certain findings in order to grant a CUP, pursuant to Section 8111-1.2.1.1 of the Ventura County NCZO. The ability to make the required findings is evaluated below.

1. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and provisions of the County’s General Plan and of Division 8, Chapters 1 and 2, of the Ventura County Ordinance Code [Section 8111-1.2.1.1.a].

   Based on the information and analysis presented in Sections C and D of this staff report, the finding that the proposed development is consistent with the intent and provisions of the County’s General Plan and of Division 8, Chapters 1 and 2, of the Ventura County Ordinance Code can be made.

2. The proposed development is compatible with the character of surrounding, legally established development [Section 8111-1.2.1.1.b].

   Well Site No. 5 is located at 602 North Valley Vista Drive in the unincorporated area of Ventura County. Existing development within the vicinity of this site includes single family dwellings. The component of the Project which will occur on this site would be to decommission and abandon an existing water well (Well No. 5). The existing permitted filtration system and tanks would remain.

   Well Site No. 7 is located at 191 Alviso Drive in the unincorporated area of Ventura County. The component of the Project which would occur on this site would be to construct a replacement water well with ancillary equipment for well operations to be enclosed within an approximately 1,000 sq. ft. pump house, install landscaping, an emergency back-up generator, and irrigation tank. Existing development within the vicinity of this site includes single family dwellings.

   As a result of the proposed Project, no conflicts to adjacent residential uses would occur. Furthermore, conditions of approval (Exhibit 6) will be imposed with this modified CUP, to ensure that the Project would be compatible with the character of the legally established development of both Project sites.

   Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

3. The proposed development would not be obnoxious or harmful or impair the utility of neighboring property or uses [Section 8111-1.2.1.1.c].

   The proposed Project would not adversely impact air quality in the vicinity of the Project sites, would not be unsightly to the existing neighborhood, and, per conditions of approval (Exhibit 6), would not create noise impacts that would impact surrounding noise sensitive uses such as single-family residences. No
aspect of the Project has been identified that would be obnoxious or harmful or affect the use of neighboring properties.

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

4. **The proposed development would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare [Section 8111-1.2.1.1.d]**.

The proposed Project involves decommissioning and abandoning one water well (Well No. 5) and installation of a replacement water well (Well No. 7) with pump house and ancillary operational equipment. The Project was reviewed by multiple County of Ventura agencies and all comments have been incorporated into the Project as required and or incorporated as conditions of approval (Exhibit 6). It has been determined that the Project would not adversely impact air quality or impair emergency response in the Las Posas Hills community of the unincorporated area of Ventura County, and therefore, no aspect of the Project has been identified that would be detrimental to the public interest or pose a threat to public health and safety.

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

5. **The proposed development, if allowed by a CUP, is compatible with existing and potential land uses in the general area where the development is to be located [Section 8111-1.2.1.1.e]**.

Pursuant to Article 5, Section 8104-1 of the Ventura County NCZO, the proposed Project would be authorized by a CUP. The Project was evaluated and found to be compliant with the development standards set forth in all pertinent sections of the Ventura County NCZO, and therefore, would be compatible with existing and potential land uses in the general area of both Project sites.

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

6. **The proposed development will occur on a legal lot [Section 8111-1.2.1.1f]**.

Assessor’s Parcel Number 159-0-032-065 (Well Site No. 5) is a legal lot created by a conveyance deed, recorded in December 16, 1963 in Book 2446, Page 466 and June 4, 1952 Book 1069, Page 369, prior to regulation by the Subdivision Map Act or Local Subdivision Ordinance.

Assessor’s Parcel Number 152-0-341-065 (Well Site No. 7) is a legal lot, noted as Lot 16 of Tract Number 2706, per Map recorded in Book 84, Page 50.

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.
7. The proposed development is approved in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and all other applicable laws.

The Project was reviewed by multiple County of Ventura agencies. Pursuant to the CEQA guidelines and through careful analysis, the Project was determined to qualify for two categorical exemptions (Class 3, Section 15303 and Class 4, Section 15304). Additionally, County staff prepared a CEQA Exemption Analysis document, which provides additional information on how the Project was determined to meet the two above mentioned categorical exemptions (Exhibit 5).

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

F. PLANNING DIRECTOR HEARING NOTICE, PUBLIC COMMENTS, AND JURISDICTIONAL COMMENTS

The Planning Division provided public notice regarding the Planning Director hearing in accordance with the Government Code (Section 65091), Ventura County NCZO (Section 8111-3.1). On February 19, 2020, the Planning Division mailed notice to owners of property within 300 feet of the property on which the Project sites are located. On February 19, 2020, the Planning Division placed a legal ad in the Ventura County Star. As of the date of this document, the Planning Division has received correspondence from seven members of the public and are attached as Exhibit 12.

Both Project sites are located within the City of Camarillo’s Sphere of Influence and Area of Interest. Therefore, on May 22, 2019 the Planning Division notified the City of Camarillo of the proposed Project and requested the City of Camarillo submit any comments that the City might have on the proposed Project. As of the date of this document, no comments from the City of Camarillo have been received.

G. RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Based upon the analysis and information provided above, Planning Division Staff recommends that the Planning Director take the following actions:

1. CERTIFY that the Planning Director has reviewed and considered this staff report and all exhibits thereto, and has considered all comments received during the public comment process;

2. FIND that this Project is categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to Sections 15303 and 15304 of the CEQA Guidelines.

3. MAKE the required findings to grant a Minor Modification of CUP No. 4858, pursuant to Section 8111-1.2.1.1 of the Ventura County NCZO, based on the substantial evidence presented in Section E of this staff report, and the entire record;
4. **GRANT** Minor Modification of CUP No. 4858 (Case No. PL19-0039), subject to conditions of approval (Exhibit 6).

5. **SPECIFY** that the Clerk of the Planning Division is the custodian, and 800 S. Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009 is the location, of the documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based.

The decision of the Planning Director is final unless appealed to the Planning Commission within 10 calendar days after the permit has been approved, conditionally approved, or denied (or on the following workday if the 10\(^\text{th}\) day falls on a weekend or holiday). Any aggrieved person may file an appeal of the decision with the Planning Division. The Planning Division shall then set a hearing date before the Planning Commission to review the matter at the earliest convenient date.

If you have any questions concerning the information presented above, please contact John Kessler at (805) 654-2461 or john.kessler@ventura.org.

Prepared by: 

John Kessler, Case Planner  
Commercial and Industrial Section  
Ventura County Planning Division

Reviewed by: 

Mindy Fogg, Manager  
Commercial and Industrial Section  
Ventura County Planning Division

**EXHIBITS**

- Exhibit 2: Well Site No. 5 Maps
- Exhibit 3: Well Site No. 7 Maps
- Exhibit 4: Project Plans
- Exhibit 5: CEQA Exemption Analysis
- Exhibit 6: Conditions of Approval
- Exhibit 7: Hopkins Well Seal and Setback Requirements, dated Aug. 22, 2019
- Exhibit 8: Geotechnical Engineering Report
- Exhibit 9: Noise Assessment
- Exhibit 10: Vibration Assessment
- Exhibit 11: Addendum to Noise and Vibration Assessments
- Exhibit 12: Public Comments received
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WELL NO.5 PUMP AND MOTOR TO BE REMOVED, WELL TO BE LEGALLY ABANDONED.
Pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code or Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq.), the proposed Project is subject to environmental review.

The State Legislature through the Secretary for Resources has found that certain classes of projects are exempt from CEQA environmental impact review because they do not have a significant effect on the environment. These projects are declared to be categorically exempt from the requirement for the preparation of environmental impact documents.

It has been determined that Class 3 and Class 4 categorical exemptions apply to the Project.

**Project Description:**

The proposed Project involves the decommissioning and abandonment of an existing water well (Well Site No. 5), located at 602 North Valley Vista Drive; and the construction and operation of a replacement water well (Well Site No. 7), located at 191 Alviso Drive. The decommissioning and abandonment of Well No. 5 would include removal of the well head motor and pump while all other existing equipment (filtration system, tanks, etc.) would remain at the subject site.

The construction of Well No. 7 would involve drilling to a depth of approximately 1,400 feet below ground surface, adding a cement grout sanitary seal to extend to a depth of approximately 900 feet. The proposed well head design would include a 250-horsepower motor to drive a turbine pump. Well No. 7 would also include an approximately 1,000-square foot roll-apart, prefabricated steel pump house structure. The proposed structure would fully enclose the well head and ancillary equipment associated with operation of the well head. Other components of Well No. 7 include:

- 2,000-gallon chlorine tank, which would be placed within a secondary 2,500-gallon precast concrete vault. Both tank and vault would be located within the pump house and fully shielded from public view;

- Discharge chamber located adjacent to the eastern elevation of the pump house. The chamber would be five feet wide by 10 feet long and four and a half feet in height. The chamber would receive a minor amount of excess extracted water and would gravity feed a proposed irrigation tank;

- 4,995-gallon water irrigation tank located to the rear of the subject site. The irrigation tank would receive water from the discharge chamber and be used to irrigate landscaping at the subject site;
• 300-kilowatt natural gasoline generator for emergency back-up purposes only. The generator would be sited to the north east of the pump house structure and located within a seven foot by 17-foot noise attenuating, weatherproof enclosure;

• Hardscape and landscape to include a concrete driveway, decomposed granite paths and a mixture of bushes, shrubs, ground cover, and citrus trees.

Under separate permit, the Project also requires installation of lateral hook-ups in the County right-of-way on Alviso Drive. This installation may occur before any other phases of the Project due to scheduled resurfacing of Alviso Drive in July of 2020 by the County of Ventura Public Works Agency (PWA).

Class 3, Section 15303 – New Construction of Small Structures:
Class 3 consists of construction and location of limited numbers of new, small facilities or structures; installation of small new equipment and facilities in small structures; and the conversion of existing small structures from one use to another where only minor modifications are made in the exterior of the structure. The numbers of structures described in this section are the maximum allowable on any legal parcel.

The proposed Project would include abandoning Well No. 5 (602 N. Valley Vista Dr.) as a result of poor water quality and failing operation. The abandonment of this well would also include removal of the well head and sealing the well to the satisfaction of the Public Works Agency, Groundwater Division. The Project would also involve construction of a replacement well, located at 191 Alviso Drive (Well No. 7). The replacement well would be fully enclosed within an approximately 1,000-square-foot pump house. Support equipment would also be located within the proposed pump house. The houses on the properties surrounding the Project site are either similar or larger in scale (one and two-stories in height, approximately 2,300 square feet to over 5,000 square feet) when compared to the proposed approximately 1,000-square-foot pump house. Thus, the Project entails the construction of small facilities to be enclosed within a new small structure.

The CEQA Guidelines provide examples of Class 3 exemptions. One such example given in Section 15303(d) is for “water main, sewage, electrical, gas, and other utility extensions, including street improvements, of reasonable length to serve such construction.” Since the Project would involve the removal and replacement of one water well, it is similar to the 15303(d) example.
Class 4, Section 15304 – Minor Alterations to Land:
Class 4 consists of minor public or private alterations in the condition of land, water, and/or vegetation which do not involve removal of healthy, mature, scenic trees except for forestry or agricultural purposes.

The proposed Project would involve abandonment of an existing well, Well No. 5 (602 N. Valley Vista Dr.). While removal of the well head and proper sealing would be required, no substantial alteration to the land would occur for this aspect of the Project. The Project would also include construction of a replacement well, located at 191 Alviso Drive (Well No. 7). This parcel is currently undeveloped and land alteration would be required during well installation. Grading, trenching, and excavation associated with the installation of the replacement well would be minimal and would not include removal of any protected tree\(^1\) on the Project site and, therefore, the Class 4 exemption would apply.

ANALYSIS OF EXCEPTIONS TO EXEMPTIONS, SECTION 15300.2:

(a) Location: Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located – a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.

A Biological Resources Assessment (Attachment 1) was included with the Project submittal. The assessment report concludes that the Project sites (602 N. Valley Vista Dr. and 191 Alviso Dr.) contain no hazardous material and “the Project sites do not contain suitable habitat for any special-status species, sensitive plant communities, or potentially jurisdictional drainage features”. Therefore, there would be no impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern and this exception to the categorical exemptions is not applicable.

(b) Cumulative Impact: All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.

---

\(^1\) Protected Tree: A tree which is any one of a variety of tree species or types as identified in Article 7 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.
At this time, there are no other foreseeable water well projects planned for the given area. Therefore, granting the requested modified Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would not result in cumulative impacts over time that would be significant. This exception to the categorical exemptions is not applicable.

(c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

Pursuant to Section 8105-5 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance (NCZO), the Planning Director may grant a CUP for Water Production, Storage, Transmission, and Distribution Facilities with five (5) or more domestic service connections (privately operated). It has been determined that no unusual circumstance would exist by the granting of the CUP.

Additionally, the proposed Project would include abandonment of Well No. 5 (602 North Valley Vista Dr.) and construction of replacement Well No. 7 (191 Alviso Dr.). The Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency requires that the Project not result in a net increase in the amount of groundwater to be pumped from the Las Posas Groundwater Basin via Well No. 7 than was previously authorized for Well No. 5 via reporting requirements by the applicant.

County staff also investigated whether the proximity of replacement Well No. 7 to existing homes would interfere with nearby septic systems and/or provide water of substandard quality. Since an approximately 900-foot cement grout sanitary seal is proposed as part of Well No. 7, the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water, determined that the separation between the proposed well and nearby septic systems would be sufficient (see Attachment 2). As such, the well is expected to provide safe potable water and existing septic systems on adjacent properties would not be adversely affected.

The Project also necessitates the installation of lateral hook-ups in the County right-of-way in Alviso Drive. This installation would be permitted via a ministerial encroachment permit, not subject to CEQA. Nonetheless, County staff reviewed the potential impacts of the installation as part of the “whole of the action” to ensure that, in combination with other phases of the Project, it would not result in potentially significant impacts to the environment. The lateral hook-ups would require trenching and installation of new pipes to connect to existing waterlines. The work would occur entirely within areas already developed with
utilities/infrastructure and paved over to provide the roadway. Any potential impacts are further minimized by timing the work to coincide with the County’s scheduled resurfacing in July of 2020 as this would ensure the removal/replacement of roadway and installation of utilities occurs only once.

Based on the above discussion, the County has determined that there are no unusual circumstances related to the proposed Project and the proposed activities would not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, this exception to the categorical exemptions is not applicable.

(d) Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.

The Project, including the removal of Well No. 5, installation of replacement Well No. 7 with support equipment, and construction of a pump house, would not damage any scenic resources and would not be visible from any scenic highway. The Project sites are not located on, or adjacent to a state designated scenic highway. Pursuant to Ventura County General Plan, Resources Appendix – 03-09-19 Edition, Figures 1.7.3a and 1.7.3b, the only state designated highway in Ventura County is the northern portion of California State Route 33, which is approximately 100 miles north west of the Project sites. Therefore, this exception to the categorical exemptions is not applicable.

(e) Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to California Government Code Section 63962.5 and documentation on file with the Planning Division, the Project sites (602 N. Valley Vista Dr. and 191 Alviso Dr.) are not located on the State of California list of identified hazardous waste or hazardous substance sites; therefore, this exception to the categorical exemptions is not applicable.
(f) **Historical Resources.** A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

A Cultural Resources Assessment Report (Attachment 3) was included with the Project submittal. The report concludes that no historical resources are located on either Project site (602 N. Valley Vista Dr. and 191 Alviso Dr.).

Additionally, on May 23, 2019, the Ventura County Cultural Heritage Program Coordinator reviewed the Project and determined there are no impacts to historical resources for the Project sites and, therefore, this exception to the categorical exemptions is not applicable.

**Attachments:**

Attachment 1 Biological Resources Assessment Report for the Crestview Mutual Water Company Well #7 Capitol Project. Rincon Consultants Project No. 18-06431, dated October 2018.


Attachment 3 Cultural Resources Assessment Report for the Well #7 Capitol Project. Rincon Consultants Project No. 18-06431. Report on file, South Central Coastal Information Center, California University Fullerton, dated October 2018.
Well #7 Capital Project

Biological Resources Assessment

prepared for

Crestview Mutual Water Company
328 Valley Vista Drive
Camarillo, California 93010
Contact: Robert Eranio, Consulting General Manager
Via email: reranio.crestview@live.com
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Introduction and Setting

This report documents the findings of a biological resources assessment (BRA) conducted by Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) for a new production well system (Well #7) at 191 Alviso Drive and the abandonment and destruction of Well #5 at 602 Valley Vista Drive, both located in unincorporated Ventura County, California for Crestview Mutual Water Company (Crestview). The sites are located approximately 800 feet north of the northern boundary of the city of Camarillo. The purpose of this report is to document existing conditions at the project site and to evaluate the potential for impacts to special-status biological resources for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Plus review process. The BRA is prepared to CEQA-Plus standards due to the potential for funding to be received through the State Revolving Fund Loan Program (discussed further below).

1.1 Project Location and Description

The project site is comprised of two locations in southwestern unincorporated Ventura County approximately 800 feet north of the northern boundary of the city of Camarillo. The existing Well #5, to be abandoned, is located at 602 Valley Vista Drive (Assessor’s Parcel Number [APN] 159-003-206) on an approximate 0.25-acre site. The proposed Well #7 would be located at 191 Alviso Drive (APN 152-034-106) on an approximate 0.56-acre site. Both well locations are within existing residential neighborhoods.

The project proposes the construction of Well #7 to replace Well #5, both managed by Crestview. Currently, each year between April and November, Crestview depends entirely on two local groundwater sources, Well #4 and Well #6. If either of those two wells were to fail, Crestview would not have sufficient capacity to meet all system demands during the summer months. The water quality in Well #5 is degraded to the point that it can only be used in emergency situations. Crestview proposes to drill Well #7 to provide a reliable source of high-quality potable water and to increase system reliability during drought conditions or in the event of a failure of Well #4 or Well #6. The new Well #7 would be placed in rotation with Well #4 and Well #6 such that each of the three wells would cycle through production and stand-by roles on a weekly basis.

Abandonment and destruction of Well #5 would require sealing the well in place with cement and gravel and cutting the head off underground. All other water supply infrastructure currently present at the Well #5 site would be left in place and would continue to operate the same as under current conditions. Construction of Well #7 and appurtenant structures would include site preparation, laying of foundations, installation of pipelines, tanks, pumps, and equipment, and paving and landscaping of disturbed areas. The foundation of the pump house would require excavation to a depth of approximately two feet. Installation of tie-ins to the existing water pipelines would require construction via open trench to a maximum depth of approximately eight feet. At the end of the construction period, the trenched area within Alviso Drive would be re-paved.
1.2 Area of Potential Effects and Study Area

The area of potential effect (APE) includes the Well #5 site and Well #7 site and generally depicts all areas that are expected to be affected by the proposed project, including staging and construction areas. For the purposes of the current project, the APE is limited to the project disturbance footprint. The project site must additionally be considered as a three-dimensional space and includes any ground disturbance associated with the project.

The APEs are located within Township 2 north, Range 21 west, and Section 22 of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Camarillo, CA 7.5-minute quadrangle (Figure 1).

The existing Well #5 site is located in a residential neighborhood at the street address of 602 Valley Vista Drive (APN 159003206), at the intersection of Valley Vista Drive and Cerro Crest Drive in unincorporated Ventura County (Figure 2). The coordinates of the site are: 31°14'47.13" N, 119°3'43.52" W. The site is bordered by residences to the north, south, and west as well as a developed orchard to the east.

The proposed Well #7 site is located in a residential neighborhood at the street address of 191 Alviso Drive (APN 152034106) north of the intersection of La Patera Drive and Alviso Drive in unincorporated Ventura County (Figure 3). The coordinates of the site are: 34°14'32.66" N, 119°4'29.78" W. The site is bordered by residences on all sides. A swale was observed within the trees to the north of the site. An equestrian easement is located north of the site and south of the observed swale (Appendix A, Project Photographs).

The study area for this report consists of the APE which includes all ground disturbance associated with the project plus a 100-foot buffer surrounding the APE.
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Figure 1 Regional Vicinity Map

Image provided by National Geographic Society, Esri and its licensors © 2018. Camarillo Quadrangle, T20N R21W S22. The topographic representation depicted in this map may not portray all of the features currently found in the vicinity today and/or features depicted in this map may have changed since the original topographic map was assembled.
Figure 2  Well #5 APE and Study Area
Figure 3  Well #7 APE and Study Area


2 Methodology

This evaluation consisted of a review of relevant background literature followed by a field survey and preparation of this report. The analysis included an investigation to determine the presence/absence of sensitive vegetation communities, jurisdictional waters and streams, and habitat that could potentially support special-status species. Rincon conducted a search and review of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) (CDFW 2018a) and Biogeographic Information and Observation System (CDFW 2018b) as reflected in the special-status species table in Appendix B, as well as the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Critical Habitat Portal (USFWS 2018a), to determine if there were any recorded observations of special-status species, habitats, or other special-status biological resources in the vicinity of the study area.

The literature review included information and data from the following additional sources:

- Ventura County Municipal Code
- Ventura County General Plan (County of Ventura 2016)
- Ventura County Initial Assessment Guidelines (County of Ventura 2011)
- National Wetlands Inventory Wetlands Mapper (USFWS 2018b)
- Essential Connectivity Area, California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project: A Strategy for Conserving a Connected California (California Department of Transportation and CDFW 2010).

2.1 Personnel

Rincon Senior Ecologist and Principal, Steven J. Hongola, oversaw preparation of this biological resources study. Associate Biologist and Project Manager Heather Imgrund managed the project and reviewed the report for quality control. Associate Biologist Danielle Yaconelli conducted the pedestrian field survey, completed the literature review, and is the primary author of this report (Appendix C). Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Jon Montgomery prepared the figures found in this report. Principal Jennifer Haddow, Ph.D., reviewed this report for quality control.

2.2 Regulatory Overview

Regulated or sensitive resources studied and analyzed herein include special-status plant and wildlife species, nesting birds and raptors, sensitive plant communities, jurisdictional waters and wetlands, wildlife movement, and locally protected resources, such as protected trees.

The County of Ventura is the lead agency for this project under CEQA. This project may also involve the use of funds provided by the federal government and administered by the State Revolving Fund Loan Program and would need to meet CEQA-Plus regulatory standards. The State Water Resources Control Board would have the responsibility for CEQA-Plus review which applies federal standards to the CEQA process.

For the purpose of this report, potential impacts to biological resources were analyzed based on the following statutes:
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- CEQA
- National Environmental Policy Act
- Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA)
- California Endangered Species Act (CESA)
- Federal Clean Water Act
- California Fish and Game Code (CFGC)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA)
- The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

A more detailed account of the current regulatory framework the proposed project is subject to is presented as Appendix D.

2.3 Site Survey

Danielle Yaconelli, Associate Biologist, conducted a reconnaissance-level field survey of the study area on September 19, 2018. Plant species observed within the Well #5 and Well #7 sites and study area were documented. The purpose of the survey was to document existing biological conditions within the study area, including plant and wildlife species, vegetation communities, jurisdictional waters and wetlands, and the potential for presence of special-status species and/or habitats. The biologist conducted the survey on foot. Where portions of the study area were inaccessible (e.g., private property), the biologist visually inspected those areas with binoculars (10 x 40). Weather conditions during the survey included an average temperature of 72 degrees Fahrenheit, winds between 0 and 3 miles per hour, and clear skies. Project photographs can be found in Appendix A.
3 Existing Conditions

Well #5 production began in 1995 as part of the Crestview Mutual Water Company. The Well #5 site contains the wellhead, and infrastructure for the well including the well, filters, tanks and aerators. The Well #5 site contains developed infrastructure that is located on concrete and is located behind a secured brick wall and a chain-link fence approximately eight feet in height with a rolling access gate on the northern edge. There are no waters or wetlands within the study area and vegetation present is ornamental or generally includes non-native species as described in further detail below. The Well #5 site is surrounded by developed or disturbed residential parcels.

The proposed Well #7 site is a vacant lot that is undeveloped, highly disturbed, and contains bare dirt with sparse vegetation. The Well #7 site contains a fenced-off parcel without buildings present. The Well #7 site is surrounded by Alviso Drive on the southern edge, a block retaining wall and chain-link fence on the western edge, a low block wall with metal lattice covered by a hedge and a chain-link fence on the eastern edge, and mature eucalyptus trees (Eucalyptus sp.) and ornamental shrubs on the northern edge. The herbaceous layer was maintained, and mulch was spread around the site. Tire tracks were present along the northern side of the site. A 45-foot wide equestrian easement is located in the northern portion of the study area and outside of the APE. An ephemeral swale was observed within the eucalyptus trees located to the north of Well #7 site. The feature is aligned east to west parallel to Alviso Drive (Figure 3). The equestrian trail runs parallel to Alviso Drive and the ephemeral swale. Vegetation present includes a majority of non-native species as described below.

3.1 Topography and Soils

The Well #5 site occurs 569 to 574 feet above mean sea level (amsl) (Google Earth 2018). The site slopes downhill south to north. According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey, the study area contains Rincon silty clay loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes, eroded, warm MAAT, MLRA 19 (USDA NRCS 2018).

The Well #7 site is located 380 to 390 feet amsl (Google Earth 2018). The site slopes downhill south to north. According to the USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey, the study area contains San Benito clay loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes, eroded, MLRA 20 (USDA NRCS 2018).

3.2 Land Cover and Vegetation

The study area is comprised of urban/developed land which is defined to be areas that have been constructed upon or otherwise physically altered to an extent that native vegetation is no longer supported. Urban/developed lands are characterized by permanent or semi-permanent structures, pavement or hardscape, and landscaped areas that often require irrigation. Areas that have been physically disturbed (by previous human activity) and are no longer recognizable as a native or naturalized vegetation association, but continue to retain a soil substrate, may also be considered urban/developed lands. At Well # 5, plant species observed during the field reconnaissance survey were entirely ornamental and included low ground cover species and succulents (e.g. Bougainvillea sp.). Within the Well #5 study area, plant species observed during the field reconnaissance survey
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were entirely ornamental and included low ground cover species and succulents (e.g. *Bougainvillea* sp.). The Well #7 study area contains disturbed habitat within the APE as well as eucalyptus woodland to the north of the APE (Figure 3). Ornamental trees are present on properties neighboring the APE within the study area. At the proposed Well #7 site, plant species observed included mostly non-native vegetation. Vegetation observed includes morning glory (*Calystegia* sp.), cheeseweed (*Malva parviflora*), tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*), smilo grass (*Stipa miliacea*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), Peruvian pepper tree (*Schinus molle*), orange tree (*Citrus* sp.), Russian thistle (*Salsola australis*), black mustard (*Brassica nigra*), common groundsel (*Senecio vulgaris*), red brome (*Bromus madritensis*), and wild oat (*Avena sativa*), and eucalyptus tree.

### 3.3 General Wildlife

The project site and surrounding area provide habitat for wildlife species that commonly occur in urban areas. Wildlife species observed at the Well #5 study area during the reconnaissance survey on September 19, 2018 include Anna’s hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), and a gull (*Larus* sp.). At the Well #7 study area, the species observed within the study area include Anna’s hummingbird, black phoebe, American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), and house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*).

Various small mammal burrows were observed throughout the Well #7 project site (Appendix A, Project Photographs). Due to the highly disturbed nature of the herbaceous layer, the number of burrows in close proximity, and the burrow sizes (less than three inches in diameter) it is likely that California ground squirrels (*Otospermophilus beecheyi*) created these burrows.
4 Special-status Biological Resources

This section evaluates the potential for the project site to support special-status biological resources. No special-status biological resources were observed during the site reconnaissance survey.

4.1 Special-status Species

Local, state, and federal agencies regulate special-status species and may require an assessment of their presence or potential presence to be conducted on site prior to the approval of any proposed development on a property. Assessments for the potential occurrence of special-status species are based upon known ranges, habitat preferences for the species, species occurrence records from the CNDDB species occurrence records from other sites in the vicinity of the study area, and previous reports for the site. The potential for each special-status species to occur in the study area was evaluated according to the following criteria:

- **No Potential.** Habitat on and adjacent to the site is clearly unsuitable for the species requirements (foraging, breeding, cover, substrate, elevation, hydrology, plant community, site history, disturbance regime).
- **Low Potential.** Few of the habitat components meeting the species requirements are present, and/or the majority of habitat on and adjacent to the site is unsuitable or of very poor quality. The species is not likely to be found on the site.
- **Moderate Potential.** Some of the habitat components meeting the species requirements are present, and/or only some of the habitat on or adjacent to the site is unsuitable. The species has a moderate probability of being found on the site.
- **High Potential.** All of the habitat components meeting the species requirements are present and/or most of the habitat on or adjacent to the site is highly suitable. The species has a high probability of being found on the site.
- **Present.** Species is observed on the site or has been recorded (e.g., CNDDB, other reports) on the site recently (within the last 5 years).

For the purpose of this report, special-status species are those plants and animals listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing as Threatened or Endangered by the USFWS under the ESA; those listed or candidates for listing as Rare, Threatened, Endangered under CESA or the Native Plant Protection Act; those identified as Fully Protected under Sections 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515 of the CFGC; Species of Special Concern identified by the CDFW; and plants occurring on Ranks 1 and 2 of the California Native Plant Society’s California Rare Plant Rank system per the following definitions:

- **List 1A** = Plants presumed extinct in California
- **List 1B.1** = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere; seriously endangered in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened/high degree and immediacy of threat)
- **List 1B.2** = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere; fairly endangered in California (20-80% occurrences threatened)
- **List 1B.3** = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere, not very endangered in California (<20% of occurrences threatened or no current threats known)

- **List 2** = Rare, threatened or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere

Based on a query of the CNDDB there are three special-status plant species and 14 special-status wildlife species documented within a 5-mile radius of the Well #5 and Well #7 sites. All 17 species were evaluated for potential to occur within the study area and results of this evaluation can be found in Appendix B. No special-status plant species were detected during the field reconnaissance survey on September 19, 2018.

Special-status wildlife species typically have very specific habitat requirements which may include, but are not limited to, vegetation communities, elevation levels and topography, and availability of primary constituent elements (i.e., space for individual and population growth, breeding, foraging, and shelter).

Given the high degree of urbanization within the Well #5 and Well #7 sites and lack of suitable habitat for each species, no special-status wildlife species are expected to occur. Additionally, there is no critical habitat designated by the USFWS within the study area.

The study area does not fall under the California Coastal Zone (California Coastal Commission 2018). No locally important species or communities were observed onsite during the field surveys (County of Ventura 2014).

### Nesting Birds

Under the provisions of the MBTA, it is unlawful “by any means or manner to pursue, hunt, take, capture (or) kill” any migratory birds except as permitted by regulations issued by the USFWS. The term “take” is defined by the USFWS regulation to mean to “pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect” any migratory bird or any part, nest, or egg of any migratory bird covered by the conventions, or to attempt those activities. In addition, sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3511 of the CFGC describe unlawful take, possession, or destruction of birds, nests, and eggs. Fully protected birds (Section 3511) may not be taken or possessed except under specific permit. Section 3503.5 of the CFGC protects all birds-of-prey and their eggs and nests against take, possession, or destruction of nests or eggs. The structures and ornamental trees within the study area and adjacent properties could provide habitat that has the potential to support protected nesting birds.

### 4.2 Sensitive Plant Communities

Plant communities are considered sensitive biological resources if they have limited distributions, have high wildlife value, include sensitive species, or are particularly susceptible to disturbance. The CDFW ranks sensitive communities as "threatened" or "very threatened" and keeps records of their occurrences in CNDDB. Similar to special-status plant and wildlife species, vegetation alliances are ranked 1 through 5 based on NatureServe’s (2012) methodology, with those alliances ranked globally (G) or statewide (S) as 1 through 3 considered sensitive.

Southern riparian scrub natural community was listed within a 5-mile radius of the Well #5 and Well #7 site and was not observed within either study area at the reconnaissance survey on September 19, 2018. Additionally, no sensitive plant communities or habitat types were identified at the reconnaissance survey on September 19, 2018. Therefore, no further analysis of sensitive plant communities or habitats is included within this report.
4.3 Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands

A potentially jurisdictional ephemeral swale occurs approximately 30 feet north of the Well #7 site and approximately 230 feet north of the Well #5 site. These features are mapped as Riverine habitat, classified as R4SBC, by the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) (USFWS 2018b). The potentially jurisdictional feature mapped by the NWI and located north of the Well #5 site was not observed visually due to private properties restricting access. The ephemeral swale north of the Well #7 site was dry during the September 19, 2018 survey.

Wild and scenic rivers do not occur on either of the sites. The closest wild and scenic river is Sespe Creek, located approximately 12 miles away from the site (National Park Service 2014).

4.4 Wildlife Movement

Wildlife movement corridors, or habitat linkages, are generally defined as connections between habitat patches that allow for physical and genetic exchange between otherwise isolated animal populations. Such linkages may serve a local purpose, such as providing a linkage between foraging and denning areas, or they may be regional in nature. Some habitat linkages may serve as migration corridors, wherein animals periodically move away from an area and then subsequently return. Others may be important as dispersal corridors for young animals. A group of habitat linkages in an area can form a wildlife corridor network.

The Well #5 and Well #7 study areas are located within a developed urban area and are surrounded by urbanized uses in each direction including roads, commercial uses and residential uses. Common mammals, such as striped skunks (*Mephitis mephitis*) and raccoons (*Procyon lotor*), may utilize the study areas for local movement. However, given the urban nature of the regional vicinity, it is unlikely that wildlife utilize the immediate area for regional movement. Furthermore, the CDFW does not include any mapped California Essential Habitat Connectivity areas within the study area (2010). Therefore, no further analysis of wildlife movement is included within this report.

4.5 Resources Protected by Local Policies and Ordinances

Protected trees are defined by the County of Ventura (County) municipal code as Historical, Heritage, Oak, Sycamore (collectively referred to as “Protected Trees”), denoted by their species or diameter at breast height (DBH; also known as “caliper”) as follows:

- “Historical tree” is any tree or group of trees identified by the County or a city as a landmark or identified on the Federal or California Historic Resources Inventory to be of historical or cultural significance or identified as contributing to a site or structure of historical or cultural significance.
- “Heritage tree” is considered any species of tree with a single trunk of ninety (90) or more inches in girth or with multiple trunks, two of which collectively measure seventy-two (72) inches in girth or more. In addition, species with naturally thin trunks when full grown (such as Washington Palms), species with naturally large trunks at an early age (such as some date palms), or trees with unnaturally enlarged trunks due to injury or disease (e.g., burls and galls) must be at least sixty feet tall or 75 years old to be considered as a heritage tree.
- “Oak tree” shall mean any species of tree of the genus *Quercus*.
- “Sycamore tree” shall mean the species *Platanus racemosa*.

Per the County Code, no person shall alter, fell, or remove a Protected Tree except in accordance with the provisions of Section 8107-25 et seq. If tree alteration, felling, or removal is part of a project requiring a discretionary permit, then the tree permit application and approval process should accompany the parent project discretionary permit. (Sec. 8107-25.3).

Per the County’s Municipal Code, the County may require replacement or transplanting (onsite or offsite) of trees proposed to be removed.

An arborist survey was not completed as part of this analysis and therefore it is not known if the eucalyptus trees to the north of the Well #7 site meet the definition of heritage trees. However, the eucalyptus trees are located north of and partially within the northern side of the 45-foot wide equestrian easement to the north of the site (Figure 3), will not be impacted by construction. Therefore, the proposed Well #7 would not encroach into potentially protected trees and no further analysis of protected trees is included in this report.

Ventura County General Plan Policy 1.5.2 requires development be sited a minimum of 100 feet from significant wetland habitats and requires mitigation of any potential impacts. A buffer reduction may be enacted by a qualified biologist. The ephemeral swale, located north of the Well #7 site, is dominated by upland grasses and eucalyptus trees. Grasses and invasive trees do not constitute significant wetland habitat. Further, the project would not encroach into the buffer beyond the existing adjacent residential development. Therefore, Well #7, proposed to be located 45 feet from the ephemeral swale, is consistent with Policy 1.5.2.

### 4.6 Conservation Plans and Other Regulated Areas

The Well #5 and Well #7 site are not subject to any Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Additionally, the sites are not located within the Coastal Zone and are therefore not regulated by the Coastal Zone Management Act. Therefore, conservation plans are not addressed further within this analysis.
5 Impact Analysis and Recommended Actions

This section discusses the potential impacts and effects to biological resources that may occur from implementation of the proposed project and recommends avoidance and minimization measures which would reduce those impacts where appropriate.

5.1 Special-Status Species

Special-status plant and wildlife species were not observed within the study area and no special-status plant or animal species are expected to occur in the study area based on habitat requirements. Therefore, the project would not affect any special-status plant or animal species.

The Well #5 and Well #7 study areas contain natural vegetation that may provide suitable nesting habitat for protected nesting birds; however, the Well #5 and Well #7 sites do not contain suitable nesting habitat for protected nesting birds. No removal of suitable nesting habitat would occur during construction. Avoidance and Minimization Measure 1 recommends pre-construction/grading surveys if project construction is initiated during the bird breeding season to avoid disturbing protected nesting birds near the sites.

Recommended Avoidance and Minimization Measure

AMM1 Nesting Birds

If construction occurs within the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31), then no more than one week prior to initiation of ground disturbance and/or vegetation removal, a nesting bird and raptor pre-construction survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist within the disturbance footprint plus a 100-foot buffer, where practicable.

Pre-construction nesting bird and raptor surveys will be conducted during the time of day when birds are active and should be of sufficient duration to reliably conclude presence/absence of nesting birds and raptors onsite and within the designated vicinity. A report of the nesting bird and raptor survey results, if applicable, will be submitted to the lead agency prior to ground and/or vegetation disturbance activities.

If nests are found, their locations will be flagged. An appropriate avoidance-buffer ranging in size from 25 to 50 feet for song birds, and up to 100 feet for raptors depending upon the species and the proposed work activity, will be determined and demarcated by a qualified biologist with suitable flagging. Active nests will be monitored at a minimum of once per week until it has been determined that the nest is no longer being used by either the young or adults. No ground disturbance will occur within this buffer until the qualified biologist confirms that the breeding/nesting is complete, and all the young have fledged. If project activities must occur within the buffer, they will be conducted at the discretion of the qualified biologist. If no nesting birds are observed during pre-construction surveys, no further actions are necessary. If a bird initiates a nest while construction activities, such
as ground disturbance or demolition and construction, are ongoing it is unlikely to be significantly disturbed by those same activities.

5.2 Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands

An ephemeral swale that may be subject to the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board and CDFW was observed within the Well #7 study area during the survey (Appendix A, Project Photographs).

The ephemeral swale is not located within the Well #7 site; it is located 45 feet from the disturbance boundary. No construction would occur within the potentially jurisdictional waters; impacts to these waters would not occur.
6 Conclusions

The avoidance and minimization measure in Section 5 is recommended to assure avoidance of impacts to protected nesting birds. The project would not impact any other special-status species, sensitive communities/habitats, wildlife movement, or conflict with adopted plans or ordinances including habitat conservation plans.
7 References


--------. 2018a. CDFW California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB), Rarefind V. 5.

--------. 2018b. Biogeographic Information and Observation System.


County of Ventura, California. 2014. Ventura County Locally Important Species List. Retrieved from https://vcrma.org/ventura-county-locally-important-species-list


Google Earth. 2018.


Appendix A

Project Photographs
Photograph 1. View looking southwest at constructed Well #5 (indicated by the red arrow) that is proposed to be deconstructed. Ornamental trees in the background.

Photograph 2. View at the proposed Well #7 site looking north. Sparse nonnative vegetation and bare ground in the foreground, ornamental shrubs in the midground, and nonnative (eucalyptus, tree tobacco, and orange) trees in the background.
Photograph 3. View at the proposed Well #7 site of small mammal burrows and cut herbaceous layer.

Photograph 4. View at the proposed Well #7 site looking north. Mulch in the foreground, nonnative tree tobacco in the midground, and eucalyptus trees in the background.
Photograph 5. View at the proposed Well #7 site looking southwest. Nonnative vegetation in the foreground and an orange tree in the midground. Mulch is surrounding all vegetation.

Photograph 6. View approximately 5 feet north of the proposed Well #7 site looking east at the ephemeral swale. Nonnative eucalyptus trees surround the swale.
Appendix B

Special-Status Species Evaluation Table
Table 1. Special-Status Species Occurrence Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Habitat Requirements</th>
<th>Potential to Occur in Project Site</th>
<th>Habitat Suitability/Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Dudleya verityi</em></td>
<td>Verity's dudleya</td>
<td>Threatened/None</td>
<td>Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub. On volcanic rock outcrops in the Santa Monica Mountains. 60-335 m. perennial herb. Blooms May-Jun</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. No chaparral, woodland, or scrub habitat present. No suitable habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Monardella sinuata ssp. gerryi</em></td>
<td>Gerry's curly-leaved monardella</td>
<td>None/None G3T1 / S1 1B.1</td>
<td>Coastal scrub. Sandy openings. 150-245 m. annual herb. Blooms Apr-Jun</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. No coastal scrub habitat present. No suitable habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudognaphalium leucocephalum</em></td>
<td>white rabbit-tobacco</td>
<td>None/None G4 / S2 2B.2</td>
<td>Riparian woodland, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, chaparral. Sandy, gravelly sites. 35-515 m. perennial herb. Blooms (Jul)Aug-Nov(Dec)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. No woodland or scrub habitat present. No suitable habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bombus crotchii</em></td>
<td>Crotch bumble bee</td>
<td>None/None G3G4 / S1S2</td>
<td>Coastal California east to the Sierra-Cascade crest and south into Mexico. Food plant genera include Antirrhinum, Phacelia, Clarkia, Dendromecon, Eschscholzia, and Eriogonum.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. No food plant present. No suitable habitat present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gasterosteus aculeatus williamsoni</em></td>
<td>unarmored threespine stickleback</td>
<td>Endangered/Endangered GST1 / S1 FP</td>
<td>Weedy pools, backwaters, and among emergent vegetation at the stream edge in small Southern California streams. Cool (&lt;24 C), clear water with abundant vegetation.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. The sites lack perennial aquatic habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gila orcutti</em></td>
<td>arroyo chub</td>
<td>None/None G2 / S2 SSC</td>
<td>Native to streams from Malibu Creek to San Luis Rey River basin. Introduced into streams in Santa Clara, Ventura, Santa Ynez, Mojave &amp; San Diego river basins. Slow water stream sections with mud or sand bottoms. Feeds heavily on aquatic vegetation and associated invertebrates.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. The sites lack perennial aquatic habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Habitat Requirements</td>
<td>Potential to Occur in Project Site</td>
<td>Habitat Suitability/ Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</em> pop. 10 steelhead - southern California DPS</td>
<td>Endangered/None GST1Q / S1</td>
<td>Federal listing refers to populations from Santa Maria River south to southern extent of range (San Mateo Creek in San Diego County). Southern steelhead likely have greater physiological tolerances to warmer water and more variable conditions.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. The sites lack perennial aquatic habitat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptiles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anniella stebbinsi</em> California legless lizard</td>
<td>None/None G3G4/ S3S4</td>
<td>Coastal sand dunes, sandy washes, alluvial fans. Moist warm loose soil with plant cover.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. No coastal sand dunes, sandy washes, or alluvial fan habitat present. Soil does not contain moisture. No suitable habitat present.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Emys marmorata</em> western pond turtle</td>
<td>None/None G3G4 / S3 SSC</td>
<td>A thoroughly aquatic turtle of ponds, marshes, rivers, streams and irrigation ditches, usually with aquatic vegetation, below 6000 ft elevation. Needs basking sites and suitable (sandy banks or grassy open fields) upland habitat up to 0.5 km from water for egg-laying.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. The sites lack perennial aquatic habitat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phrynosoma blainvillii</em> coast horned lizard</td>
<td>None/None G3G4 / S3S4 SSC</td>
<td>Frequents a wide variety of habitats, most common in lowlands along sandy washes with scattered low bushes. Open areas for sunning, bushes for cover, patches of loose soil for burial, and abundant supply of ants and other insects.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. While open areas for sunning and loose soil for burial occurs at Well #7 site, sandy washes with scattered low bush habitat is not present onsite. CNDDB records exist approximately 4.8 miles away from the APE (2011, 2015, 2016).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thamnophis sirtalis infernalis</em> south coast gartersnake</td>
<td>None/None GST1T2/S1S2</td>
<td>Forests, mixed woodlands, grassland, chaparral, farmlands, often near ponds, marshes, or streams.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. The sites lack forests, woodland, grassland, chaparral, and farmland habitat. No ponds, marshes, or streams observed onsite.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Habitat Requirements</td>
<td>Potential to Occur in Project Site</td>
<td>Habitat Suitability/Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agelaius tricolor</em></td>
<td>tricolored blackbird</td>
<td>None/Threatened G2G3 / S1S2 SSC</td>
<td>Highly colonial species, most numerous in Central Valley &amp; vicinity. Largely endemic to California. Requires open water, protected nesting substrate, and foraging area with insect prey within a few km of the colony.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. Open water, protected nesting substrate, and foraging area not present onsite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Athene cunicularia</em></td>
<td>burrowing owl</td>
<td>None/None G4 / S3 SSC</td>
<td>Open, dry annual or perennial grasslands, deserts, and scrublands characterized by low-growing vegetation. Subterranean nester, dependent upon burrowing mammals, most notably, the California ground squirrel.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Although ground squirrel burrows present at Well #7 site, the site is completely surrounded by a residential neighborhood and highly disturbed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eremophila alpestris actia</em></td>
<td>California horned lark</td>
<td>None/None GST4Q / S4 WL</td>
<td>Coastal regions, chiefly from Sonoma County to San Diego County. Also, main part of San Joaquin Valley and east to foothills. Short-grass prairie, &quot;bald&quot; hills, mountain meadows, open coastal plains, fallow grain fields, alkali flats.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Although grass and a &quot;bald&quot; hill exists on the Well #7 site, the project site is disturbed and surrounded by a residential neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Falco peregrinus anatum</em></td>
<td>American peregrine falcon</td>
<td>Delisted/Delisted G4T4 / S3S4 FP</td>
<td>Near wetlands, lakes, rivers, or other water; on cliffs, banks, dunes, mounds; also, human-made structures. Nest consists of a scrape or a depression or ledge in an open site.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. The sites lack wetlands, lakes, rivers, and perennial water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vireo bellii pusillus</em></td>
<td>least Bell's vireo</td>
<td>Endangered/Endangered GST2 / S2</td>
<td>Summer resident of Southern California in low riparian in vicinity of water or in dry river bottoms; below 2000 ft. Nests placed along margins of bushes or on twigs projecting into pathways, usually willow, Baccharis, mesquite.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. The sites lack riparian habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Taxidea taxus</em></td>
<td>American badger</td>
<td>None/None G5 / S3 SSC</td>
<td>Most abundant in drier open stages of most shrub, forest, and herbaceous habitats, with friable soils. Needs sufficient food, friable soils and open, uncultivated ground. Preys on burrowing rodents. Digs burrows.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Well #5 and Well #7 sites are disturbed and/or developed. While Well #7 contains friable soils, it lacks shrub, forest, and herbaceous habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Name Common Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Habitat Requirements</td>
<td>Potential to Occur in Project Site</td>
<td>Habitat Suitability/ Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status: Federal/State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE = Federal Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT = Federal Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFT = Proposed Federal Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDL = Federal Delisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE = State Endangered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST = State Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR = State Rare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDL = State Delisted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC = CDFW Species of Special Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP = CDFW Fully Protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WL = CDFW Watch List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRPR (CNPS California Rare Plant Rank):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A = Presumed Extinct in California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B = Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California and elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California, but more common elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Need more information (a Review List)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Plants of Limited Distribution (a Watch List)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRPR Threat Code Extension:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1 = Seriously endangered in California (&gt;80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 = Fairly endangered in California (20-80% of occurrences threatened)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 = Not very endangered in California (&lt;20% of occurrences threatened)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Statuses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1 or S1 = Critically Imperiled Globally or Subnationally (state)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 or S2 = Imperiled Globally or Subnationally (state)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3 or S3 = Vulnerable to extirpation or extinction Globally or Subnationally (state)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4/S or S4/S = Apparently secure, common and abundant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH or SH = Possibly Extirpated – missing; known from only historical occurrences but still some hope of rediscovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional notations may be provided as follows:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = Intraspecific Taxon (subspecies, varieties, and other designations below the level of species)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q = Questionable taxonomy that may reduce conservation priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? = Inexact numeric rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Steven J. Hongola

PRINCIPAL ECOLOGIST

Steven J. Hongola serves as a Principal and Senior Ecologist with more than 15 years of professional experience in the environmental field. His areas of expertise include program management, biological resources assessments, focused surveys for sensitive species, jurisdictional waters and wetlands delineations, habitat restoration and management, conservation planning, regulatory permitting, and biological compliance monitoring. Mr. Hongola has direct experience managing on-call contracts with multiple concurrent assignments and large numbers of field staff. He understands the importance of fulfilling assignments when requested and working with staff to resolve issues as they arise.

PROJECT EXPERIENCE

WATER UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

- Santa Ana River Bridge Seismic Retrofit and Routine Maintenance Project Compliance Monitoring, Metropolitan Water District, Riverside County
- Prestressed Concrete Cylinder Pipe Rehabilitation Program – Second Lower Feeder Addendum Technical Studies and Construction Monitoring, Metropolitan, Riverside County
- Pala Force Main Project Biological Resource Assessment, Eastern Municipal Water District & K.S. Dunbar & Associates, Temecula, Riverside County
- Wilson Creek Basins Water Recharge Project Biological Resources Assessment, Yucaipa Valley Water District, San Bernardino County
- Copper Sulfate Applications to Copper Basin and Gene Wash Reservoirs Biological Assessment, Metropolitan Water District, San Bernardino County
- F.E. Weymouth Treatment Plant Environmental Compliance Monitoring, Metropolitan Water District, City of La Verne, Los Angeles County
- Sepulveda Temporary Pump Station Project Nesting Bird Surveys, Metropolitan Water District, City of Los Angeles
- Palos Verdes Reservoir Upgrades Project Compliance Monitoring, Metropolitan Water District, Los Angeles County
- Woodland Hills Water Recycling Project Biological Services, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District/subcontract to Woodward and Curran (formerly) RMC Water and Environment, Los Angeles County
- New Non-Potable Water Connections IS-MND and Biological Resources Assessment, Coachella Valley Water District
- Whitewater Stormwater Flood Easement Project EIR and Biological Resources Assessment, Coachella Valley Water District
- City of Los Angeles Sanitation District (LASAN) LA-Glendale Wastewater Treatment Plant Biological Technical Study, subcontract to Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
- Mulholland Highway to Tapia Water Reclamation Facility Pipeline Project Environmental Monitoring, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
- Recycled Water System Construction Project Biological Studies, City of Hesperia
PROJECT EXPERIENCE, CONT'D

JURISDICTIONAL WATERS AND WETLANDS DELINEATIONS AND CRAM SURVEYS
- J Street Drain Improvement, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Ormond Beach, Ventura County
- Supplemental Geotechnical Investigations on the Santa Clara River, United Water Conservation District, Ventura County
- Ortega Bridge Project CRAM Surveys, Mission Creek, City of Santa Barbara
- Access Road Water Crossings QA/QC, San Diego Gas and Electric, San Diego County
- California Avenue Widening Project, University of California, Irvine, Orange County
- San Joaquin Student Housing Project, University of California Santa Barbara
- Triton Substation Project, Southern California Edison, City of Temecula / Riverside County

SENSITIVE SPECIES SURVEYS
- Coastal California Gnatcatcher Surveys, Southern California Gas Company, Pipeline Safety Enhancement Program (PSEP), Thousand Oaks, Ventura County
- Least Bell’s Vireo and Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Focused Surveys, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Conejo Creek and Santa Clara River Maintenance Projects, Ventura County
- Sensitive Wildlife Surveys, Palm Springs Wastewater Treatment Plant Solar Project, SolarCity, Palm Springs, Riverside County
- Coastal California Gnatcatcher Habitat Assessments, Various Flood Control Basins, San Bernardino County Flood Control District, San Bernardino County

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCE ASSESSMENTS
- Distributed Solar Projects (Confidential Client), Central Valley and Mojave Desert
- Comprehensive Biological Resources Study, More Mesa, Santa Barbara County
- Conejo Mountain Memorial Park, Initial Study Biological Assessment, Ventura County
- Scripps Park West, Phase II, City of San Diego, San Diego County
- Lechuza Beach Access Expansion Project, Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority, Malibu, Los Angeles County

HABITAT RESTORATION, MANAGEMENT, AND CONSERVATION PLANNING
- Habitat Conservation Plan, Freeman Diversion Fish Passage, Santa Clara River, United Water Conservation District, Ventura County
- Long Grade Canyon Creek Restoration, CSU Channel Islands, Ventura County
- The Crosby Habitat Management Program, The Crosby at Rancho Santa Fe Homeowners Association, San Diego County
- Coastal Region Conservation Program, Southern California Gas Company, Southern California
- Hollywood Water Quality Improvement Project, LADWP, City of Los Angeles
Heather Imgrund, MESM

ASSOCIATE BIOLOGIST/PROJECT MANAGER

Heather Imgrund is an Associate Biologist/Project Manager for Rincon Consultants. She has over 11 years of experience in project management, preparation and management biological resource assessments, CEQA documents, resource management policy, permitting, permit compliance and report preparation. Her experience is in a wide range of areas, including oil and gas development and decommissioning, water infrastructure, local coastal planning and land development.

EDUCATION

- M.E.S.M., Environmental Science and Management, University of California at Santa Barbara, Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, Santa Barbara, 2005
- B.S., Evolution and Ecology, University of California at Davis, 2002

EXPERIENCE

- Rincon Consultants, Inc. (2014 - present)
- Santa Barbara County Planning and Development (2006 - 2014)
- Quad Knopf Inc. (2005 - 2006)

PERMITTING AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW BIOLOGIST

- Atwater Bridge Jurisdictional Delineation, City of Los Angeles
- Maywood Mutual No. 2 Water System Construction Project Biological Resources Assessment, Water Replenishment District of Southern California
- Romero Canyon Road Biological Resources Assessment, Santa Barbara County CA
- Los Angeles Glendale Wastewater Treatment Plan Biological Resources Assessment, City of Los Angeles
- Pole Creek Fish Passage Project Environmental Review, Ventura County and City of Fillmore
- Los Osos Habitat Conservation Plan EA/EIR, San Luis Obispo County
- Vine Transit Bus Maintenance Facility Project EIR, Napa County
- Pipeline Safety Enhancement Plan, High Level Reviews, Southern California Gas Company, Various Locations
- Palm Desert Groundwater Replenishment Facility Project Biological Resources Assessment and EIR, City of Palm Desert
- Old Town Sidewalk Improvement Project MND, City of Goleta
- 918 E. Thompson Boulevard Biological Resources Inventory, City of Ventura
- Contracted City Biologist, City of Malibu

PERMITTING AND COMPLIANCE

- Thacher School Faculty Housing Biological Condition Compliance, County of Ventura
- Refugio Beach Oil Spill Response Project, City of Goleta
- PRC 421 Access Road Maintenance and Repair Project, City of Goleta
- Hercules Gas Plant Remediation and Restoration, County of Santa Barbara
- ARCO Dos Pueblos Pipeline Removal, City of Goleta and County of Santa Barbara
- Unocal Point Conception Decommissioning Project, County of Santa Barbara
- Gaviota Terminal Abandonment, County of Santa Barbara
- Southern California Gas Company Storage Enhancement Project, County of Santa Barbara
PROJECT EXPERIENCE, CONT'D

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND LONG RANGE COASTAL PLANNING
- Coastal Land Use Plan Update, City of Oxnard
- Summerland Community Plan Update and EIR, Santa Barbara County
- Climate Adaptation Vulnerability Assessment, County of Santa Barbara

MITIGATION MONITORING AND CONSTRUCTION COMPLIANCE
- Agoura Road Widening Biological Compliance Monitoring and Reporting, City of Agoura Hills

CEQA/NEPA
- PRC 421 Access Road Maintenance and Repair Project MND, City of Goleta
- Skechers Design Center and Executive Offices Project EIR, City of Hermosa Beach
- One Beverly Hills Project EIR, City of Beverly Hills
- Old Town Village Mixed Use Project IS-MND, City of Goleta
- Coastal Apartment Homes and Senior/Assisted Living IS-MND, City of Oxnard
- Riverwalk Residential Development Project EIR, City of Long Beach
- Los Osos Habitat Conservation Plan EA/EIR, San Luis Obispo County
- Lower Santa Clara River Salt and Nutrient Management Plan Substitute Environmental Document, Ventura County Watershed Protection District
- Spears Manufacturing Helistop ND, City of Santa Paula
- Scott Street Environmental Assessment, San Francisco Mayor’s Office of Housing
- 2014 Regional Transportation Plan-Sustainable Communities Strategy EIR, Stanislaus County Association of Governments
- 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan-Sustainable Communities Strategy EIR, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
- 2014 Regional Transportation Plan – Sustainability Communities Strategy EIR, Tulare County
- Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan Update EIR, County of Santa Barbara
- Summerland Community Plan Supplemental EIR, County of Santa Barbara
- ARCO Dos Pueblos Pipeline Removal MND, County of Santa Barbara
Danielle Yaconelli

ASSOCIATE BIOLOGIST/FISHERIES BIOLOGIST

Danielle Yaconelli a Fisheries Biologist with Rincon Consultants, where she specializes in California’s coastal watershed ecosystems. She has extensive knowledge of California’s riparian flora and fauna, has experience conducting restoration and monitoring projects, as well as collected data for various endangered and sensitive species. She has experience surveying for and identifying various aquatic species in Ventura County (e.g. Santa Ana sucker, arroyo chub, and three-spine stickleback). Ms. Yaconelli has specific training in survey protocols, habitat requirements, and natural histories of southern California steelhead (steelhead). She assisted in all aspects of funding, implementing, and monitoring grant-funded restoration projects in the riparian corridor. Ms. Yaconelli has assisted with numerous construction monitoring and ecological restoration projects throughout the southern California region.

TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES

- Ms. Yaconelli has experience identifying aquatic riparian species in Santa Barbara, Ventura, and Los Angeles.
- Ms. Yaconelli assisted in relocating aquatic species (including arroyo chub, three-spine stickleback, and steelhead) due to construction and seasonal changes.
- Ms. Yaconelli conducted spawning, presence/absence, and habitat surveys related to endangered steelhead in the Ventura River and Santa Clara River Watersheds.
- Ms. Yaconelli assisted on several projects to remove check dams that were considered steelhead habitat impediments.
- Ms. Yaconelli has experience analyzing water quality (pH, dissolved oxygen, conductivity, temperature, salinity, turbidity) from various fresh-water systems within Santa Clara River Watershed (SCRW) and Ventura River Watershed (VRW) with a hand-held water quality meter that she maintained and calibrated.
- Ms. Yaconelli has experience with boat-based surveys to collect and process invasive quagga mussel samples from Lake Piru and Piru Creek.
- Ms. Yaconelli monitored on several construction projects that have required oversight to avoid impacts to native and sensitive species.

PROJECT EXPERIENCE

Ms. Yaconelli conducted aquatic surveys along Montecito and San Ysidro Creeks to assess steelhead and California red-legged frog habitat/activity, within working areas. Ms. Yaconelli monitored construction to ensure compliance with applicable permits and project avoidance and minimization measures.

Standard Pacific Homes – Cavaletto Tree Farm Housing Project, Santa Barbara, CA (2017–Present)
Ms. Yaconelli assisted with monitoring to avoid and minimize impacts to native oak
trees while construction occurs. Ms. Yaconelli monitored crews working within 5 feet of the tree dripline, assessed impacts to trees that are in proximity to the development, and logged daily activities. She communicated with the foreman of the site to determine when further monitors are needed.

Dockweiler 21 – Dockweiler Residential Development Project, Santa Clarita, CA (2017)
Ms. Yaconelli assisted in conducted a jurisdictional delineation to determine the location and extent of waters and wetlands within the project site potentially subject to the jurisdiction of USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW. Site was also surveyed for riparian habitat, substrate type, and fauna onsite.

Ventura County Watershed Protection District – San Antonio Creek Spreading Grounds Rehabilitation Project, Ojai, CA (2018)
Ms. Yaconelli conducted steelhead spawning surveys in the VRW along San Antonio Creek.

Ms. Yaconelli conducted aquatic surveys along Montecito and San Ysidro Creeks to assess steelhead and California red-legged frog habitat/activity.

Metropolitan Water District – Santa Ana River Expansion Joint Replacement Construction Monitoring Project, Riverside, CA (2017-2018)
Ms. Yaconelli assisted in monitoring along the Santa Ana River. Monitoring included observing dewatering activities, installing exclusionary fencing, and conducting a survey for stranded aquatic species after dewatering was complete.

Ventura County Watershed Protection District – South Branch Arroyo Conejo Channel Wall Repair (2017-Present)
Ms. Yaconelli assisted with monitoring to avoid and minimize impacts to Arroyo Conejo Channel flora and fauna while construction occurs. She assisted with biological surveys for wildlife, baseline water quality sampling, the oversight of diversion construction, and weekly surface water quality monitoring.

Casitas Municipal Water District – Ventura River Basin Monitoring and Research, Ventura, CA (2005-Present)
Ms. Yaconelli assisted in data collection for various riparian surveys in the VRW. Bank/snorkel surveys for fish identification were conducted weekly during steelhead fish passage season at predetermined locations throughout the watershed to assess the size and life history of steelhead observed; quantities and sizes of other species in the locations were also recorded. Spawning surveys were conducted biweekly through VRW at predetermined sites or reaches to identify and count steelhead redds.

Southern California Gas Company – L8109 MP 45309 Emergency Repair, Ventura, CA (2017)
Ms. Yaconelli provided monitoring support before and during Ventura River streambed construction to minimize impacts to species onsite. She assisted in netting and relocating various species (three-spine stickleback and arroyo chub) while client dewatered a portion of the river. Ms. Yaconelli monitored for negative
ecological impacts while machinery altered and graded the streambed.

**California Conservation Corps – Steelhead Specific Surveys Conducted with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and other agencies (2013-2015)**
Ms. Yaconelli assisted CDFW and other agencies (California State Parks, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association) with steelhead specific surveys in the VRW. She aided with presence/absence, spawning, stream habitat typing, stream transects, and pebble count surveys to collect data that will ultimately assist in the recovery of the endangered species.

**California Conservation Corps – Lion Creek Check Dam Removal (2014)**
The CCC partnered with US Forest Service, NOAA Recovery Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, and CDFW to remove Lion Creek Check Dam in the SCRW. The removed barrier created 3.7 miles of accessible steelhead habitat upstream of the project location. Ms. Yaconelli conducted a pre-project snorkel survey to quantify the amount of steelhead in proximity to the project site. She also assisted CDFW in netting steelhead and other fish onsite while electrofishing occurred. Ms. Yaconelli assisted the project manager in aspects of training and managing construction crews, monitoring the project site, and maintaining best management practices to ensure the project remained in compliance.

**United Water Conservation District – Quagga Mussel Monitoring in Lake Piru and Piru Creek, Ventura, CA (2014-Present)**
Ms. Yaconelli assisted in monitoring recruitment and growth of quagga mussels, as well as the population’s impacts to water quality in the SCRW. She assessed the water quality of Lake Piru and Piru Creek with various hand-held water quality meters (Quanta and YSI) and calibrated the meters for every use. HOBO temperature loggers were also deployed, maintained, and downloaded monthly to ensure quality of readings. Ms. Yaconelli was responsible for staging artificial substrate for quagga recruitment and monitoring the growth and recruitment of the mussels. The mussels were then collected and assessed in a lab to determine sizing and recruiting differences between various seasons.

**Casitas Municipal Water District – Water Quality Monitoring in Ventura River, Ventura, CA (2010-Present)**
Ms. Yaconelli assessed water quality at various locations within the VRW monthly as part of an ongoing dataset. She maintained the water quality meter used (including calibration and storage).

**Santa Barbara City Creeks Division – Arroyo Burro Arundo Removal, Santa Barbara, CA (2014-Present)**
Ms. Yaconelli assisted in training and monitoring California Conservation Corps hand-crews in removing invasive *Arundo donax* (Arundo) from Arroyo Burro Creek in Santa Barbara County. The Arundo was removed with hand-tools and chipped onsite to prevent the spread of the invasive vegetation. Ms. Yaconelli monitored the site while crews were working to ensure best management practices were met and no adverse impacts were made to surrounding habitat.
OTHER PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- Ms. Yaconelli assisted lead biologists in surveying the Santa Ana River for Santa Ana Sucker specimen and habitat.
- Ms. Yaconelli assisted with California red-legged frog and tidewater goby presence/absence surveys.
- Ms. Yaconelli coordinated several restoration projects/activities between California Conservation Corps, Camarillo center and other local organizations.
- Ms. Yaconelli assisted in educating local sixth graders about the ecology of the VRW.
- Ms. Yaconelli assisted in applying and received funding for several Federal Restoration Grant Program (FRGP) grants to positively impact steelhead habitat in Ventura and Santa Barbara counties.
- Ms. Yaconelli trained numerous California Conservation Corps staff members in the importance of fisheries restoration and best management practices.
- Ms. Yaconelli has experience implementing permits from California Department of Fish and Wildlife, US Army Corps of Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control Boards.
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Regulatory Framework

The following is a brief summary of the regulatory context under which biological resources are managed at the federal and state levels. A number of federal and state statutes provide a regulatory structure that guides the protection of biological resources. Agencies with the responsibility and regulatory guiding documents for protection of biological resources within the project area include:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (wetlands and other waters of the United States);
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (federally listed species and migratory birds);
- California Department Fish and Wildlife (formerly California Department of Fish and Game) (riparian areas and other waters of the State, state-listed species);
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (waters of the State).

These agencies are responsible for ensuring the implementation of regulations under the following acts and laws:

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
- Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA);
- California Endangered Species Act (CESA);
- Federal Clean Water Act (CWA);
- California Fish and Game Code (CFGC);
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA);
- The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act; and
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

Federal Statutes and Administering Agencies


The Endangered Species Act (ESA; 16 USC § 153 et seq.) provides a program for the conservation of threatened and endangered plants and animals and the habitats in which they are found. The lead federal agencies for implementing ESA are the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The USFWS generally implements the ESA for terrestrial and freshwater species, while the NMFS implements the ESA for marine and anadromous species. The law requires federal agencies, in consultation with the USFWS and/or NMFS, to ensure that actions they authorize, fund, or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat of such species. Further, the ESA prohibits the unauthorized "take" of any listed species of endangered fish or wildlife, as well as the import, export, possession, or sale of listed species or their parts. “Take” is defined to mean to harass, harm (which includes habitat modification), pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct.
Projects that would result in “take” of any federally listed threatened or endangered animal species are required to obtain authorization from the USFWS or NMFS through either Section 7 (interagency consultation with a federal nexus) or Section 10 (Habitat Conservation Plan) of the ESA, depending on whether the project is a “federal action” funded, authorized, or carried out by a federal agency. Threatened and endangered plants receive lesser protection under the ESA; take of listed plants is prohibited only on federal land or if conducted in violation of state law. The permitting process involves an evaluation of whether a project would jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat, and what measures or alternatives would be required to avoid jeopardizing the species.

Clean Water Act and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has authority to regulate activities that discharge fill of material into wetlands or other “waters of the United States.” Perennial and intermittent creeks are considered waters of the United States if they are hydrologically connected to other jurisdictional waters. The USACE also implements the federal policy embodied in Executive Order 11990, which is intended to result in no net loss of wetlands. In achieving the goals of the Clean Water Act, the USACE seeks to avoid and minimize adverse impacts where practicable, and to offset unavoidable adverse impacts, on existing aquatic resources. Any fill of wetlands that are hydrologically connected to jurisdictional waters would require a permit from the USACE prior to the start of work. Typically, when a project involves impacts to waters of the United States, the goal of no net loss of wetland acres or values is met through compensatory mitigation involving the creation or enhancement of similar habitats.

State Water Resources Control Board.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards are responsible for controlling water quality in California. These agencies implement the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and the State’s responsibilities under the Clean Water Act, setting and enforcing standards for water quality, and regulating the discharge of pollutants from point and non-point sources. The SWRCB was additionally authorized to establish water quality guidelines for long range resource planning concerning ground and surface water management and the use of recycled water.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 United States Code [USC] Section 703-711) implements various treaties and conventions between the U.S. and Canada, Japan, Mexico and the former Soviet Union for the protection of migratory birds. Under the Act, taking, killing or possessing migratory birds is unlawful. Unless permitted by regulations, the Act provides that it is unlawful to pursue, hunt, take, capture or kill; attempt to take, capture or kill; possess, offer to or sell, barter, purchase, deliver or cause to be shipped, exported, imported, transported, carried or received any migratory bird, part, nest, egg or product, manufactured or not. According to the Act, a person, association, partnership or corporation which violates the Act or its regulations is guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of up to $500, jail up to six months, or both. Anyone who knowingly takes a migratory bird and intends to, offers to, or actually sells or barter the bird is guilty of a felony, with fines up to $2,000, jail up to two years, or both. (Permissible fines are increased significantly by the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, as amended). The Act should not be construed to prevent states and territories from making or enforcing laws or
regulations not inconsistent with the Act or which give further protection to migratory birds, nests and eggs, if such laws and regulations do not extend open seasons.

The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.

The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668c), enacted in 1940 and amended several times since then, prohibits anyone, without a permit issued by the Secretary of the Interior, from "taking" bald eagles, including their parts, nests, or eggs. The Act provides criminal penalties for persons who "take, possess, sell, purchase, barter, offer to sell, purchase or barter, transport, export or import, at any time or any manner, any bald eagle ... [or any golden eagle], alive or dead, or any part, nest, or egg thereof." The Act defines "take" as "pursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect, molest or disturb." As defined by the act "Disturb" means: “to agitate or bother a bald or golden eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available, 1) injury to an eagle, 2) a decrease in its productivity, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior, or 3) nest abandonment, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior." In addition to immediate impacts, this definition also covers impacts that result from human-induced alterations initiated around a previously used nest site during a time when eagles are not present, if, upon the eagle's return, such alterations agitate or bother an eagle to a degree that interferes with or interrupts normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering habits, and causes injury, death or nest abandonment. A violation of the Act can result in a fine of $100,000 ($200,000 for organizations), imprisonment for one year, or both, for a first offense. Penalties increase substantially for additional offenses, and a second violation of the Act is a felony.

State Statutes and Administering Agencies

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Cal. Water Code § 13000 et seq.) provides for implementation of portions of the federal Clean Water Act by the SWRCB, including issuance of Section 401 Certifications and Section 402 NPDES Permits. Issuance of a Section 401 Certification requires documenting compliance with state water quality standards, including watershed plans, designated beneficial uses, and the total maximum daily load (TMDL) program. The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act requires the regulation of all pollutant discharges, including wastes in project runoff that could affect the quality of the state’s water. Any entity proposing to discharge a waste must file a Report of Waste Discharge with the appropriate RWQCB or SWRCB. The act also provides for the development and periodic reviews of basin plans that designate beneficial uses of California’s major rivers and groundwater basins and establish water quality objectives for those waters. The limits of waters subject to the Porter-Cologne Act are not dependent on federal jurisdiction. The Act regulates discharges that could affect the quality of waters of the state and requires that waste discharge requirements (WDR) be obtained for discharges, including discharges of fill material, that are not otherwise authorized by Section 404 or Section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act.

California Endangered Species Act and Native Plant Protection Act.

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) is intended to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance species designated as endangered or threatened, and their habitat. (CFGC Section 2052). Plants and wildlife designated as threatened or endangered under CESA are listed in 14 CCR Sections 670.2 and 670.5, respectively. CESA directs all state agencies, boards, and commissions to seek to conserve
endangered and threatened species, and to utilize their authority in furtherance of that policy (CFGC Section 2055). Further, CESA emphasizes that state agencies should not approve projects which would jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat essential to the continued existence of those species, if there are reasonable and prudent alternatives available consistent with conserving the species or its habitat that would prevent jeopardy (CFGC Section 2052.1).

CESA provides statutory protection to species listed as threatened or endangered, as well as to species that are candidates for listing. Specifically, the law prohibits the unauthorized take, possession, purchase, sale, or import/export into or out of the State of any CESA-protected species or their parts or products. "Take" is defined specifically in the CFGC (Section 86) to mean "hunt, pursue, catch, capture, or kill," or an attempt to do any such act. However, CDFW may authorize, by permit, the take of endangered, threatened, or candidate species if all of the following conditions are met (CFGC Sections 2081 (b) and (c):

1. The authorized take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity;
2. The impacts of the authorized take are minimized and fully mitigated;
3. The measures required to minimize and fully mitigate the impacts of the authorized take:
   a. Are roughly proportional in extent to the impact of the take on the species;
   b. Maintain the applicant's objectives to the greatest extent possible; and
   c. Are capable of successful implementation;
4. Adequate funding is provided to implement the required minimization and mitigation measures and to monitor compliance with, and the effectiveness of, the measures; and,
5. Issuance of the permit will not jeopardize the continued existence of a state-listed species.

The incidental take of listed species is authorized by CDFG on a discretionary basis. Full mitigation for take of listed species is determined on a project-specific basis, and various combinations of mitigation actions can substantiate a conclusion that the full mitigation standard has been met for a particular project. Generally, full mitigation can be achieved by offsetting the project's incidental take of individuals of the covered species, along with the other direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the species, including habitat loss, such that the covered species continues to survive and thrive after completion of the project and required mitigation.

The CDFW is also responsible for administering the Native Plant Protection Act (NPPA) (CDFG Section s1900 et seq.). The NPPA authorizes the CDFW to establish criteria for determining if a species, subspecies, or variety of native plant is endangered or rare, and provides some protection for listed plants. However, the NPPA is an older statute, pre-dating the CESA, and most of the NPPA's requirements have been integrated into CDFW's procedures for implementing CESA. When CESA was enacted, all plants listed as Endangered under the NPPA were also granted Endangered status under CESA. However, species listed as "Rare" under the NPPA were not correspondingly listed as "Threatened" under CESA at that time. Effective in 2015, CDFW promulgated regulations (14 CCR 786.9) under the authority of the NPPA, establishing that CESA's permitting procedures would be applied to plants listed under the NPPA as "Rare." With this change, there is little practical difference for the regulated public between plants listed under CESA and those listed under the NPPA.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) derives its authority from the CFGC. In addition to administering the CESA, CDFW has additional responsibilities under the CFGC, some of which are summarized below.
California Fish and Game Code sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 describe unlawful take, possession, or destruction of birds, nests, and eggs. Section 3503 prohibits the needless destruction of birds' nests, Section 3503.5 protects all birds-of-prey and their eggs and nests against take, possession, or destruction, and Section 3513 makes it a state-level offense to take or possess birds protected by the federal MBTA. CDFW administers these requirements.

Sections 3511, 4700, 5050, and 5515 of the CFGC designate "Fully Protected" birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians, and fishes, respectively. Fully Protected species may not be taken, except for conservation purposes or in conjunction with an approved Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP). The CESA permitting process cannot be used to authorize take of Fully Protected species, and projects must be designed to avoid incidental take of these species unless an NCCP is in place.

Perennial and intermittent streams and associated riparian vegetation, when present, also fall under the jurisdiction of the CDFW. Section 1600 et seq. of the Fish and Game Code (Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements) gives the CDFW regulatory authority over work within the stream zone (which could extend to the 100-year flood plain) consisting of, but not limited to, the diversion or obstruction of the natural flow or changes in the channel, bed, or bank of any river, stream or lake.

Section 1602 of the CFGC states that it is unlawful for any person to "substantially divert or obstruct the natural flow of, or substantially change or use any material from the bed, channel, or bank of, any river, stream, or lake" without first notifying CDFW of that activity. Thereafter, if CDFW determines and informs the entity that the activity will not substantially adversely affect any existing fish or wildlife resources, the entity may commence the activity. If, however, CDFW determines that the activity may substantially adversely affect an existing fish or wildlife resource, the entity may be required to obtain from CDFW a Streambed Alteration Agreement, which will include reasonable measures necessary to protect the affected resource(s), before the entity may conduct the activity or activities described in the notification. (Fish & G. Code, § 1602). Streambed Alteration Agreements are typically required for activities such as excavation or placement of fill within a stream channel, vegetation clearing, installation (and sometimes operation) of structures that divert the flow of water, installation of culverts and bridge supports, cofferdams for construction dewatering, and bank reinforcement.

Under State law the CDFW is responsible for the conservation, protection, and management of wildlife, native plants, and habitat necessary to maintain biologically sustainable populations. In this trustee capacity, CDFW reviews environmental documents and provides recommendations to lead agencies regarding conservation of biological resources. The CDFW has also developed lists of "Species of Special Concern" (SSC), an advisory sensitivity designation intended to draw attention to species that are not listed as Threatened or Endangered under CESA, but that are experiencing declines or other conservation needs. The purpose of the SSC designation is to:

- Focus attention on animals at conservation risk by CDFW, other State, local and Federal governmental entities, regulators, land managers, planners, consulting biologists, and others;
- Stimulate research on poorly known species; and,
- Achieve conservation and recovery of these animals before they meet CESA criteria for listing as threatened or endangered.
November 7, 2019

Ventura County Watershed Protection District  
800 South Victoria Avenue  
Ventura, CA 93009-1600  
Attention: Mr. Jeff Dorrington

Dear Mr. Dorrington,

The State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water (DDW) received a proposal from the Crestview Mutual Water Company (CMWC) on August 23, 2019 to add a new public water supply well, Well #7, to their existing water supply permit. The proposal included a site map and a report from a licensed engineering geologist. The wells proposed location is within 150 feet of a seepage pit on the neighboring property to the east. The well is approximately 150 feet from a seepage pit to the west of the proposed site and approximately 118 feet from a seepage pit to the east of the proposed site. Due to the inability to meet the minimum setback distance established by Department of Water Resources for drinking water wells and seepage pits, the Division of Drinking Water has evaluated the proposal and makes the following determination.

To address the inadequate separation, CMWC is proposing to drill a well which is 1,400 feet deep and will have a 940-foot cement grout sanitary seal. A well which meets minimum separation requirements is required to have at least a 50-foot seal. The sanitary seal is proposed to extend below a substantial clay layer in the area. The clay layer acts as a barrier for vertical migration of contaminants.

There are two existing wells near the proposed Well #7 site. Below is a description of the existing wells which are drilled through and have pumped or are pumping water from beneath this clay strata. Existing water quality demonstrates this is an effective barrier.

Crestview Mutual Water Company Well 4 is approximately 1,500 feet east of the proposed site on the same street and is located between and adjacent to two residential parcels. The well completion report describes Well 4 as 903 feet deep and having a 35-foot sanitary seal. It further describes the well as sealed off from strata 0-575 feet below the surface to protect against pollution. The well is routinely sampled for coliforms and nitrate prior to treatment. Total coliforms are rarely detected and there have been no fecal coliform detections. Nitrate is required to be sampled annually and a review of results...
back to the 1990s shows the well had one detection at 0.1 mg/L as N. The rest of the samples were non-detect for nitrate.

Crestview Mutual Water Company’s Well 3 was drilled in 1966 approximately 600 feet west of the proposed Well 7 site and is currently inactive. The well is also located between two residential lots. It is 1,393 feet deep, was constructed with a 75-foot sanitary seal and the highest perforation is located at 1000 feet. The well completion report also describes a significant clay layer above the well’s perforations. When the well was active between 1994 and 2004, it was sampled annually for nitrate and it was always below the detection limit of 0.4 mg/L. Bacteriological sampling shows the well was very rarely total coliform positive and never fecal coliform positive.

Well completion reports for Wells 3 and 4, which are to the west and east of the proposed wells site respectively, provide good information on the subsurface strata. The existing well’s proximity to the proposed well site strongly suggest the same subsurface features exist at the proposed location. Additionally, a certified geologist, reports the subsurface features will be effectively utilized when constructing the new well to protect it against nearby contaminating activities, specifically the adjacent seepage pits.

After assessing the proposed location and construction of Well #7, the Division of Drinking Water has determined that its proposed construction provides the same level of public health protection as if the well were 150 feet from a seepage pit and had a 50-foot seal. DDW will require Crestview Mutual Water Company to monitor water quality for nitrate and coliforms at an increased frequency to further demonstrate the well’s construction is protective of public health.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Jeff Densmore at jeff.densmore@waterboards.ca.gov or 805.566.1326.

Sincerely,

Jeff Densmore, P.E., District Engineer
Santa Barbara District
Division of Drinking Water
State Water Resources Control Board

cc: Robert, Eranio, Crestview Mutual Water Company
    Rebecca Lustig, Ventura County EHD
Well #7 Capital Project

Cultural Resources Assessment Report

prepared for
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Executive Summary

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) was retained by the Crestview Mutual Water Company to perform a cultural resources assessment for the Well #7 Capital Project (project) in Camarillo, Ventura County, California. The purpose of this report is to document the tasks conducted by Rincon; specifically, a cultural resources records search, Native American outreach, local historic group consultation, and a field survey. This study has been completed in accordance with the requirements of a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)-Plus investigation, which includes an evaluation of project impacts under CEQA, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and the National Environmental Policy Act in the case that a federal nexus (i.e., federal funding and/or permitting) is established during the course of the project.

Based on the results of the records search, Native American outreach, local historic consultation, and field survey, no cultural resources (prehistoric or historic) were identified within the project’s area of potential effects. Therefore, Rincon recommends a finding of no effect to historic properties under Section 106 of NHPA and no impact to historical resources under CEQA. No further cultural resources work is recommended for the current project.

Rincon presents the following recommendations in case of unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources or human remains during project development.

Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources

If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area must halt and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (National Park Service 1983) should be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If the discovery proves to be significant under NHPA and/or CEQA, additional work such as data recovery excavation and Native American consultation may be warranted to avoid any significant impacts.

Human Remains

The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities. If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD has 48 hours from being granted site access to make recommendations for the disposition of the remains. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the land owner shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from subsequent disturbance.
1 Introduction

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) was retained by the Crestview Mutual Water Company (Crestview) to perform a cultural resources assessment for the Well #7 Capital Project (project) in Camarillo, Ventura County, California. The purpose of this report is to document the tasks conducted by Rincon; specifically, a cultural resources records search, Native American outreach, local historic group consultation, and a field survey. Rincon understands that the project is subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

1.1 Project Description

Crestview is a mutually owned water company that provides domestic water services almost exclusively to residential customers. Crestview’s service area includes a portion of unincorporated Ventura County as well as a portion of the city of Camarillo. Crestview serves an area of approximately 1,835 square miles with 618 water service connections.

In 1995, water supply production from Well #5 began to serve daily water demands within Crestview’s service area. Shortly after production commenced, water quality at Well #5 started to decline. Between 1996 and 2003, Crestview investigated the source of the poor water quality at Well #5 and explored options to treat the water or eliminate the source of contamination. None of the treatment or well improvement options proved feasible, and in late 2007, Well #5 was placed on stand-by.

The proposed project involves the construction and operation of Well #7 to replace Well #5, which would be abandoned, thereby addressing these water supply and water quality considerations. Well #5 would be destroyed in place by sealing the well with cement and gravel, and cutting off the well head underground. All other water supply infrastructure currently present at the Well #5 site would be left in place and would continue their current operations.

The proposed project would involve drilling Well #7 and constructing a roll-apart pump house building with a coiling door to enclose it. In addition to Well #7 and the pump house, the project would include site preparation, laying of foundations for appurtenant structures, installation of pipelines, tanks, pumps, and equipment, and paving and landscaping of disturbed areas.

1.2 Project Location

The project area is situated within a residential neighborhood in unincorporated Ventura County and encompasses two discontinuous areas, both of which lie within Township 2 north, Range 21 west, and Section 22 of the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Camarillo, CA 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle (Figure 1). The Well 5 site is located at 602 Valley Vista Drive and consists of a 0.25-acre water treatment facility. The Well 7 site is located at 191 Alviso Drive and consists of an undeveloped lot approximately 0.56-acre in size (Figure 2). The coordinates for Well 5 are 34°14’47.14” N, 119°03’43.68” W, and are 34°14’32.54” N, 119°04’29.82” W for Well 7.
1.3 Area of Potential Effects

The project area of potential effect (APE) is defined in 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800.16(d) as the “geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such property exists.” The APE generally depicts all areas expected to be affected by the proposed project, including construction and staging areas. Project development at Well #5 would be limited to sealing the well head. Development for Well #7 would include drilling of the well, installation of the pump house and appurtenant structures, and construction of the security wall. Construction staging and materials storage would occur on-site. As defined for this project, the APE encompasses the entire Well #5 and Well #7 project sites, a total of 0.81-acre.

The APE must additionally be considered as a three-dimensional space and as such, includes the vertical depth of ground disturbance associated with the project. The maximum depth of proposed ground disturbance is associated with the drilling of Well #7, which would involve the excavation of a 28 inch (71 centimeter) hole to a depth of 1,400 feet (427 meters). Foundations for the emergency generator enclosure and chemical storage facility would require excavation to a depth of approximately 1 foot (30 centimeters), and the foundation of the pump house would require excavation to a depth of approximately 2 feet (61 centimeters). Installation of tie-ins to the existing water pipelines would require construction via open trench to a maximum depth of approximately 8 feet (2.4 meters). Therefore, the vertical extent of the APE would be 8 feet (2.4 meters) in depth, with the exception of Well #7 itself, which would be 1,400 feet (427 meters) in depth. No indirect effects (i.e., visual, auditory, or atmospheric) are anticipated for the project.

1.4 Personnel

Rincon Archaeologist and Principal Investigator Tiffany Clark, PhD, Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) provided management oversight for this cultural resources study. Dr. Clark meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for prehistoric and historic archaeology (National Park Service [NPS] 1983). Archaeologist Meagan Szromba, MA, RPA assisted with the Native American outreach, performed the field surveys, and is the primary author of this report (Appendix A). Archaeologist Tricia Dodds, MA, RPA, performed the cultural resources records search. Architectural Historian Rachel Perzel conducted the local historic group consultation. Geographic Information Systems Analyst Jon Montgomery prepared the figures found in this report. Principal Jennifer Haddow, PhD, reviewed this report for quality control.
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**Figure 1 Project Location Map**

Imagery provided by National Geographic Society, Esri and its licensors © 2018. Comarillo Quadrangle, T02N R21W S22. The topographic representation depicted in this map may not portray all of the features currently found in the vicinity today and/or features depicted in this map may have changed since the original topographic map was assembled.
Figure 2 APE Map
This section includes a discussion of the applicable state and local laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards governing cultural resources that should be adhered to before and during implementation of the proposed project.

### 2 Federal Regulations

#### 2.1 Cultural Resources

The proposed project is considered a federal undertaking due to the potential for federal funding and is subject to Section 106 of NHPA. Section 106 applies when a project, activity, or program is funded in whole or in part under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of a federal agency, including those carried out by or on behalf of a federal agency; those carried out with federal financial assistance; and those requiring a federal permit, license or approval. Cultural resources are considered during federal undertakings chiefly under Section 106 of NHPA of 1966 (as amended) through one of its implementing regulations, 36 CFR 800 (Protection of Historic Properties), as well as the National Environmental Policy Act. Properties of traditional, religious, and cultural importance to Native Americans are considered under Section 101 (d)(6)(A) of NHPA, and Section 106 36 CFR 800.3-800.10. Other federal laws include the Archaeological Data Preservation Act of 1974, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1989, among others.

Section 106 of NHPA (16 United States Code 470f) requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings (36 CFR 800.1). Under Section 106, the significance of any adversely affected historic property is assessed and mitigation measures are proposed to reduce any impacts to an acceptable level. Historic properties are those significant cultural resources that are listed in or are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) per the criteria listed below (36 CFR 60.4):

The quality of significance in American, state, and local history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and meet one or more of the following criteria:

- **a.** Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history
- **b.** Are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past
- **c.** Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of installation, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction
- **d.** Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

Ordinarily, cemeteries, birthplaces, or graves of historic figures; properties owned by religious institutions or used for religious purposes; structures that have been moved from their original locations; reconstructed historic buildings; and properties that are primarily commemorative in nature are not considered eligible for the NRHP, unless they satisfy certain conditions. In general, a resource must be 50 years of age to be considered for the NRHP, unless it satisfies a standard of exceptional importance.
2.2 State Regulations

2.2.1 Cultural Resources

CEQA requires a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on historical resources (Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 21084.1) or tribal cultural resources (PRC Section 21074[a][1][A]-[B]). A historical resource is a resource listed, or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); a resource included in a local register of historical resources; or an object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[a][1-3]).

A resource shall be considered historically significant if it meets any of the following criteria:

1) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage
2) Is associated with the lives of persons important to our past
3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values
4) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

Generally, a cultural resource must be at least 50 years of age to be considered for listing on the CRHR. Resources that have achieved significance within the past 50 years may also be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR, provided that enough time has lapsed to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource (Office of Historic Preservation N.d.:3).

In addition, if it can be demonstrated that a project will cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that resources cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (PRC Section 21083.2[a], [b]).

PRC Section 21083.2(g) defines a unique archaeological resource as an artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it meets any of the following criteria:

1) Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information
2) Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type
3) Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person

As of July 1, 2015, California Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) was enacted and expands CEQA by defining a new resource category called tribal cultural resources (TCRs). AB 52 establishes that “a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a TCR is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (PRC Section 21084.2). It further states that the lead agency shall establish measures to avoid impacts that would alter the significant characteristics of a TCR, when feasible (PRC Section 21084.3).

PRC Section 21074(a)(1)(A) and (B) defines TCRs as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” and meets either of the following criteria:

1) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources, as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k)
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2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of PRC 5024.1. In applying these criteria, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes regarding TCRs. The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be certified. Under AB 52, lead agencies are required to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” Native American tribes to be included in the process are those that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency. However, because the proposed project is Categorically Exempt from analysis under CEQA, AB 52 consultation is not required.
3 Setting

The APE is located within Ventura County at an approximate elevation of 177 feet (54 meters) above mean sea level and 10 miles (16 kilometers) from the Pacific Coast. None of the surrounding area retains its natural setting, with the APE located in a residential area characterized by single-family homes. Vegetation within the vicinity of the APE consists of ornamental trees, including low ground cover and succulents, consistent with urban environmental settings. The area has been occupied continuously from prehistory through the present.

3.1 Prehistoric Setting

During the latter half of the twentieth century, many archaeologists developed chronological sequences to explain prehistoric cultural changes within all or portions of southern California (c.f., Moratto 1984; Jones and Klar 2007). Wallace (1955, 1978) devised a prehistoric chronology for the southern California coastal region based on early studies and focused on data synthesis that included four horizons: Early Man, Milling Stone, Intermediate, and Late Prehistoric. Though initially lacking the chronological precision of absolute dates (Moratto 1984), Wallace's (1955) synthesis has been modified and improved using thousands of radiocarbon dates obtained by southern California researchers over recent decades (Koerper and Drover 1983; Koerper et al. 2002; Byrd and Raab 2007). The prehistoric chronological sequence for southern California presented below is a composite based on Wallace (1955, 1978) as well as later studies, including Koerper and Drover (1983).

3.1.1 Early Man Horizon (10,000 – 6000 BCE)

Numerous pre-8000 Before Common Era (BCE) sites have been identified along the mainland coast and Channel Islands of southern California (c.f., Moratto 1984; Erlandson 1991; Rick et al. 2001; Johnson et al. 2002; Jones and Klar 2007). The Arlington Springs site on Santa Rosa Island produced human femurs dated to approximately 13,000 years ago (Johnson et al. 2002; Arnold et al. 2004). On San Miguel Island, human occupation at Daisy Cave (CA-SMI-261) has been dated to nearly 13,000 years ago and included basketry greater than 12,000 years old, the earliest recorded on the Pacific Coast (Arnold et al. 2004).

Although few Clovis or Folsom style fluted points have been found in southern California (e.g., Erlandson et al. 1987; Dillon 2002), Early Man Horizon sites are generally associated with a greater emphasis on hunting than later horizons. Recent data indicate that the Early Man economy was a diverse mixture of hunting and gathering, including a significant focus on aquatic resources in coastal areas (e.g., Jones et al. 2002) and on inland Pleistocene lakeshores (Moratto 1984). A warm and dry 3,000-year period called the Altithermal began around 6000 BCE. The conditions of the Altithermal are likely responsible for the change in human subsistence patterns at this time, including a greater emphasis on plant foods and small game.

3.1.2 Milling Stone Horizon (6000 – 3000 BCE)

Wallace (1955:219) defined the Milling Stone Horizon as “marked by extensive use of milling stones and mullers, a general lack of well-made projectile points, and burials with rock cairns.” The dominance of such artifact types indicate a subsistence strategy oriented around collecting plant foods and small animals. A broad spectrum of food resources were consumed including small and large terrestrial mammals, sea mammals, birds, shellfish and other littoral and estuarine species, near-shore fishes, and seeds and other plant products (Kennett 2005). Variability in artifact collections over time and from the
Setting

cost to inland sites indicates that Milling Stone Horizon subsistence strategies adapted to environmental conditions (Jones 1996; Byrd and Raab 2007). Lithic artifacts associated with Milling Stone Horizon sites are dominated by locally available tool stone and in addition to ground stone tools such as manos and metates, chopping, scraping, and cutting tools are very common. The mortar and pestle, associated with acorns or other foods processed through pounding, were first used during the Milling Stone Horizon and increased dramatically in later periods (Wallace 1955, 1978; Jones 1996).

3.1.3 Intermediate Horizon (3000 BCE – CE 500)

Wallace’s Intermediate Horizon dates from approximately 3000 BCE – Common Era (CE) 500 and is characterized by a shift toward a hunting and maritime subsistence strategy, as well as greater use of plant foods. During the Intermediate Horizon, a noticeable trend occurred towards a greater adaptation to local resources including a broad variety of fish, land mammals, and sea mammals along the coast. Tool kits for hunting, fishing, and processing food and materials reflect this increased diversity, with flake scrapers, drills, various projectile points, and shell fishhooks being manufactured.

Mortars and pestles became more common during this transitional period, gradually replacing manos and metates as the dominant milling equipment. This change in milling stone technology is believed to signal a transition from the processing and consumption of hard seed resources to the increased reliance on acorns (Jones 1996). Mortuary practices during the Intermediate typically included fully flexed burials oriented toward the west (Wallace 1955).

3.1.4 Late Prehistoric Horizon (CE 500 – Historic Contact)

During Wallace’s (1955, 1978) Late Prehistoric Horizon, the diversity of plant food resources and land and sea mammal hunting increased even further than during the Intermediate Horizon. More classes of artifacts were observed during this period and high quality exotic lithic materials were used for small, finely worked projectile points associated with the bow and arrow. Steatite containers were made for cooking and storage and an increased use of asphalt for waterproofing is noted. More artistic artifacts were recovered from Late Prehistoric sites and larger, more permanent villages supported an increased population size and social structure (Wallace 1955).

According to Warren (1968), the period between CE 500 and Historic contact is divided into three regional patterns. The Chumash Tradition is present mainly in the region of Santa Barbara and Ventura counties; the Takic or Numic Tradition is present mainly in the Los Angeles and Orange Counties region; and the Yuman Tradition is present mainly in the San Diego region. The seemingly abrupt changes in material culture, burial practices, and subsistence focus at the beginning of the Late Prehistoric horizon are considered the result of a migration to the coast of peoples from inland desert regions to the east; however, the Chumash were not assimilated or replaced and retained cultural identity. A wealth of ornaments, ceremonial, and artistic items characterize the Chumash Tradition (Warren 1968) and characteristic mortuary practices included burial in crowded cemeteries. Burials are normally flexed, placed face down, and oriented toward the north or west (Warren 1968:5).

3.2 Ethnographic Context

The APE lies within Chumash ethnographic territory, which extends along the coast of southern and central California, as well as interior regions and the northern Channel Islands. The Chumash spoke six closely related Chumashan languages, which have been divided into three branches—Northern Chumash (consisting only of Obispeño), Central Chumash (consisting of Purisimeño, Ineseño, Barbareño, and Ventureño), and Island Chumash (Jones and Klar 2007:80). The APE is within an area historically occupied by the Ventureño Chumash, so called after their historic period association with Mission San...
Buenaventura (Grant 1978). Groups neighboring Chumash territory included the Salinan to the north, the Southern Valley Yokuts and Tataviam to the east, and the Gabrieliño (Tongva) to the south.

Coastal Chumash lived in hemispherical dwellings made of willow branches, with whale bone and tule reed mats reinforcing the roof; these dwellings housed as many as 50 people (Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians 2009). The Chumash are well-known for their wooden plank canoe, or tomol. The tomol was an especially important tool for the procurement of marine resources and for maintaining trade networks between Coastal and Island Chumash. The village of Muwu, at Point Mugu, was visited by Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo in 1542 and referred to as Pueblo de las Canoas after the numerous canoes they encountered. Other Chumash sites in the region included Lalimanux at the base of the Conejo Grade and Hipuk at Westlake Village (Sampson 2017).

Sea mammals were hunted from tomols with harpoons, while deep-sea fish were caught using nets and hooks and lines. Shellfish were gathered from beaches using digging sticks, and mussels and abalone were pried from rocks using wood or bone wedges. In addition to marine resources, the acorn was an especially important resource for the Chumash. Acorn procurement and processing involved the manufacture of baskets for gathering, winnowing, and cooking, and the production of mortars and milling stones for grinding. At interior sites, the Chumash decorated natural caves with art, including depictions of human and animal figures with charcoal and later natural pigments (Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians 2009). The Chumash also manufactured various utilitarian and non-utilitarian items. Eating utensils, ornaments, fishhooks, harpoons, effigies, and other items were made using bone, stone and shell. Olivella shell beads were especially important for trade.

The Chumash were heavily affected by the arrival of Europeans. The Spanish missions and later Mexican and American settlers dramatically altered traditional Chumash lifeways. Chumash population was drastically reduced by the introduction of European diseases. However, many descendants of the Chumash still live in the region and a cultural revitalization has been ongoing since the 20th century (Glassow et al. 2007).

### 3.3 History

The post-contact history of California is generally divided into three time spans: the Spanish period (1769 – 1821), the Mexican period (1821 – 1848), and the American period (1848 – present). Each of these periods is briefly described below.

#### 3.3.1 Spanish Period (1769 – 1821)

Spanish exploration of California began when Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo led the first European expedition into the region in 1542. For more than 200 years after his initial expedition, Spanish, Portuguese, British, and Russian explorers sailed the California coast and made limited inland expeditions, but they did not establish permanent settlements (Bean 1968; Rolle 1987). In 1769, Gaspar de Portolá and Franciscan Father Junípero Serra established the first Spanish settlement in what was then known as Alta (upper) California at Mission San Diego de Alcalá. This was the first of 21 missions erected by the Spanish between 1769 and 1823. Mission San Buenaventura was founded in 1782, and it was during this time that initial Spanish settlement of the project vicinity began.

#### 3.3.2 Mexican Period (1821 – 1848)

The Mexican Period commenced when news of the success of the Mexican War of Independence (1810 – 1821) against the Spanish crown reached California in 1822. This period saw the privatization of mission lands in California with the passage of the Secularization Act of 1833. This act federalized mission lands and enabled Mexican governors in California to distribute former mission lands to individuals in the form of land grants. Successive Mexican governors made approximately 700 land grants between 1833 and
1846 (Shumway 2007), putting most of the state’s lands into private ownership for the first time. About 20 land grants (ranchos) were located in Ventura County. In 1847, a portion of land known as Rancho Calleguas was granted to Jose Ruis in the area that is now Camarillo.

The Mexican Period for Ventura County and adjacent areas ended in early January 1847. Mexican forces fought combined U.S. Army and Navy forces in the Battle of the San Gabriel River on January 8 and in the Battle of La Mesa on January 9 (Nevin 1978). American victory in both of these battles confirmed the capture of Los Angeles by American forces (Rolle 2003). On January 10, leaders of the Pueblo of Los Angeles surrendered peacefully after Mexican General Jose Maria Flores withdrew his forces. Shortly thereafter, newly appointed Mexican Military Commander of California Andrés Pico surrendered all of Alta California to U.S. Army Lieutenant Colonel John C. Fremont in the Treaty of Cahuenga (Nevin 1978).

### 3.3.3 American Period (1848 – Present)

The American Period officially began with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, in which the United States agreed to pay Mexico $15 million for the conquered territory, including California, Nevada, Utah, and parts of Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Wyoming. Settlement of southern California continued to increase during the early American Period. Many ranchos in the county were sold or otherwise acquired by Americans, and most were subdivided into agricultural parcels or towns.

The discovery of gold in northern California in 1848 led to the California Gold Rush (Guinn 1976; Workman 1935:26). By 1853, the population of California exceeded 300,000. Ventura County was officially divided from Santa Barbara County on January 1, 1873. Thousands of settlers and immigrants continued to move into the state, particularly after the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 and the real estate boom of the 1880s (Dumke 1944). The Saugus to Santa Barbara Branch (or Santa Paula Branch) of the Southern Pacific Railroad was constructed in the mid-1880s, encouraging travel through and settlement of the Santa Clara River Valley, as well as a large distribution network for its citrus and other products (Sperry 2006). Brothers Juan and Adolfo Camarillo are credited with establishing the Camarillo area, after they obtained the Rancho Calleguas land grant and changed its name.
4 Background Research

4.1 Cultural Resources Records Search

On September 6 and 18, 2018, Rincon conducted records searches of the California Historical Resources Information System for the project at the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) located at California State University, Fullerton. The searches were conducted to identify any previously recorded cultural resources and previously conducted cultural resources studies within the APE and a 0.5-mile radius surrounding it. Rincon additionally conducted a review of the NRHP, the CRHR, and the Historic Resources Inventory, as well as a review of all available historical maps and aerial photographs (Appendix B).

The SCCIC records search identified no previously documented cultural resources within the APE (Table 1). One cultural resource (P-56-153098) has been recorded within a 0.5-mile radius of the APE on the south side of Valley Vista Drive approximately 200 feet (61 meters) northeast of Marine View Drive. The wooden utility pole was recommended ineligible for listing on the NRHP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Number</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recorder(s) and Year(s)</th>
<th>NRHP/CRHR Eligibility Status</th>
<th>Relationship to APE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-56-153098</td>
<td>Historic structure</td>
<td>Wood utility pole</td>
<td>Brent D. Johnson 2014</td>
<td>Not eligible for NRHP; not evaluated for CRHR</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Relationship to APE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VN-00312</td>
<td>Lopez, Robert</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td><em>An Archaeological Reconnaissance of Eighty-three Acres within the Unincorporated Area of Ventura County, California, known as Las Posas Estates (tt-2706)</em></td>
<td>Within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-00750</td>
<td>Lopez, Robert</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td><em>An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the 202.5 Acres of the Proposed Rancho Las Posas Groves, Ventura County, California</em></td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Background Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Relationship to APE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VN-01003</td>
<td>MacFarlane, Heather</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Survey for 365 Valley Vista, Camarillo</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-01010</td>
<td>Callison, Sheila</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Survey Data Sheet: Pm-3277</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-01410</td>
<td>Briuer, Frederick L.</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Assessment of the Archaeological Impact Revolon-Beardsley Projects</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-02525</td>
<td>Wlodarski, Robert J.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>A Phase I Archaeological Study for Tentative Tract 5725 the Proposed Subdivision of a 57.15-acre Property in Camarillo Hills, County of Ventura, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-02857</td>
<td>Harper, Caprice</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Proposed Las Posas Transmission Main Project, Ventura County, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-03205</td>
<td>Bonner, Diane</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for the Proposed AT&amp;T Mobility LLC Site SBV001 (Vista Del Cima and Via Con Dios) located at 380 ½ Valley Vista Drive, Camarillo, Ventura County, California</td>
<td>Outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APE: Area of Potential Effects
Source: South Central Coastal Information Center 2018

### 4.1.1 Historic Imagery Review

A review of historical aerial photographs (NETRonline 2018) determined that the portion of the APE associated with Well #5 facility was not developed until the 1990s. Thus, all of the structures within the APE are less than 50 years old and do not require management consideration as potential historic properties under NHPA or historical resources under CEQA. The portion of the APE that encompasses the Well #7 site has never been developed, but contained an orchard from approximately 1967 to 1980.

### 4.2 Native American Outreach

Rincon assisted in Native American consultation efforts as part of the Section 106 process. Towards this end, Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on September 7 and 12, 2018 to request Sacred Lands File (SLF) searches of the APE and a 0.5-mile radius surrounding it. As part of this request, Rincon asked the NAHC to provide a list of Native American groups and/or individuals culturally affiliated with the area who may have knowledge of cultural resources within the APE. The NAHC responded on September 11 and 17, 2018, respectively, stating that the results of the SLF searches were negative. Rincon sent letters to the NAHC-listed contacts on September 21, 2018 and followed up with contacts by telephone on October 10, 2018 (Appendix C).

On October 10, 2018, Patrick Tumamait of the Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians stated that if any inadvertent discoveries were made during project construction, he would like to be notified.
On October 10, 2018, Mia Lopez of the Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation asked for the outreach letter to be sent to her via email; Rincon sent the correspondence on the same day. No additional response has yet been received from Ms. Lopez.

On October 10, 2018, Eleanor Arrellanes of the Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians stated that she would review the letter and would respond if she had any comments or concerns. No additional response has yet been received from Ms. Arrellanes.

On October 15, 2018, Freddie Romero, on behalf of Chairperson Kenneth Kahn of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians responded asking if local tribes had been notified of the project. Rincon informed him they had, and Mr. Romero deferred all comments to these local groups.

Rincon did not receive any additional responses from Native American contacts as of October 19, 2018.

### 4.3 Local Historic Consultation

On September 21, 2018, Rincon mailed letters to four local historic groups to request input on potential or known historic resources within the APE or vicinity. These groups included: the Pleasant Valley Historical Society, the County of Ventura, the San Buenaventura Conservancy, and the Museum of Ventura County. Rincon followed up with these groups by telephone and email on October 4 and October 8, 2018 (Appendix D).

On September 24, 2018, Joy Todd, President of the Pleasant Valley Historical Society, responded confirming receipt of the letter, and stated that she is unaware of any prehistoric or historic resources in the vicinity of the project area.

On October 7, 2018, Stephen Schafer of the San Buenaventura Conservancy replied via email that the organization was not aware of any cultural resources within the project area.

On October 15, 2018, Ashley Cook, Cultural Heritage Planner with the County of Ventura, replied via email stating that Ventura County is unaware of any historic or paleontological resources, or archaeological reports within the vicinity of the project area.

Rincon did not receive any additional responses from local historic groups as of October 19, 2018.
5 Field Survey

5.1 Methods

On September 19, 2018, Rincon performed a pedestrian field survey of the APE. During the field survey, Rincon examined all exposed ground surfaces for artifacts (e.g., flaked stone tools, tool-making debris, stone milling tools, ceramics, fire-affected rock), ecofacts (marine shell and bone), soil discoloration that might indicate the presence of a cultural midden, soil depressions, and features indicative of the former presence of structures or buildings (e.g., standing exterior walls, postholes, foundations) or historic debris (e.g., metal, glass, ceramics). Ground disturbances such as burrows and drainages were also visually inspected. Transect spacing throughout the survey was no less than 15 meters.

5.2 Results

Results of the field survey indicate that the Well #5 project site is completely developed with infrastructure associated with the former operation of the well (Figure 3). No native ground surfaces were found within the APE. Given the level of development, visibility of the ground surface throughout the survey was zero percent.

The Well #7 site is undeveloped and contains scattered non-native vegetation and mulch material (Figure 4). The project site is sloped downward to the north, where it is lined by a grove of eucalyptus trees and a footpath. Total visibility throughout the survey was approximately 50 percent; visibility was near excellent towards the south and central portions of the survey area, and low visibility downslope along the northern boundary. However, several rodent burrows were present and displaced dirt was examined for cultural material. Some small and fragmented pieces of shell (probably marine) were noted within loose dirt; however, there was no evidence to indicate this shell was associated with cultural activities.

No cultural resources were identified within the APE during the field survey.
Figure 3 Well #5 site, facing west.
Figure 4 Well #7 site, facing northeast.
6 Findings and Recommendations

The results of the cultural resources records search, Native American outreach, local historic group consultation, and field survey did not identify any prehistoric or historic cultural resources within the APE. Ground disturbance associated with the destruction of Well #5 is expected to be limited to the immediate area surrounding the well head; sediments in this area have likely been previously disturbed by well construction and maintenance activities. According to historical aerial photographs, the portion of the APE containing the Well #5 project site was not developed until the 1990s. Thus, all of the structures within the APE are less than 50 years old and do not require management consideration as potential historic properties under NHPA or historical resources under CEQA.

The Well #7 project site contained an orchard until at least 1980 and has never been developed with structures. Proposed excavation associated with the development of Well #7 would involve the installation of pipelines and water treatment facilities, as well as paving and landscaping of the project area to a maximum depth of eight feet below ground surface, with the exception of Well #7, which will be drilled to a depth of 1,400 feet. The former presence of an orchard at this location suggests that surficial sediments within the Well #7 project area may have been previously disturbed to the depths required for the current project construction. Though the drilling of Well #7 is expected to be 1,400 feet below ground surface, it is reasonable to assume that these depths exceed those that would contain cultural resources.

Based on the results of this cultural resources assessment report, Rincon recommends a finding of no effect to historic properties under Section 106 of NHPA and no impact to historical resources under CEQA. No further cultural resources work is recommended for the current project.

Rincon recommends measures in case of unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources or human remains during execution of the current project scope.

Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural Resources

If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area must halt and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (NPS 1983) should be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If the discovery proves to be significant under NHPA and/or CEQA, additional work such as data recovery excavation and Native American consultation may be warranted to avoid any significant impacts.

Human Remains

The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities. If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County Coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD has 48 hours from being granted site access to make recommendations for the disposition of the remains. If the MLD does not make recommendations within 48 hours, the land owner shall reinter the remains in an area of the property secure from subsequent disturbance.
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Meagan Szromba, MA, RPA

ARCHAEOLOGIST – PROJECT MANAGER

Meagan Szromba is an archaeologist and project manager with extensive experience conducting cultural resources studies in California. She has performed a full range of archaeological and historical studies in support of the California Environmental Quality Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Ms. Szromba has a Master’s Degree in Public Archaeology, and has specialized training and experience conducting archaeological technical studies including excavation, mitigation and data recovery, site documentation, site evaluations, monitoring, and surveys.
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- Archaeological Survey Report for the Olive Mill Road Interchange Project, Santa Barbara, California (2018) – Client: City of Santa Barbara
- Archaeological Survey Report for the San Ysidro Road Interchange Project, Santa Barbara, California (2018) – Client: County of Santa Barbara
- Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Ortega Hill Road Geotechnical Investigation, Summerland, California (2018) – Client: SoCalGas
- Cultural Resources Study for the Ararat Homes Project, Los Angeles, California (2018) – Client: Ararat Homes of Los Angeles
- Phase I Cultural Resources Study for the 600 South San Gabriel Project, San Gabriel, California (2018) – Client: City of San Gabriel
- Archaeological Study and Environmental Impact Report for the Walnut Ridge Specific Plan Project, Walnut, California (2018) – Client: City of Walnut
- Extended Phase I/Phase II Archaeological Testing for the Hollister Avenue – State Street Improvements Project, Goleta, California (2018) – Client: County of Santa Barbara
- Cultural Resources Technical Study for the Select by LaTerra Mixed Use Project, Burbank, California (2017) – Client: City of Burbank
- Cultural Resources Analysis for the Shen Residence Project, Rolling Hills, California (2017) – Client: Meyers Nave
- Archaeological Site Update and Mitigation Recommendations for the Gaviota State Park Valve Automation Project, Gaviota State Park, California (2017) – Client: SoCalGas
- Archaeological Resources Technical Study for the Lancaster Warehouse Project, Lancaster, California (2017) – Client: M.M.M. Maxwell Engineering

EDUCATION

MA, Public Archaeology, California State University, Northridge, 2016
BA, Anthropology, California State University, Long Beach, 2013

REGISTRATIONS

Registered Professional Archaeologist, ID#: 41783154
Phase I Archaeological Resources Investigation for the Thacher School Dining Hall Project, Ojai, California (2017) – Client: Thacher School

Cultural Resources Technical Study for the 650 Tank Farm Road Project, San Luis Obispo, California (2017) – Client: City of San Luis Obispo

Cultural Resources Constraints Analysis for the Foxen Canyon Parcel Project, Los Olivos, California (2017) – Client: Thomas J. Motherway

Cultural Resources Analysis for the Maywood Mutual No. 2 Water System Construction Project, Maywood, California (2017) – Client: KEH & Associates


Cultural Resources Investigation for the Palos Verdes Recycled Water Pipelines Project, Palos Verdes Estates and Torrance, California (2017) – Client: MNS Engineers

Phase I Archaeological Resources Evaluation for the Wright Property Remodel Project, Pismo Beach, California (2017) – Client: Ernie Kim Architects

Cultural Resources Technical Study for the Clover Energy Storage and Generation Tie-in Line Project, Lancaster, California (2017) – Client: 8minutenergy

Archaeological Site Testing, Excavation, and Mitigation Planning for the Goleta Extended Phase I Project, Goleta, California (2017) – Client: SoCal Gas

Cultural Resources Investigation for the Civic Center Way Improvements Project, Malibu, California (2017) – Client: Kimley-Horn

Archaeological Study for the Dockweiler Residential Development Project, Santa Clarita, California (2017) – Client: Trevion Investments, LLC


Phase I Archaeological Resources Analysis for the 3720 Broad Street Project, San Luis Obispo, California (2017) – Client: People’s Self-Help Housing

Archaeological Study for the Faith Lutheran Church Project, Carpinteria, California (2017) – Client: Faith Lutheran Church


Cultural Resources Technical Study for the Farms at Malibu Valley Project, Calabasas, California (2017) – Client: Farms at Malibu Valley

Archaeological Resources Technical Study for the 751 West Los Angeles Avenue Project, Simi Valley, California (2017) – Client: Brack Manufacturing

PROJECT EXPERIENCE, CONT’D

Archaeological Testing and Excavation for the Templeton to Atascadero Connector Project, Atascadero, California (2016) – Client: Caltrans

Archaeological Reconnaissance for the Puerco Canyon Project, Malibu, California (2016) – Client: Weintraub Real Estate Group

Phase I Cultural Resources Study for the Belridge and Berrenda Mesa Project, Kern County, California (2016) – Client: SolarCity
• Archaeological Resources Technical Evaluation for the Artesia Live II Project, Artesia, California (2016) – Client: Willdan Engineering
• Cultural Resources Technical Study for the Westpark Community Center Improvements Project, Ventura, California (2016) – Client: City of Ventura
• Archaeological Survey Report for the Cabrillo Boulevard Rail Bridge Replacement Project, Santa Barbara, California (2016) – Client: TY Lin
• Protection Plan for the Old Ridge Route for the Line 2000 Anomaly 7 Repair Project, Angeles National Forest, California (2016) – Client: USDA Forest Service
• Update to County Guidelines for Archaeological Sensitivity Determinations and Permitting Requirements, Ventura, California (2016) – Client: County of Ventura
• Cultural Resources Technical Study for the San Jose State University Science Building Project, San Jose, California (2016) – Client: San Jose State University
• Phase II Archaeological Testing Services for the Orcutt Area Specific Plan Project, San Luis Obispo, California (2016) – Client: Ambient Communities LLC
• Phase II Archaeological Testing and Evaluation of the San Luis Ranch Complex, San Luis Obispo, California (2016) – Client: City of San Luis Obispo
• Cultural Resources Impact Assessment for the Coptic Orthodox Church Project, Chino Hills, California (2016) – Client: City of Chino Hills
• Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Lupe’s Mixed Use Project, Thousand Oaks, California (2016) – Client: Daly Group Inc.
• Cultural Resources Study for the Roosevelt Walker Community Center, Santa Ana, California (2016) – Client: City of Santa Ana
• Archaeological Study for the Shaver Lake Boat Launch Facility Site Improvements Project, Shaver Lake, California (2016) – Client: Blair, Church & Flynn Consulting Engineers, Inc.
• Archaeological Resources Evaluation for the Pothole Trailhead Parking Project, Lake Piru, California (2016) – Client: United Water Conservation District
• Cultural Resources Study for the Avalon Homes Project, Oxnard, California (2016) – Client: City of Oxnard
• Emergency Evaluation and Cultural Resources Mitigation Planning for the Hall Canyon Oil Spill Response, Ventura, California (2016) – Client: Crimson Pipeline
• Archaeological Evaluation for the Vista Pacifica Project, Oxnard, California (2016) – Client: City of Oxnard Housing Department
• Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Cherry Canyon Unauthorized Trail Project, La Cañada Flintridge, California (2016) – Client: City of La Cañada Flintridge
• Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Padres Trail Desilting Basin Project, La Cañada Flintridge, California (2016) – Client: City of La Cañada Flintridge
• Cultural Resources Investigation for the Widening of Willow Avenue Project, Clovis, California (2016) – Client: Blair, Church & Flynn Consulting Engineers, Inc.
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SENIOR ARCHAEOLOGIST/PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

Tiffany Clark is a Senior Archaeologist/Project Manager with Rincon Consultants. She has over 20 years of experience in cultural resource management in California, Arizona, and New Mexico. Her professional experience includes all phases of survey, excavation, laboratory analysis, research design, report preparation, construction monitoring, Native American consultation, and project management. She has prepared numerous technical reports and environmental documents for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and Section 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Dr. Clark is a member of the Register of Professional Archaeologists and exceeds the Secretary of Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in Archaeology.

DETAILED PROJECT EXPERIENCE

**Coachella Valley Water District Groundwater Replenishment Project, City of Palm Desert, Riverside County.** Role: Project Archaeologist. Rincon was contracted by the Coachella Valley Water District to provide cultural and paleontological services per the project’s Mitigation and Monitoring Program. Dr. Clark was responsible for supervising the preparation of an archaeological monitoring plan, archaeological sensitivity training, and archaeological spot checking for the Phase 1 portion of the project.

**Coachella Valley Water District, Westside School Water Consolidation Project, Thermal, Riverside County.** Role: Principal Investigator. The Coachella Valley Water District is proposing the construction and installation of an extension of a domestic water mainline located near the Westside School in the community of Thermal. Rincon was contracted to conduct a cultural resource assessment for the project. Dr. Clark was responsible for supervising the record search, Native American outreach, pedestrian survey, and preparation of a technical report.

**San Bernardino County Distribution System Infrastructure Protection Program for the Metropolitan Water District, San Bernardino County.** Role: Senior Archaeologist. Supervised an archaeological assessment for the Project that included literature review and record searches, a Phase I survey, and preparation of a technical report and mitigation measures for the Metropolitan Water District water distribution infrastructure project.

**Orange County Distribution System Infrastructure Protection Program for the Metropolitan Water District, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties.** Role: Senior Archaeologist. Supervised an archaeological assessment for the Project that included literature review and record searches, a Phase I survey, Phase II testing, and preparation of a technical report and mitigation measures for the Metropolitan Water District water distribution infrastructure project.

**Sycamore Canyon Business Park Buildings 1 and 2, Riverside County.** Role: Principal Investigator and Project Manager. Supervised a Phase I survey and Phase II evaluation study in support of a proposed warehouse development in the City of Riverside. Work...
efforts involved the significance evaluation of three prehistoric bedrock milling sites located within the Project area, development and implementation of a focused cultural landscape study, preparation of an archaeological monitoring plan, 3-dimensional modeling of bedrock milling features, and a protein residue study. The Project was conducted in compliance with CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

Sidewalk Improvement Project, City of Riverside, Riverside County, California. Role: Principal Investigator. The City of Riverside, in conjunction with the Caltrans District 8, proposed sidewalk improvements in three residential areas within the City of Riverside. Dr. Clark supervised cultural resource records searches and literature reviews; archival research; reconnaissance surveys; Native American consultation and coordination; coordination with local and federal agencies; and preparation of Area of Potential Effect Maps, Archaeological Survey Report, and Historic Properties Survey Report. The Project was conducted in compliance with CEQA and Section 106 of the NHPA.

City of Pasadena Water and Power, Azusa Hydroelectric Project, City of Azusa, Los Angeles County. Role: Principal Investigator and Project Manager. Responsible for conducting cultural resources studies in support of a conduit exemption application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Dr. Clark coordinated with the USDA Forest Service to delineate the Project’s Area of Potential Effect and supervised archaeological and historical background research, communication with Native American tribal representatives, a pedestrian survey of the APE, documentation of identified cultural resources, and significance evaluations of cultural resources associated with the Azusa Conduit.

ADDITIONAL PROJECT EXPERIENCE

TECHNICAL STUDIES

- City of Coachella and California Department of Transportation, District 8 – State Route 86/Avenue 50 New Interchange Project, City of Coachella, Riverside County
- California Department of Transportation, Interstate-10 Corridor Project, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties
- City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and Bureau of Engineering – Sixth Street Park, Arts, River & Connectivity Improvements Project, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County
- California Army National Guard – Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base Buried Site Testing Program, Orange County
- Terra Verde Group – Tapestry Specific Plan Project, City of Hesperia, San Bernardino County, Environmental Document CEQA Assistance Open Services, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District
- California Energy Commission – Amended Carlsbad Energy Center Project, City of Carlsbad, San Diego County
- San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), Interstate 10 Eastbound Truck Climbing Lane Improvement Project, San Bernardino and Riverside Counties
- Interstate-10 Corridor Project, Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties
- Los Angeles International Airport Runway 6L-24R Safety Area and Associated Improvements Project, Los Angeles County
- San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, Interstate 215 / University Parkway Interchange Project, City of San Bernardino, San Bernardino County
- California Department of Conservation – Analysis of Oil and Gas Well Stimulation Treatments in California Environmental Impact Report, California (Statewide)
Appendix B

Records Search Results
CHRIS Information Center Records Search Data Sheet

Project Name: Croatan Mutual Water Company
Project Number: 18-06431
Date: 9/16/2018
Information Center: SCCIC
Search Radius: Half Mile: ✓ One Mile: ✓ Other: 
USGS Quadrangle: Camarillo
Public Land Survey System (PLSS): Township: 02N Range: 21W Section: 2423
County: Ventura
Previously Recorded Sites: 

Previous Studies: S

National Register of Historic Places:
California Register of Historical Resources:
California Points of Historical Interest:
California Historical Landmarks List:
Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility:
California Historical Resources Inventory:
Historic Maps: N/A

Copies: Y N
Copies: Y N
Copies: Y N
Copies: Y N
Copies: Y N

Notes:
09:30-10:30
### CHRIS Information Center Records Search Data Sheet

**Project Name:** Crestview Mutual Water Company  
**Project Number:** 18-06-431  
**Date:** 9/18/2018  
**Information Center:** SCCIC  
**Search Radius:** Half Mile: **√**  
**USGS Quadrangle:** Camarillo + Santa Paula  
**Public Land Survey System (PLSS):**  
**County:** Ventura  
**Previously Recorded Sites:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Register of Historic Places:**  
- Copies: Y  

**California Register of Historical Resources:**  
- Copies: Y  

**California Points of Historical Interest:**  
- Copies: Y  

**California Historical Landmarks List:**  
- Copies: Y  

**Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility:**  
- Copies: Y  

**California Historical Resources Inventory:**  
- Copies: Y  

**Historic Maps:** N/A  

**Notes:**

---

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Number</th>
<th>Within Project Site</th>
<th>Adjacent to Project Site</th>
<th>Outside of Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Name:** Cooture
## Resource List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary No.</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Attribute codes</th>
<th>Recorded by</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-56-153098</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Name - Pole #291496E; Resource Name - Vista Del Cima &amp; Via Con Dios / SBV001 (44372)</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Historic</td>
<td>HP11 (Engineering structure)</td>
<td>2014 (Brent D. Johnson, Heritage Preservation Consultants)</td>
<td>VN-03205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Resource Name or #:* Vista Del Cima & Via Con Dios / SBVO01 (44372)

**P2. Location:** □ Not for Publication  □ Unrestricted

- a. County: Ventura
- b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Camarillo  Date: 1981  T 2N; R 21W; ¼ of ¼ of Sec 22; San Bernardino B.M.
- c. Address: 380 ½ Valley Vista Drive  City: Camarillo  Zip: 93010
- d. UTM: Zone: 11;  mE/ mN (G.P.S.)
- e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate) Elevation:
  Parcel #: N/A, Elevation: 121 m (397 ft), N 34° 14' 32.32", W 119° 04' 09.97"

**P3a. Description:** (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)
The resource occupies the south side of Valley Vista Drive, 200 feet northeast of Marine View Drive on an unpaved public right-of-way owned by the County of Ventura, in Tract 50 of Rancho Las Posas, which is an unincorporated area of the city of Camarillo. The property is bounded to the southeast by 380 Valley Vista Drive, a 2.34 acre equestrian property with a single family residence, built circa 1957; to the southwest is Marine View Drive, beyond which is 350 Valley Vista Drive, a 1.0 acre property with a single family residence, built circa 1989; to the west is Valley Vista Drive, beyond which is 365 Valley Vista Drive, a 1.0 acre property with a single family residence, built circa 1955; to the northwest is Valley Vista Drive and on the northwest side of the street is 385 Valley Vista Drive, a 1.01 acre property with a single family residence, built circa 1958, beyond which is the Las Posas Hills Subdivision; to the northeast is 408 Valley Vista Drive, a 2.05 acre property with a single family residence, built circa 1963.

(Continued to page 2)

**P3b. Resource Attributes:** (List attributes and codes) HP11. Engineering Structure

**P4. Resources Present:**  □ Building  □ Structure  □ Object  □ Site  □ District  □ Element of District  □ Other (Isolates, etc.)

**P5a. Photo or Drawing:** (Photo required for buildings, structures, and objects.)

**P5b. Description of Photo:** (View, date, accession #)
View looking northeast at the wood pole and AT&T Mobility facility. Photo taken 2/20/2014.

**P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:**  □ Historic  □ Prehistoric  □ Both
The wood electricity distribution pole, located at 380 ½ Valley Vista Drive, was erected in 1951 according to records on file with the County of Ventura.

**P7. Owner and Address:**
County of Ventura, Public Right of Way
Kimberly Prillhart, Planning Director
800 South Victoria, Avenue L-1740
Ventura, CA 93009

**P8. Recorded by:** (Name, affiliation, and address)
Brent D. Johnson,
Heritage Preservation Consultants
PO Box 80142, RSM CA 92688

**P9. Date Recorded:** 3/16/2014

**P10. Survey Type:** (Describe)
Evaluation of Potential Historic Property

**P11. Report Citation:** None

**Attachments:** □ NONE  □ Location Map  □ Sketch Map  □ Continuation Sheet  □ Building, Structure, and Object Record  □ Archaeological Record  □ District Record  □ Linear Feature Record  □ Milling Station Record  □ Rock Art Record  □ Artifact Record  □ Photograph Record  □ Other (List):
DPR 923A (1/85)

*Required information
Wood poles have a long history in the electrical and communications industries. The number of wood distribution poles in the United States is estimated to range from 110 to 132 million. Trees that are commonly used for wood poles are sturdy species that have a high-density such as a Douglas fir, or shortleaf pine. Factors that affect the strength of the wood include spiral and diagonal grain, knots and knot clusters, damage done by sap stains, insects, bird damage, lightning damage, and decay fungi. The wood poles are air seasoned prior to chemical treatment, or in some cases are sterilized through kiln drying. This process ensures preservative penetration and retention of the creosote or oil-borne preservative.

Most of the wood poles used in Los Angeles and Ventura County originated from the Southern California Edison, Visalia Pole Yard, in Tulare County, California. The fabrication yard was operated by Southern California Edison from 1925 to 1980, producing poles for use in the distribution of electricity throughout its service territory. Western red cedar trees were logged and transported to the yard, debarked, sized, shaped, and chemically preserved. The chemical preservation treatment process consisted of immersion of the wood poles in heated tanks of preservative fluid. SCE used creosote primarily; however, in 1968 the company began using pentachlorophenol (PCP). A solution of pentachlorophenol and diesel (petroleum hydrocarbons) was eventually substituted in the wood preservation process.

The subject transmission pole (#2191496E) is part of Southern California Edison’s 69 kV electricity distribution systems in Camarillo and is sixty-one feet tall with a footing of approximately five feet in depth, and has a circumference of approximately 55 inches at a height of four feet above the ground. A wood pole such as this is typically characterized in terms of three zones, which from top to bottom are: the supply space, which is for electrical transmission; the neutral space—a safe zone for workers; and the communications space, which supports telephone service and cable TV. The top of the subject pole has a static wire, which bleeds lightning surges. Below the static wire are three transmission insulators positioned at 61.4, 58.6, and 55.1 feet above ground level. Several feet below the insulators is a high voltage cross arm for primary phase conductors at a height of 39.8 feet, and below that is another cross arm for secondary phase conductors at a height of 33.9 feet AGL. The primary phase conductors distribute wires and carry electricity from the substations, while the secondary phase conductors bring electricity from the utility pole to the home and have a voltage of 120/240 V. Below the secondary phase conductors is approximately six to seven feet of neutral space, and below that at a height of 21 feet, six-inches, is an AT&T double extension arm that suspends two antenna RCs. Below the antenna mount system is what appears to be two relay racks at approximately 15 feet AGL.

Although the structure has lost its historic configuration or pattern of organization through contemporary modifications to the structure, the appurtenance that is proposed for the wood pole tower is consistent with the original engineering intent of the pole design, which is to distribute power and telecommunications. In addition, the proposed new antenna system design is reversible, and can be removed without altering the historic character of the pole.
**State of California — The Resources Agency**

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

**BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 3 of 7</th>
<th><em>NRHP Status Code</em></th>
<th><em>Resource Name or #</em></th>
<th>Vista Del Cima &amp; Via Con Dios / SBV001 (44372)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**B1.** Historic Name: Pole #291496E

**B2.** Common Name: Same

**B3.** Original Use: Power Transmission Pole

**B4.** Present Use: Same

**B5.** Architectural Style: N/A

**B6.** Construction History: According to records on file with the County of Ventura, the wood transmission pole was erected at its present location in 1951. The existing cellular panel antennas and associated utility boxes attached to the pole were installed in 2005.

**B7.** Moved? ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ Unknown Date: N/A

**B8.** Related Features: N/A

**B9a.** Architect: N/A

**B9b.** Builder: Southern California Edison, Visalia Pole Yard

**B10.** Significance: Theme: Electrification of Camarillo

**Period of Significance:** 1951

**Property Type:** Engineering Structure (Wood Power Distribution Pole)

**Applicable Criteria:** N/A

(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

The original Rancho Las Posas Mexican land grant spanned an area from present day Moorpark to Camarillo, encompassing 26,623 acres. The land was held by the Carillo family from 1834 until 1842, when Jose de la Guerra y Noriega purchased the land for cattle ranching. De la Guerra’s heirs sold the rancho to the Philadelphia and California Petroleum Company in 1870. (Rancho Las Posas, Wiki) However, the modern history of Camarillo began with the small agricultural hamlet of Springville, which in 1880 consisted of a few homes, a livery stable, a blacksmith shop, and a small store with a post office.

In 1887, William T. Fulton purchased one hundred sixty acres, west of what is now Lewis Road, for raising Lima beans, walnuts, and apricots. The arrival of the railroad in the same year, which bypassed the town of Oxnard, lead to the birth of the town of Springville where the new railroad depot was built. Fulton eventually subdivided the land for residential and commercial development between 1910 and 1916, and for a brief period the town was known as Fultonville, until the Southern Pacific railroad named the depot Camarillo. (Cansler, p23)

(See Continuation Sheet, page 4)

**B11.** Additional Resource Attributes: HP11. Engineering Structure

**B12. References:**

Please see Page 5 for a complete list of references.

**B13. Remarks:** None

**B14. Evaluator:**

Brent D. Johnson, Historian
Heritage Preservation Consultants
PO Box 80142
Rancho Santa Margarita CA 92688

**Date of Evaluation:** 3/16/2014

---

(This space reserved for official comments.)
With the new railroad and the development of the Norwegian Grade (1911), which carved a road between the Santa Rosa Valley and Los Angeles, the town of Camarillo prospered. The donation of Don Juan Camarillo of 100 acres of land of the Rancho Calleguas and Los Posas (1927) laid the foundation for St. John’s Seminary, which included a monastic-style chapel, dormitories, and memorial libraries. A few years later, the pioneering Mission Revival-style Camarillo State Hospital (1932) was opened, which would become the locus for the California State University Channel Islands. In 1942, the California State Highway Department constructed a 5,000 foot runway, expanding the original 3,500 foot landing field, which became the Oxnard Air Force Base, and is currently the Camarillo Airport.

The 1950s were transformative in the history of Camarillo. In 1951, 6,000 acres of the Crystal Sugar Company were sold to Mr. E.J. Evans and L.F. Arnold, which were brokered as 140 parcels in the surrounding area. In the same year, the Army Corps of Engineers extended the runway at Oxnard Air Base, rebuilding the Air Force station for joint civilian and military use, attracting both military and commercial aviation enterprise to Camarillo. Then in the mid-1950s the Ventura Freeway was completed from Los Angeles through the Santa Monica Mountains by the Conejo Grade, further encouraging the growth of population in Pleasant Valley and the community Camarillo. The demand for new roads, buildings, and utility infrastructure during the population boom that followed WWII is the context in which the subject electrical transmission system was erected.

Statement of Historic Integrity

In regard to the seven aspects of integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feel and association, the structure on this property has retained its original location. The structure’s setting, feel and association have remained intact since it was erected. The structure’s original materials appear to have been maintained in good condition and the integrity level of the property is good.

National Register of Historic Places Eligibility Evaluation

The property was assessed under the National Register Criterion A for its potential significance as part of an historic trend that may have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history. The relevant historic context of this property is the electrification of Camarillo. The history of the Southern California Edison Company dates to 1896 when a group of business people, including Elmer Peck and George Baker, established the West Side Lighting Company to provide electricity to Los Angeles. In 1897 West Side merged with Los Angeles Edison Electric, which owned the rights to the Edison name and patents in the region, and Baker became the president of the new concern. During this time, Edison Electric installed the first DC-power underground conduits in the Southwest. (Lehman Bros. Collection)

In 1917, Southern California Edison purchased the Pacific Light and Power Corporation, and acquired control of both the Ventura County Power Company and the Mt. Whitney Power Electric Company, becoming the major private supplier of electricity in Southern California. (Water and Power Assoc.) Southern California Edison Company purchased 90.3 shares of preferred and 15.6 shares of common stock of the Ventura County Power Company for the sum of $5,053.95 and the Ventura company transferred all its property and rights to the Edison company provided the Edison company assume all outstanding debts and obligations. (Railroad Commission)

The distribution of electricity in Ventura County and the township of Camarillo not only brought the modern convenience of electric light, but most significantly, it afforded rural farmers the opportunity to refrigerate slaughtered animals, the majority of which were lost to spoilage, particularly during the warmer months.

By May of 1942 Edison had joined with other investor and government-owned utilities in California, southern Nevada, and Arizona to form the Pacific Southwest Pool. The organization provided service to areas suffering power shortages or outages during the duration of World War II. In the post-War period, Edison grew substantially as many industrial and military personnel returned to the Southern California region at a rate of 1,000 per week. Edison installed its one millionth meter in 1951, the same year that the Subject Property was installed. (Lehman Bros. Collection)

Although the subject property does represent a period of unprecedented growth in the history of the city, which placed an unusual demand on the construction of new utility infrastructure, the structure is not significant within the broader context of historical patterns and trends that shaped Camarillo. Neither does it mark an important moment in American history. The building is not an important example of industrial architecture that conveys meaningful information about the economic growth of Camarillo and the Ventura County area at mid-century. Therefore, the property does not appear to qualify for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion A. (Continued on Page 5)
The property was considered under Criterion B for its association with the lives of persons significant in our past. No connection with significant people could be established. Therefore, the property does not appear to qualify for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion B.

The property was evaluated under Criterion C for embodying the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of Modern construction, or representing the work of a master, or possessing high artistic values, or representing a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. The wood pole electrical transmission structure is undifferentiated with respect to millions of other poles that were mass-produced through industrial methods during the time period. The poles were produced without particular regard to craftsmanship or aesthetic value, and the determining characteristics for the production of each pole were based on cost, fatigue load limit, and service life. Therefore, the property does not appear to qualify for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion B.

The property was considered for Criterion D for the potential to yield, or may be likely to yield, information important to prehistory or history. In order for buildings, structures and objects to be eligible under this criterion, they need to "be, or must have been, the principal source of information." The property does not have potential to answer important questions in history or prehistory, which is due to the fact that the structure is not unique in its design or use of materials. Furthermore, there is no archaeological site associated with the property. Therefore, the property does not appear to qualify for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) under Criterion D.

In summary, the property does not appear to qualify for the NRHP under Criterion A, B, C and/or D.

References


*Resource Name or #: Vista Del Cima & Via Con Dios / SBV001 (44372)

*Recorded by: Brent D. Johnson

*Date: 3/16/2014

1. View looking northeast at the subject from Valley Vista Drive
2. View looking southwest at the subject from Valley Vista Drive
3. View looking north at the subject from the utility easement on the east side of Valley Vista Drive
4. View looking at the existing antennas and relay boxes on the subject
5. View looking northeast at the AT&T lease area
6. View of the power pole identification tag

*Required information
*Map Name: Camarillo Quadrangle  
*Scale: 1:15,000  
*Date of Map: 1981  

TOPO map printed on 02/28/14 from "Untitled.tpo"

Project Site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Number</th>
<th>Within Project Site</th>
<th>Adjacent to Project Site</th>
<th>Outside of Project Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32005</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Number</td>
<td>Within Project Site</td>
<td>Adjacent to Project Site</td>
<td>Outside of Project Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2857</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2525</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Name: Crestview 18-06431
Imagery provided by National Geographic Society, Esri and its licensors © 2018.
Camarillo & Santa Paula Quadrangles. TIDN R21W S14,15,22,23. The topographic representation depicted in this map may not portray all of the features currently found in the vicinity today and/or features depicted in this map may have changed since the original topographic map was assembled.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VN-00312</td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Lopez, Robert</td>
<td>An Archaeological Reconnaissance of Eighty-three Acres Within the Unincorporated Area of Ventura County, California, Known As Las Posas Estates (tt-2706).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-00750</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Lopez, Robert</td>
<td>An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the 202.5 Acres of the Proposed Rancho Las Posas Groves, Ventura County, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-01003</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>MacFarlane, Heather</td>
<td>Phase I Archaeological Survey for 365 Valley Vista, Camarillo</td>
<td>MacFarlane Archaeological Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-02525</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Wlodarski, Robert J.</td>
<td>A Phase I Archaeological Study for Tentative Tract 5725 the Proposed Subdivision of a 57.15-acre Property in Camarillo Hills County of Ventura, California</td>
<td>Historical, Environmental, Archaeological, Research, Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-02857</td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Harper, Caprice</td>
<td>Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment for the Proposed Las Posas Transmission Main Project, Ventura County, California</td>
<td>BonTerra Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN-03205</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Bonner, Diane</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Records Search and Site Visit Results for the Proposed AT&amp;T Mobility LLC Site SBV001 (Vista Del Cima and Via Con Dios) located at 380 1/2 Valley Vista Drive, Camarillo, Ventura County, California</td>
<td>WH Bonner and Associates 56-153098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request

Native American Heritage Commission
1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95691
(916) 373-3710
(916) 373-5471 – Fax
nahc@nahc.ca.gov

Information below is required for a Sacred Lands File Search

Project Title: Crestview Well #7 Capital Project

County: Ventura County

USGS Quadrangle Name: Camarillo

Township: 2N Range: 21W Sections: 21, 22

Contact Person: Meagan Szromba

Company/Firm/Agency: Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Street Address: 180 N Ashwood Ave.

City, CA: Ventura, CA Zip: 93003

Phone: (805) 644 4455 Email: mszromba@rinconconsultants.com

Project Description: Rincon understands the project to involve the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7, and the abandonment and destruction of Well #5, located in Camarillo, Ventura County, California.

☒ Section 106 contact list
Sacred Lands File & Native American Contacts List Request
Native American Heritage Commission
1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95691
(916) 373-3710
(916) 373-5471 – Fax
nahc@nahc.ca.gov

Information below is required for a Sacred Lands File Search

Project Title: Crestview Well #7 Capital Project

County: Ventura County

USGS Quadrangle Name: Camarillo and Santa Paula

Township: 2N  Range: 21W  Sections: 14, 15, 22, 23

Contact Person: Meagan Szromba

Company/Firm/Agency: Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Street Address: 180 N Ashwood Ave.

City, CA: Ventura, CA  Zip: 93003

Phone: (805) 644 4455  Email: mszromba@rinconconsultants.com

Project Description: Rincon understands the project to involve the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7, and the abandonment and destruction of Well #5, located in Camarillo, Ventura County, California.

☒ Section 106 contact list
September 11, 2018

Meagan Szromba
Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Sent by Email: mszromba@rinconconsultants.com

Re: Crestview Well #7 Capital Project, Ventura County

Dear Ms. Szromba,

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information you have submitted for the above referenced project. The results were negative. However, the absence of specific site information in the SLF does not preclude the presence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources for cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and/or recorded sites.

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans tribes who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these tribes, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at 916-573-1033 or frank.lienert@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Frank Lienert
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians  
Kenneth Kahn. Chairperson  
P.O. Box 517  
Santa Ynez, CA 93460  
kahn@santaynezchumash.org  
(805) 688-7997  
(805) 686-9578 Fax

Barbarenos/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians  
Raudel Joe Banuelos, Jr.  
331 Mira Flores Court  
Camarillo, CA 93012  
(805) 427-0015

Barbarenos/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians  
Julie Lynn Tumamait-Stenslie. Chair  
365 North Poli Ave  
Ojai, CA 93023  
itumamait@hotmail.com  
(805) 646-6214

Barbarenos/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians  
Patrick Tumamait  
992 El Camino Corto  
Ojai, CA 93023  
(805) 216-1253 Cell

Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation  
Mia Lopez  
24 S. Voluntario Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
mialopez2424@gmail.com  
(805) 324-0135

Barbarenos/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians  
Eleanor Arrellanes  
P.O. Box 5687  
Ventura, CA 93005  
(805) 701-3246

This list is current only as of the date of this document and is based on the information available to the Commission on the date it was produced.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American Tribes with regard to cultural resources assessments for the proposed Crestview Well #7 Capital Project, Ventura County.
September 17, 2018

Meagan Szromba
Rincon

Sent by Email: mszromba@rinconconsultants.com

Re: Crestview Well #7 Capital Project, Ventura County

Dear Ms. Szromba,

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information you have submitted for the above referenced project. The results were negative. However, the absence of specific site information in the SLF does not preclude the presence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources for cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and/or recorded sites.

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans tribes who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these tribes, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at 916-573-1033 or frank.lienert@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Frank Lienert
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians  
Kenneth Kahn. Chairperson  
P.O. Box 517  
Santa Ynez, CA 93460  
kkahn@santaynezchumash.org  
(805) 688-7997  
(805) 686-9578 Fax

Barbarenovo/Venturenno Band of Mission Indians  
Julie Lynn Tumamait-Stenslie. Chair  
365 North Poli Ave  
Ojai, CA 93023  
itumamait@hotmail.com  
(805) 646-6214

Barbarenovo/Venturenno Band of Mission Indians  
Patrick Tumamait  
992 El Camino Corto  
Ojai, CA 93023  
(805) 216-1253 Cell

Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation  
Mia Lopez  
24 S. Voluntario Street  
Santa Barbara, CA 93101  
mialopez2424@gmail.com  
(805) 324-0135

Barbarenovo/Venturenno Band of Mission Indians  
Eleanor Arrellanes  
P.O. Box 5687  
Ventura, CA 93005  
(805) 701-3246

This list is current only as of the date of this document and is based on the information available to the Commission on the date it was produced.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American Tribes with regard to cultural resources assessments for the proposed Crestview Well #7 Capital Project, Ventura County
September 21, 2018

Eleanor Arrellanes
Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians
PO Box 5687
Ventura, California 93005

Subject: Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project,
Camarillo, Ventura County, California

Dear Ms. Arrellanes,

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project (project). The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7, located at 191 Alviso Drive and the abandonment and destruction of Well #5, located at 602 Valley Vista Drive in Camarillo, California (see attached Project Location Map).

The purpose of this letter is to inquire about your knowledge of potential cultural resources within the vicinity that may be impacted by project development. Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area that was returned with negative results. Additionally, a records search was performed of the California Historical Resources Information System for the project which did not identify any cultural resources within the project areas. However, we are aware that the results of the SLF and records search are not exhaustive, and that additional cultural resources may exist within the area.

This project may involve federal funding; thus, this cultural resources study is being prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Rincon is assisting the Crestview Mutual Water Company with their Section 106 consultation effort, and we are writing to provide you with an opportunity to be involved in the Section 106 consultation process. If you or your organization has any knowledge or specific concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area, please respond by telephone at (805) 644 4455 extension 165, or by email at mszromba@rinconconsultants.com. Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are interested in consultation.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Meagan Szromba, MA, RPA
Archaeologist

Attached: Project Location Map
Project Location Map
September 21, 2018

Raudel Joe Banuelos, Jr.
Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians
331 Mira Flores Court
Camarillo, California 93012

Subject: Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project, Camarillo, Ventura County, California

Dear Mr. Banuelos,

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project (project). The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7, located at 191 Alviso Drive and the abandonment and destruction of Well #5, located at 602 Valley Vista Drive in Camarillo, California (see attached Project Location Map).

The purpose of this letter is to inquire about your knowledge of potential cultural resources within the vicinity that may be impacted by project development. Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area that was returned with negative results. Additionally, a records search was performed of the California Historical Resources Information System for the project which did not identify any cultural resources within the project areas. However, we are aware that the results of the SLF and records search are not exhaustive, and that additional cultural resources may exist within the area.

This project may involve federal funding; thus, this cultural resources study is being prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Rincon is assisting the Crestview Mutual Water Company with their Section 106 consultation effort, and we are writing to provide you with an opportunity to be involved in the Section 106 consultation process. If you or your organization has any knowledge or specific concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area, please respond by telephone at (805) 644-4455 extension 165, or by email at mszromba@rinconconsultants.com. Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are interested in consultation.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Meagan Szromba, MA, RPA
Archaeologist

Attached: Project Location Map
September 21, 2018

Kenneth Kahn, Chairperson
Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians
PO Box 517
Santa Ynez, California 93460

Subject: Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project,
Camarillo, Ventura County, California

Dear Chairperson Kahn,

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project (project). The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7, located at 191 Alviso Drive and the abandonment and destruction of Well #5, located at 602 Valley Vista Drive in Camarillo, California (see attached Project Location Map).

The purpose of this letter is to inquire about your knowledge of potential cultural resources within the vicinity that may be impacted by project development. Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area that was returned with negative results. Additionally, a records search was performed of the California Historical Resources Information System for the project which did not identify any cultural resources within the project areas. However, we are aware that the results of the SLF and records search are not exhaustive, and that additional cultural resources may exist within the area.

This project may involve federal funding; thus, this cultural resources study is being prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Rincon is assisting the Crestview Mutual Water Company with their Section 106 consultation effort, and we are writing to provide you with an opportunity to be involved in the Section 106 consultation process. If you or your organization has any knowledge or specific concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area, please respond by telephone at (805) 644 4455 extension 165, or by email at mszromba@rinconconsultants.com. Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are interested in consultation.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Meagan Szromba, MA, RPA
Archaeologist

Attached: Project Location Map
September 21, 2018

Mia Lopez
Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation
24 S. Voluntario Street
Santa Barbara, California 93101

Subject: Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project, Camarillo, Ventura County, California

Dear Ms. Lopez,

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project (project). The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7, located at 191 Alviso Drive and the abandonment and destruction of Well #5, located at 602 Valley Vista Drive in Camarillo, California (see attached Project Location Map).

The purpose of this letter is to inquire about your knowledge of potential cultural resources within the vicinity that may be impacted by project development. Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area that was returned with negative results. Additionally, a records search was performed of the California Historical Resources Information System for the project which did not identify any cultural resources within the project areas. However, we are aware that the results of the SLF and records search are not exhaustive, and that additional cultural resources may exist within the area.

This project may involve federal funding; thus, this cultural resources study is being prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Rincon is assisting the Crestview Mutual Water Company with their Section 106 consultation effort, and we are writing to provide you with an opportunity to be involved in the Section 106 consultation process. If you or your organization has any knowledge or specific concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area, please respond by telephone at (805) 644 4455 extension 165, or by email at mszromba@rinconconsultants.com. Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are interested in consultation.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Meagan Szromba, MA, RPA
Archaeologist

Attached: Project Location Map
Hello Mia,

Attached is the original correspondence for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 project. Please let me know if you need anything else or have any questions.

Best,

Meagan Szromba, MA, RPA
Archaeologist – Project Manager

Rincon Consultants, Inc.
805 644 4455 ext 165
www.rinconconsultants.com

Environmental Scientists Planners Engineers
Ranked 2017 “Best Firm To Work For” – Zweig Group
September 21, 2018

Patrick Tumamait
Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians
992 El Camino Corto
Ojai, California 93023

Subject: Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project, Camarillo, Ventura County, California

Dear Mr. Tumamait,

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project (project). The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7, located at 191 Alviso Drive and the abandonment and destruction of Well #5, located at 602 Valley Vista Drive in Camarillo, California (see attached Project Location Map).

The purpose of this letter is to inquire about your knowledge of potential cultural resources within the vicinity that may be impacted by project development. Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area that was returned with negative results. Additionally, a records search was performed of the California Historical Resources Information System for the project which did not identify any cultural resources within the project areas. However, we are aware that the results of the SLF and records search are not exhaustive, and that additional cultural resources may exist within the area.

This project may involve federal funding; thus, this cultural resources study is being prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Rincon is assisting the Crestview Mutual Water Company with their Section 106 consultation effort, and we are writing to provide you with an opportunity to be involved in the Section 106 consultation process. If you or your organization has any knowledge or specific concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area, please respond by telephone at (805) 644 4455 extension 165, or by email at mszromba@rinconconsultants.com. Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are interested in consultation.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Meagan Szromba, MA, RPA
Archaeologist

Attached: Project Location Map
September 21, 2018

Julie Lynn Tumamait-Stenslie, Chairperson
Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians
365 North Poli Avenue
Ojai, California 93023

Subject: Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project, Camarillo, Ventura County, California

Dear Chairperson Tumamait-Stenslie,

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project (project). The proposed project involves the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7, located at 191 Alviso Drive and the abandonment and destruction of Well #5, located at 602 Valley Vista Drive in Camarillo, California (see attached Project Location Map).

The purpose of this letter is to inquire about your knowledge of potential cultural resources within the vicinity that may be impacted by project development. Rincon contacted the Native American Heritage Commission to request a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area that was returned with negative results. Additionally, a records search was performed of the California Historical Resources Information System for the project which did not identify any cultural resources within the project areas. However, we are aware that the results of the SLF and records search are not exhaustive, and that additional cultural resources may exist within the area.

This project may involve federal funding; thus, this cultural resources study is being prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Rincon is assisting the Crestview Mutual Water Company with their Section 106 consultation effort, and we are writing to provide you with an opportunity to be involved in the Section 106 consultation process. If you or your organization has any knowledge or specific concerns regarding cultural resources in the project area, please respond by telephone at (805) 644 4455 extension 165, or by email at mszromba@rinconconsultants.com. Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are interested in consultation.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Meagan Szromba, MA, RPA
Archaeologist

Attached: Project Location Map
Project Location Map

---
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## Native American Contact Table

### Crestview Water Company Well #7 Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native American Contact</th>
<th>Tribal Affiliation</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Contact Attempt</th>
<th>Follow Up Attempt</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Kahn, Chairperson</td>
<td>Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians</td>
<td>PO Box 517 Santa Ynez, CA 93460</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kkahnsanta@ynezchumash.org">kkahnsanta@ynezchumash.org</a></td>
<td>(805)688-7997</td>
<td>Letter sent September 21, 2018</td>
<td>Call made on October 10, 2018</td>
<td>Left a voice message with Freddie Romero, the tribal representative who handles outreach requests. Mr. Romero called Rincon on October 15, 2018 to confirm if local tribes had been notified of the project; Rincon informed him that they had, and Mr. Romero deferred all comments to these local groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Lynn Tumamait-Stenslie, Chairperson</td>
<td>Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>365 North Poli Avenue Ojai, CA 93023</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.tumamait@hotmail.com">j.tumamait@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>(805)646-6214</td>
<td>Letter sent September 21, 2018</td>
<td>Call made on October 10, 2018</td>
<td>Left a voice message. Did not receive a response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Tumamait</td>
<td>Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>992 El Camino Corto Ojai, CA 93023</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(805)216-1253</td>
<td>Letter sent September 21, 2018</td>
<td>Call made on October 10, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Tumamait stated that if unanticipated discoveries are made during the project, the Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians would like to be notified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia Lopez</td>
<td>Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation</td>
<td>24 S. Voluntario Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101</td>
<td>mia <a href="mailto:Lopez2424@gmail.com">Lopez2424@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(805)324-0135</td>
<td>Letter sent September 21, 2018</td>
<td>Call made on October 10, 2018</td>
<td>Ms. Lopez asked for the letter to be sent to her via email. Rincon sent the letter on the same day. Did not receive an additional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Arrellanes</td>
<td>Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>PO Box 5687 Ventura, CA 93005</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(805)701-3246</td>
<td>Letter sent September 21, 2018</td>
<td>Call made on October 10, 2018</td>
<td>Ms. Arrellanes stated that she would review the letter and would respond if she had any comments or concerns. Did not receive an additional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Contact</td>
<td>Tribal Affiliation</td>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>Contact Attempt</td>
<td>Follow Up Attempt</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raudel Joe Banuelos, Jr.</td>
<td>Barbareño/Ventureño Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>331 Mira Flores Court, Camarillo, CA 93012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(805)427-0015</td>
<td>Letter sent September 21, 2018</td>
<td>Call made on October 10, 2018</td>
<td>Left a voice message. Did not receive a response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Response 2018
September 20, 2018

County of Ventura
Ventura County Planning Division
C/O Cultural Heritage Planner
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, California 93009

Subject: Cultural Resources Technical Study for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project, Camarillo, Unincorporated Ventura County, California

To Whom It May Concern,

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project (proposed project). The proposed project consists of the abandonment and destruction of Well #5 and the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7. Well #5 is located on a 0.25-acre parcel at 602 Valley Vista Drive in Camarillo (Unincorporated Ventura County/ Ventura County APN-159003206). It was constructed in the 1990s and includes a large water tank and additional water treatment and distribution infrastructure. The proposed location of Well # 7 is a vacant, 0.56-acre parcel on Alviso Drive in Camarillo (Unincorporated Ventura County/ Ventura County APN-152034106). The purpose of this letter is to inquire about your knowledge of potential historic resources within the vicinity that may be impacted by project development.

This project may involve federal funding; thus, this cultural resources study is being prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Rincon is assisting the Crestview Mutual Water Company with their Section 106 consultation effort, and we are writing to provide you with an opportunity to be involved in the Section 106 consultation process. If you or your organization has any knowledge or specific concerns regarding historic resources in the project area, please respond by telephone at (805) 644 4455 extension 138, or by email at rperzel@rinconconsultants.com. Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are interested in consultation. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Rachel Perzel
Architectural Historian

Attached: Project Location Map
Project Location Map
September 20, 2018

Elena Brokaw, Executive Director
Museum of Ventura County
100 East Main Street
Ventura, California 93001

Subject: Cultural Resources Evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project, Camarillo, Unincorporated Ventura County, California

Dear Ms. Brokaw,

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project (proposed project). The proposed project consists of the abandonment and destruction of Well #5 and the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7. Well #5 is located on a 0.25-acre parcel at 602 Valley Vista Drive in Camarillo (Unincorporated Ventura County/ Ventura County APN-159003206). It was constructed in the 1990s and includes a large water tank and additional water treatment and distribution infrastructure. The proposed location of Well # 7 is a vacant, 0.56-acre parcel on Alviso Drive in Camarillo (Unincorporated Ventura County/ Ventura County APN-152034106). The purpose of this letter is to inquire about your knowledge of potential historic resources within the vicinity that may be impacted by project development.

This project may involve federal funding; thus, this cultural resources study is being prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Rincon is assisting the Crestview Mutual Water Company with their Section 106 consultation effort, and we are writing to provide you with an opportunity to be involved in the Section 106 consultation process. If you or your organization has any knowledge or specific concerns regarding historic resources in the project area, please respond by telephone at (805) 644 4455 extension 138, or by email at rperzel@rinconconsultants.com. Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are interested in consultation. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Rachel Perzel
Architectural Historian

Attached: Project Location Map
September 20, 2018

Joy Todd, President
Pleasant Valley Historical Society
P.O. Box 570
Camarillo, CA 93011-0570

Subject: Cultural Resources Technical Study for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project, Camarillo, Unincorporated Ventura County, California

Dear Ms. Todd,

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project (proposed project). The proposed project consists of the abandonment and destruction of Well #5 and the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7. Well #5 is located on a 0.25-acre parcel at 602 Valley Vista Drive in Camarillo (Unincorporated Ventura County/ Ventura County APN-159003206). It was constructed in the 1990s and includes a large water tank and additional water treatment and distribution infrastructure. The proposed location of Well #7 is a vacant, 0.56-acre parcel on Alviso Drive in Camarillo (Unincorporated Ventura County/ Ventura County APN-152034106). The purpose of this letter is to inquire about your knowledge of potential historic resources within the vicinity that may be impacted by project development.

This project may involve federal funding; thus, this cultural resources study is being prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Rincon is assisting the Crestview Mutual Water Company with their Section 106 consultation effort, and we are writing to provide you with an opportunity to be involved in the Section 106 consultation process. If you or your organization has any knowledge or specific concerns regarding historic resources in the project area, please respond by telephone at (805) 644 4455 extension 138, or by email at rperzel@rinconconsultants.com. Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are interested in consultation. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Rachel Perzel
Architectural Historian

Attached: Project Location Map
Project Location Map
September 20, 2018

San Buenaventura Conservancy
P.O. Box 23263
Ventura, California 93002

Subject: Cultural Resources Technical Study for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project, Camarillo, Unincorporated Ventura County, California

To Whom It May Concern,

Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) has been retained to conduct a cultural resources evaluation for the Crestview Water Company Well #7 Capital Project (proposed project). The proposed project consists of the abandonment and destruction of Well #5 and the construction and operation of a new production well, Well #7. Well #5 is located on a 0.25-acre parcel at 602 Valley Vista Drive in Camarillo (Unincorporated Ventura County/ Ventura County APN-159003206). It was constructed in the 1990s and includes a large water tank and additional water treatment and distribution infrastructure. The proposed location of Well # 7 is a vacant, 0.56-acre parcel on Alviso Drive in Camarillo (Unincorporated Ventura County/ Ventura County APN-152034106). The purpose of this letter is to inquire about your knowledge of potential historic resources within the vicinity that may be impacted by project development.

This project may involve federal funding; thus, this cultural resources study is being prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Rincon is assisting the Crestview Mutual Water Company with their Section 106 consultation effort, and we are writing to provide you with an opportunity to be involved in the Section 106 consultation process. If you or your organization has any knowledge or specific concerns regarding historic resources in the project area, please respond by telephone at (805) 644 4455 extension 138, or by email at rperzel@rinconconsultants.com. Please respond within 30 days of receipt of this letter if you are interested in consultation. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Rachel Perzel
Architectural Historian

Attached: Project Location Map
## Table 1
### Historic Groups Consultation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Group/Government Contact</th>
<th>Rincon Coordination Efforts</th>
<th>Response to Coordination Efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joy Todd, President</td>
<td>9/21/2018: Letter sent via U.S. Mail</td>
<td>9/24/2018: Joy Todd from Pleasant Valley Historical Society called Rincon Architectural Historian Rachel Perzel to confirm that she received the Section 106 letter. On the call she expressed that she is unaware of an prehistoric or historic resources in the vicinity of the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Valley Historical Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camarillo, CA 93011-0570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805-482-3660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:pvhs@pvhsline.org">pvhs@pvhsline.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Todd, President</td>
<td>9/21/2018: Letter sent via U.S. Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Valley Historical Society</td>
<td>10/4/2018: Sent follow up email to <a href="mailto:Ashley.Cook@ventura.org">Ashley.Cook@ventura.org</a>; resent letter digitally.</td>
<td>10/15/2018: Received letter via email from Ashley Cook-letter stated that Ventura County is unaware of any historic or paleontological resources or archaeological reports within the vicinity of the project area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Ventura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Planner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 S. Victoria Ave. #1740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura, CA 93009-1740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(805) 654-5042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:schaf@west.net">schaf@west.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Schafer of the SB Conservancy replied via email that the organization was not aware of any cultural resources in the project area.</td>
<td>10/7/2018: Stephen Schafer of the SB Conservancy replied via email that the organization was not aware of any cultural resources in the project area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Buenaventura Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 23263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura, CA 93002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:schaf@west.net">schaf@west.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Brokaw, Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 East Main Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura, CA 93001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805-653-0323 ext. 303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ebrokaw@venturamuseum.org">ebrokaw@venturamuseum.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Ventura County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Brokaw, Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 East Main Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura, CA 93001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>805-653-0323 ext. 303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:ebrokaw@venturamuseum.org">ebrokaw@venturamuseum.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2018: Letter sent via U.S. Mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/4/2018: Follow up phone call; left message on voicemail for Elena Brokaw requesting callback.</td>
<td>10/8/2018: Follow up email sent to <a href="mailto:ebrokaw@venturamuseum.org">ebrokaw@venturamuseum.org</a>; resent letter digitally.</td>
<td>No response was received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Project Description

This CUP is based on and limited to compliance with the project description found in this condition below, all County land use hearing exhibits in support of the Project marked Exhibits 2 to 12 of the Planning Director hearing dated March 5, 2020 and conditions of approval set forth below. Together, these documents describe the Project. Any deviations from the Project must first be reviewed and approved by the County in order to determine if the Project deviations conform to the original approval. Project deviations may require Planning Director approval for changes to the permit or further California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental review, or both. Any Project deviation that is implemented without requisite County review and approval(s) constitutes a violation of the conditions of this permit and applicable law.

The Project description is as follows:

This permit authorizes the continued operation and maintenance of an existing water filtration and pressure boost pump facility for a 40-year period (from the effective date of PL14-0040). The facility will continue to be operated and maintained by the Crestview Mutual Water Company (CMWC), a private water utility company. The infrastructure system incorporates five separate property sites with above and below-ground facilities. The existing facilities are included in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor’s Parcel No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Existing Facility Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152-0-332-165</td>
<td>6 Alviso Drive</td>
<td>Water Well No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159-0-032-065</td>
<td>602 North Valley Vista Drive</td>
<td>Water Well No. 5 &amp; Booster Station Treatment Plant (Water Well No. 5 decommissioned and abandoned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159-0-032-075</td>
<td>602 North Valley Vista Drive</td>
<td>Water Reservoir No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152-0-190-285</td>
<td>241 Crestview Avenue / 109 Avocado Place</td>
<td>Water Well No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152-0-102-030</td>
<td>328 Valley Vista Drive</td>
<td>Water Reservoir No. 2, Office and storage yard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to existing facilities (Table 1, above) and pursuant to Minor Modification No. 2 of CUP No. 4858 (Case No. PL19-0039), this permit authorizes CMWC to decommission and abandon an existing water well (Well No. 5), located at 602 North Valley Vista Drive (APN 159-0-032-065) and construct a replacement water well (Well...
No. 7), located at 191 Alviso Drive (APN 152-0-341-065). Table 2 (below) provides information for a sixth facility with above and below-ground infrastructure for CMWC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor’s Parcel No.</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Existing Facility Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152-0-341-065</td>
<td>191 Alviso Drive</td>
<td>Water Well No. 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistent with the Project plans (Exhibit 4 of Case No. PL19-0039) and the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance, the following provides a detailed description of the Project for Well Site No. 5 (APN 159-0-032-065) and Well Site No. 7 (APN 152-0-341-065):

Well Site No. 5 (APN 159-0-032-065)

CMWC is authorized to decommission and abandon an existing water well (Well No. 5), which includes removal of the well head motor and pump. All other existing equipment (filtration system, tanks, etc.) are authorized to remain at this Project site.

Well Site No. 7 (APN 152-0-341-065)

CMWC is authorized to construct a replacement water well (Well No. 7) slightly southwest of the center of this Project site. The replacement well is authorized to be drilled at a depth of approximately 1,400 below ground surface (bgs) and shall include a cement grout sanitary seal to extend to a depth of approximately 900 feet bgs for the purpose of sealing poorer water quality zones.

The well head design includes a 250-horsepower motor to drive a turbine pump and equipped with Variable Frequency Drive (VFD), to produce potable water at the appropriate head pressure to Zone 2 and Zone 3 of the CMWC district.

- Zone 2 of the CMWC district supplies private potable water to units at an elevation of 435 feet bgs to 180 feet bgs; and,

- Zone 3 of the CMWC district supplies private potable water to units at an elevation of 700 feet bgs to 435 feet bgs.

Water production from Well No. 7 shall be placed in appropriate rotation with production from Well No. 4 (located at 6 Alviso Drive) and Well No. 6 (located at 241 Crestview Drive). Additionally, reporting requirements to the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency will require that water extraction from Well No. 7 shall not exceed existing allocations as set forth by the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency.
Additional authorized improvements for this site include:

a. An approximately 1,000 sq. ft. roll-apart, prefabricated steel pump house structure. The structure shall fully enclose the well head and ancillary equipment associated with operation of the well head. The pump house shall include the following design elements:
   (1) textured exterior wall panels painted in a neutral color scheme;
   (2) exterior doors with complimentary light fixtures;
   (3) covered porch area;
   (4) faux windows with decorative shutters;
   (5) faux Spanish tile roofing material;
   (6) rain gutters; and,
   (7) noise attenuating panels on interior walls.

b. 2,000-gallon chlorine tank placed within a secondary 2,500-gallon precast concrete vault. Both tank and vault shall be located within the pump house and fully shielded from public view;

c. Discharge chamber located adjacent to the eastern elevation of the pump house. The chamber shall be five feet wide by 10 feet long and four and a half feet in height. The chamber receives a minor amount of excess extracted water and shall gravity feed a proposed water irrigation tank;

d. 4,995-gallon water irrigation tank located to the rear of this site. The irrigation tank receives water from the discharge chamber and shall be used to irrigate landscaping at this site;

e. 300-kilowatt natural gasoline generator for emergency back-up purposes only. The generator shall be sited to the north east of the pump house structure and located within a seven foot by 17-foot noise attenuating, weatherproof enclosure; and,

f. Hardscape and landscape including a concrete driveway, decomposed granite paths and a mixture of bushes, shrubs, ground cover, and citrus trees.

The grading, development, use, and maintenance of the property, the size, shape, arrangement, and location of structures, parking areas and landscape areas, and the protection and preservation of resources shall conform to the project description above and all approved County land use hearing exhibits in support of the Project and conditions of approval below.
IN ADDITION TO CONDITION OF APPROVAL NO. 1 (PROJECT DESCRIPTION), THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL APPLY TO ALL FACILITIES OF CUP NO. 4858 (APN NOS. 152-0-332-065, 159-0-032-065, 159-0-032-075, 152-0-190-285, 152-0-102-030, AND 152-0-341-065):

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY CONDITIONS

Planning Division Conditions

2. Site Maintenance

Purpose: To ensure that the Project site is maintained in a neat and orderly manner so as not to create any hazardous conditions or unsightly conditions which are visible from outside of the Project site.

Requirement: The Permittee shall maintain the Project site in a neat and orderly manner, and in compliance with the project description set forth in Condition No. 1. Only equipment and/or materials which the Planning Director determines to substantially comply with the project description shall be stored within the Project site during the life of the Project.

Documentation: The Permittee shall maintain the Project site in compliance with Condition No. 1 and the approved plans for the Project.

Timing: The Permittee shall maintain the Project site in a neat and orderly manner and in compliance with Condition No. 1 throughout the life of the Project.

Monitoring and Reporting: The County Building Inspector, Public Works Agency Grading Inspector, Fire Marshall, and/or Planning Division staff has the authority to conduct periodic site inspections to ensure the Permittee’s ongoing compliance with this condition consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

3. CUP Modification

Prior to undertaking any operational or construction-related activity which is not expressly described in these conditions or project description, the Permittee shall first contact the Planning Director to determine if the proposed activity requires a modification of this CUP. The Planning Director may, at the Planning Director's sole discretion, require the Permittee to file a written and/or mapped description of the proposed activity in order to determine if a CUP modification is required. If a CUP modification is required, the modification shall be subject to:

a. The modification approval standards of the Ventura County Ordinance Code in effect at the time the modification application is acted on by the Planning Director; and,
b. Environmental review, as required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; California Public Resources Code, § 21000-21178) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, § 15000-15387), as amended from time to time.

4. Acceptance of Conditions and Schedule of Enforcement Responses

The Permittee’s acceptance of this CUP and/or commencement of construction and/or operations under this CUP shall constitute the Permittee’s formal agreement to comply with all conditions of this CUP. Failure to abide by and comply with any condition for the granting of this CUP shall constitute grounds for enforcement action provided in the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance (2011, Article 14), which shall include, but is not limited to, the following:

a. Public reporting of violations to the Planning Commission and/or Board of Supervisors;
b. Suspension of the permitted land uses (Condition No. 1); Modification of the CUP conditions listed herein;
c. Recordation of a “Notice of Noncompliance” on the deed to the subject property;
d. The imposition of civil administrative penalties; and/or,
e. Revocation of this CUP.

The Permittee is responsible for being aware of and complying with the CUP conditions and all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

5. Time Limits

a. Use inauguration:

(1) The approval decision for this CUP becomes effective upon the expiration of the 10-day appeal period following the approval decision or when any appeals of the decision are finally resolved. Once the approval decision becomes effective, the Permittee must obtain a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration in order to initiate the land uses provided in Condition No. 1 (project description) applicable to Well Site No. 5 and Well Site No. 7 only.

(2) This CUP shall expire and become null and void if the Permittee fails to obtain a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration within one year from the date the approval decision of this CUP becomes effective. The Planning Director may grant a one year extension of time to the Permittee in order to obtain the Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration if the Permittee can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Director that the Permittee has made a diligent effort to inaugurate
the permitted land use, and the Permittee has requested the time extension in writing at least 30 days prior to the one-year expiration date.

(3) Prior to the issuance of the Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration, all fees and charges billed to that date by any County agency, as well as any fines, penalties, and sureties, must be paid in full. After issuance of the Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration, any final billed processing fees must be paid within 30 days of the billing date or the County may revoke this CUP.

b. Permit Life or Operations Period: This CUP will expire on August 2, 2054. The lack of additional notification of the expiration date provided by the County to the Permittee shall not constitute grounds to continue the uses that are authorized by this CUP after the CUP expiration date. The uses authorized by this CUP may continue after the CUP expiration date if:

(1) The Permittee has filed a permit modification application pursuant to § 8111-6 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance prior to August 2, 2054; and,

(2) The County decision-maker grants the requested modification.

The uses authorized by this CUP may continue during processing of a timely-filed modification application in accordance with § 8111-2.10 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

6. Documentation Verifying Compliance with Other Agencies’ Requirements Related to this CUP

Purpose: To ensure compliance with and notification of federal, state, or local government regulatory agencies that have requirements that pertain to the Project (Condition No. 1, above) that is the subject of this CUP.

Requirement: Upon the request of the Planning Director, the Permittee shall provide the Planning Division with documentation (e.g., copies of permits or agreements from other agencies, which are required pursuant to a condition of this CUP) to verify that the Permittee has obtained or satisfied all applicable federal, state, and local entitlements and conditions that pertain to the Project.

Documentation: The Permittee shall provide this documentation to the County Planning Division in the form that is acceptable to the agency issuing the entitlement or clearance, to be included in the Planning Division Project file.
Timing: The documentation shall be submitted to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of the Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration or as dictated by the respective agency.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division maintains the documentation provided by the Permittee in the respective Project file. In the event that the federal, state, or local government regulatory agency prepares new documentation due to changes in the Project or the other agency’s requirements, the Permittee shall submit the new documentation within 30 days of receipt of the documentation from the other agency.

7. Notice of CUP Requirements and Retention of CUP Conditions On-Site

Purpose: To ensure full and proper notice of permit requirements and conditions affecting the use of the subject property.

Requirement: Unless otherwise required by the Planning Director, the Permittee shall notify, in writing, the Property Owner(s) of record, contractors, and all other parties and vendors regularly dealing with the daily operation of the proposed activities, of the pertinent conditions of this CUP.

Documentation: The Permittee shall maintain a current set of CUP conditions and exhibits at the Project site.

Timing: Prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration and until expiration of the CUP.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division has the authority to conduct periodic site inspections to ensure ongoing compliance with this condition consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

8. Recorded Notice of Land Use Entitlement

Purpose: The Permittee shall record a “Notice of Land Use Entitlement” form and the conditions of this CUP with the deed for the subject property that notifies the current and future Property Owner(s) of the conditions of this CUP.

Requirement: The Permittee shall sign, have notarized, and record with the Office of the County Recorder, a Notice of Land Use Entitlement form furnished by the Planning Division, for the tax assessor’s parcels that are subject to this CUP.

Documentation: The Permittee shall provide a copy of the recorded Notice of Land Use Entitlement to the County Planning Division.

Timing: The Notice of Land Use Entitlement shall be recorded prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration.
Monitoring and Reporting: The Permittee shall return a copy of the recorded Notice of Land Use Entitlement to the Planning Division for the Project file.

   a. Cost Responsibilities: The Permittee shall bear the full costs of all County staff time, materials, and County-retained consultants associated with condition compliance review and monitoring, other permit monitoring programs, and enforcement activities, actions, and processes conducted pursuant to § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance related to this CUP. Such condition compliance review, monitoring and enforcement activities may include (but are not limited to): periodic site inspections; preparation, review, and approval of studies and reports; review of permit conditions and related records; enforcement hearings and processes; drafting and implementing compliance agreements; and attending to the modification, suspension, or revocation of permits. Costs will be billed at the rates set forth in the Planning Division or other applicable County Fee Schedule, and at the contract rates of County-retained consultants, in effect at the time the costs are incurred.

   b. Pursuant to the requirements of CUP No. 4858 (as modified by Permit Adjustment Nos. LU06-0007 and LU06-0143 and Minor Modification Case Nos. PL14-0040 and PL19-0039), the Resource Management Agency created Condition Compliance Case No. CC07-0029 to cover the costs associated with condition compliance review, monitoring, and enforcement activities, and any duly imposed civil administrative penalties, regarding CUP No. 4858. The Planning Division will continue to use Condition Compliance Case No. CC07-0029 to cover the costs associated with condition compliance review, monitoring, and enforcement activities described in subsection 9.a (above), and any duly imposed civil administrative penalties regarding this CUP.

   Within 10 calendar days of the effective date of the final decision approving this CUP, the Permittee shall submit a new, updated, and completed reimbursement agreement for Condition Compliance Case No. CC07-0029, in a form provided by the Planning Division, obligating the Permittee to pay all condition compliance review, monitoring, and enforcement costs, and any civil administrative penalties, subject to the Permittee’s right to challenge all such charges and penalties prior to payment.

   c. Billing Process: The Permittee shall pay all Planning Division invoices within 30 days of receipt thereof. Failure to timely pay an invoice shall subject the Permittee to late fees and charges set forth in the Planning Division Fee Schedule, and shall be grounds for suspension, modification, or revocation of this CUP. The Permittee shall have the right to challenge any charge or penalty prior to payment.
10. **Defense and Indemnity**

   a. The Permittee shall defend, at the Permittee’s sole expense with legal counsel acceptable to the County, against any and all claims, actions, or proceedings against the County, any other public agency with a governing body consisting of the members of the County Board of Supervisors, or any of their respective board members, officials, employees and agents (collectively, “Indemnified Parties”) arising out of or in any way related to the County’s issuance, administration, or enforcement of this CUP. The County shall promptly notify the Permittee of any such claim, action or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense.

   b. The Permittee shall also indemnify and hold harmless the Indemnified Parties from and against any and all losses, damages, awards, fines, expenses, penalties, judgments, settlements, or liabilities of whatever nature, including but not limited to court costs and attorney fees (collectively, “Liabilities”), arising out of or in any way related to any claim, action or proceeding subject to subpart (a) above, regardless of how a court apportions any such Liabilities as between the Permittee, the County, and/or third parties.

   c. Except with respect to claims, actions, proceedings, and Liabilities resulting from an Indemnified Party’s sole active negligence or intentional misconduct, the Permittee shall also indemnify, defend (at Permittee’s sole expense with legal counsel acceptable to County), and hold harmless the Indemnified Parties from and against any and all claims, actions, proceedings, and Liabilities arising out of, or in any way related to, the construction, maintenance, land use, or operations conducted pursuant to this CUP, regardless of how a court apports any such Liabilities as between the Permittee, the County, and/or third parties. The County shall promptly notify the Permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense.

   d. Neither the issuance of this CUP, nor compliance with the conditions hereof, shall relieve the Permittee from any responsibility otherwise imposed by law for damage to persons or property; nor shall the issuance of this CUP serve to impose any liability upon the Indemnified Parties for injury or damage to persons or property.

10. **Invalidation of Condition(s)**

   If any of the conditions or limitations of this CUP are held to be invalid, that holding shall not invalidate any of the remaining CUP conditions or limitations. In the event the Planning Director determines that any condition contained herein is in conflict with any other condition contained herein, then where principles of law do not provide to the contrary, the conditions most protective of public health and safety, consistent with
Crestview Mutual Water Company’s status as a private water utility, and natural environmental resources shall prevail to the extent feasible.

In the event that any condition imposing a fee, exaction, or dedication is challenged by the Permittee in an action filed in a court of law, or threatened to be filed therein, which action is brought in the time period provided for by the Code of Civil Procedures (§ 1094.6), or other applicable law, this CUP shall be allowed to continue in force until the expiration of the limitation period applicable to such action, or until final resolution of such action, provided the Permittee has, in the interim, fully complied with the fee, exaction, or dedication being challenged.

If a court of law invalidates any condition, and the invalidation would change the findings associated with the approval of this CUP, at the discretion of the Planning Director, the Planning Director may review the Project and impose substitute feasible conditions to adequately address the subject matter of the invalidated condition. The Planning Director shall make the determination of adequacy. If the Planning Director cannot identify substitute feasible conditions to replace the invalidated condition and cannot identify overriding considerations for the significant impacts that are not mitigated to a level of insignificance as a result of the invalidation of the condition, then this CUP may be revoked.

11. Relationship of CUP Conditions, Laws and Other Permits
The Permittee shall design, maintain, and operate the CUP area and any facilities thereon in compliance with all applicable requirements and enactments of Federal, State, and County authorities. In the event of conflict between various requirements, the more restrictive requirements shall apply. In the event the Planning Director determines that any CUP condition contained herein is in conflict with any other CUP condition contained herein, when principles of law do not provide to the contrary, the CUP condition most protective of public health and safety, consistent with Crestview Mutual Water Company’s status as a private water utility, and environmental resources shall prevail to the extent feasible.

No condition of this CUP for uses allowed by the Ventura County Ordinance Code shall be interpreted as permitting or requiring any violation of law, lawful rules or regulations, or orders of an authorized governmental agency. Neither the issuance of this CUP, nor compliance with the conditions of this CUP, shall relieve the Permittee from any responsibility otherwise imposed by law for damage to persons or property.

12. Contact Person
Purpose: To designate a person responsible for responding to complaints.

Requirement: The Permittee shall designate a contact person(s) to respond to complaints from citizens and the County which are related to the permitted uses of this CUP.

Documentation: The Permittee shall provide the Planning Director with the contact information (e.g., name and/or position title, address, business and cell phone numbers,
and email addresses) of the Permittee’s field agent who receives all orders, notices, and communications regarding matters of condition and code compliance at the CUP site.

**Timing:** Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration, the Permittee shall provide the Planning Division the contact information of the Permittee’s field agent(s) for the Project file. If the address or phone number of the Permittee’s field agent(s) should change, or the responsibility is assigned to another person, the Permittee shall provide the Planning Division with the new information in writing within three calendar days of the change in the Permittee’s field agent.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Planning Division maintains the contact information provided by the Permittee in the respective Project file. The Planning Division has the authority to periodically confirm the contact information consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

13. **Resolution of Complaints**
The following process shall be used to resolve complaints related to the Project:

The Permittee shall post the telephone number for the designated Contact Person as identified pursuant to Condition No. 12 (above) in a visible location on the site. The Contact Person shall be available via telephone on a 24-hour basis. Persons with concerns about the use as it is occurring may directly contact the Contact Person;

- a. If a written complaint about this CUP is received by the County, Planning staff may contact the Permittee’s Contact Person or the Permittee to request information regarding the alleged violation; and,

- b. If, following a complaint investigation by County staff, a violation of Ventura County Code or a condition of this permit is confirmed, County enforcement actions pursuant to § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance may be initiated.

14. **Reporting of Major Incidents**

**Purpose:** To ensure that the Planning Director is notified of major incidents within the CUP area.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall immediately notify the Planning Director by telephone, email, FAX, and/or voicemail of any incidents (e.g., natural disasters, fires, explosions, spills, landslides, or slope failures) that could pose a hazard to life or property inside or outside the CUP area.

**Documentation:** Upon request of any County agency, the Permittee shall provide a written report of any incident that shall include, but is not limited to: a description of the facts of the incident; the corrective measures used, if any; and, the steps taken to prevent a recurrence of the incident.
Timing: The Permittee shall provide the written report to the requesting County agency and Planning Division within seven days of the request.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division maintains any documentation provided by the Permittee related to major incidents in the CUP file.

15. Change of Owner and/or Permittee
Purpose: To ensure that the Planning Division is properly and promptly notified of any change of ownership or change of Permittee affecting the CUP site.

Requirement: The Permittee shall file, as an initial notice with the Planning Director, the new name(s), address(es), telephone/FAX number(s), and email addresses of the new owner(s), lessee(s), operator(s) of the permitted uses, and the company officer(s). The Permittee shall provide the Planning Director with a final notice once the transfer of ownership and/or operational control has occurred.

Documentation: The initial notice must be submitted with the new Property Owner’s and/or Permittee’s contact information. The final notice of transfer must include the effective date and time of the transfer and a letter signed by the new Property Owner(s), lessee(s), and/or operator(s) of the permitted uses acknowledging and agreeing to comply with all conditions of this CUP.

Timing: The Permittee shall provide written notice to the Planning Director 10 calendar days prior to the change of ownership or change of Permittee. The Permittee shall provide the final notice to the Planning Director within 15 calendar days of the effective date of the transfer.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division maintains notices submitted by the Permittee in the Project file and has the authority to periodically confirm the information consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

16. Landscaping and Screening
Purpose: To comply with the County’s landscaping requirements.

Requirement: The existing landscaping shall be maintained throughout the effective term of the CUP.

Documentation: The Permittee shall ensure all existing landscaping is properly maintained and remains in substantial conformance with the approved landscape plan for the CUP. Any changes to approved landscape plan that would affect the character or quantity of plant material must be approved by the Planning Director prior to implementation.
Timing: The Permittee shall provide documentation to the Planning Division upon request.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division maintains the landscape plans and color photo documentation in the Project file and has the authority to periodically confirm that the landscaping is maintained by the Permittee in accordance with the approved plan consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

17. Lighting Plan
Purpose: To ensure lighting on the subject property is provided in compliance with § 8106-8.6 and § 8108-5.12 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

Requirement: The Permittee shall ensure that lighting on the subject property:

a. avoids interference with reasonable use of adjoining properties;
b. avoids conflict with landscape features;
c. minimizes on-site and eliminates off-site glare;
d. provides adequate on-site lighting for security;
e. minimizes impacts to wildlife movement;
f. minimizes energy consumption; and,
g. includes devices that are compatible with the design of the permitted facility and minimize energy consumption.

The existing pole-mounted light standards on the properties shall be maintained throughout the life of the subject CUP permit. Any changes to the as built plans that affect the character or quantity of the facilities and surrounding residential neighborhoods must be approved by the Planning Director prior to installation.

Documentation: The Permittee shall ensure all existing lighting is properly maintained and remains in substantial conformance with the approved lighting plan for the CUP.

Timing: The Permittee shall provide documentation to the Planning Division upon request.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division maintains the as built plans in the Project file and has the authority to periodically confirm that lighting is maintained by the Permittee in accordance with the approved plan consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

18. Sign Plan
Purpose: To ensure signage on the property complies with Chapter 1, Article 10 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.
Requirement: The existing signage on the property shall be maintained throughout the life of the CUP. Any changes to the existing signage that affect the character or quantity of the facilities and surrounding residential neighborhoods must be approved by the Planning Director prior to installation.

Documentation: The Permittee shall ensure all existing signage is properly maintained and remains in substantial conformance with the approved signage plan for the CUP.

Timing: The Permittee shall provide documentation to the Planning Division upon request.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division maintains the color photo documentation in the Project file and has the authority to periodically confirm that the signage is maintained by the Permittee in accordance with the approved plan consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

19. Availability of Parking Spaces

Purpose: To ensure compliance with all applicable provisions in § 8108-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

Requirement: The Permittee shall ensure that the required four motor vehicle parking spaces (including accessible spaces) remain continuously available at the main office site (328 Valley Vista Drive) for their intended parking use and are not used for merchandise display, storage, vehicle repair, or any other unauthorized use. The Permittee shall maintain the required parking area as illustrated on the approved site plan. This maintenance requirement includes but is not limited to; the number of parking spaces, curbs, directional markings, accessible parking symbols, screening, sight distance, surfaces, signs, striping, lighting fixtures, landscaping, and trash and recyclables enclosures.

Documentation: The Permittee shall ensure all existing parking is properly maintained and remains in substantial conformance with the approved parking plan for the CUP.

Timing: The Permittee shall provide documentation to the Planning Division upon request.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division maintains a stamped copy of the approved site plan provided by the Permittee in the Project file. The Planning Division has the authority to conduct periodic site inspections to ensure ongoing compliance with this condition consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.
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20. Trash and Recycling Storage Area

**Purpose:** In order to comply with § 8106-8.7 and § 8108-5.13 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall ensure that trash and waste diversion (e.g., recyclables and yard waste) enclosures are maintained on the Project site in accordance with the County of Ventura’s adopted “Space Allocation for Recycling and Refuse Collection Design Criteria and Specifications Guidelines.”

**Timing:** The Permittee shall provide documentation to the Planning Division upon request.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall ensure all existing trash and recycling storage areas are properly maintained and remain in substantial conformance with the approved site plans for the CUP.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Planning Division maintains a copy of the approved site plan in the Project file. The Planning Division has the authority to periodically inspecting the site to ensure that the trash enclosures are maintained consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

21. Process Treatment Chemicals Delivery Times

Deliveries of process treatment chemicals to the site shall be limited to once every two weeks. That delivery may occur on Monday through Friday between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Off-loading time shall be limited to two hours. Deliveries shall be limited to no more than once per calendar month. Should a change in the treatment process necessitate more frequent deliveries or longer offloading times, the County shall be notified, in writing, at least two workdays prior to the commencement of the accelerated schedule. The Planning Director shall approve the accelerated schedule, in writing, prior to it being implemented.

22. Regular Maintenance Times

All other facility maintenance activities, including scheduled landscape maintenance, shall occur between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Sunday.

23. Emergency Maintenance

In cases of emergency facility maintenance or potential disruption of service to the public the limitations of Condition of Approval No. 22 (above) are not applicable. However, the applicant shall notify the Planning Director, in writing, within 24 hours following the emergency event, describing the problem, duration in time of the emergency, and corrective action taken.
Environmental Health Division

24. General Vector Control – Mosquito Breeding

**Purpose:** To ensure site does not contribute to the harborage and/or breeding of potential vectors of disease or create a public nuisance.

**Requirement:** Manage standing water onsite so it will not create mosquito breeding sources.

**Timing:** The Permittee shall maintain the Project site so as not to contribute to the harborage and/or breeding of mosquitoes, nor the creation of a public nuisance throughout the life of the Project.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** Ventura County Environmental Health Division (EHD) staff respond to, and maintain records of, any complaints received which relate to mosquito breeding at the site.

PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY CONDITIONS

Transportation Department

25. Pay Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee

**Purpose:** To address the cumulative adverse impacts of traffic on the Regional Road Network, Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies, and Programs Section 4.2.2 6 and Ventura County Ordinance Code, Division 8, Chapter 6 require that the Public Works Agency Transportation Department (PWATD) collect a Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee (TIMF).

**Requirement:** The applicant/permittee shall deposit with the PWATD a TIMF. The trip generation rate and TIMF will be calculated based on the applicant’s information. The applicant/permittee may choose to submit additional information or provide a Traffic Study to supplement the information currently provided to establish the trip generation rate. The TIMF may be adjusted for inflation at the time of deposit in accordance with the latest version of the Engineering News Record Construction Cost Index. Based on the applicant’s information:

a) The TIMF due to the County of Ventura would be:

\[ \text{TIMF}\text{ due to County of Ventura} = 2 \text{ ADT} \times 67.95^{(1)} / \text{ADT} \]

b) The TIMF due to the City of Camarillo would be:

\[ \text{TIMF due to City of Camarillo} = 2 \text{ ADT} \times 69.00^{(2)} / \text{ADT} \]
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Total ADT

2 ADT = 1 Standard Maintenance Truck/Car / day x 2 trips / vehicle

Notes:

(1) The trips generated by the Project shall be used as a baseline level so that the TIMF may be computed for future increases to the trip generation. Based on the applicant’s information, the baseline level will be 2 Average Daily Trips (ADT).

(2) County of Ventura TIMF for the Average Daily Trips in the Camarillo Area District # 7.

(3) The City of Camarillo Reciprocal TIMF for the Average Daily Trips.

(4) The TIMF due to the City of Camarillo is to be transferred to the City within 30 calendar days in accordance with the reciprocal traffic mitigation agreement between the City and the County of Ventura.

Documentation: The Permittee shall come to the PWATD counter, fill out the TIMF form, and pay the TIMF. The Permittee shall provide a copy of the Conditions of Approval for the Project. The fee will not be collected without sufficient documentation.

Timing: This condition shall be met prior to the issuance of the Building Permit and/or Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration, whichever comes first.

Monitoring and Reporting: The PWATD will review and approve the payment of the TIMF.

OTHER VENTURA COUNTY AGENCIES CONDITIONS

Ventura County Fire Protection District

26. Fire Department Clearance
Purpose: To provide the Permittee a list of all applicable Ventura County Fire Protection District Department (VCFPD) requirements for their Project.

Requirement: The Permittee shall obtain VCFPD Form #126 “Requirements for Construction” for any new structures before issuance of building permits.

Documentation: The Permittee shall obtain VCFPD Form #126 “Requirements for Construction” for any new structures before issuance of building permits.”
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Timing: The Permittee shall submit VCFPD Form #126 Application to the Fire Prevention Bureau for approval before issuance of building permits.

Monitoring and Reporting: A copy of the completed VCFPD Form #126 shall be kept on file with the Fire Prevention Bureau. The Fire Prevention Bureau will conduct a final onsite inspection of the Project to ensure compliance with all conditions and applicable codes / ordinances.

27. Access Road Gates
Purpose: To ensure that adequate fire department access is provided in conformance with current California State Law and Ventura County Fire Protection District Standards.

Requirement: The Permittee shall maintain all gates along required fire access roads/driveways consistent with Fire Protection District Standards.

Documentation: A stamped copy of the approved access plans.

Timing: The Permittee shall submit access plans to the Fire Prevention Bureau for approval prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration.

Monitoring and Reporting: A copy of the approved access plan shall be kept on file with the Fire Prevention Bureau. The Fire Prevention Bureau shall conduct a final inspection to ensure that access gates are installed according to the approved plans. Unless a modification is approved by the Fire Prevention Bureau, the Permittee, and their successors in interest, shall maintain the gates for the life of the development.

28. Fire Code Permits
Purpose: In order to minimize fire hazards, the Project shall be constructed in conformance with the requirements of the Ventura County Fire Code.

Requirement: The Permittee shall obtain all applicable Fire Code permits.

Documentation: The Permittee shall submit a Fire Code permit application along with required documentation/plans to the Fire Prevention Bureau for review and approval.

Timing: The Permittee shall submit a Fire Code permit application along with required documentation/plans to the Fire Prevention Bureau for approval before final occupancy, installation and/or use of any item/system requiring a Fire Code permit.

Monitoring and Reporting: A copy of the approved Fire Code permits shall be kept on file with the Fire Prevention Bureau. The Fire Prevention Bureau shall conduct a final inspection to ensure that the requirements of the Fire Code permit are installed according to the approved plans. Unless a modification is approved by the Fire
Prevention Bureau, the Permittee, and their successors in interest, shall maintain the conditions of the Fire Code permit for the life of the development.

29. Inspection Authority

Purpose: To ensure on going compliance with all applicable codes, ordinances and Project conditions.

Requirement: The Permittee, by accepting these Project conditions of approval, shall acknowledge that the fire code official (Fire District) is authorized to enter at all reasonable times and examine any building, structure or premises subject to this Project approval for the purpose of enforcing the Fire Code and these conditions of approval.

Documentation: A copy of the approved entitlement conditions.

Timing: The Permittee shall allow ongoing inspections by the fire code official (Fire District) for the life of the Project.

Monitoring and Reporting: A copy of the approved entitlement conditions shall be kept on file with the Fire Prevention Bureau. The Fire Prevention Bureau shall ensure ongoing compliance with this condition through on-site inspections.

IN ADDITION TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL NOS. 1 – 29 (ABOVE), WHICH APPLY TO ALL FACILITIES OF CUP NO. 4858, THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL APPLY SPECIFICALLY TO WELL SITE NO. 5 (602 NORTH VALLEY VISTA DRIVE / APN NO. 159-0-032-065) AND WELL SITE NO. 7 (191 ALVISO DRIVE / APN NO. 152-0-341-065) OF CUP NO. 4858:

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY CONDITIONS

Planning Division

30. Required Improvements for CUP

Purpose: To ensure the Project site conforms to the plans approved at the Planning Director hearing on March 5, 2020 in support of the Project.

Requirement: The Permittee shall ensure that all required off-site and on-site improvements for the Project, including structures, paving, and landscaping are completed in conformance with the approved plans stamped as hearing Exhibit 4. The Permittee shall prepare and submit all final building and site plans for the County’s review and approval in accordance with the approved plans.

Documentation: The Permittee shall obtain Planning Division staff’s stamped approval on the Project plans and submit them to the County for inclusion in the Project file. The
Permittee shall submit additional plans to the Planning Division for review and stamped approval (e.g., landscape plans) for inclusion in the Project file, as necessary.

**Timing:** Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration the Permittee shall submit all final development plans to the Planning Division for review and approval. Unless the Planning Director and/or Public Works Agency Director allow the Permittee to provide financial security and a final executed agreement, approved as to form by the County Counsel, that ensures completion of such improvements, the Permittee shall complete all required improvements prior to final inspection. The Permittee shall maintain the required improvements for the life of the Project.

31. **Construction Activities**
Prior to any construction, the Permittee shall obtain a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration from the Planning Division, and a Building Permit from the Building and Safety Division. Prior to any grading, the Permittee shall obtain a Grading Permit from the Public Works Agency.

**PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY CONDITIONS**

**Water Quality Section**

32. **Compliance with Stormwater Development Construction Program**

**Purpose:** To ensure compliance with the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit No. CAS004002 (Permit) the Project will be subject to the construction requirements for surface water quality and storm water runoff in accordance with Part 4.F., “Development Construction Program” of the Permit.

**Requirement:** The construction of the Project shall meet requirements contained in Part 4.F. “Development Construction Program” of the Permit through the inclusion of effective implementation of the Construction BMPs during all ground disturbing activities.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall submit to the Watershed Protection District – County Stormwater Program Section (CSP) for review and approval a completed and signed SW 1 form (Best Management Practices for Construction Less Than One Acre) which can be found at [https://www.vcpublicworks.org/wsd/waterquality/](https://www.vcpublicworks.org/wsd/waterquality/).

**Timing:** The above listed item shall be submitted to the CSP for review and approval prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** CSP will review the submitted materials for consistency with the NPDES Municipal Stormwater Permit. Building Permit Inspectors will conduct inspections during construction to ensure effective installation of the required BMPs.
33. Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Plan (Form B)

**Purpose:** Ordinance 4421 requires the Permittee to divert recyclable construction and demolition (C&D) materials generated by their Project (e.g., wood, metal, greenwaste, soil, concrete, asphalt, paper, cardboard, etc.) from local landfills through recycling, reuse, or salvage. Review Ordinance 4421 at: https://www.vcpublicworks.org/wsd/iwmd/businessrecycling/#GreenWasteProcessing

Further, the 2016 California Green Building Code Sections 4.408 and 5.408 require a minimum of 65% diversion of construction and demolition materials from landfill disposal.

**Requirement:** The Permittee must submit a comprehensive recycling plan (Form B – Recycling Plan) to the IWMD for any proposed construction and/or demolition projects that require a building permit.

**Documentation:** The Form B – Recycling Plan must ensure a minimum of 65% of the recyclable C&D debris generated by the Project will be diverted from the landfill by recycling, reuse, or salvage. A copy of Form B is available at: http://onestop.vcpublicworks.org/integrated-waste-management-forms.

A comprehensive list of permitted recyclers, County-franchised haulers, and solid waste & recycling facilities in Ventura County is available at: http://onestoppermit.ventura.org/. A list of local facilities permitted to recycle soil, wood, and greenwaste is available at: https://www.vcpublicworks.org/wsd/iwmd/businessrecycling/#GreenWasteProcessing. A complete list of County-franchised solid waste haulers is available at: https://www.vcpublicworks.org/wsd/iwmd/construction/#solid-waste-collectors.

**Timing:** Upon Building and Safety Division’s issuance of a building permit for the Project, the Permittee must submit a Form B – Recycling Plan to the IWMD for approval.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Permittee is required to keep a copy of their approved Form B – Recycling Plan until Building and Safety Division’s issuance of final permit.

34. Construction and Demolition Debris Reporting Form (Form C)

**Purpose:** Ordinance 4421 requires the Permittee to divert recyclable construction and demolition (C&D) materials generated by their Project (e.g., wood, metal, greenwaste, soil, concrete, paper, cardboard, plastic containers, etc.) from local landfills through recycling, reuse, or salvage. Review Ordinance 4421 at: http://onestop.vcpublicworks.org/integrated-waste-management-laws-ordinances. The 2016 California Green Building Code Sections 4.408 and 5.408 require a minimum of 65% diversion of construction and demolition materials from landfill disposal.
Requirement: The Permittee must submit a Form C – Reporting Form to the IWMD for approval upon issuance of their final Building and Safety Division permit. A copy of Form C – Reporting Form is available at: https://www.vcpublicworks.org/wsd/iwmd/businessrecycling/#GreenWasteProcessing.

Documentation: The Permittee must submit original recycling facility receipts and/or documentation of reuse with their Form C – Reporting Form to verify a minimum of 65% of the recyclable C&D debris generated by their Project was diverted from the landfill.

Timing: A completed Form C – Reporting Form, with required recycling facility receipts and/or documentation or reuse, must be submitted to the IWMD for approval at the time of Building and Safety Division's issuance of final permit.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Permittee is required to keep a copy of their approved Form C – Reporting Form until Building and Safety Division's issuance of final permit.

OTHER VENTURA COUNTY AGENCIES CONDITIONS

Air Pollution Control District

35. Rules and Regulations for Grading and Construction

Purpose: To ensure that fugitive dust and particulate matter that may result from site preparation and grading activities are minimized to the greatest extent feasible.

Requirement: The Permittee shall comply with the provisions of applicable Ventura County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) Rules and Regulations, which include but are not limited to, Rule 50 (Opacity), Rule 51 (Nuisance), and Rule 55 (Fugitive Dust).

Documentation: The project applicant shall ensure compliance with the following provisions:

a. The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations shall be minimized to prevent excessive amounts of dust;

b. Pre-grading/excavation activities shall include watering the area to be graded or excavated before commencement of grading or excavation operations. Application of water should penetrate sufficiently to minimize fugitive dust during grading activities;

c. All trucks shall cover their loads as required by California Vehicle Code § 23114;

d. Fugitive dust throughout the construction site shall be controlled by the use of a watering truck or equivalent means (except during and immediately after rainfall). Water shall be applied to all unpaved roads, unpaved parking
areas or staging areas, and active portions of the construction site. Environmentally safe dust control agents may be used in lieu of watering;

e. Graded and/or excavated inactive areas of the construction site shall be monitored at least weekly for dust stabilization. Soil stabilization methods, such as water and roll compaction, and environmentally safe dust control materials, shall be periodically applied to portions of the construction site;

f. Temporary signs shall be posted onsite limiting traffic to 15 miles per hour or less; and,

g. All clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e., wind speed sufficient to cause fugitive dust to be a nuisance or hazard to adjacent properties). During periods of high winds, all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations shall be curtailed to the degree necessary to prevent fugitive dust created by onsite activities and operations from being a nuisance or hazard, either offsite or onsite.

Timing: Throughout the construction/grading phases of the project.

Monitoring and Reporting: Dust control is a standard condition on all Grading Permits issued by Public Works Agency and grading inspector shall perform periodic site inspections throughout the grading period. Monitoring and Enforcement of dust-related provisions for construction operation shall be conducted by Ventura County APCD staff and is complaint-driven.

36. Construction Equipment

Purpose: In order to ensure that ozone precursor and particulate emissions from diesel-powered mobile construction equipment are reduced to the greatest amount feasible.

Requirement: The Permittee shall comply with the provisions of all applicable California State Laws and Ventura County APCD Rules and Regulations regarding portable construction equipment and construction vehicles.

Documentation: The project applicant shall ensure compliance with the following State Laws and Ventura County APCD requirements:

a. Construction equipment shall not have visible emissions greater than 20% opacity, as required by Ventura County APCD Rule 50, Opacity;

b. Off-Road Heavy-Duty trucks shall comply with the California State Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicles (Title 13, CCR § 2449), the purpose of which is to reduce NOx and diesel particulate matter exhaust emissions;
c. On-Road Heavy-Duty trucks shall comply with the California State Regulation for In-Use On-Road Diesel Vehicles (Title 13, CCR § 2025), the purpose of which is to reduce NOx and diesel particulate matter exhaust emissions;

d. All commercial on-road and off-road diesel vehicles are subject to the idling limits of Title 13, CCR § 2485, § 2449(d)(3), respectively. Construction equipment shall not idle for more than five (5) consecutive minutes. The idling limit does not apply to:

   (1) idling when queuing;

   (2) idling to verify that the vehicle is in safe operating condition;

   (3) idling for testing, servicing, repairing or diagnostic purposes;

   (4) idling necessary to accomplish work for which the vehicle was designed (such as operating a crane);

   (5) idling required to bring the machine system to operating temperature; and, 

   (6) idling necessary to ensure safe operation of the vehicle.

It is the Permittee’s responsibility to have a written idling policy that is made available to operators of the vehicles and equipment and informs them that idling is limited to five (5) consecutive minutes or less, except as exempted in subsection a. above.

The following are recommended for construction equipment and vehicles:

   a. Diesel powered equipment should be replaced by electric equipment whenever feasible;

   b. Maintain equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturer’s specifications;

   c. Lengthen the construction period during smog season (May through October), to minimize the number of vehicles and equipment operating at the same time; and,

   d. Use alternatively fueled construction equipment, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), or electric, if feasible.

Timing: Throughout the construction/grading phases of the project.

Monitoring and Reporting: Reporting of compliance with the required State Laws regarding diesel vehicles is conducted via annual fleet mix reporting, phasing out of older-tier equipment, and routine surveillance and audits by Ventura County APCD
inspectors. The applicable recommended measures shall be included in the construction plan submitted to Building and Safety and County building/grading inspector shall perform periodic site inspections throughout the construction period. Monitoring and Enforcement of dust-related construction activities shall be conducted by Ventura County APCD staff and is complaint-driven.

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY CONDITIONS**

**Planning Division**

37. Construction Noise

**Purpose:** In order for this Project to comply with the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs Noise Policy 2.16.2-1(5) and the County of Ventura Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan (Amended 2010).

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall limit construction activity for site preparation and development to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Saturday, Sunday, and State holidays. Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting is not subject to these restrictions.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall post a sign stating these restrictions in a conspicuous location on the Project site, in order so that the sign is visible to the general public. The Permittee shall provide photo documentation showing posting of the required signage to the Planning Division, prior to the commencement of grading and construction activities. The sign must provide a telephone number of the site foreman, or other person who controls activities on the jobsite, for use for complaints from the public. The Permittee shall maintain a “Complaint Log,” noting the date, time, complainant’s name, complaint, and any corrective action taken, in the event that the Permittee receives noise complaints. The Permittee must submit the “Complaint Log” to the Planning Division upon the Planning Director’s request.

**Timing:** The Permittee shall install the sign prior to the issuance of a building permit and throughout all grading and construction activities. The Permittee shall maintain the signage on-site until all grading and construction activities are complete. If the Planning Director requests the Permittee to submit the “Complaint Log” to the Planning Division, the Permittee shall submit the “Complaint Log” within one-day of receiving the Planning Director’s request.
Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division reviews, and maintains in the Project file, the photo documentation of the sign and the “Complaint Log.” The Planning Division has the authority to conduct site inspections and take enforcement actions to ensure that the Permittee conducts grading and construction activities in compliance with this condition, consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

OTHER VENTURA COUNTY AGENCIES CONDITIONS

Ventura County Fire Protection District

38. Hazardous Fire Area
Purpose: To advise the applicant that the Project is located within a Hazardous Fire Area and ensure compliance with California Building and Fire Codes.

Requirement: The Permittee shall construct all structures to meet hazardous fire area building code requirements.

Documentation: A stamped copy of the approved building plans to be retained by the Building Department.

Timing: The Permittee shall submit building plans to the Building Department for approval before the issuance of building permits.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Fire Prevention Bureau shall conduct a final inspection to ensure that the structure is constructed according to the approved hazardous fire area building code requirements. Unless a modification is approved by the Fire Prevention Bureau, the Permittee, and his successors in interest, shall maintain the approved construction for the life of the structure.

39. Hazard Abatement
Purpose: To ensure compliance with Ventura County Fire Protection District Ordinance.

Requirement: The Permittee shall have all grass or brush adjacent to structure’s footprint cleared for a distance of 100 feet or to the property line if less than 100 feet. All grass and brush shall be removed a distance of 10 feet on each side of all access road(s)/driveway(s) within the Project. The Fire District may require the entire parcel to be cleared. Note: A Notice to Abate Fire Hazard may be recorded against the parcel.

Documentation: A signed copy of the Ventura County Fire Protection District’s Form #126 “Requirement for Construction” or the “Notice to Abate” issued under the Fire District’s Fire Hazard Reduction Program.
Timing: The Permittee shall remove all grass and brush as outlined by the Ventura County Fire Protection District's Fire Hazard Reduction Program guidelines before the start of construction on any structure.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Fire Prevention Bureau shall conduct onsite inspections to ensure compliance with this condition.

IN ADDITION TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL NOS. 1 – 29, (ABOVE) AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL NOS. 30 – 34, (ABOVE) THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL APPLY SPECIFICALLY TO WELL SITE NO. 7 (191 ALVISO DRIVE / APN NO. 152-0-341-065) OF CUP NO. 4858:

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY CONDITIONS

Planning Division

40. Construction Noise

Purpose: In order for this Project to comply with the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs Noise Policy 2.16.2-1(5) and the County of Ventura Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan (Amended 2010).

Requirement: The Permittee shall limit construction activity for site preparation and development which generates noise during Construction Phases 1 (Site Development and Grading) and 3 (Construction and Paving) to the hours between 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Saturday, Sunday, and State holidays. Activities which generate noise during Construction Phase 2 (Well Drilling and Casing Installation) may be conducted 24-hours-per-day, all days of the week. Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting is not subject to these restrictions. All heavy equipment used for Project construction that can utilize mufflers shall do so.

The following noise barriers shall be used:

a. 24-foot-tall, Sound Transmission Class (STC)-32 noise barriers shall be positioned on the east and west sides of the Project. These barriers shall be in place for the entire construction duration (Construction Phases 1, 2, and 3);

b. 16-foot-tall, STC-32 noise barrier shall be positioned on the south side of the Project. This barrier shall include a gate to allow Project access. This barrier shall be in place for the entire construction duration (Construction Phases 1, 2, and 3);
c. 16-foot-tall, STC-32 noise barrier shall be positioned to the north of the construction activity. This barrier shall be in place for Construction Phases 2 and 3. Note: This barrier will not be in place during Phase 1 because the site must be graded before it can be installed; and,

d. 8-foot-tall, STC-24, free-standing, portable noise barriers shall be positioned adjacent to the drill rig engine and the generator used during casing installation on the east and west sides of the Project. Note: These barriers will only be used during Construction Phase 2 (Well Drilling and Casing Installation).

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall post a sign stating these restrictions in a conspicuous location on the Project site, in order so that the sign is visible to the general public. The Permittee shall provide photo documentation showing posting of the required signage to the Planning Division, prior to the commencement of grading and construction activities. The sign must provide a telephone number of the site foreman, or other person who controls activities on the jobsite, for use for complaints from the public. The Permittee shall maintain a “Complaint Log,” noting the date, time, complainant’s name, complaint, and any corrective action taken, in the event that the Permittee receives noise complaints. The Permittee must submit the “Complaint Log” to the Planning Division upon the Planning Director’s request.

Two weeks prior to commencement of Construction Phase 2 (Well Drilling and Casing Installation), the Permittee shall notify the adjacent neighbors via mail as well as by hand-delivered informational sheets to doors/mailboxes, regarding the commencement of 24-hour construction activities.

**Timing:** The Permittee shall install the sign prior to the issuance of a building permit and throughout all grading and construction activities. The Permittee shall maintain the signage on-site until all grading and construction activities are complete. If the Planning Director requests the Permittee to submit the “Complaint Log” to the Planning Division, the Permittee shall submit the “Complaint Log” within one-day of receiving the Planning Director’s request.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Planning Division reviews, and maintains in the Project file, the photo documentation of the sign and the “Complaint Log.” The Planning Division has the authority to conduct site inspections and take enforcement actions to ensure that the Permittee conducts grading and construction activities in compliance with this condition, consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.
41. **Landscaping**

**Purpose:** To comply with the County’s landscaping requirements.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall retain a landscape architect to prepare a landscape plan that complies with the requirements of this condition and the “Ventura County Landscape Design Criteria” (1992).

**Landscaping Objectives:** The Permittee must install and maintain landscaping that serves the following functions:

- a. Provides visual relief and visual integration. The Permittee must install landscaping that blends structures with surroundings;
- b. Ensures compatibility with community character. The Permittee must install landscaping that visually integrates the development with the character of the surrounding community; and,
- c. Shades and improves the aesthetics of paved areas.

**Landscaping Design:** The Permittee shall design all landscaping such that the landscaping requires minimal amounts of water and uses required water efficiently, in accordance with the water efficiency requirements of the Landscape Design Criteria and must achieve the following design objectives:

- a. Use Available Non-Potable Sources of Water. The landscaping must involve the harvesting and/or use of alternative, non-potable sources of water, including stormwater, reclaimed water, and gray water, if available to the Project site;
- b. Protection of Solar Access. The Permittee must design the landscaping to avoid the introduction of vegetation that would now or in the future cast substantial shadow on existing solar collectors or photovoltaic cells or impair the function of a nearby building using passive solar heat collection; and,
- c. Species Diversity. The landscape plan must integrate a variety of plant species, heights, colors, and textures, as appropriate given the size of the landscape.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall submit three sets of a draft landscape plan to the Planning Division for review and approval. A California registered landscape architect (or other qualified individual as approved by the Planning Director) shall prepare the landscape plan, demonstrating compliance with the requirements set forth in this condition (above) and the Ventura County Landscape Design Criteria. The landscape architect responsible for the work shall stamp the plan. After landscape installation, the Permittee shall submit to Planning Division staff a statement from the Project landscape architect that the Permittee installed all landscaping as shown on the approved landscape plan. Prior to installation of the landscaping, the Permittee must obtain the
Planning Director's approval of any changes to the landscape plans that affect the character or quantity of the plant material or irrigation system design.

**Timing:** The Permittee shall submit the landscape plan to the Planning Division for review and approval prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration. Landscaping installation and maintenance activities shall occur according to the timing requirements set forth in the “Ventura County Landscape Design Criteria” (§ F).

**Monitoring and Reporting:** Landscaping approval/installation verification, monitoring activities, and enforcement activities shall occur according to the procedures set forth in the “Ventura County Landscape Design Criteria” (§§ F and G) and § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Division maintains the landscape plans and statement by the landscape architect in the Project file and has the authority to conduct site inspections to ensure that the Permittee installs and maintains the landscaping in accordance with the approved plan consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

42. **Avoidance of Nesting Birds**

**Purpose:** In order to prevent impacts to birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, land clearing and construction activities shall be regulated.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall conduct all demolition, tree removal/trimming, vegetation clearing, and grading activities (collectively, “land clearing activities”), and construction in such a way as to avoid nesting native birds. This can be accomplished by implementing one of the following options:

a. **Timing of land clearing or construction:** Prohibit land clearing or construction activities during the breeding and nesting season (February 1 – September 1), in which case the following surveys are not required; or

b. **Surveys and avoidance of occupied nests:** Conduct site-specific surveys prior to land clearing or construction activities during the breeding and nesting season (February 1 – September 1) and avoid occupied bird nests. A County-approved biologist shall conduct surveys to identify any occupied (active) bird nests in the area proposed for disturbance. Occupied nests shall be avoided until juvenile birds have vacated the nest.

The County-approved biologist shall conduct an initial breeding and nesting bird survey 30 days prior to the initiation of land clearing or construction activities. The County-approved biologist shall continue to survey the Project site on a weekly basis, with the last survey completed no more than three days prior to the initiation of land clearing activities. The nesting bird survey must cover the development footprint and 300 feet from the development footprint. If occupied (active) nests are found, land clearing activities within a setback area surrounding the nest shall be postponed or halted. Land
clearing activities may commence in the setback area when the nest is vacated (juveniles have fledged) provided that there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting, as determined by the County-approved biologist. Land clearing activities can also occur outside of the setback areas. Pursuant to the recommendations of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the required setback is 300 feet for most birds and 500 feet for raptors. This setback can be increased or decreased based on the recommendation of the County-approved biologist and approval from the Planning Division.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall provide to the Planning Division a Survey Report from a County-approved biologist documenting the results of the initial nesting bird survey and a plan for continued surveys and avoidance of nests in accordance with the requirements set forth in this condition (above). Along with the Survey Report, the Permittee shall provide a copy of a signed contract (financial information redacted) with a County-approved biologist responsible for the surveys, monitoring of any occupied nests discovered, and establishment of mandatory setback areas. The Permittee shall submit to the Planning Division a Nesting Bird Avoidance Report from a County-approved biologist following land clearing activities documenting actions taken to avoid nesting birds and results.

**Timing:** If land clearing or construction activities will occur between February 1 – September 1, the County-approved biologist shall conduct the nesting bird surveys 30 days prior to initiation of land clearing or construction activities, and weekly thereafter. The last survey for nesting birds shall be conducted no more than three days prior to initiation of land clearing or construction activities. The Permittee shall submit the Survey Report documenting the results of the first nesting bird survey and the signed contract to the Planning Division prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration. The Permittee shall submit the Nesting Bird Avoidance Report within 14 days of completion of the land clearing or construction activities.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Planning Division reviews the Survey Report and signed contract for adequacy prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration. The Planning Division maintains copies of the signed contract, Survey Report, and Nesting Bird Avoidance Report in the Project file.

43. Paleontological Resources

**Purpose:** To avoid significant impacts to paleontological resources that may exist on the subject property.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall retain a paleontological consultant or professional geologist to monitor all subsurface grading, trenching, or construction activities on the Project site.
Documentation: The paleontological consultant or professional geologist shall provide a monthly report to the Planning Division summarizing the activities during the reporting period. If no paleontological resources are discovered, the paleontological consultant or professional geologist shall submit a brief letter to the Planning Division, stating that no paleontological resources were discovered and that the monitoring activities have been completed.

Timing: The paleontological consultant or professional geologist shall monitor the Project site during all subsurface grading, trenching, or construction activities. The paleontological consultant or professional geologist shall provide the reports monthly during all subsurface grading, trenching, or construction activities.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division reviews the monitoring reports and maintains the monitoring reports in the Project file. The paleontological consultant or professional geologist shall monitor the Project site during all subsurface grading, trenching, or construction activities. The Planning Division has the authority to conduct site inspections to ensure that the monitoring activities occur in compliance with this condition, consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

44. Paleontological Resources Discovered During Grading

Purpose: In order to mitigate potential impacts to paleontological resources that may be encountered during ground disturbance or construction activities.

Requirement: If any paleontological remains are uncovered during ground disturbance or construction activities, the Permittee shall:

- a. Cease operations and assure the preservation of the area in which the discovery was made;
- b. Notify the Planning Director in writing, within three days of the discovery;
- c. Obtain the services of a paleontological consultant or professional geologist who shall assess the find and provide a report that assesses the resources and sets forth recommendations on the proper disposition of the site;
- d. Obtain the Planning Director’s written concurrence with the recommended disposition of the site before resuming development; and,
- e. Implement the agreed upon recommendations.

Documentation: The Permittee shall submit the paleontologist’s or geologist’s reports. Additional documentation may be required to demonstrate that the Permittee has implemented the recommendations set forth in the paleontological report.
Timing: If any paleontological remains are uncovered during ground disturbance or construction activities, the Permittee shall provide the written notification to the Planning Director within three days of the discovery. The Permittee shall submit the paleontological report to the Planning Division immediately upon completion of the report.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Permittee shall provide the paleontological report to the Planning Division to be made part of the Project file. The Permittee shall implement any recommendations made in the paleontological report to the satisfaction of the Planning Director. The paleontologist shall monitor all ground disturbance activities within the area in which the discovery was made, in order to ensure the successful implementation of the recommendations made in the paleontological report. The Planning Division has the authority to conduct site inspections to ensure that the Permittee implements the recommendations set forth in the paleontological report, consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

45. Archaeological Resources

Purpose: To avoid significant impacts to archeological resources that may exist on the subject property.

Requirement: The Permittee shall retain a Native American monitor to monitor all subsurface grading, trenching, or construction activities on the Project site.

Documentation: The Native American monitor shall provide a monthly report to the Planning Division summarizing the activities during the reporting period. If no archaeological resources are discovered, the Native American monitor shall submit a brief letter to the Planning Division, stating that no archaeological resources were discovered and that the monitoring activities have been completed.

Timing: The Native American monitor shall monitor the Project site during all subsurface grading, trenching, or construction activities. The Native American monitor shall provide the reports monthly during all subsurface grading, trenching, or construction activities.

Monitoring and Reporting: The Planning Division reviews the monitoring reports and maintains the monitoring reports in the Project file. The Native American monitor shall monitor the Project site during all subsurface grading, trenching, or construction activities. The Planning Division has the authority to conduct site inspections to ensure that the monitoring activities occur in compliance with this condition, consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.
46. Archaeological Resources Discovered During Grading

**Purpose:** In order to mitigate potential impacts to archaeological resources discovered during ground disturbance.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall implement the following procedures:

a. If any archaeological or historical artifacts are uncovered during ground disturbance or construction activities, the Permittee shall:
   
   1. Cease operations and assure the preservation of the area in which the discovery was made;
   
   2. Notify the Planning Director in writing, within three days of the discovery;
   
   3. Obtain the services of a County-approved archaeologist who shall assess the find and provide recommendations on the proper disposition of the site in a written report format;
   
   4. Obtain the Planning Director’s written concurrence of the recommended disposition of the site before resuming development; and,
   
   5. Implement the agreed upon recommendations.

b. If any human burial remains are encountered during ground disturbance or construction activities, the Permittee shall:

   1. Cease operations and assure the preservation of the area in which the discovery was made;
   
   2. Immediately notify the County Coroner and the Planning Director;
   
   3. Obtain the services of a County-approved archaeologist and, if necessary, Native American Monitor(s), who shall assess the find and provide recommendations on the proper disposition of the site in a written report format;
   
   4. Obtain the Planning Director’s written concurrence of the recommended disposition of the site before resuming development on-site; and,
   
   5. Implement the agreed upon recommendations.

**Documentation:** If archaeological remains are encountered, the Permittee shall submit a report prepared by a County-approved archaeologist including recommendations for the proper disposition of the site. Additional documentation may be required to
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...demonstrate that the Permittee has implemented any recommendations made by the archaeologist’s report.

**Timing:** If any archaeological remains are uncovered during ground disturbance or construction activities, the Permittee shall provide the written notification to the Planning Director within three days of the discovery. The Permittee shall submit the archaeological report to the Planning Division immediately upon completion of the report.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Permittee shall provide the archaeological report to the Planning Division to be made part of the Project file. The Permittee shall implement any recommendations made in the archaeological report to the satisfaction of the Planning Director. The archaeologist shall monitor all ground disturbance activities within the area in which the discovery was made, in order to ensure the successful implementation of the recommendations made in the archaeological report. The Planning Division has the authority to conduct site inspections to ensure that the Permittee implements the recommendations set forth in the archaeological report, consistent with the requirements of § 8114-3 of the Ventura County Non-Coastal Zoning Ordinance.

**Environmental Health Division**

47. State Division of Drinking Water - Water Supply Permit

**Purpose:** To demonstrate conformance with California Safe Drinking Water Act and California Code of Regulations, Title 22.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall complete the process to obtain approval for the new water supply well and pump house from the State Division of Drinking Water (DDW).

**Timing:** Permittee shall provide proof of DDW approval prior to obtaining a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration.

48. Hazardous Materials / Waste Management (CUPA Permit Required)

**Purpose:** To comply with the California Code of Regulations Title 22, Division 4.5, California Health and Safety Code chapter 6.95; and Ventura County Ordinance Code, and to ensure the safe storage, handling, and disposal of any potentially hazardous material.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall submit a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) to the Environmental Health Division/Certified Unified Program Agency (Ventura CUPA) for storage of hazardous materials above reporting thresholds (200 cubic feet gas, 55 gallons liquid, 500 pounds solid).

**Documentation:** A completed HMBP must be submitted to the Ventura CUPA electronically through the California Environmental Reporting System (CERS).
Timing: HMBP must be submitted through CERS annually, and whenever there is a change to the type, quantity, or location of the hazardous materials.

Monitoring and Reporting: Verification of hazardous materials inventory as well as ongoing compliance with requirements shall be accomplished through field inspection by Ventura CUPA staff. Additional information on the storage and handling requirements for hazardous materials may be found on the Ventura County Environmental Health Division/Certified Unified Program Agency website: https://vcrma.org/cupa.

PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY CONDITIONS

Transportation Department

49. Construct Driveway Access
Purpose: Driveway access shall be in accordance with the County Road Standards, the Driveways and Curb Cuts Brochure, and the County’s Access Policies.

Requirement: The driveway shall be constructed per County Road Standard Plate E 2 (Residential Driveway), or as modified and approved by the County’s Permit Engineer. The Permittee shall obtain an Encroachment Permit from the PWATD. Contact the Transportation Department Permits Division at (805) 654-2055 for the requirements of the Encroachment Permit. The Encroachment Permit form is available on the internet. Improvement plans and supporting documentation may be required by the Transportation Department Permits Division. The Permittee shall provide calculations showing that there is adequate sight distance on both sides of the driveway.

Documentation: The PWATD will review the improvement plans and supporting documentation.

Timing: This condition shall be met prior to the issuance of the Building Permit and/or Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration, whichever comes first.

Monitoring and Reporting: The PWATD Inspectors will monitor construction and verify that the work is performed in accordance with the Encroachment Permit.

50. Obtain Encroachment Permit
Purpose: The current right of way width on Alviso Drive is 50 feet wide along the front of this parcel. An Encroachment Permit is required for any work conducted within the County road right of way, for example but not limited to, driveways, utility installation, planter walls, and landscaping and any construction related storage in the County road right of way.
**Requirement:** The Permittee shall contact the Transportation Department Permits Division at (805) 654-2055 for requirements of the Encroachment Permit.

An Encroachment Permit is required for any work and construction related storage conducted within the County right of way. The Permittee shall contact the Transportation Department Permits Division at (805) 654-2055 for requirements of the Encroachment Permit. The application shall be submitted to the PWATD.

**Documentation:** The application shall be submitted to the PWATD. When applying for the Encroachment Permit, the Permittee shall provide sufficient documentation, including, but not limited to,

- a. Resource Management Agency Project Number (Case No. PL19-0039);
- b. a copy of the Transportation Department Conditions of Approval; and,
- c. a sketch or map showing the work to be accomplished, Project scope, Project APN No., address, and street name. Permit applications without sufficient documentation for processing may not be accepted for processing.

**Timing:** This condition shall be met prior to the issuance of the Building Permit and/or Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration, whichever comes first.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The PWATD will review the application and supporting documentation. The PWATD Inspectors will monitor construction and verify that the work is performed in accordance with the Encroachment Permit.

---

**Engineering Services Department**

51. Grading Permit

**Purpose:** In order to ensure the Permittee performs all grading in compliance with Appendix J of the Ventura County Building Code.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall submit a grading plan showing existing and proposed elevations to the Public Works Agency’s Development and Inspection Services Division for review and approval. If a grading permit is required, a State licensed civil engineer must prepare and submit the grading plans, geotechnical and hydrology reports as necessary, to Development and Inspection Services Division for review and approval. The Permittee must post sufficient surety in order to ensure proper completion of the proposed grading.

**Documentation:** If a grading permit is required, all materials detailed on Public Works Agency Grading Permit Submittal Checklist, must be submitted to Development and Inspection Services Division for review and approval.
Timing: All applicable documentation, as specified above, must be submitted for review prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration.

Monitoring and Reporting: Public Works Agency engineers will review grading plans and reports for compliance with Ventura County codes, ordinances and standards, as well as state and federal laws. Public Works Agency inspectors will monitor the proposed grading to verify that the work is done in compliance with the approved plans and reports.

52. Drainage Plan

Purpose: To ensure runoff is discharged in accordance with Ventura County Building Code, Ventura County Public Works Agency, Watershed Protection District, national and State standards.

Requirement: The Permittee shall submit drainage plans and hydrologic and hydraulic calculations, which are prepared by a registered civil engineer, to the Public Works Agency’s Development and Inspection Services Division for review and approval. The Permittee shall post sufficient surety in order to ensure proper completion of the drainage plan.

Documentation: Drainage plans and hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall address the following: quantities of water, water flow rates, major water courses, drainage areas and patterns, diversions, collection systems, flood hazard areas, sumps, debris basins, detention facilities, and drainage courses devised to manage the drainage. The hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall be in compliance with the Ventura County Watershed Protection District’s hydrology and design manuals. The hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall include evidence that all the buildable sites in the proposed Project will be protected from flooding based on a one-percent annual chance storm.

Timing: All documentation, as specified above, must be submitted to Public Works Agency prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for Construction and Use Inauguration.

Monitoring and Reporting: Public Works Agency engineers will review drainage plans and hydrologic and hydraulic calculations for compliance with state and federal laws, as well as Ventura County codes, ordinances and standards. Public Works Agency inspectors will monitor the construction to verify that the work is done in compliance with the approved plans and reports.
August 22, 2019  
Project No. 01-002-05  
Crestview Mutual Water Company  
328 Valley Vista Drive  
Camarillo, California 93010  
Attention: Mr. Robert Eranio  
General Manager  
Subject: Well Seal and Set Back Requirements for Crestview Mutual Water Company Well No. 7 Construction Project.

Dear Mr. Eranio:  

As requested, Hopkins Groundwater Consultants, Inc. (Hopkins) is providing this review of well location set back requirements and site-specific geologic conditions to assist the Crestview Mutual Water Company (Crestview) with the permitting of proposed Well No. 7 as a potable supply. The proposed well will be located on a parcel owned by Crestview within a residential neighborhood as shown on Plate 1 – Well Location Map. As located, the well has a horizontal distance of less than the 150-foot setback requirement for septic tank disposal systems that utilize seepage pits. The location of proximate domestic septic systems is shown on Plate 2 – Septic System Location Map. It is our understanding that the seepage pits consist of borings that extend to depths of between 50 and 60 feet below ground surface (bgs).

To assess the potential impacts of the waste disposal systems indicated above, we constructed a correlation of the preliminary well design and the subsurface hydrogeology as shown by an electric log of Crestview Well No. 3 (State Well No. 02N21W-22E01) located just over 500 feet from the site. As shown on Plate 3 – Hydrogeology and Preliminary Well Design, the shallow subsurface materials contain interbedded silt, sand, gravel, and clay layers that extend down to the depth of the first viable aquifer zone which is located between the depths of approximately 350 and 520 feet bgs. From the geophysical log information, the static water level at the time of drilling was approximately 430 feet bgs. Beneath the first aquifer zone is approximately 400 feet of clay materials that lies between the depths of 520 and 920 feet bgs. This thick layer serves as a natural barrier to vertical migration of sources of groundwater recharge adjacent the site and impedes downward flow to the aquifer zones proposed for use by the new well. As shown on Plate 3, the first aquifer zones proposed for production is at a depth of approximately 1,000 feet bgs. The proposed cement grout sanitary seal extends to a depth of approximately 940 feet bgs for the specific purpose of sealing off poorer water quality zones in the shallower sediments. The substantial sanitary seal depth and the natural aquitard layers provide protection from surface recharge sources of contaminants that is greater than an additional horizontal setback distance at the ground surface.
It is our professional opinion that the proposed well design and the local hydrogeologic conditions described above provide the desired protection of the municipal water supply that is proposed for development at the Crestview Well No. 7 location. These protective conditions are sufficient to waive the regulatory setback requirements from the site-specific sources of potential contamination. This conclusion is further supported by the proximal wells (Crestview Well No. 3 and 4) that have significantly shallower sanitary seals and have operated for decades without nitrate impacts to the quality of groundwater produced.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the Crestview Mutual Water Company and its agents for specific application to the Crestview Well No. 7 construction project. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations presented herein were prepared in accordance with generally accepted hydrogeological engineering and planning practices. No other warranty, express or implied, is made.

As always, we appreciate the opportunity to be of service and trust that the information summarized in this letter-report is sufficient for Crestview’s needs. If you need any additional information or have any questions, please give us a call.

Sincerely,

HOPKINS GROUNDWATER CONSULTANTS, INC.

Curtis J. Hopkins
Principal Hydrogeologist
Certified Engineering Geologist EG 1800
Certified Hydrogeologist HG 114

Attachment: Plate 1 – Well Location Map
Plate 2 – Septic System Location Map
Plate 3 – Hydrogeology and Preliminary Well Design

Copy: Mr. Jeff Densmore, State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Drinking Water
Mr. Jeff Dorrington, Ventura County Watershed Protection District, Water Resources Division
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GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING REPORT
191 ALVISO DRIVE
CAMARILLO AREA OF VENTURA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

PROJECT NO.: 302698-001
JANUARY 4, 2019

PREPARED FOR
CRESTVIEW MUTUAL WATER COMPANY
ATTENTION: ROBERT ERANIO

BY
EARTH SYSTEMS PACIFIC
1731-A WALTER STREET
VENTURA, CALIFORNIA 93003
January 4, 2019  

Crestview Mutual Water Company  
Attention: Robert Eranio  
328 Valley Vista Drive  
Camarillo, CA 93010  

Project: 191 Alviso Drive  
Camarillo Area of Ventura County, California  
Subject: Geotechnical Engineering Report  

As authorized, Earth Systems Pacific (Earth Systems) has performed a geotechnical study for proposed construction at 191 Alviso Drive in the Camarillo area of Ventura County, California. The accompanying Geotechnical Engineering Report presents the results of our subsurface exploration and laboratory testing programs, and our conclusions and recommendations pertaining to geotechnical aspects of project design. This report completes Phase 1 of the scope of services described within our Proposal VEN-18-08-010 dated August 20, 2018; revised October 10, 2018; and authorized by you on November 1, 2018.

We have appreciated the opportunity to be of service to you on this project. Please call if you have any questions, or if we can be of further service.

Respectfully submitted,

EARTH SYSTEMS PACIFIC  

Reviewed and Approved

Meng Wei Lu  
Civil Engineer  

Richard M. Beard  
Geotechnical Engineer  

Todd J. Tranby  
Engineering Geologist  

Copies: 4 - Client (3 hardcopies, 1 email)  
1 - Project File
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INTRODUCTION

Project Description
This report presents results of a Geotechnical Engineering study performed for proposed construction at 191 Alviso Drive in the Camarillo area of Ventura County, California (see Vicinity Map in Appendix A). It is anticipated that the proposed construction will be support structures around a proposed water well including a building pad, a materials pad, a generator pad, and a retaining wall.

Structural considerations for building column loads of up to 10 kips with maximum wall loads of 1 kip per lineal foot were used as a basis for the recommendations of this report. If actual loads vary significantly from these assumed loads, Earth Systems should be notified since reevaluation of the recommendations contained in this report may be required.

Purpose and Scope of Work
The purpose of the geotechnical study that led to this report was to analyze the soil/bedrock conditions of the project site and to provide geotechnical recommendations for construction. The soil conditions include surface and subsurface soil types, expansion potential, soil strength, settlement potential, bearing capacity, and the presence or absence of subsurface water. The scope of work included:

- Performing a reconnaissance of the project site.
- Drilling, sampling, and logging 2 hollow-stem-auger borings to study bedrock, soil, and groundwater conditions.
- Laboratory testing soil samples obtained from the subsurface exploration to determine their physical and engineering properties.
- Consulting with owner representatives and design professionals.
- Analyzing the geotechnical data obtained.
- Preparing this report.

Contained in this report are:

- Descriptions and results of field and laboratory tests that were performed.
- Conclusions and recommendations pertaining to site grading and structural design.
Site Setting
The project site is currently a vacant lot that covered by short grass. Chain-link fencing is installed abound the southern boundary of the site. The project site is bounded by Alviso Drive to the south, a natural drainage to the north, and residential lots to the west and east. The project site appears to drain to the northwards. The geographic coordinates of the project site are 34.2424° North Latitude and 119.0749° West Longitude.

REGIONAL GEOLOGY

The property lies within the western portion of the Transverse Ranges geologic province. Numerous east-west trending folds and reverse faults indicative of active north-south transpressional tectonics characterize the region.

Regional Geologic Map 1 (T.W. Dibblee, Jr, Geologic Map of the Camarillo and Newbury Park Quadrangles, 1990) indicates the northeast-southwest trending Springville Fault Zone to be about 3,800 feet southeast of the site (see Appendix A).

Regional Geologic Map 2 (USGS/CGS, SCAMP Geologic Map of the Camarillo 7.5’ Quadrangle, 2004) indicates the northeast-southwest trending Springville Fault Zone to be about 3,200 feet southeast of the site (see Appendix A).

The site is mapped by T.W. Dibblee, Jr. as underlain by Saugus Formation Bedrock, and mapped by the USGS/CGS as underlain by both Saugus Formation Bedrock and Las Posas Formation Bedrock. Our field study encountered a layer of soil (thickness of up to about 3 feet) overlying Saugus Formation Bedrock.

SEISMICITY AND SEISMIC DESIGN

Although the project site is not within a State-designated "fault rupture hazard zone", it is located in an active seismic region where large numbers of earthquakes are recorded each year. Historically, major earthquakes felt in the vicinity of the project site have originated from faults near the area. These include the 1857 Fort Tejon earthquake, the 1872 Owens Valley earthquake, and the 1952 Arvin-Tehachapi earthquake.
It is assumed that the 2016 CBC and ASCE 7-10 guidelines will apply for the seismic design parameters. The 2016 CBC includes several seismic design parameters that are influenced by the geographic site location with respect to active and potentially active faults, and with respect to subsurface soil or rock conditions. The seismic design parameters presented herein were determined by the United States Seismic Design Maps "risk-targeted" calculator on the USGS website for the project site coordinates (34.2424° North Latitude and 119.0749° West Longitude). The calculator adjusts for Soil Site Class C, and for Occupancy (Risk) Category I/II/III.

The calculated 2016 California Building Code (CBC) and ASCE 7-10 seismic parameters typically used for structural design are included in Appendix D and summarized in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Seismic Parameters (2016 CBC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Design Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Class (Table 20.3-1 of ASCE 7-10 with 2013 update)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy (Risk) Category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) Ground Motion**
  - Peak Modified Ground Acceleration – PGAₘ = 1.105 g
  - Spectral Response Acceleration, Short Period – Sₛ = 2.785 g
  - Spectral Response Acceleration at 1 sec. – S₁ = 0.995 g
  - Site Coefficient – Fₐ = 1.00
  - Site Coefficient – Fᵥ = 1.30
  - Site-Modified Spectral Response Acceleration, Short Period – Sₘₛ = 2.785 g
  - Site-Modified Spectral Response Acceleration at 1 sec. – Sₘ₁ = 1.294 g

- **Design Earthquake Ground Motion**
  - Short Period Spectral Response – S₀ₛ = 1.857 g
  - One Second Spectral Response – S₀₁ = 0.862 g

The values presented in the table above are appropriate for a 2 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years. A listing of the calculated 2016 CBC and ASCE 7-10 seismic parameters is included in Appendix D.

The Fault Parameters table in Appendix D lists the significant "active" and "potentially active" faults within a 34-mile (55-kilometer) radius of the project site. The distance between the
project site and the nearest portion of each fault is shown, as well as the respective estimated maximum earthquake magnitudes, and the deterministic mean site peak ground accelerations.

SOIL/BEDROCK AND GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS

Evaluation of the subsurface indicates that much of the project site is blanketed by a layer of soil (clayey silt, thickness of up to about 3 feet) which is underlain by Saugus Formation Bedrock.

Testing indicates that anticipated bearing soils lie in the "High" expansion range based on a measured expansion index of 102. A locally adopted version of this classification of soil expansion, Table 1809.7, is included in Appendix C of this report. It appears that soils can be cut by normal grading equipment.

Groundwater was not encountered in either boring to a maximum depth of about 31.5 feet below ground surface. According to the Seismic Hazard Zones Report for the Camarillo 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Ventura County, California (CGS, 2002), the project site is within a valley/mountain boundary zone. See Historical High Groundwater Map in Appendix A. It should be noted that fluctuations in groundwater levels may occur because of variations in rainfall, regional climate, and other factors.

A sample of near-surface soil was tested for pH, resistivity, soluble sulfates, and soluble chlorides. The test results provided in Appendix B should be distributed to the design team for their interpretations pertaining to the corrosivity or reactivity of various construction materials (such as concrete and piping) with the soils. It should be noted that sulfate content (15 mg/Kg) is in the "S0" exposure class (i.e. "Negligible" severity range) of Table 19.3.1.1 of ACI 318-14. Therefore, special concrete designs will not be necessary for the measured sulfate content according to Table 19.3.2.1 of ACI 318-14.

Based on criteria established by the County of Los Angeles, the measured resistivity of a near-surface soil sample (6,700 ohms-cm) indicates that near-surface soils are "Moderately Corrosive" to ferrous metal (i.e. cast iron, etc.) pipes. It should be noted that Earth Systems does not practice soil corrosion engineering.
HYDROCOLLAPSE POTENTIAL

Hydrocollapse is a phenomenon in which naturally occurring soil deposits, or non-engineered fill soils, collapse when wetted. Natural soils that are susceptible to this phenomenon are typically aeolian, debris flow, alluvial, or colluvial deposits with high apparent strength when dry. Loosely compacted fills can also be susceptible to this phenomenon. The dry strength is attributed to salts, clays, silts, and in some cases capillary tension, "bonding" larger soil grains together. So long as these soils remain dry, their strength and resistance to compression are retained. However, when wetted, the salt, clay, or silt bonding agent is weakened or dissolved, or capillary tension reduced, eventually leading to collapse. Soils susceptible to this phenomenon are found throughout the southwestern United States.

The potential of this phenomenon is considered to be low at the project site because the project site is underlain at shallow depths by Saugus Formation Bedrock that is typically not susceptible to hydrocollapse.

LIQUEFACTION POTENTIAL

Earthquake-induced cyclic loading can be the cause of several significant phenomena, including liquefaction in fine sands and silty sands. Liquefaction results in a loss of soil strength and can cause structures to settle and, in extreme cases, to experience bearing failure.

The potential hazard posed by liquefaction is considered to be low at the project site because:

- The project site does not lie within a potentially liquefiable zone (see Seismic Hazard Zones Map in Appendix A).
- The project site is underlain at shallow depths (about 3 feet) by Saugus Formation Bedrock that is typically not susceptible to liquefaction.

SEISMIC-INDUCED SETTLEMENT OF DRY SANDS

Dry (unsaturated) soils tend to settle and densify when subjected to earthquake shaking. The amount of settlement is a function of relative density, cyclic shear strain magnitude, and the number of strain cycles. A procedure to evaluate this type of settlement was developed by
Seed and Silver (1972) and later modified by Pyke, et al. (1975). Tokimatsu and Seed (1987) presented a simplified procedure that has been reduced to a series of equations by Pradel (1998). Research on this subject is continuing (Stewart, et al., 2004).

The potential of this phenomenon is considered to be low at the project site because the project site is underlain at shallow depths by Saugus Formation Bedrock that is typically not susceptible to seismic-induced settlement of dry sands.

**FAULT RUPTURE HAZARD**

A fault is a break in the earth's crust upon which movement has occurred in the recent geologic past and future movement is expected. A summary of nearby active faults is presented in Appendix D under Table 1 Fault Parameters.

The project site does not lie within a State of California designated active fault hazard zone. The activity of faults is classified by the State of California based on the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (1972). An active fault has had surface rupture with Holocene time (the past 11,000 years). A potentially active fault shows evidence of surface displacement during Quaternary time (last 1.6 million years). An inactive fault has no evidence of movement within the Quaternary time.

As previously discussed in the Regional Geology section of this report, all nearby faults according to both reviewed Regional Geologic Maps are no closer than about 3,200 feet from the project site. Therefore, the potential for fault rupture at the project site is considered low.

**LANDSLIDES**

Landsliding is a process where a distinct mass of rock or soil moves downslope because of gravity. No landslides are mapped on the project site by Dibblee or USGS (see Regional Geologic Maps in Appendix A). Because there are no identified landslides either on or trending into the project site, hazards associated with these phenomena are considered low.
ROCKFALL

Loose boulder-sized rocks and/or weathering bedrock outcrops located upslope from construction can lead to a rockfall hazard. Because of the project site's location on top of a slope area, the potential for rockfall onto the project site appears to be low.

EARTHQUAKE-INDUCED FLOODING

Earthquake-induced flooding types include tsunamis, seiches, and reservoir failure. Because of the inland location of the project site, hazards from tsunamis and seiches are considered unlikely. Additionally, there are no reservoirs upstream of the project site. Therefore, earthquake-induced flooding is not considered a potential hazard at the project site.

OTHER FLOODING

The project site is not within any of the flood hazard areas mapped by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), FEMA Flood Map for Ventura County Unincorporated Areas, effective January 7, 2015, Map No. 06111C0927F.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the data provided in this report, it appears that the project site is suitable for the proposed improvements from a geotechnical engineering standpoint provided that the recommendations provided herein are properly implemented into the project.

Earth Systems recommends conventional footings and/or pad footings to be used to support the proposed improvements. Given the site conditions encountered, we conclude that remedial grading will be needed to provide a more uniform bearing condition (i.e., the footings should be supported only by recompacted fill, not by native soil and/or native Saugus Formation Bedrock).

Specific conclusions and recommendations addressing these geotechnical considerations, as well as general recommendations regarding the geotechnical aspects of design and construction, are presented in the following sections.
A. Grading

1. Pre-Grading Considerations
   a. Roof draining systems should be designed so that water is not discharged into bearing soils or near structures.
   b. Final site grade should be designed so that all water is diverted away from the structures over paved surfaces, or over landscaped surfaces in accordance with current codes. Water should not be allowed to pond anywhere on the pad.
   c. Shrinkage of soils (uncertified fills) affected by compaction is estimated to be about 5 percent based on an anticipated average compaction of 92 percent.
   d. Earth Systems should be retained to provide geotechnical engineering services during site development and grading, and foundation construction phases of the work to observe compliance with the design concepts, specifications and recommendations. This will allow for timely design changes in the event that subsurface conditions differ from those anticipated prior to the start of construction.
   e. Plans and specifications should be provided to Earth Systems prior to grading. Plans should include the grading plans, foundation plans, and foundation details. Earth Systems will review these plans only for conformity with geotechnical parameters not including drainage. It is the responsibility of the Client and other Engineers to review and approve designs and plans for conformity with all engineering and design requirements necessary to the proper function and performance of the structure.
   f. Compaction tests should be made to determine the relative compaction of the fills in accordance with the following minimum guidelines: two tests for each 1.5-foot vertical lift in every isolated area graded; two tests for each 500 cubic yards of material placed; and two tests at finished subgrade elevation in the areas of remedial grading.

2. Rough Grading/Areas of Development
   a. Grading at a minimum should conform to the 2016 California Building Code.
   b. The existing ground surface should be initially prepared for grading by removing all vegetation, trees, large roots, debris, other organic material and non-complying fill. Organics and debris should be stockpiled away from areas to be graded, and ultimately removed from the project site to prevent their inclusion in fills. Voids created by removal of such material should be properly
backfilled and compacted. No compacted fill should be placed unless the underlying soil has been observed by the Geotechnical Engineer.

c. To provide a uniform and constructible pad, overexcavation and recompaction of soils in these construction areas will be necessary. Soils should be overexcavated to at least 1.5 feet below the bottom of footings (or through soil). Overexcavation should be extended to a distance of at least 5 feet laterally, but not less than a distance equal to the depth of removal, beyond the outside edge of the foundation elements.

d. The bottoms of all excavations should be observed by a representative of Earth Systems prior to processing or placing fill.

e. The resulting surface(s) should then be scarified an additional 6 inches, uniformly moisture conditioned to about 3 percent over the optimum moisture content, and compacted to achieve a minimum relative compaction of 90 percent of the ASTM D1557 maximum dry density. Compaction of the prepared subgrade should be verified by testing prior to the placement of engineered fill.

f. To control differential settlement and provide a more uniform bearing condition, foundations should bear completely onto recompacted soil

g. On-site soils may be used for fill once they are cleaned of all organic material, rocks, debris, and irreducible material larger than 6 inches.

h. Fill and backfill placed 3% over the optimum moisture in layers with a loose thickness not greater than 8 inches should be compacted to a minimum of 90 percent of the maximum dry density obtainable by the ASTM D1557 test method unless otherwise recommended or specified by the Geotechnical Engineer or his/her representative. Random compaction tests by Earth Systems can assist the Grading Contractor in evaluating whether the Grading Contractor is meeting compaction requirements. However, compaction tests pertain only to a specific location and do not guaranty that all fill has been compacted to the prescribed percentage of maximum density. It is the ultimate responsibility of the Grading Contractor to achieve uniform compaction in accordance with the requirements of this report and the grading ordinance.

i. Import soils used (if any) to raise site grade should be equal to, or better than, on-site soils in strength, expansion, and compressibility characteristics. Import soil can be evaluated, but will not be prequalified by the Geotechnical
Engineer. Final comments on the characteristics of the import will be given after the material is at the project site.

j. Periodic wetting of the soils after grading would be beneficial in regard to presaturation.

3. Utility Trenches
   a. Utility trench backfill should be governed by the provisions of this report relating to minimum compaction standards. In general, on-site service lines may be backfilled with native soils compacted to 90 percent of maximum density. Backfill of offsite service lines will be subject to the specifications of the jurisdictional agency or this report, whichever are greater.
   b. Utility trenches running parallel to footings should be located at least 5 feet outside the footing line, or above a 1:1 (horizontal to vertical) projection downward from the outside edge of the bottom of the footing.
   c. Compacted on-site native soils should be utilized for backfill below structures. Clean sand backfill should be avoided under structures because it provides a conduit for water to migrate under foundations.
   d. Backfill operations should be observed and tested by the Geotechnical Engineer to monitor compliance with these recommendations.
   e. Rocks greater than 6 inches in diameter should not be placed in trench zones (from 12 inches below pavement subgrade or ground surface to 12 inches above top of pipe or box); rocks greater than 2.5 inches in diameter should not be placed in pipe zones (from 12 inches above top of pipe or box to 6 inches below bottom of pipe or box exterior).
   f. Jetting should not be utilized for compaction in utility trenches.

B. Structural Design
   1. Conventional Shallow Foundations
      a. Conventional continuous footings and/or interior pad footings can be used to support structures. It should be noted that if pad footings are to be used, they must be tied together by grade beams (each way) or by slabs. Based on the tested expansion index of 102, perimeter continuous and/or pad footings should have a minimum embedment depth of 27 inches, and interior pad footings should have a minimum embedment depth of 12 inches. The
expansion index should be re-evaluated at the completion of rough grading to confirm that these minimum footing depths are appropriate.

b. Footings should bear into firm recompacted fill as recommended elsewhere in this report. Foundation excavations should be observed by a representative of this firm after excavation, but prior to placing of reinforcing steel or concrete, to verify bearing conditions.

c. Perimeter footings embedded 27 inches deep may be designed based on an allowable bearing value of 2,200 psf. This value includes a safety factor of 3. This allowable bearing value is net (weight of footing and soil surcharge may be neglected) and is applicable for dead plus reasonable live loads.

d. Interior footings embedded 12 inches deep may be designed based on an allowable bearing value of 1,800 psf. This value includes a safety factor of 3. This allowable bearing value is net (weight of footing and soil surcharge may be neglected) and is applicable for dead plus reasonable live loads.

e. Bearing values may be increased by one-third when transient loads such as wind and/or seismicity are included.

f. Lateral loads may be resisted by soil friction on floor slabs and foundations and by passive resistance of the soils acting on foundation stem walls. Lateral capacity is based on the assumption that any required backfill adjacent to foundations and grade beams is properly compacted.

g. The information that follows regarding reinforcement and premoistening for footings is the same as that given in Table 1809.7 for the "High" expansion range. Actual footing designs should be provided by the project Structural Engineer, but the dimensions and reinforcement he recommends should not be less than the criteria set forth in Table 1809.7 for the appropriate expansion range.

h. Continuous footings bottomed in soils in the "High" expansion range should be reinforced, at a minimum, with two No. 4 bars along the bottom and two No. 4 bars along the top. In addition, bent No. 3 bars on 24-inch centers should extend from within the footings to a minimum of 3 feet into adjacent slabs.

i. Bearing soils in the "High" expansion range should be premoistened to about 3 percent above optimum moisture content to a depth of 33 inches below lowest adjacent grade. Premoistening should be confirmed by testing.
2. **Slabs-on-Grade**
   
a. Concrete slabs on grade should be supported by firm recompacted fills as recommended elsewhere in this report. Because the soils of the project site are in the “High” expansion range, it should be anticipated that exterior concrete supported on grade will be susceptible to movement with seasonal change in soil moisture content. The following recommendations for concrete slabs on grade can help mitigate, but not eliminate, such movement.

b. It is recommended that perimeter slabs (walkways, patios, etc.) be designed relatively independent of footing stems (i.e. free floating) so foundation adjustment will be less likely to cause cracking. Because the on-site soils are highly expansive, the exterior concrete slabs on grade should have turned-down edges of at least 8 inches into the soil.

c. The information that follows regarding design criteria for slabs is generally the same as that given in Table 1809.7 for the "High" expansion range. Actual slab designs should be provided by the project Structural Engineer, but the reinforcement and slab thicknesses he recommends should not be less than the criteria set forth in Table 1809.7 for the appropriate expansion range, or as recommended below, whichever is more stringent.

d. Slabs bottomed on soils in the "High" expansion range should be underlaid with a minimum of 4 inches of sand. Areas where floor wetness would be undesirable should be underlaid with a vapor retarder (as specified by the Project Architect or Civil Engineer) to reduce moisture transmission from the subgrade soils to the slab. The retarder should be placed as specified by the project Structural Engineer or Architect.

e. Slabs bottomed on soils in the "High" expansion range should at a minimum be reinforced at mid-slab with No. 3 bars on 24-inch centers, each way. No. 3 bars acting as dowels should also extend out of the perimeter footings, and should be bent so that they extend a minimum of 3 feet into adjacent slabs.

f. Soils underlying slabs that are in the "High" expansion range should be premoistened to about 3 percent above optimum moisture content to a depth of 33 inches below lowest adjacent grade.

g. Premoistening of slab areas should be observed and tested by this firm for compliance with these recommendations prior to placing of sand, reinforcing steel, or concrete.
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3. Frictional and Lateral Coefficients
   a. Resistance to lateral loading may be provided by soil friction acting on the base of foundations. A coefficient of friction of 0.53 may be applied to dead load forces. This value does not include a safety factor.
   b. Passive resistance acting on the sides of foundation stems equal to 310 pcf of equivalent fluid weight may be included for resistance to lateral load. This value does not include a safety factor.
   c. A minimum safety factor of 1.5 should be used when designing for sliding or overturning.
   d. Passive resistance may be combined with frictional resistance provided that a one-third reduction in the coefficient of friction is used.

4. Retaining Walls
   a. Conventional cantilever retaining walls should not be backfilled with on-site soils because of the expansion potential of those soils. Walls that are backfilled at a 1:1 projection upward from the heels of the wall footings with crushed rock or non-expansive sand, may be designed for active pressures of 38 pcf of equivalent fluid weight for well-drained, level backfill. An 18-inch thick cap of compacted native soils should be placed above the rock or sand. Filter fabric should be placed between the rock or sand and native soils and/or backfill over the top.
   b. The pressures listed above were based on the assumption that backfill soils will be compacted to 90 percent of maximum dry density as determined by the ASTM D 1557 Test Method.
   c. Retaining walls may need to be designed for a seismic loading force that is applied in addition to the static forces when seismic shaking occurs. A seismic increment of earth pressure determined using 34 pcf of additional equivalent fluid weight needs to be considered for cantilever retaining walls that retain more than 6 feet of soil. This pressure has been determined by a procedure presented by Al Atik and Sitar (2010). The seismic increment of pressure can be assumed to be distributed so that the centroid of pressure acts at 0.33H above the base of a retaining wall, where H is the wall height in feet. Because this seismic force is transient, and in accordance with CBC Section 1807.2.3, a minimum safety factor of 1.1 may be used for sliding and overturning when seismic loads are included.
d. The lateral earth pressure to be resisted by the retaining walls or similar structures should also be increased to allow for any other applicable surcharge loads. The surcharges considered should include forces generated by any structures or temporary loads that would influence the wall design.

e. A system of backfill drainage should be incorporated into retaining wall designs. Backfill comprising the drainage system immediately behind retaining structures should be free-draining granular material with a filter fabric between it and the rest of the backfill soils. As an alternative, the backs of walls could be lined with geodrain systems. The backdrains should extend from the bottoms of the walls to about 18 inches from finished backfill grade. Waterproofing may aid in reducing the potential for efflorescence on the faces of retaining walls.

f. Compaction on the uphill sides of walls within a horizontal distance equal to one wall height should be performed by hand-operated or other lightweight compaction equipment. This is intended to reduce potential "locked-in" lateral pressures caused by compaction with heavy grading equipment.

g. Water should not be allowed to pond near the tops of retaining walls. To accomplish this, final backfill site grades should be such that all water is diverted away from retaining walls.

5. Settlement Considerations

a. A maximum settlement (static and seismic combined) of about half of an inch (0.5") is anticipated for foundations and slabs designed as recommended.

b. Differential settlement between adjacent load bearing members could be about one-half the maximum settlement.

c. The Project Structural Engineer will need to design the foundation system to accommodate the potential settlement values.

ADDITIONAL SERVICES

This report is based on the assumption that an adequate program of monitoring and testing will be performed by Earth Systems during construction to check compliance with the recommendations given in this report. The recommended tests and observations include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:
• Review of the structural and grading plans during the design phase of the project.
• Observation and testing during site preparation, grading, placing of engineered fill, and foundation construction.
• Consultation as required during construction.

LIMITATIONS AND UNIFORMITY OF CONDITIONS

The analyses and recommendations submitted in this report are based in part upon the data obtained from the on-site borings. The nature and extent of variations beyond the points of exploration may not become evident until construction. If variations then appear evident, it will be necessary to reevaluate the recommendations of this report.

The scope of services did not include any environmental assessment or investigation for the presence or absence of wetlands, hazardous or toxic materials in the soil, surface water, groundwater or air, on, below, or around this site. Any statements in this report or on the soil boring logs regarding odors noted, unusual or suspicious items or conditions observed, are strictly for the information of the client.

Findings of this report are valid as of this date; however, changes in conditions of a property can occur with passage of time whether they are because of natural processes or works of man on this or adjacent properties. In addition, changes in applicable or appropriate standards may occur whether they result from legislation or broadening of knowledge. Accordingly, findings of this report may be invalidated wholly or partially by changes outside our control. Therefore, this report is subject to review and should not be relied upon after a period of 1 year.

In the event that any changes in the nature, design, or location of the proposed structures and other improvements are planned, the conclusions and recommendations contained in this report should not be considered valid unless the changes are reviewed and conclusions of this report modified or verified in writing.

This report is issued with the understanding that it is the responsibility of the Owner, or of his representative to ensure that the information and recommendations contained herein are called to the attention of the Architect and Engineers for the project and incorporated into the plan and that the necessary steps are taken to see that the Contractor and Subcontractors carry out such recommendations in the field.
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As the Geotechnical Engineers for this project, Earth Systems has striven to provide services in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering practices in this community at this time. No warranty or guarantee is expressed or implied. This report was prepared for the exclusive use of the Client for the purposes stated in this document for the referenced project only. No third party may use or rely on this report without express written authorization from Earth Systems for such use or reliance.

It is recommended that Earth Systems be provided the opportunity for a general review of final design and specifications in order that earthwork and foundation recommendations may be properly interpreted and implemented in the design and specifications. If Earth Systems is not accorded the privilege of making this recommended review, it can assume no responsibility for misinterpretation of the recommendations contained herein.
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*Taken from Dibblee, Jr., Geologic Map of The Camarillo and Newbury Park Quadrangles, Ventura County, California, 1990, DF-28.

GEOLOGIC SYMBOLS

FORMATION CONTACT: dashed where inferred or subaerial, dotted where concealed
MEMBER CONTACT: between units of a formation
CONTACT BETWEEN SURFICIAL SEDIMENTS: labeled only approximations in places

FAULT: Dashed where inferred or subaerial, dotted where concealed, quoted where existence is doubtful. Parallel arrows indicate inferred relative lateral movement. Relative vertical movement is shown by UFD (U=upthrown side, D=downthrown side). Short arrow indicates dip of fault plane. Spotted are on upper plates of low angle thrust fault.

FOLDS:
- Anticline
- Syncline

Strike and dip of sedimentary rocks
- Strike
- Dip

Strike and dip of metamorphic or igneous rock foliation or flow banding or compositional layers
- Strike
- Dip

OTHER SYMBOLS:
- Fold axes and outcrop directions
- Water bodies shown as map
- Snow ice
- Spring

Approximate Scale: 1" = 2,000'

SAUGUS FORMATION
(Kof Hakara, 1969; Kato, 1974; Weber et al., 1973; Jakes, 1979)
Nonmarine fluviatile; probably Pleistocene age in this area
QTs Weakly indurated, light gray to light brown pebble- to cobble gravel, sand and clay; includes indurated paleo-soil layers locally; gravel contains clasts of granitic and metavolcanic rocks, quartzite and siltstone shale (Monterey Formation); in eastern Los Posas Hills contains lenses of volcanic detritus from Conejo Volcanics at and near base; grades downward and in part eastward into Los Posas Sand

Qoa Dissected, weakly indurated alluvial gravel, sand and clay

OLDER DISSECTED SURFICIAL SEDIMENTS

REGIONAL GEOLOGIC MAP 1

191 Alviso Drive
Camarillo Area of Ventura County, California
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302698-001
Approximate Site Location

*Taken from USGS, SCAMP Geologic Map of the Camarillo 7.5' Quadrangle, Ventura County, California, 2004.

**MAP SYMBOLS**
- Contact between map units - Generally approximately located or inferred, dotted where concealed.
- Contact between similar map units of different relative age - Recognized by scour and indurated channeling features. Generally approximately located.
- Fault - Generally approximately located or inferred, dotted where concealed, queried where location is uncertain.
- Axis of antcline
- Axis of syncline
- Strike and dip of bedding.
- Landslide - Arrows indicate principal direction of movement, queried where existence is questionable (some geologic features are drawn within questionable landforms); hachured where headscarp is unmapable.

Qlp: Las Posas Formation (Pleistocene)
Qs: Saugus Formation (Pleistocene)

Approximate Scale: 1" = 2,000'
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HISTORICAL HIGH GROUNDWATER MAP

191 Alviso Drive
Camarillo Area of Ventura County, California

Earth Systems

January 2019 302698-001

*Taken from CGS, Seismic Hazard Zone Report For The Camarillo 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Ventura County, California, 2002.

Approximate Site Location

Approximate Scale: 1" = 2,000'

Depth to historically highest ground water level in feet

Well

Borehole Site

Approximate location of landslides and liquefaction observed following the Point Magu Earthquake of February 21, 1973.

Valley / Mountains Boundary

Groundwater Barrier

N
Approximate Boring Location

Approximate Scale: 1" = 60'

SITE PLAN
191 Alviso Drive
Camarillo Area of Ventura County, California

Earth Systems
January 2019
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FIELD STUDY

A. Two borings (B-1 and B-2) were drilled to a maximum depth of about 31.5 feet below the existing ground surface to observe the soil/bedrock profile and to obtain samples for laboratory analyses. The borings were drilled on November 15, 2018, using 6-inch diameter hollow-stem continuous flight auger powered by a Mobile Drill B-61 truck mounted drilling rig. The approximate locations of the borings were determined in the field by pacing and sighting, and are shown on the Site Plan in this Appendix.

B. Samples were obtained within the borings with a Modified California (M.C.) ring sampler (ASTM D 3550 with shoe similar to ASTM D 1586). The M.C. sampler has a 3-inch outside diameter, and a 2.42-inch inside diameter when used with brass ring liners (as it was during this study). The samples were obtained by driving the sampler with a 140-pound hammer dropping 30 inches in accordance with ASTM D 1586. The hammer was operated with an automatic trip mechanism.

C. Two bulk samples were collected from the cuttings of the soils encountered between the depths of 0 to 3 feet in Boring B-1, and 1.5 to 6 feet in Boring B-2.

D. The final logs of the borings represent interpretations of the contents of the field logs and the results of laboratory testing performed on the samples obtained during the subsurface study. The final logs are included in this Appendix.
Logs of Borings
BORING NO: B-1
PROJECT NAME: 191 Alviso Drive
PROJECT NUMBER: 302698-001
BORING LOCATION: Per Plan

DRILLING DATE: November 15, 2018
DRILL RIG: Mobile Drill B-61
DRILLING METHOD: Six-Inch Hollow Stem Auger
LOGGED BY: SC

DESCRIPTION OF UNITS

SOIL: Dark brown clayey silt; stiff; dry to damp.

SAUGUS FORMATION: Yellowish brown silty fine sand with abundant seashells; dense; damp.

SAUGUS FORMATION: Mottled yellowish brown silty fine sand; bedded; iron staining; dense; moist.

SAUGUS FORMATION: Interbedded yellowish brown and gray fine sandstone and siltstone; bedded; dense; moist.

SAUGUS FORMATION: Interbedded yellowish brown and gray fine sandstone and siltstone; bedded; blocky; dense; moist.

Total Depth: 31.5 feet.
No Groundwater Encountered.

Note: The stratification lines shown represent the approximate boundaries between soil and/or rock types and the transitions may be gradual.
**BORING NO:** B-2  
**PROJECT NAME:** 191 Alviso Drive  
**PROJECT NUMBER:** 302698-001  
**BORING LOCATION:** Per Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Depth (ft)</th>
<th>Sample Type (Q)</th>
<th>SPT (blows)</th>
<th>Penetration Resistance (B/A)</th>
<th>USC Class (ML)</th>
<th>Unit Dry WT (pcf)</th>
<th>Moisture Content (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Depth:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31.51 ft</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Groundwater Encountered.

---

**DESCRIPTION OF UNITS**

**SOIL:** Dark brown clayey silt; stiff; dry to damp.

**SAUGUS FORMATION:** Dark yellowish brown silty sand seashell conglomerate; medium dense; damp.

**SAUGUS FORMATION:** Dark yellowish brown silty sand; bedded; medium dense; damp to moist.

**SAUGUS FORMATION:** Interbedded yellowish brown and gray fine sandstone and siltstone; bedded; medium dense; moist.

**SAUGUS FORMATION:** Interbedded yellowish brown and gray fine sandstone and siltstone; bedded; medium dense; moist.

**SAUGUS FORMATION:** Interbedded yellowish brown and gray fine sandstone and siltstone; bedded; blocky; iron staining; medium dense; moist.

**SAUGUS FORMATION:** Interbedded yellowish brown and gray fine sandstone and siltstone; bedded; dense;

Note: The stratification lines shown represent the approximate boundaries between soil and/or rock types and the transitions may be gradual.
1. The location of borings were approximately determined by pacing and/or siting from visible features. Elevations of borings are approximately determined by interpolating between plan contours. The location and elevation of the borings should be considered.

2. The stratification lines represent the approximate boundary between soil types and the transition may be gradual.

3. Water level readings have been made in the drill holes at times and under conditions stated on the boring logs. This data has been reviewed and interpretations made in the text of this report. However, it must be noted that fluctuations in the level of the groundwater may occur due to variations in rainfall, tides, temperature, and other factors at the time measurements were made.
### Unified Soil Classification System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Divisions</th>
<th>Graph Symbol</th>
<th>Letter Symbol</th>
<th>Typical Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coarse Grained Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel and Gravelly Soils</td>
<td></td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>Well-graded gravels, gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50% of coarse fraction retained on No. 4 sieve</td>
<td></td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Poorly-graded gravels, gravel-sand mixtures, little or no fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravels with fines (appreciable amount of fines)</td>
<td></td>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Silty gravels, gravel-sand-silt mixtures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sand and Sandy Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Clayey gravels, gravel-sand-clay mixtures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50% of material is larger than No. 200 sieve size</td>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Well-graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean sand (little or no fines)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Poorly-graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sands with fines (appreciable amount of fines)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Silty sands, sand-silt mixtures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fine Grained Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Clayey sands, sand-clay mixtures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silts and Clays</td>
<td></td>
<td>ML</td>
<td>Inorganic silts and very fine sands, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sands or clayey silts with slight plasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid limit less than 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays, silty clays, lean clays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organic Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>OL</td>
<td>Organic silts and organic silty clays of low plasticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50% of material is smaller than No. 200 sieve size</td>
<td></td>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Inorganic silts, micaceous or diatomaceous fine sand or silty soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silts and Clays</td>
<td></td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Inorganic clays of high plasticity, fat clays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid limit greater than 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Organic clays of medium to high plasticity, organic silts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highly Organic Soils</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Peat, humus, swamp soils with high organic content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Dual symbols are used to indicate borderline soil classifications.

---

**Unified Soil Classification System**

Earth Systems
APPENDIX B

Laboratory Testing
Tabulated Laboratory Test Results
Individual Laboratory Test Results
LABORATORY TESTING

A. Samples were reviewed along with field logs to determine which would be analyzed further. Those chosen for laboratory analyses were considered representative of soils that would be exposed and/or used during grading, and those deemed to be within the influence of proposed structures. Test results are presented in graphic and tabular form in this Appendix.

B. In-situ moisture content and dry unit weight for the ring samples were determined in general accordance with ASTM D 2937.

C. A maximum density test was performed to estimate the moisture-density relationship of typical soil materials. The test was performed in accordance with ASTM D 1557.

D. The relative strength characteristics of soils were determined from the results of a direct shear test on a remolded sample. The specimen was placed in contact with water at least 24 hours before testing, and was then sheared under normal loads ranging from 1 to 3 ksf in general accordance with ASTM D 3080.

E. An expansion index test was performed on a bulk soil sample in accordance with ASTM D 4829. The sample was surcharged under 144 pounds per square foot at moisture content of near 50 percent saturation. The sample was then submerged in water for 24 hours, and the amount of expansion was recorded with a dial indicator.

F. A portion of the bulk sample was sent to another laboratory for analyses of soil pH, resistivity, chloride contents, and sulfate contents. Soluble chloride and sulfate contents were determined on a dry weight basis. Resistivity testing was performed in accordance with California Test Method 424, wherein the ratio of soil to water was 1:3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BORING AND DEPTH</td>
<td>B-1@0'-3'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCS</td>
<td>ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM DRY DENSITY (pcf)</td>
<td>109.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTIMUM MOISTURE (%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK COHESION (psf)</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAK FRICTION ANGLE</td>
<td>23°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULTIMATE COHESION (psf)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULTIMATE FRICTION ANGLE</td>
<td>28°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPANSION INDEX</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESISTIVITY (ohms-cm)</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLUBLE CHLORIDES (mg/Kg)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLUBLE SULFATES (mg/Kg)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EARTH SYSTEMS PACIFIC
Individual Laboratory Test Results
File Number: 302698-001
Lab Number: 098035

MAXIMUM DENSITY / OPTIMUM MOISTURE

Job Name: 191 Alviso Drive
Sample ID: B1 @ 0-3'
Date: 12/26/2018
Description: Dark Brown Clayey Silt
SG: 2.34

Maximum Density: 109.5 pcf
Optimum Moisture: 14%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sieve Size</th>
<th>% Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4&quot;</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/8&quot;</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure Used: A
Prep. Method: Moist
Rammer Type: Automatic

Zero Air Voids Lines,
sg = 2.65, 2.70, 2.75

Dry Density, pcf

Moisture Content, percent
Direct Shear Data*

Sample Location: B1 @ 0.3'
Sample Description: Clayey Silt
Dry Density (pcf): 98.5
Initial % Moisture: 14.2
Average Degree of Saturation: 100.0
Shear Rate (in/min): 0.005 in/min

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal stress (psf)</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>3000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak stress (psf)</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate stress (psf)</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Angle of Friction (degrees): 23 28
- Cohesive Strength (psf): 470 110

Test Type: Peak & Ultimate

* Test Method: ASTM D-3080
EXPANSION INDEX

Job Name: 191 Alviso Drive
Sample ID: B 1 @ 0-3'
Soil Description: ML

Initial Moisture, %: 11.1
Initial Compacted Dry Density, pcf: 105.1
Initial Saturation, %: 50
Final Moisture, %: 33.7
Volumetric Swell, %: 10.2

Expansion Index: 102  High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EI</th>
<th>UBC Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-90</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-130</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130+</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prepared for: Earth Systems Pacific  
1731 A Walter Street  
Ventura, CA 93003  
Attn: Todd Tranby

Report Date: December 13, 2018  
Laboratory Number: 182202  
Project Name: 191 Alviso Drive  
Project No: 302698-001  
Sampled by: Client

Enclosed are the analysis results for samples received December 5, 2018 with the Chain of Custody document. The samples were received in good condition, at 16.2°C, and it was identified and assigned the laboratory ID number listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLE DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CAS LAB NUMBER ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-100-3'</td>
<td>182202-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By my signature below, I certify that the results contained in this laboratory report comply with applicable standards for certification by the California Department of Public Health's Environmental Laboratories Accreditation Program (ELAP), both technically and for completeness, and that, based on my inquiry of the person or persons directly responsible for performing the analyses, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete.

Lance Lewy—Laboratory Director

If you have any further questions or concerns, please contact me at your convenience. This report consists of 2 pages excluding the cover letter and the Chain of Custody.

This report shall not be reproduced except in full without the written approval of CAS. The test results reported represent only the item being tested and may not represent the entire material from which the sample was taken.
**CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS**

Client: Earth Systems Pacific  
CAS LAB NO: 182202-01  
Sample ID: B-180-3'  
Analyst: GP  
Date Sampled: 12/04/18  
Date Received: 12/05/18  
Sample Matrix: Soil

**WET CHEMISTRY ANALYSIS SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPOUND</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>PQL</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>ANALYZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH (Corrosivity)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>S.U.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>9045</td>
<td>12/06/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistivity*</td>
<td>6700</td>
<td>Ohms-cm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>SM 120.1M</td>
<td>12/06/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>mg/Kg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>300.0M</td>
<td>12/06/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>mg/Kg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>300.0M</td>
<td>12/06/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sample was extracted using a 1:3 ratio of soil and DI water.

DF: Dilution Factor  
PQL: Practical Quantitation Limit  
BQL: Below Quantitation Limit  
mg/Kg: Milligrams/Kilograms (ppm)
Quality Control Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client:</th>
<th>EARTH SYSTEMS</th>
<th>Date Sampled:</th>
<th>12/04/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample ID:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date Received:</td>
<td>12/05/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS LAB NO:</td>
<td>182202</td>
<td>Date Analyzed:</td>
<td>12/06/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Matrix:</td>
<td>SOIL</td>
<td>Analyst:</td>
<td>GP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Name</th>
<th>Qualifier</th>
<th>Sample Result</th>
<th>QC Result</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Spike Level</th>
<th>%REC</th>
<th>Control Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BQL</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>90-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Control Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.65</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181206 Blank Spike</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181206 Blank Spike Duplicate</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.73</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80-120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloride (by EPA 300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BQL</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>90-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Control Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181206 Blank Spike</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181206 Blank Spike Duplicate</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>mg/L</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80-120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate (by EPA 300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ALL QC SAMPLES ARE PREPARED IN LIQUID PHASE
mg/L: Milligrams/Liter (ppm)
%Rec: Percent Recovered
BQL: Below Practical Quantitation Limit
APPENDIX C

Table 1809.7 Minimum Foundation Design Table
TABLE 1809.7
PRESCRIPTIVE FOOTINGS FOR SUPPORTING WALLS OF LIGHT FRAME CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEIGHTED EXPANSION INDEX</th>
<th>FOUNDATION FOR SLAB &amp; RAISED FLOOR SYSTEM (4)(8)</th>
<th>CONCRETE SLABS (8)(12)</th>
<th>PREMOISTENING OF SOILS UNDER FOOTINGS, PIERS AND SLABS (4)(5)</th>
<th>RESTRICTION ON PIERS UNDER RAISED FLOORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER OF STORIES</td>
<td>STEM THICKNESS</td>
<td>FOOTING WIDTH</td>
<td>FOOTING THICKNESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INCHES</td>
<td>INCHES</td>
<td>INCHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 20 Very Low (non-expansive)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50 Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-90 Medium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-150 High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above 150 Very High

Special design by licensed engineer/architect

*Refer to next page for footnotes (1) through (14).
FOOTNOTES TO TABLE 1809.7

1. Premoistening is required where specified in Table 1809.7 in order to achieve maximum and uniform expansion of the soil prior to construction and thus limit structural distress caused by uneven expansion and shrinkage. Other systems which do not include premoistening may be approved by the Building Official when such alternatives are shown to provide equivalent safeguards against the adverse effects of expansive soil.

2. Reinforcement for continuous foundations shall be placed not less than 3" above the bottom of the footing and not less than 3" below the top of the stem.

3. Reinforcement shall be placed at mid-depth of slab.

4. After premoistening, the specified moisture content of soils shall be maintained until concrete is placed. Required moisture content shall be verified by an approved testing laboratory not more than 24 hours prior to placement of concrete.

5. Crawl spaces under raised floors need not be pre-moistened except under interior footings. Interior footings which are not enclosed by a continuous perimeter foundation system or equivalent concrete or masonry moisture barrier complying with Footnote # 12 of Table 1809.7 shall be designed and constructed as specified for perimeter footings in Table 1809.7.

6. Foundation stem walls which exceed a height of three times the stem thickness above lowest adjacent grade shall be reinforced in accordance with Chapter 21 and Section 1914 in the IBC, or as required by engineering design, whichever is more restrictive.

7. Bent reinforcing bars between exterior footing and slab shall be omitted when floor is designed as an independent, "floating" slab.

8. Where frost conditions or unusual conditions beyond the scope of this table are found, design shall be in accordance with recommendations of a foundation investigation. Concrete slabs shall have a minimum thickness of 4 inches when the expansion index exceeds 50.

9. The ground under a raised floor system may be excavated to the elevation of the top of the perimeter footing, except where otherwise required by engineering design or to mitigate groundwater conditions.

10. GRADE BEAM, GARAGE OPENING. A grade beam not less than 12" x 12" in cross section, or 12" x depth required by Table 1809.7, whichever is deeper, reinforced as specified for continuous foundations in Table 1809.7, shall be provided at garage door openings.

11. Where a post-tensioning slab system is used, the width and depth of the perimeter footings shall meet the requirements of this table.

12. An approved vapor barrier shall be installed below concrete slab-on-grade floors of all residential occupancies in such a manner as to form an effective barrier against the migration of moisture into the slab. When sheet plastic material is employed for this purpose it shall be not less than 6 mils (.006 inch) in thickness. The installation of a vapor barrier shall not impair the effectiveness of required anchor bolts or other structural parts of a building. Foundations at the perimeter of concrete floor slabs shall form a continuous moisture barrier of Portland cement concrete or solid grouted masonry to the depths required by Table 1809.7.

13. When buildings are located on expansive soil having an expansion index greater than 50, gutters, downspouts, piping, and/or other non-erosive devices shall be provided to collect and conduct rainwater to a street, storm drain, or other approved watercourse or disposal area.

14. Fireplace footings shall be reinforced with a horizontal grid located 3" above the bottom of the footing and consisting of not less than No. 4 Bars at 12" on center each way. Vertical chimney reinforcing bars shall be hooked under the grid. Depth of fireplace chimney footings shall be no less than that required by Table 1809.7.
APPENDIX D

2016 CBC & ASCE 7-10 Seismic Parameters
USGS Design Maps Reports
Fault Parameters
2016 California Building Code (CBC) (ASCE 7-10) Seismic Design Parameters

Seismic Design Category: E
Site Class: C
Latitude: 34.242 N
Longitude: -119.075 W

Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) Ground Motion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Period Spectral Response</th>
<th>Sr</th>
<th>2.785 g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 second Spectral Response</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>0.995 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coefficient Fa</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coefficient Fv</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>2.785 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM1</td>
<td>1.294 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design Earthquake Ground Motion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Period Spectral Response</th>
<th>Sds</th>
<th>1.857 g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 second Spectral Response</td>
<td>SdS</td>
<td>0.862 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>0.09 sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ts</td>
<td>0.46 sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Importance Factor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FpCA</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.5-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period (sec)</th>
<th>Sa (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USGS-Provided Output

\[ S_0 = 2.785 \text{ g} \quad S_{NS} = 2.785 \text{ g} \quad S_{OS} = 1.856 \text{ g} \]
\[ S_i = 0.995 \text{ g} \quad S_{NSI} = 1.294 \text{ g} \quad S_{OSI} = 0.862 \text{ g} \]

For information on how the SS and SI values above have been calculated from probabilistic (risk-targeted) and deterministic ground motions in the direction of maximum horizontal response, please return to the application and select the "2009 NEHRP" building code reference document.

For PGA, T, Csp, and Csi values, please view the detailed report.

Although this information is a product of the U.S. Geological Survey, we provide no warranty, expressed or implied, as to the accuracy of the data contained therein. This tool is not a substitute for technical subject-matter knowledge.
Design Maps Detailed Report

ASCE 7-10 Standard (34.2424°N, 119.0749°W)

Site Class C - "Very Dense Soil and Soft Rock", Risk Category I/II/III

Section 11.4.1 - Mapped Acceleration Parameters

Note: Ground motion values provided below are for the direction of maximum horizontal spectral response acceleration. They have been converted from corresponding geometric mean ground motions computed by the USGS by applying factors of 1.1 (to obtain $S_s$) and 1.3 (to obtain $S_l$). Maps in the 2010 ASCE-7 Standard are provided for Site Class B. Adjustments for other Site Classes are made, as needed, in Section 11.4.3.

From Figure 22-1 \[^{[1]}\]

\[
S_s = 2.785 \text{ g}
\]

From Figure 22-2 \[^{[2]}\]

\[
S_l = 0.995 \text{ g}
\]

Section 11.4.2 - Site Class

The authority having jurisdiction (not the USGS), site-specific geotechnical data, and/or the default has classified the site as Site Class C, based on the site soil properties in accordance with Chapter 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Class</th>
<th>$v_s$</th>
<th>$\bar{N}$ or $\bar{N}_h$</th>
<th>$S_s$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Hard Rock</td>
<td>&gt;5,000 ft/s</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Rock</td>
<td>2,500 to 5,000 ft/s</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Very dense soil and soft rock</td>
<td>1,200 to 2,500 ft/s</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>&gt;2,000 psf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Stiff Soil</td>
<td>600 to 1,200 ft/s</td>
<td>15 to 50</td>
<td>1,000 to 2,000 psf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Soft clay soil</td>
<td>&lt;600 ft/s</td>
<td>&lt;15</td>
<td>&lt;1,000 psf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any profile with more than 10 ft of soil having the characteristics:
- Plasticity index $PI > 20$,
- Moisture content $w \geq 40\%$, and
- Undrained shear strength $S_s < 500$ psf

F. Soils requiring site response analysis in accordance with Section 21.1

For SI: $1\text{ft/s} = 0.3048 \text{ m/s} \quad 1\text{lb/ft}^2 = 0.0479 \text{ kN/m}^2$
Section 11.4.3 — Site Coefficients and Risk-Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE<sub>eq</sub>) Spectral Response Acceleration Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Class</th>
<th>Mapped MCE&lt;sub&gt;eq&lt;/sub&gt; Spectral Response Acceleration Parameter at Short Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_0 \leq 0.25 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>See Section 11.4.7 of ASCE 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Use straight-line interpolation for intermediate values of \( S_0 \)

For Site Class = C and \( S_0 = 2.785 \) g, \( F_S = 1.000 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Class</th>
<th>Mapped MCE&lt;sub&gt;eq&lt;/sub&gt; Spectral Response Acceleration Parameter at 1-s Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 \leq 0.10 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>See Section 11.4.7 of ASCE 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Use straight-line interpolation for intermediate values of \( S_1 \)

For Site Class = C and \( S_1 = 0.995 \) g, \( F_S = 1.300 \)
Equation (11.4-1):  
\[ S_{HS} = F_a S_s = 1.000 \times 2.785 = 2.785 \text{ g} \]

Equation (11.4-2):  
\[ S_{H1} = F_a S_t = 1.300 \times 0.995 = 1.294 \text{ g} \]

Section 11.4.4 — Design Spectral Acceleration Parameters

Equation (11.4-3):  
\[ S_{DS} = \frac{1}{2} S_{HS} = \frac{1}{2} \times 2.785 = 1.856 \text{ g} \]

Equation (11.4-4):  
\[ S_{DT} = \frac{1}{2} S_{H1} = \frac{1}{2} \times 1.294 = 0.862 \text{ g} \]

Section 11.4.5 — Design Response Spectrum

From Figure 22-12[3]  
\[ T_L = 8 \text{ seconds} \]

Section 11.4.6 — Risk-Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCEa) Response Spectrum

The MCEa Response Spectrum is determined by multiplying the design response spectrum above by 1.5.


Section 11.8.3 — Additional Geotechnical Investigation Report Requirements for Seismic Design Categories D through F

From Figure 22-7\(^4\)

**Equation (11.8-1):**

\[ P_{GA} = F_{PGA} \times PGA = 1.000 \times 1.105 = 1.105 \, g \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Class</th>
<th>Mapped MCE Geometric Mean Peak Ground Acceleration, PGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGA ≤ 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>See Section 11.4.7 of ASCE 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Use straight-line interpolation for intermediate values of PGA

For Site Class = C and PGA = 1.105 g, \( F_{PGA} = 1.000 \)

Section 21.2.1.1 — Method 1 (from Chapter 21 - Site-Specific Ground Motion Procedures for Seismic Design)

From Figure 22-17\(^5\)

\[ C_{\text{RS}} = 0.902 \]

From Figure 22-18\(^6\)

\[ C_{\text{RI}} = 0.908 \]
Section 11.6 — Seismic Design Category

Table 11.6-1 Seismic Design Category Based on Short Period Response Acceleration Parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE OF $S_{os}$</th>
<th>RISK CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I or II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{os} &lt; 0.167g$</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.167g \leq S_{os} &lt; 0.33g$</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.33g \leq S_{os} &lt; 0.50g$</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.50g \leq S_{os}$</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Risk Category $= I$ and $S_{os} = 1.856$ g, Seismic Design Category $= D$

Table 11.6-2 Seismic Design Category Based on 1-S Period Response Acceleration Parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE OF $S_{di}$</th>
<th>RISK CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I or II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{di} &lt; 0.067g$</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.067g \leq S_{di} &lt; 0.133g$</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.133g \leq S_{di} &lt; 0.20g$</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.20g \leq S_{di}$</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Risk Category $= I$ and $S_{di} = 0.862$ g, Seismic Design Category $= D$

Note: When $S_{d}$ is greater than or equal to 0.75g, the Seismic Design Category is E for buildings in Risk Categories I, II, and III, and F for those in Risk Category IV, irrespective of the above.

Seismic Design Category $\equiv \text{"the more severe design category in accordance with Table 11.6-1 or 11.6-2"} = E$

Note: See Section 11.6 for alternative approaches to calculating Seismic Design Category.
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Table 1
Fault Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault Section Name</th>
<th>Distance (miles)</th>
<th>Distance (km)</th>
<th>Avg Dip Angle (deg.)</th>
<th>Avg Dip Direction (deg.)</th>
<th>Avg Rake (deg.)</th>
<th>Trace Length (km)</th>
<th>Fault Type</th>
<th>Mean Mag</th>
<th>Mean Return Interval (years)</th>
<th>Slip Rate (mm/yr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San-Santa Rosa</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge (Onshore)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pismo-Santa Barbara</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Cayetano (Extension), alt 1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Cayetano (Extension), alt 2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Cayetano (Projection)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思 Mountain</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Coast, alt 1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Coast, alt 2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Coast, alt 3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思 Ridge-Parida-Santa Ana</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Islands Thrust</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Dume, alt 1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Dume, alt 2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Susana, alt 1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Susana, alt 2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Ynez (East)</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Channel</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Cruz Island</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Catalina Ridge</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Islands Western Deep Ramp</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Valle</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Valle, alt 1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Valle, alt 2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Islands (Projection)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Mtn</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-PitPoint (Lower)-Montalvo</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Catalina Ridge</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-San Gabriel</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Santa Monica Bay</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Catalina Ridge</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Compton</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-San Gabriel</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Compton</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Big Pine (Central)</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Santa Monica, alt 1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Santa Monica, alt 2</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Santa Monica, alt 2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>构思-Santa Monica, alt 2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference: USGS OFR 2007-1437 (CGS SP 203)
Based on Site Coordinates of 34°24′24″ Latitude, -119°07′49″ Longitude
Mean Magnitude for Type A Faults based on 0.1 weight for unsegmented section, 0.9 weight for segmented model (weighted by probability of each scenario with section listed as given on Table 3 of Appendix G in OFR 2007-1437). Mean magnitude is average of Ellsworth-B and Hanks & Bakun moment area relationship.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) has been prepared for Crestview Mutual Water Company’s (Crestview) Water Well No. 7 Facility (Facility) to quantify and determine the significance of noise impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed water well (Project). This NIA follows methodologies outlined in the Ventura County General Plan (December 2016), the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines (April 2011), the City of Camarillo General Plan (2015), and Ventura County’s Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan (July 2010).

Crestview proposes to install and operate a new water well, called Water Well No. 7, at 191 Alviso Drive (Project). The site is currently a vacant lot. The primary noise source associated with the Project is an electric pump, which will primarily operate in the early morning, between 12:00 am and 9:00 am, but may operate at other times when necessary. The pump will be in a building that will provide noise attenuation.

This NIA includes noise measurements of the background noise at the Project site and of Crestview’s existing Water Well No. 6. From these measurements, Project operation and construction phase noise impacts are calculated and compared to the applicable significance thresholds.

This NIA finds that:

- Project operation phase noise impacts are less than significant at all receptors without mitigation.
- Project construction phase noise impacts are less than significant at all receptors without mitigation.

Please note that Section 8 of this Assessment includes a list of Project features that must be in place to ensure that the conclusions presented in this Assessment are accurate.
**NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT (NIA)**

Crestview Mutual Water Company – Water Well No. 7
191 Alviso Drive
Camarillo, CA 93010

April 26, 2019

**SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION**

This Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) has been prepared for Crestview Mutual Water Company's (Crestview) Water Well No. 7 Facility (Facility) to quantify and determine the significance of noise impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed water well (Project). This NIA follows methodologies outlined in the Ventura County General Plan (December 2016), the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines (April 2011), the City of Camarillo General Plan (2015), and Ventura County's Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan (July 2010).

### 1.1 Definitions

The following terms are employed in this NIA:

- **Decibel (dB).** The decibel is the unit used to measure the intensity of a sound. Because humans can hear sounds across a broad range of acoustic power (everything from your fingertip brushing lightly over skin to a loud jet engine), the decibel uses a logarithmic scale to represent power. On the decibel scale, the smallest audible sound (i.e., total silence for a human) is 0 dB. A sound 10 times more powerful is 10 dB. A sound 100 times more powerful than total silence is 20 dB. A sound 1,000 times more powerful than total silence is 30 dB.

- **A-Weighted Decibel (dBA).** Sound intensity measured using the A-weighting filter, which de-emphasizes low and high frequencies of sound in a way that mimics a human's experience of hearing. The A-weighted sound level is the primary weighting used for environmental noise.

- **Equivalent Continuous Sound Level (L_{eq}).** The average sound level over a designated period of time, frequently 1 hour (L_{eq}-1hr). This is often referred to as "equivalent sound level", hence the "eq" subscript. The "equivalence" is to a sound of constant level that has the same total acoustic energy content as the measured sound.

- **Ambient Noise Level.** The noise environment related to all sources of noise that are not associated with the Project. This is also referred to as "background noise". A receptor's total experienced noise level is the combination of ambient noise and Project noise.

- **Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL – dBA).** The 24-hour average sound level with weighting that emphasizes nighttime and evening noise using the following adjustments:
  - Daytime noise (7 a.m. to 7 p.m.): no adjustment;
  - Evening noise (7 p.m. and 10 p.m.): +5 dBA adjustment; and
  - Nighttime noise (10 p.m. and 7 a.m.): +10 dBA adjustment.
The following illustration, from Ventura County’s Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan, provides the typical sound levels of some common noise sources.
SECTION 2 REGULATORY BACKGROUND

This section discusses the Project’s regulatory setting, including the Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines (Guidelines), the Ventura County General Plan (VC General Plan), the City of Camarillo General Plan (Camarillo General Plan), and the Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan (Construction Guidelines).

2.1 Ventura County Initial Study Assessment Guidelines

The Guidelines designate threshold criteria that can be utilized to determine if a project has a significant impact on the environment. Specifically, the Guidelines’ noise section presents the methodology by which noise impacts should be calculated and indicates that the General Plan’s noise standards should be used as the significance thresholds for noise impacts in Ventura County.

2.2 Ventura County General Plan

The VC General Plan, both in the Goals, Policies & Programs section and the Hazards Appendix, contains additional detail regarding the methodologies to be used for the assessment of noise impacts. The General Plan also includes noise standards that, as directed by the Guidelines, are to be used as significance thresholds for noise impacts at sensitive receptors, which include dwellings, schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches, and libraries.

2.3 Camarillo General Plan

The Camarillo General Plan’s purpose is to “ensure acceptable noise levels near noise-sensitive uses such as schools, houses of worship, hospitals, and convalescent homes in accordance with the City’s Land Use/Noise Compatibility Matrix.” The matrix indicates that, for low density residential land uses, a noise level of up to 60 dBA CNEL is normally acceptable, a noise level of up to 70 dBA CNEL is conditionally acceptable, a noise level of up to 75 dBA CNEL is normally unacceptable, and a noise level of more than 75 dBA CNEL is clearly unacceptable.

2.4 Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan

The Construction Guidelines present methodologies for quantification of construction noise impacts, default noise level assumptions for common construction equipment, and construction noise threshold criteria. This NIA utilizes the methodologies presented in the Construction Guidelines to determine the expected Project construction phase impacts and compares them to the applicable threshold.
SECTION 3  ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

This section describes the noise environment and receptors of concern near the Facility.

3.1 Noise Environment

The Facility is in a portion of Camarillo designated as a rural density residential land use. It is surrounded by single family residences.

The area’s noise environment is quiet, even for an area zoned as rural density residential. This is because a hill formation to the south provides substantial noise shielding from Camarillo’s main sources of noise (including US Highway 101, the airport, Las Posas Road, etc.). Due to this separation from other sources of noise, the ambient noise at the Facility is dominated by local road noise and miscellaneous noise from surrounding residents. As these sources of noise are less active at night, the Facility’s night time noise environment lacks a substantial source of noise.

Ambient noise at the Facility was 34.6 dBA $L_{eq}$ on August 3rd, 2018 at about 3:00 am. A Quest Technologies Soundpro DL sound level meter set to record A-weighted sound with a slow response performed the measurement. The meter was calibrated prior to the measurements. The measurement was collected on a tripod about 5 feet above ground level. Appendix C includes the noise measurement log, collected in 1-minute increments.

3.2 Receptors

The Guidelines define noise sensitive receptors as “dwellings, schools, hospitals, nursing homes, churches, and libraries”. This NIA includes analysis of the nearest sensitive receptor (in this case, residences) in each direction from the Facility. These receptors will experience the highest noise impacts from the Project. If Project noise is less than significant at these receptors, it is less than significant at all other receptors in the area as well.

This NIA quantifies noise impacts at the following receptors (see Figure 1 for receptor locations):

- **North Receptor** is the nearest sensitive receptor (residence) on the north side of the Facility. The source-receptor distance, which is the distance from the proposed well to the nearest portion of this residence, is about 325 feet.

- **East Receptor** is the nearest residence to the east of the Facility. The source-receptor distance for the east receptor is about 110 feet.

- **South Receptor** is the nearest residence to the south of the Facility, across Alviso Drive. The source-receptor distance for the south receptor is about 175 feet.

- **West Receptor** is the nearest residence to the west of the Facility. The source-receptor distance for the West Receptor is about 55 feet.
SECTION 4  PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Crestview provides water service to residents of the Rancho Los Posas area of the City of Camarillo. The residents collectively own Crestview and obtain water from Crestview at cost (i.e., without profit markup).

Crestview obtains water from wells in the Rancho Los Posas neighborhood. Crestview proposes to install and operate a new water well, called Water Well No. 7, at 191 Alviso Drive (Project). The site is currently a vacant lot.

A small building will contain the well, an electric pump, and a chemical storage area. A backup generator will be housed in a separate structure. The backup generator will provide power to operate the well during power outages when electricity is not available. To the extent possible, Crestview has designed the Project to look like a normal residence from the street. To this end, the building will include facade windows that are not actually openings in the walls. These facade windows will have a negligible effect on noise propagation, so they are not included in this NIA. The building will also include a rollup door on the north side. The effect of this rollup door is included in this NIA. This NIA also assumes that any vents necessary for operation will be located on the north side, the south side, or the roof of the building. The effect of these vents is also included in this NIA.

The primary noise source associated with the Project is an electric pump, which will primarily operate in the early morning, between 12:00 am and 9:00 am, but may operate at other times when necessary. The backup generator will also produce noise during power outages, but the noise-attenuating structure where it will be located will reduce its noise impact. Due the infrequent and limited duration of expected backup generator usage, this NIA focuses on noise impacts associated with operation of the pump.

Block walls are currently located on the Facility's east and west property lines shared with the East Receptor and the West Receptor. The wall to the east is not expected to break line of site between the Project source and the East Receptor. While this wall may reduce noise impacts on some portions of the East Receptor (specifically, the rear portion of the house), the calculations in this NIA assume that it will not reduce noise levels. The west side wall, on the other hand, is expected to break line of site between the Project source and the East Receptor, making it a more effective noise barrier. An ideal noise barrier would be taller than this wall, though, so the calculations in this NIA assume that it provides a small reduction in noise impacts to the West Receptor.
4.1 Construction

Project construction will include the following phases:

- **Construction Phase 1: Site Development and Grading.** This phase will include clearing, grading, and site development work. This phase will last about a month.
- **Construction Phase 2: Well Drilling.** This phase includes drilling of the water well, which will also take about a month to complete.
- **Construction Phase 3: Construction and Paving.** This phase includes construction of the building, installation of equipment, and paving of the driveway. This phase will last about two and a half months.

The Phase 2 well drilling operations must be conducted on a 24-hour per day schedule to mitigate the risk of the well shaft collapsing. However, noise generating activities during Phase 1 and Phase 3 of construction will only be conducted during the day, as defined by the Construction Guidelines (from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday through Friday and from 9:00 am to 7:00 pm on weekends and holidays).

All heavy equipment used for Project construction that can utilize mufflers will do so.

Temporary noise barriers will be placed on all four sides of the Project's construction activities. A supplemental, portable barrier will also be placed adjacent to the drill rig engine. Each of the barriers is described in detail below:

- 24-foot-tall, STC-32 noise barriers will be positioned on the east and west sides of the Project as shown on Figure 2. These barriers will be in place for the entire construction duration (Construction Phases 1, 2, and 3).
- 16-foot-tall, STC-32 noise barrier will be positioned on the south side of the Project as shown on Figure 2. This barrier will include a gate to allow Project access. This barrier will be in place for the entire construction duration (Construction Phases 1, 2, and 3).
- 16-foot-tall, STC-32 noise barrier will be positioned to the north of the construction activity, as shown on Figure 2. This barrier will be in place for Construction Phases 2 and 3. It will not be in place during Phase 1 because the site must be graded before it can be installed.
- 8-foot-tall, STC-24, free-standing, portable noise barrier will be positioned adjacent to the drill rig's engine on the west side as shown on Figure 3. This barrier will only be used during Construction Phase 2.
SECTION 5  SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

The Guidelines recommend that noise standards from the VC General Plan be used as the significance threshold for noise impact assessments. The following excerpt identifies the noise standards that apply to this Project, which apply to peak hour noise levels.

(4) Noise generators, proposed to be located near any noise sensitive use, shall incorporate noise control measures so that ongoing outdoor noise levels received by the noise sensitive receptor, measured at the exterior wall of the building, does not exceed any of the following standards:

- $Leq(1h) \leq 55 dB(A)$ or ambient noise level plus $3 dB(A)$, whichever is greater, during any hour from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
- $Leq(1h) \leq 50 dB(A)$ or ambient noise level plus $3 dB(A)$, whichever is greater, during any hour from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.
- $Leq(1h) \leq 45 dB(A)$ or ambient noise level plus $3 dB(A)$, whichever is greater, during any hour from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.

Source: Ventura County General Plan – Goals, Policies & Programs Section, XXXX

The pump will normally operate in the early morning, so the lowest of the above standards is utilized as the significance threshold for this Project. The measured ambient noise level during early morning (34.6 dBA) is below the applicable standard in the VC General Plan (45 dBA), so the standard is utilized as the significance threshold for this Project.

The Camarillo General Plan also includes noise standards that may apply to the Project. For low density residential receptors, it states that a noise level of 60 dBA CNEL or below is “normally acceptable”. As a CNEL standard, this threshold applies to noise levels averaged over a 24-hour period.

Table 1 presents the significance thresholds applicable to Project operation.

**Table 1  Operation Phase Significance Thresholds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Type</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak Hour (VC General Plan)</td>
<td>45 dBA Leq(1hr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-hour (Camarillo General Plan)</td>
<td>60 dBA CNEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Construction Guidelines presents noise threshold criteria for construction projects. The threshold varies based on the duration of construction activities, with longer projects having lower thresholds. As Project construction will last longer than 8 weeks, the lowest threshold, as presented in Table 2, is applicable.

Table 2  Construction Phase Significance Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold*</th>
<th>$L_{eq}(1hr)$</th>
<th>$L_{max}$**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daytime</td>
<td>55 dBA</td>
<td>75 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>50 dBA</td>
<td>70 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nighttime</td>
<td>45 dBA</td>
<td>65 dBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The daytime threshold covers 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. The evening threshold covers 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. on all days. The nighttime threshold covers 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Monday through Friday, and from 10:00 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. on weekends and holidays.

**The $L_{max}$ threshold represents a limit that cannot be exceeded more than 8 times per hour during daytime, 6 times per hour during evening, and 4 times per hour during nighttime. Unless the noise source is highly impulsive (e.g., pile driving, blasting, etc.), a project that meets the $L_{eq}(1hr)$ threshold will usually meet the $L_{max}$ threshold as well. Therefore, for this NIA, compliance with the $L_{eq}(1hr)$ threshold also implies compliance with the $L_{max}$ threshold.
SECTION 6  PROJECT IMPACTS

This section describes the calculation methodologies used in this NIA and presents the results of the analysis. Appendix B includes the noise impact calculations and Appendix C includes logs of the noise measurements used in this NIA.

6.1 Operation Phase Impacts

To characterize the expected noise level associated with Project operations, noise monitoring was conducted at Crestview's existing Water Well No. 6. Like the Project, Water Well No. 6 includes an electric pump inside a building. While the pump was operating in the early morning on August 3rd, 2018, noise was measured in four locations, one on each side of the building. The resulting noise levels were then normalized to a 50-foot basis. Table 3 summarizes the noise levels measured at Water Well No. 6.

### Table 3  Summary of Water Well No. 6 Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Leq @ 50 feet (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Side of building with a vent</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Side of building without openings</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Side of building with rollup door and vents</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Side of building without openings</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 illustrates how rollup doors and vents affect noise levels in the area. As the Project will have a rollup door and vents on the north side, Measurement 3 is used to calculate the noise impact at the North Receptor. The south side of the building will include vents, so Measurement 1 is used to calculate the noise impact at the South Receptor. The east and west sides of the building do not have openings (the pedestrian door is not included as an opening because its impact on noise propagation is expected to be negligible), so noise impacts for the East and West Receptors are based on the average of Measurement 2 and Measurement 4.

Noise propagation from source to receptor is calculated based on the industry standard noise attenuation rate of 6 decibels per doubling of distance for the unimpeded propagation of noise. The existing wall on the Project’s western property line is assumed to provide 5 dBA reduction of noise at the West Receptor. Based on the Federal Highway Administration’s Noise Barrier Design Handbook, 5 dBA is the minimum reduction expected when a barrier breaks line of site (see excerpt in Appendix D). Line of site to the North and South Receptors is impeded by vegetation, changes in elevation, and/or small retaining walls. These factors are estimated to provide 2 dBA of noise reduction at the North and South Receptors. Furthermore, additional shielding is provided inside the well building by the chlorine tank and containment wall, which are located between the well pump and the vents near ground level on the south facing wall. As these interior shielding elements were not included in the Well 6 source measurement, they are assumed to provide an additional 2 dBA of reduction for the South Receptor.

CNEL noise impacts are determined by assuming Project peak hour noise impacts from midnight to 9:00 am.
Table 4 presents the operation phase noise impacts associated with the Project. Note that all impacts are less than the applicable significance thresholds.

**Table 4  Project Operational Phase Noise Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Peak Hour Impact dBA $L_{eq}(1\text{hr})$</th>
<th>24-Hour Impact dBA $CNEL$</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Threshold</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Table 4 demonstrates that operation of the Project will not exceed the applicable noise significance thresholds, it is also important to understand how the Project will affect the existing noise environment in the area. For this reason, Project nighttime noise impacts are compared to the background noise levels in Table 5.

**Table 5  Project Operation Phase Noise Compared to Background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Project Noise $L_{eq}$ dBA</th>
<th>Background Noise $L_{eq}$ dBA</th>
<th>Project Increase $L_{eq}$ dBA</th>
<th>Qualitative Assessment of Change in Nighttime Noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>+3.6</td>
<td>Barely noticeable change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>Unnoticeable change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>+2.9</td>
<td>Unnoticeable change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
<td>Unnoticeable change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: It is important to understand these factors when evaluating the noise impacts presented in this Assessment:

1. Calculation methodologies in this Assessment utilize worst case assumptions to obtain maximum expected impacts.
2. All Project noise impacts in this Assessment are for exterior noise levels at the nearby receptors. Interior noise levels will be considerably less than those presented in this Assessment, even with windows open.
3. Project operation will produce a continuous, broad spectrum noise. On a decibel per decibel basis, this is one of the least intrusive types of noises. In other words, the Project noise will be similar in character (i.e., the type of sound, not the volume of the sound) to an electric fan.
6.2 Construction Phase Impacts

Noise impacts associated with heavy equipment operation during Project construction are calculated based on methodologies in the Construction Guidelines. As the construction noise significance threshold is based on peak hour noise impacts, only equipment that is expected to be operated simultaneously during the peak hour of activity for each phase is included in the analysis. In other words, the following is not an exhaustive list of all construction equipment that may be used; rather, it is an estimate of the equipment expected to be used during the peak hour of activity for each phase of construction.

- **Construction Phase 1: Site Development and Grading**: Backhoe.
- **Construction Phase 2: Well Drilling**: Drill rig and pump.
- **Construction Phase 3: Construction and Paving**: Crane and concrete mixer.

Table 6 presents the Project noise impacts for each of the construction phases. Note that all noise impacts are less than significant at all receptors.

**Table 6  Project Construction Noise Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Phase 1 Impact dBA $L_{eq}(1hr)$</th>
<th>Phase 2 Impact dBA $L_{eq}(1hr)$</th>
<th>Phase 3 Impact dBA $L_{eq}(1hr)$</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Significance Threshold* | 55 | 45 | 55 | --- |

*Construction Phases 1 and 3 will only occur during daytime, so they are compared to the daytime significance threshold. Construction Phase 2 will occur 24-hours-per-day, so it is compared to the nighttime threshold.
SECTION 7  MITIGATION MEASURES

As shown in Section 6, Project operation and construction noise impacts are less than significant. Therefore, mitigation is not necessary for this Project.

However, please note that several features of the Project must be in place to ensure that the conclusions presented in this Assessment are accurate. These features are listed in Section 8.
SECTION 8 CONCLUSION

This NIA finds that:

- Project operation phase noise impacts are less than significant at all receptors without mitigation.
- Project construction phase noise impacts are less than significant at all receptors without mitigation.

Please note that the following Project features must be in place to ensure that the conclusions presented in this Assessment are accurate.

**Necessary Operation Phase Project features:**

- Only the north side of the well building will include a rollup door.
- All vents through the well building will be located on the north facing wall, the south facing wall, or the roof (in other words, no vents shall be located on the east or west walls of the well building). Any vents on the south facing wall will be located near the ground.

**Necessary Construction Phase Project features:**

- Activities that generate noise during Construction Phases 1 (Site Development and Grading) and 3 (Construction and Paving) will only be conducted from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday through Friday and from 9:00 am to 7:00 pm on weekends and holidays. Construction Phase 2 (Well Drilling) will be conducted 24-hours-per-day.
- All heavy equipment used for Project construction that can utilize mufflers shall do so.
- The following noise barriers will be used:
  - 24-foot-tall, STC-32 noise barriers will be positioned on the east and west sides of the Project as shown on Figure 2. These barriers will be in place for the entire construction duration (Construction Phases 1, 2, and 3).
  - 16-foot-tall, STC-32 noise barrier will be positioned on the south side of the Project as shown on Figure 2. This barrier will include a gate to allow Project access. This barrier will be in place for the entire construction duration (Construction Phases 1, 2, and 3).
  - 16-foot-tall, STC-32 noise barrier will be positioned to the north of the construction activity, as shown on Figure 2. This barrier will be in place for Construction Phases 2 and 3. It will not be in place during Phase 1 because the site must be graded before it can be installed.
  - 8-foot-tall, STC-24, free-standing, portable noise barrier will be positioned adjacent to the drill rig's engine on the west side as shown on Figure 3. This barrier will only be used during Construction Phase 2.
APPENDIX A   FIGURES
FIGURE 1 - VICINITY MAP
NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Facility: Water Well No. 7
Crestview Mutual Water Company
Camarillo, CA 93010

Prepared By: Z Consulting Company
Date: 1/27/18
In addition to the perimeter sound barriers shown on Figure 2, portable acoustic panels will be placed west of and adjacent to the drilling rig’s engine for the duration of drilling. This figure shows anticipated drill rig orientation and suitable portable barrier placement.
APPENDIX B  NOISE IMPACT CALCULATIONS
## Construction Phase 1: Site Development and Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Lmax @ 50' (dBA)*</th>
<th>Usage Factor*</th>
<th>Usage Adjust. (dB)</th>
<th>Leq @ 50' (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 73.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Source-Receptor Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Distance Adjust. (dBA)</th>
<th>Noise Barrier Adjustment (dBA)**</th>
<th>Muffler Adjustment (dBA)***</th>
<th>Leq @ Receptor (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Construction Phase 2: Well Drilling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Lmax @ 50' (dBA)*</th>
<th>Usage Factor*</th>
<th>Usage Adjust. (dB)</th>
<th>Leq @ 50' (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drill Rig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 75.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Source-Receptor Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Distance Adjust. (dBA)</th>
<th>Noise Barrier Adjustment (dBA)**</th>
<th>Muffler Adjustment (dBA)***</th>
<th>Leq @ Receptor (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Construction Phase 3: Construction and Paving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Lmax @ 50' (dBA)*</th>
<th>Usage Factor*</th>
<th>Usage Adjust. (dB)</th>
<th>Leq @ 50' (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-11.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 75.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Source-Receptor Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Distance Adjust. (dBA)</th>
<th>Noise Barrier Adjustment (dBA)**</th>
<th>Muffler Adjustment (dBA)***</th>
<th>Leq @ Receptor (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Calculation methods, equipment noise levels, and usage factors from Ventura County's Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan.

**Usage factors are defaults for domestic housing construction, which is representative of project's small size and scope.

Temporary noise barriers will be used during construction as described below and shown on Figures 2 and 3:

- 24 foot tall, STC-32 barriers will be used on the east and west for the duration of construction for a 15 dBA reduction (Figure 2).
- 16 foot tall, STC-32 barrier will be used on the south for the duration of construction for a 10 dBA reduction (Figure 2).
- 16 foot tall, STC-32 barrier will be used on the north side for the 2nd and 3rd phases of construction for a 10 dBA reduction (Figure 2).
- 8 foot tall, STC-24 barrier will be placed adjacent to drill rig's engine on the west side for the duration of drilling for a 5 dBA reduction (Figure 3).

***The use of mufflers is expected to provide a 10 dBA noise reduction based on The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances (see assessment text for more information).
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**Operation Phase Calculations**

### Source Noise Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement #</th>
<th>Side of Bldg</th>
<th>Measured Leq (dBA)</th>
<th>Adjustment (dBA)</th>
<th>Measurement Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Leq @ 50ft (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vent</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No openings</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rollup door and vents</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No openings</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Noise Propogation Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Based on Measurement #</th>
<th>Source Leq @ 50ft (dBA)</th>
<th>Source-Receptor Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Source Leq @ Receptor (dBA)</th>
<th>Exterior LOS Adjustment (dBA)***</th>
<th>Interior LOS Adjustment (dBA)***</th>
<th>Adjusted Leq (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>avg of 2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>avg of 2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nighttime Peak Hour Significance Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Ambient Leq (dBA)</th>
<th>Sig. Threshold Leq (dBA)</th>
<th>Impact Leq (dBA)</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CNEL Significance Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Sig. Threshold CNEL (dBA)</th>
<th>Impact CNEL (dBA)***</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Measurement 4 is adjusted to account for the suboptimal location of the measurement (between the building and a block wall).

Reflection of noise from the wall artificially increased the measured noise level, so the result was adjusted to compensate.

** The source noise level for sides of the building without openings is based on the average of the suitable measurements (2 and 4).

*** LOS = line of sight. Exterior LOS adjustment takes into account things that break line of site between the well building and the receptors.

Interior LOS adjustment takes into account things that break line of site between the well pump and the vents in the well building.

See Section 6.1 of the report for additional information regarding these factors.

**** CNEL impact is calculated by assuming peak hour noise levels for ever hour of operation (from midnight to 9 am).
Session Report - Well 6 Measurements
8/3/2018

Information Panel

Name: S001 - Noise Source Measurements
Location: Well 6
Model Type: SoundPro DL
Device Name: BHR120002
Start Time: 8/3/2018 1:41:37 AM
Stop Time: 8/3/2018 2:51:17 AM
Run Time: 01:07:43
Serial Number: BHR120002
Device Firmware Rev: R.13H
Company Name: Z Consulting Company
User Name: GLZ

Calibration History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Calibration Action</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Cal. Model Type</th>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Cert. Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/3/2018</td>
<td>Calibration</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logged Data Chart

S001 - Noise Source Measurements: Logged Data Chart
## Study 1 - East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lmax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.2 dB</td>
<td>Leq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.4 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Logged Data Chart

Study 1: Logged Data Chart
### Study 2 - North

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lmax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51 dB</td>
<td>Leq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.5 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Logged Data Chart

Study 2: Logged Data Chart

![Logged Data Chart](image-url)
### Study 3 - West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lmax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.1 dB</td>
<td>Leq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Logged Data Chart

Study 3: Logged Data Chart
Study 4 - South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lmax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.9 dB</td>
<td>Leq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.1 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logged Data Chart

Study 4: Logged Data Chart
Session Report - Well 7 Ambient Monitoring
8/3/2018

Information Panel

Name: S002
Location: Well 7
Model Type: SoundPro DL
Device Name: BHR120002
Start Time: 8/3/2018 3:04:45 AM
Stop Time: 8/3/2018 3:34:25 AM
Run Time: 00:29:40
Serial Number: BHR120002
Device Firmware Rev: R.13H
Company Name: Z Consulting Company
User Name: GLZ

Calibration History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Calibration Action</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Cal. Model Type</th>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Cert. Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/3/2018 1:38:33 AM</td>
<td>Calibration</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well 7 Ambient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.6 dB</td>
<td>Lmax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.2 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logged Data Chart

![Logged Data Chart](image)
### TABLE V. NOISE CONTROL FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Control Techniques</th>
<th>Probable Noise Reduction in dB(A)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhaust</td>
<td>improved muffler</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casing</td>
<td>improved design of block</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enclosure</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fan (cooling)</td>
<td>redesign</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silencers, ducts and mufflers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intake</td>
<td>silencers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>redesign, new materials</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enclosure</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydraulics</td>
<td>redesign, new materials</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enclosure</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust (pneumatic)</td>
<td>muffler</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool-Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interaction</td>
<td>enclosure</td>
<td>7-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change in principle</td>
<td>10-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that noise reductions are not additive. Incremental reductions can be realized only by simultaneous quieting of all sources of equal strength.*
Typically, a 5-dB(A) IL can be expected for receivers whose line-of-sight to the roadway is just blocked by the barrier. A general rule-of-thumb is that each additional 1 m of barrier height above line-of-sight blockage will provide about 1.5 dB(A) of additional attenuation (see Figure 13).

![Figure 13. Line-of-sight.](image)

Properly-designed noise barriers should attain an IL approaching 10 dB(A), which is equivalent to a perceived halving in loudness for the first row of homes directly behind the barrier. For those residents not directly behind the barrier, a noise reduction of 3 to 5 dB(A) can typically be provided, which is just slightly perceptible to the human ear. Table 4 shows the relationship between barrier IL and design feasibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier Insertion Loss</th>
<th>Design Feasibility</th>
<th>Reduction in Sound Energy</th>
<th>Relative Reduction in Loudness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 dB(A)</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>Readily perceptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 dB(A)</td>
<td>Attainable</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Half as loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 dB(A)</td>
<td>Very difficult</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>One-third as loud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 dB(A)</td>
<td>Nearly impossible</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>One-fourth as loud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.2 **Barrier Length.** Noise barriers should be tall enough and long enough so that only a small portion of sound diffracts around the edges. If a barrier is not long enough, degradations in barrier performance of up to 5 dB(A) less than the barrier's design noise reduction may be seen for those receivers near the barrier ends. A rule-of-thumb is that a barrier should be long enough such that the distance between a receiver and a barrier end is at least four times the perpendicular distance from the receiver to the barrier along a line drawn between the receiver and the roadway (see Figure 14). Another way of looking at
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REGISTRATIONS

Registered Professional Engineer (Chemical): California CH6331
July 29, 2019

Robert Eranio
General Manager
Crestview Mutual Water Company
328 Valley Vista Drive
Camarillo, CA 93010

RE: VIBRATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT
WATER WELL NO. 7 PROJECT
CRESTVIEW MUTUAL WATER COMPANY

Dear Mr. Eranio,

This letter has been prepared to assess the potential vibration impacts associated with Crestview Mutual Water Company’s proposed Water Well No. 7 project (Project). It quantifies and determines the significance of Project vibration impacts on the nearby residential receptors.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Crestview proposes to install and operate a new water well, called Water Well No. 7, at 191 Alviso Drive. The site is currently a vacant lot.

The primary source of vibration associated with the Project’s construction phase is the drill rig used to drill the water well. As such, this letter focuses on vibration impacts from this source. The other construction operations that will occur onsite are comparable to those that frequently occur on similar sites when a residence is constructed (grading, structure building, concrete work, landscaping, etc.) and are not expected to cause vibration impacts at the neighboring receptors.

The Project’s operation phase will include operation of a well pump inside a structure. An emergency generator will also be utilized when power is unavailable. Both the pump and emergency generator will be smooth-running and are not expected to cause vibration impacts at the neighboring receptors.
SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLD

The County of Ventura’s *Initial Study Assessment Guidelines* (April 26, 2011) indicate that the following significance threshold should be used for vibration impacts from construction:

*Any project that either individually or when combined with other recently approved, pending, and probable future projects, includes construction activities involving blasting, pile-driving, vibratory compaction, demolition, and drilling or excavation which exceed the threshold criteria provided in the Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (Section 12.2) is considered to have a potentially significant impact.*

There are no other construction activities near the site that may cause vibration impacts, so the Project is addressed individually.

The Federal Transit Association’s (FTA) *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* (May 2006, FTA Guidelines) Section 12.2.2 includes vibration criteria that ensure that receptor structures will not be damaged by the Project’s construction activities. As a structures ability to withstand vibration depends on its type of construction, different vibration criteria are provided for different receptor building categories. These criteria, which are utilized as the significance threshold for Project vibration impacts, are presented in the Table 1.

Table 1 – Construction Vibration Significance Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor Building Category</th>
<th>PPV (in/sec)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.  Reinforced-concrete, steel or timber (no plaster)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Engineered concrete and masonry (no plaster)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Non-engineered timber and masonry buildings</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Buildings extremely susceptible to vibration damage</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Vibration impacts are presented in terms of peak particle velocity (PPV), which has units of inches per second. PPV is the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of the vibration signal.*

The receptors nearest to the Project most closely fit building category III (non-engineered timber and masonry buildings), so a significance threshold of 0.2 PPV is utilized to determine the significance of Project vibration impacts.
VIBRATION CALCULATIONS

Section 12.2.2 of the FTA Guidelines presents reference vibration levels for a variety of construction equipment. The source that more closely represents the Project’s water well drilling operation is caisson drilling, which has a reference vibration level of 0.089 PPV at 25 feet. This is the reference vibration level used for this analysis. Please note that this vibration level is expected to be a conservative representation of drill rig vibration because another source indicates that a drill rig produces a vibration level of only 0.022 PPV at 25 feet.¹

The following equation, from Section 12.2.1 of the FTA Guidelines is utilized to adjust the source vibration level for the actual distance to the receptor.

\[ PPV = PPV_{reference} \times (25/\text{Distance})^{1.5} \]

Table 2 presents the Project’s construction vibration impacts at the nearest receptor in each direction based on the above equation and a reference vibration level of 0.089 PPV at 25 feet.

Table 2 – Project Construction Vibration Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Approximate Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Vibration Impact (PPV)</th>
<th>Significance Threshold (PPV)</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report demonstrates that vibration impacts associated with the Project are less than significant at all receptors.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Respectfully,

Garrett Zuleger, P.E.
Z Consulting Company

https://www.countyofsbc.org/uploadedFiles/plndev/Content/Projects/Appendix%20L%20Noise%20and%20Vibration.pdf
October 31, 2019

Robert Eranio
General Manager
Crestview Mutual Water Company
328 Valley Vista Drive
Camarillo, CA 93010

RE: ADDENDUM TO NIA AND VIA WATER WELL NO. 7 PROJECT
CRESTVIEW MUTUAL WATER COMPANY

Dear Mr. Eranio,

Z Consulting Company (ZCONCO) prepared a Noise Impact Assessment (NIA, dated April 26, 2019) and a Vibration Impact Assessment (VIA, dated July 29, 2019) for Crestview Mutual Water Company’s (Crestview) proposed Water Well No. 7 Project (Project). Subsequent to their preparation, a minor change was made to the location of the water well on the Project site (see Updated Figure 2 attached). Therefore, this Addendum has been prepared to update the results of the NIA and VIA to account for this change.

UPDATED NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT (NIA) IMPACTS

The location of the well on the Project site has been moved a small distance east, slightly increasing noise impacts in that direction and decreasing noise impacts to the west. To ensure that drill rig noise levels during Project construction remain less than significant to the east receptor, the following additional noise barrier will be utilized (in addition to those presented on page 13 of the NIA):

- 8-foot-tall, STC-24, free-standing, portable noise barriers will be positioned adjacent to the drill rig’s engine on the east side as shown on Updated Figure 3 (attached). This barrier will only be used during Construction Phase 2 (Drilling).

The noise calculations from the NIA have been updated with the new source-receptor distances and the above noise barrier (attached). Tables 4, 5 and 6 from the NIA have also been updated and are presented below. Please note that the updated Project operation and construction phase noise impacts remain less than the applicable significance thresholds.
### Updated Table 4  
**Project Operational Phase Noise Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Peak Hour Impact dBA $L_{eq}(1hr)$</th>
<th>24-Hour Impact dBA CNEL</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance Threshold</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td>*** --- ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Updated Table 5  
**Project Operation Phase Noise Compared to Background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Project Noise $L_{eq}$ dBA</th>
<th>Background Noise $L_{eq}$ dBA</th>
<th>Project Increase $L_{eq}$ dBA</th>
<th>Qualitative Assessment of Change in Nighttime Noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>+3.8</td>
<td>Barely noticeable change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>+2.5</td>
<td>Unnoticeable change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>+2.9</td>
<td>Unnoticeable change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>+0.8</td>
<td>Unnoticeable change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* It is important to understand these factors when evaluating the noise impacts presented in this Assessment:

1. Calculation methodologies in this Assessment utilize worst case assumptions to obtain maximum expected impacts.
2. All Project noise impacts in this Assessment are for exterior noise levels at the nearby receptors. Interior noise levels will be considerably less than those presented in this Assessment, even with windows open.
3. Project operation will produce a continuous, broad spectrum noise. On a decibel per decibel basis, this is one of the least intrusive types of noises. In other words, the Project noise will be similar in character (i.e., the type of sound, not the volume of the sound) to an electric fan.

### Updated Table 6  
**Project Construction Noise Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Phase 1 Impact dBA $L_{eq}(1hr)$</th>
<th>Phase 2 Impact dBA $L_{eq}(1hr)$</th>
<th>Phase 3 Impact dBA $L_{eq}(1hr)$</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance Threshold</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td>*** --- ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Construction Phases 1 and 3 will only occur during daytime, so they are compared to the daytime significance threshold. Construction Phase 2 will occur 24-hours-per-day, so it is compared to the nighttime threshold.*
UPDATED VIBRATION IMPACT ASSESSMENT (VIA) IMPACTS

Table 2 from the VIA has been updated and is presented below. Please note that the updated Project construction phase vibration impacts remain less than the applicable significance threshold.

Updated Table 2  Project Construction Vibration Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Approximate Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Vibration Impact (PPV)</th>
<th>Significance Threshold (PPV)</th>
<th>Significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSION

This Addendum demonstrates that, with the updated water well location and additional construction noise barrier, the Projects noise and vibration impacts remain less than the applicable significance thresholds at all receptors.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Respectfully,

Garrett Zuleger, P.E.
Z Consulting Company

Attached: Updated Figure 2 – Construction Operations
Updated Figure 3 – Drill Rig Acoustic Panels
Updated Construction Phase Noise Calculations
Updated Operation Phase Noise Calculations
In addition to the perimeter sound barriers shown on Figure 2, portable acoustic panels will be placed adjacent to the drilling rig's engine for the duration of drilling on the east and west sides. This figure shows anticipated drill rig orientation and suitable portable barrier placement.
### Construction Phase 1: Site Development and Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Lmax @ 50' (dBA)*</th>
<th>Usage Factor</th>
<th>Usage Adjust. (dB)</th>
<th>Leq @ 50' (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>73.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Receptor Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source-Receptor Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Distance Adjust. (dBA)</th>
<th>Noise Barrier Adjustment (dBA)**</th>
<th>Muffler Adjustment (dBA)***</th>
<th>Leq @ Receptor (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>-16.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Calculation methods, equipment noise levels, and usage factors from Ventura County’s Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan.

Usage factors are defaults for domestic housing construction, which is representative of project’s small size and scope.

** Temporary noise barriers will be used during construction as described below and shown on Figures 2 and 3:

- 24 foot tall, STC-32 barriers will be used on the east and west for the duration of construction for a 15 dBA reduction (Figure 2).
- 16 foot tall, STC-32 barrier will be used on the south for the duration of construction for a 10 dBA reduction (Figure 2).
- 16 foot tall, STC-32 barrier will be used on the north side for the 2nd and 3rd phases of construction for a 10 dBA reduction (Figure 2).
- 8 foot tall, STC-24 barrier will be placed adjacent to drill rig’s engine on the west side for the duration of drilling for a 5 dBA reduction (Figure 3).
- 8 foot tall, STC-24 barrier will be placed adjacent to drill rig’s engine on the east side for the duration of drilling for a 5 dBA reduction (Figure 3).

*** The use of mufflers is expected to provide a 10 dBA noise reduction noise based on The Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances (see assessment text for more information).
UPDATED OPERATION CALCS.

Source Noise Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement #</th>
<th>Side of Bldg</th>
<th>Measured Leq (dBA)</th>
<th>Adjustment (dBA)*</th>
<th>Measurement Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Leq @ 50ft (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vent</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No openings</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rollup door and vents</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No openings</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noise Propogation Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Based on Measurement # **</th>
<th>Source Leq @ 50ft (dBA)</th>
<th>Source-Receptor Distance (ft)</th>
<th>Source Leq @ Receptor (dBA)</th>
<th>Exterior LOS Adjustment (dBA)***</th>
<th>Interior LOS Adjustment (dBA)***</th>
<th>Adjusted Leq (dBA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>avg of 2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>avg of 2 &amp; 4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nighttime Peak Hour Significance Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Ambient Leq (dBA)</th>
<th>Sig. Threshold Leq (dBA)</th>
<th>Impact Leq (dBA)</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CNEL Significance Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receptor</th>
<th>Sig. Threshold CNEL (dBA)</th>
<th>Impact CNEL (dBA)****</th>
<th>Significant Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Measurement 4 is adjusted to account for the suboptimal location of the measurement (between the building and a block wall). Reflection of noise from the wall artificially increased the measured noise level, so the result was adjusted to compensate.

** The source noise level for sides of the building without openings is based on the average of the suitable measurements (#2 and #4).

*** LOS = line of sight. Exterior LOS adjustment takes into account things that break line of site between the well building and the receptors. Interior LOS adjustment takes into account things that break line of site between the well pump and the vents in the well building. See Section 6.1 of the report for additional information regarding these factors.

**** CNEL impact is calculated by assuming peak hour noise levels for every hour of operation (from midnight to 9 am).
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October 22, 2019

Via Facsimile 805-654-2509
Ms. John Kessler
Resource Management Agency
County of Ventura
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, California 93009

Re: Crestview Well Project; PL19-0039

Dear Mr. Kessler:

You file will reflect several communications from this office on behalf of a number of adjacent property owners concerning the above referenced. I initially was reaching out to Jennifer Welch as I understood she was the manager for this project. I learned from Ms. Welch that she was not involved and that you were the primary planner with your manager being Mindy Fogg. Your file will reflect that I reached out to you and Ms. Fogg last week. I appreciate yours and Ms. Fogg’s telephone call yesterday.

Please know that we have attempted to obtain information from Mr. Densmore of the State Water Board. We have not received that information though the time under statute for him to provide that information has expired. We understand that Mr. Densmore is working on it and we will receive information from him shortly.

Please be advised that we do not believe that Mr. Densmore or the State or the County have been provided accurate or complete information concerning the significant public health and safety issues that exist with respect to this proposed well. There are also a number of other concerns that exist and unfortunately Crestview Mutual Water Company and Mr. Eranio have been less than transparent with the community. By way of example only, early on Mr. Eranio communicated that he believed that when and if such a well were to be drilled it would go on for some months, would go on 24/7 and would be noisy and disruptive and in that context indicated that the neighbors in the vicinity may need to go to hotels which would be paid for by Crestview Mutual Water Company. When he was asked to confirm this offer, he disavowed his public statements. We offer this only as an example of what has occurred, there are a number of issues that have arisen with respect to how this matter has unfolded.
Name: Mr. John Kessler
Re: Crestview Well Project; PI.19-0039
Date: October 22, 2019
Page: 2

There is very significant opposition to this project and that opposition is environmental, as well as public health and safety. On behalf of our clients, we intend to interface with Mr. Densmore and the State Water Board when and if they comply with their obligations of transparency. We provide you this information because we do not know when Mr. Densmore will communicate with the County on this matter and we are concerned that he will do so prior to the interested and concerned neighbors being afforded the opportunity to provide information to the State Water Board on the issues.

Please note by prior correspondence I have requested that this office be noticed on all matters and provided copies of all materials received or issued. I appreciate yours and Ms. Fogg's confirmation that this office is now on the dissemination/notice list.

Thank you for your anticipated professional courtesy and cooperation in this matter.

Very truly yours,

GOLDENRING & PROSSER
A Professional Law Corporation

By: PETER A. GOLDENRING

PAG:nc
c: Mindy Fogg, mindy.fogg@ventura.org
2566.IKessler10-22-19
FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET

Date: October 14, 2019
Facsimile No.: 805-654-2509
To: Jennifer Welch
Firm: County of Ventura
From: Peter A. Goldenring, Esq.
Assistant: Nancy Choquette
File: 2566.1

Total Pages Sent (includes cover sheet): 4

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES, PLEASE CALL.
October 11, 2019

Via Facsimile 805-654-2509
Ms. Jennifer Welch
Resource Management Agency
County of Ventura
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, California 93009

Re: Crestview Mutual Water Company Well Sites 5 and 7
CUP No. 4858
Case No. PL19-0039

Dear Jennifer:

I am assuming you are buried in work. It would be helpful if I could just have an email confirmation that you received the October 8, 2019, copy enclosed, and that you will get back to me at some point.

Thank you for your continuing professional courtesy and assistance.

Very truly yours,

GOLDENRING & PROSSER
A Professional Law Corporation

By: PETER A. GOLDENRING

PAG:nc
Enclosure
2566.1 Welch 10-11-19
Via Facsimile 805-654-2509
Ms. Jennifer Welch
Resource Management Agency
County of Ventura
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, California 93009

Re: Crestview Mutual Water Company Well Sites 5 and 7
CUP No. 4858
Case No. PL19-0039

October 8, 2019

Dear Jennifer:

Kindly be advised that this office is counsel for one or more immediately adjacent property owners concerning the above referenced. There are very significant concerns, environmental and otherwise, concerning the above referenced matters. Everything that I have seen indicates that these may not be clearly and unambiguously being presented and/or understood by the Resource Management Agency.

We have reviewed your September 18, 2019 correspondence where you opine that the above referenced matters are categorically exempt from environmental review. We believe that to be inaccurate, factually and legally.

Of particular concern is that we are not aware of the categorical exemption having been communicated to all of the interested and affected landowners and residents.

On behalf of our clients, we request the following:

1. The opportunity to review the entire file in this matter at your convenience.

2. Clarity as to whether or not your determination of categorical exemption from CEQA was communicated to any property owners or interested parties other than Mr. Eramo.

3. That your file be documented that this office is counsel for adjacent and interested property owners and that we are to be copied on all notices and advisement concerning these matters.
Name: Ms. Jennifer Welch
Re: Crestview Mutual Water Company Well Sites 5 and 7
Date: October 8, 2019
Page: 2

We ask for any documents to indicate any disclosures by Mr. Eranio with respect to his conflicts involving him handling this matter and if those conflicts, if disclosed, have been evaluated in any fashion.

As always, I look forward to your professional courtesy and prompt response.

Very truly yours,

GOLDENRING & PROSSER
A Professional Law Corporation

By: PETER A. GOLDENRING

PAG:nc
2566.1Welch10-08-19
GOLDENRING & PROSSER
A Professional Law Corporation
6050 Seahawk Street
Ventura, California 93003
Telephone: 805-642-6702
Facsimile: 805-642-3145

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL COVER SHEET

Date: October 8, 2019
Facsimile No.: 805-654-2509
To: Jennifer Welch
Firm: County of Ventura
From: Peter A. Goldenring, Esq.
Assistant: Nancy Choquette
File: 2566.1
Total Pages Sent (includes cover sheet): 3

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES, PLEASE CALL.
October 8, 2019

Via Facsimile 805-654-2509
Ms. Jennifer Welch
Resource Management Agency
County of Ventura
800 South Victoria Avenue
Ventura, California 93009

Re: Crestview Mutual Water Company Well Sites 5 and 7
CUP No. 4858
Case No. PL19-0039

Dear Jennifer:

Kindly be advised that this office is counsel for one or more immediately adjacent property owners concerning the above referenced. There are very significant concerns, environmental and otherwise, concerning the above referenced matters. Everything that I have seen indicates that these may not be clearly and unambiguously being presented and/or understood by the Resource Management Agency.

We have reviewed your September 18, 2019 correspondence where you opine that the above referenced matters are categorically exempt from environmental review. We believe that to be inaccurate, factually and legally.

Of particular concern is that we are not aware of the categorical exemption having been communicated to all of the interested and affected landowners and residents.

On behalf of our clients, we request the following:

1. The opportunity to review the entire file in this matter at your convenience.

2. Clarity as to whether or not your determination of categorical exemption from CEQA was communicated to any property owners or interested parties other than Mr. Eranio.

3. That your file be documented that this office is counsel for adjacent and interested property owners and that we are to be copied on all notices and advisement concerning these matters.
Name: Ms. Jennifer Welch  
Re: Crestview Mutual Water Company Well Sites 5 and 7  
Date: October 8, 2019  
Page: 2

We ask for any documents to indicate any disclosures by Mr. Eranio with respect to his conflicts involving him handling this matter and if those conflicts, if disclosed, have been evaluated in any fashion.

As always, I look forward to your professional courtesy and prompt response.

Very truly yours,

GOLDENRING & PROSSER
A Professional Law Corporation

By: PETER A. GOLDENRING

PAG: nc
2566.1 Welch 10-08-19
Michael Rolls
179 Alviso Drive
Camarillo, CA 93010

October 1, 2019

Supervisor Kelly Long
1203 Flynn Road #220
Camarillo, California 93012

Dear Supervisor Long,

Thank you for meeting with myself and other members of the Las Posas Hills Homeowners Association regarding our concerns over the Crestview Water Well application. We sincerely appreciate your time and realize the questions put forth need input from planning to clarify the points raised. Below to assist you are our questions, memorialized to help you when discussing with County Staff. We are looking forward to receiving specifics as to how this project became categorically exempt given the conflicts with the basic CEQA related requirements. Further but not CEQA related this project in within a community governed by CC&R’s. Drilling is not allowed and the Project was deemed unacceptable by the HOA.

Please review the response to the Determination of Environmental Document dated September 18, 2019 for Case No. PL 19-0039. The letter states the project is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to Sections 15303 and 15304 of the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act. We believe the environmental analysis may be inadequate for this project and that the project may have been misrepresented. The construction of a water well does not qualify for a Categorical Exemption under Sections 15303, and 15304 as stated in the County letter.

According to the CEQA Guidelines, categorical exemptions are not absolute. There are exceptions depending on the nature or location of the project. Classes 3 and 4 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located (Section 15300.2). A project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may be significant in a particularly sensitive environment, such as a water well project in a quiet, residential neighborhood.

We have outlined several issues below that were not addressed during the project review and are requesting answers.

• The Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) prepared by Z Consulting Company and dated April 26, 2019, states that well drilling be conducted 24 hours a day and will take at least a month to complete. The NIA also states that noise barriers will be positioned on all four sides of the project’s construction activities. However, there was no dB(A) or Construction-Related Vibration information included in the NIA, as required in the County’s Initial Study Assessment Guidelines.
  o How are homeowners located in the immediate vicinity, some within 55 feet of the drilling, to know what the noise level will be during construction even with these noise barriers?
  o How could this application be deemed complete when the noise and vibration impacts from well drilling construction were not adequately analyzed?
According to the Noise Impact Assessment, prepared by Z Consulting Company, dated April 26, 2019, there will be continuous noise from the water well pump operating from midnight to 9:00 am. While the pump may generate noise beneath the County’s acceptable standard, it will be a source of continuous noise in a residential neighborhood with a home located only 55 ft away.

- Was the proximity of homes and the time of pumping taken into consideration during the project’s evaluation?

We understand that the County Biologist conducted a site visit and determined no biological impacts to the adjacent blueline stream and mapped wetland based on that site visit alone without the benefit of an Initial Study Biological Assessment (ISBA) as required prior to application completeness determination.

- Did the County Biologist follow the procedures identified in Step 3 of the Initial Study Assessment Guidelines (ISAG) Biological Resources Methodology Section? If not, it appears that this project has been treated differently from other projects in the County that are adjacent to identified blueline streams and wetlands where an ISBA is required as part of the submittal information.

Ventura County Building Code (VCBC), Appendix H, requires a minimum 200-foot horizontal separation, or setback, between a seepage pit and a public water well. The proposed well location does not meet this setback and may impact the surrounding properties. Due to the proposed location of this public water well, owners of the adjacent properties may not be able to obtain permits for repair or replacement of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTS) or new OWTS without installing supplemental treatment components for nitrogen and pathogen reduction and/or providing documentation to the permitting authority regarding the impact of the OWTS on the water source (see VCBC Table CPC Appendix H-1). We understand that the cost of installing supplemental treatment components for nitrogen and pathogen reduction cost upward of $50,000 and require on-going monitoring at an additional annual cost.

- How is the County addressing the Advisory Information from Rebecca Lustig included in the August 1, 2019 Completeness Determination letter?

Although this is a small structure, it is not a benign, compatible use in a residential neighborhood. We ask that the County reconsider the Categorical Exemption status for this project and prepare a full initial study assessment.

Respectfully,

Michael Rolls
CAUTION: If this email looks suspicious, DO NOT click. Forward to Spam.Manager@ventura.org.

Good evening, Mr. Kessler:
I have made presentations to the Las Posas Owners Association, Crestview Mutual Water Co board, Las Posas Users Group and Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency opposing the location of a proposed well project by Crestview Mutual Water Co. I would like to forward this information to you as you consider the CUP / well application Crestview has submitted for 191 Alviso Dr., Camarillo. The HOA has denied the project, as our CC&R’s do not allow for drilling, as each lot is meant for a single family residence. Please be advised that I have just been informed of the Local Agency Management Program (LAMP) that recognizes local conditions and maintains existing OVVS siting and design standards. As I understand this (and forgive me, I am new at this), if the well is approved, and something goes wrong with our surrounding septic systems, given that the well is not in compliance with the State setback requirements, we as neighbors will be adversely affected, and face costly advanced treatment systems to handle the wastewater.
I would appreciate our concerns be taken into account regarding this project.
Thank you kindly for your attention to this matter.
Christine Cohen

"Life is not about waiting for the storms to pass... it's about learning to dance in the rain"
Comments to the Las Posas Users Group

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Item 5 - Discussion of Water Well Permit No. 0284

Good morning.

My name is Christine Cohen and I reside at 69 La Patera Dr. Camarillo - across the street from this proposed well.

What I would like to let this body know is that this water company has been less than forthcoming on providing accurate and timely information to its shareholders. Let me be clear, this is not just a matter about a well that Crestview claims will not extract more water than currently allocated in its service area. This is about a water company that bought a piece of property in an upscale residential neighborhood which came with Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions. The Las Posas Hills Owners Association has denied approval of this proposed well project on multiple grounds of violating the CC&R’s.

The selected well site is completely enveloped within state-mandated setbacks from individual sewage disposal systems, surface water drainages, and sensitive habitat.

Using existing public County records along with GPS technology, a simple analysis to locate septic tanks and seepage pits can be conducted. Existing seepage pits are shown in Exhibit A along with a 150-foot halo surrounding the seepage pit locations. The halos depicted in Exhibit A (handout) were drawn at 145 feet to account for a margin of error in plotting the seepage pit locations. The proposed well location on 191 Alviso does not meet the minimum 150-foot setback from a potential contamination source.

A discretionary variance to these standards from county and state agencies is unprecedented in recent decades for public supply wells regardless of well design. Given the sandy nature of the soils in the area, deep annular seals (which are known to be limited in their impediment to pathogens) are likely to be ineffective. The County well drilling permit application prepared by the applicant fails to indicate the locations of required septic (and other) features and does not comply with the state standards.

The proposed well project backs up to a natural creek, which the application’s Drainage Study refers to as an open swale. Unfortunately, start up and discharge water will be flowing down this creek bed. According to the Homeowner’s Association, the drainage easement is owned by the Association. No application to modify this drainage easement has been submitted to the Homeowners Association.

Given the natural topography and orientation of the parcel, significant grading would be required to render the property safe enough to orient a drilling rig capable of reaching the proposed depths
and diameters of drilling. Estimates of the volume of soil that would require grading exceed the 50 cubic yards that would trigger a county grading permit requirement, and may substantially affect drainage and nearby slope stability issues.

The application filed with the County of Ventura reflects ambiguous language regarding the intended abandonment of Well #5, which in this application appears more definitive. The county application suggests that Well #5 may or may not be completely abandoned. Well #5 brought up what we residents refer to as “dinosaur water”. It ceased operation in 2007 due to the poor water quality. This well was amortized over decades. Ratepayers are still paying for this fiasco.

The CMWC Well No. 7 site is intended to replace CMWC Well No. 5, which ostensibly failed due to water quality concerns. However, the proposed replacement well site is located on the same geologic structure (the Camarillo Hills anticline) at a nearly identical stratigraphic location, depth, and design as the failed well. Given the orientation of the strata, logs from nearby oil exploration wells indicate that the typical target geologic unit, known as the Fox Canyon Aquifer, is much shallower and unlikely to be saturated at this location. The Fox Canyon Aquifer outcrops just south and east of the proposed well site, leaving deeper and poorer quality aquifers as the only viable saturated targets at this location.

Given the small size of the proposed parcel, and proximity of sensitive receptors, meeting the county noise ordinance will be impossible without compromising the safety of the drill site environment. Deep-founded, tall noise attenuation barriers would be required, which require a significant space for safe construction around the perimeter of the parcel. This significantly limits the work space, and limits the orientation of any drilling rig that would be capable of drilling to the 1500-ft proposed depth and 16-inch casing diameter of CMWC Well No. 7.

We have not been provided with an alternative site analysis. Our questions are brushed off and not answered because the board goes into executive session under the auspices of significant exposure to litigation. This project is rife with flawed analysis and is being pushed through at any cost.

Bottom line: At issue is the siting of this well. It does not belong here, and this project needs to hit the reset button to find a better location.
Comments to the Fox Canyon Groundwater Management Agency

Wednesday, July 24, 2019

Good afternoon,

My name is Christine Cohen and I reside at 69 La Patera Dr. Camarillo - across the street from a proposed well (well #7) for which your Executive Director is being asked to grant approval - Water Well Permit No. 0284.

This application, submitted by Crestview Mutual Water Company (a non-profit mutual water company) was on the agenda for the Las Posas Users Group at their meeting this morning.

What I would like to let this body know is that this water company has been less than forthcoming on providing accurate and timely information to its shareholders. Let me be clear, this is not just a matter about a well that Crestview claims will not extract more water than currently allocated in its service area. This is about a water company that bought a piece of property in an upscale residential neighborhood which came with Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions. The Las Posas Hills Owners Association has denied approval of this proposed well project on multiple grounds of violating our CC&R’s, including the provision prohibiting drilling any wells.

The selected well site is completely enveloped within state-mandated setbacks from individual sewage disposal systems, surface water drainages, and sensitive habitat. Using existing public County records along with GPS technology, a simple analysis to locate septic tanks and seepage pits can be conducted. Existing seepage pits are shown in Exhibit A along with a 150-foot halo surrounding the seepage pit locations. The halos depicted in Exhibit A (handout) were drawn at 145 feet to account for a margin of error in plotting the seepage pit locations. The proposed well location on 191 Alviso does not meet the minimum 150-foot setback from a potential contamination source.

A discretionary variance to these standards from county and state agencies is unprecedented in recent decades for public supply wells regardless of well design. Given the sandy nature of the soils in the area, deep annular seals (which are known to be limited in their impediment to pathogens) are likely to be ineffective. The well drilling permit application prepared by the applicant fails to indicate the locations of required septic (and other) features and does not comply with the state standards.

The proposed well project backs up to what historically was a blue line creek; a natural creek which the application’s Drainage Study refers to as an “open swale.” Unfortunately, drill sludge, start up, and discharge water will be flowing down this creek bed. This creek bed is privately owned by each property owner long the creek. No permissions have been sought to discharge drill sludge on each private property owner’s lots. According to the Homeowners Association,
the flow easement is owned by the Association. No application for a variance has been submitted to the Homeowners Association.

Given the natural topography and orientation of the parcel, significant grading would be required to render the property safe enough to orient a drilling rig capable of reaching the proposed depths and diameters of drilling. Estimates of the volume of soil that would require grading exceed the 50 cubic yards that would trigger a county grading permit requirement, and may substantially affect drainage and nearby slope stability issues.

The application filed with the County of Ventura reflects ambiguous language regarding the intended abandonment of well #5, which in this application appears more definitive. The county application suggests that well #5 may or may not be completely abandoned. Well #5 brought up what we residents refer to as “dinosaur water”. It ceased operation in 2007 due to the poor water quality. This well was amortized over decades. Ratepayers are still paying for this fiasco.

The proposed well #7 site is intended to replace well #5, which ostensibly failed due to water quality concerns. However, the proposed replacement well site is located on the same geologic structure (the Camarillo Hills anticline) at a nearly identical stratigraphic location, depth, and design as the failed well. Given the orientation of the strata, logs from nearby oil exploration wells indicate that the typical target geologic unit, known as the Fox Canyon Aquifer, is much shallower and unlikely to be saturated at this location. The Fox Canyon Aquifer outcrops just south and east of the proposed well site, leaving deeper and poorer quality aquifers as the only viable saturated targets at this location.

Given the small size of the proposed parcel, and proximity of sensitive receptors, meeting the county noise ordinance will be impossible without compromising the safety of the drill site environment. Deep-founded, tall noise attenuation barriers would be required, which require a significant space for safe construction around the perimeter of the parcel. This significantly limits the work space, and limits the orientation of any drilling rig that would be capable of drilling to the 1500-ft proposed depth and 16-inch casing diameter of proposed Well #7.

We have not been provided with an alternative site analysis. Our questions are brushed off and not answered because the board goes into executive session under the auspices of significant exposure to litigation. This project is rife with flawed analysis and is being pushed through at any cost.

In this morning’s LPUG meeting, questions arose regarding the outcrop boundaries and which maps were used to determine whether the proposed well was outside the outcrop area or not. We suggest that this be further investigated.

Bottom line: At issue is the siting of this well. It does not belong here, and this project needs to hit the reset button to find a better location. We urge you to deny this application.
Proposed Location of Well #7: Known Seepage Pit Locations with 150-ft Setback
Proposed Location of Well #7: Known Seepage Pit Locations

Legend
- 191 Alviso Drive

Seepage Pits
- Abandoned
- Active
Dear Robert and Board of Directors:

Attached please find a denial for your choice of roofing for your proposed lot at 191 Alviso.

The Association's Architectural Committee voted not to approve your plans based upon the issues as outlined in the attachment.

As you may be aware you are welcome to appeal this decision to the entire Board of Directors at their next meeting.

Sincerely,

On Behalf of the Board of Directors of Las Posas Hills Owners Association

Ruth Cederstrom, PCAM®, CCAM®
Community Association Manager

Encl. BOD
EXHIBIT "A"

Crestview Mutual Water District Architectural Committee Grounds for Denial:

- Article VIII, Section 1, page 36- Each Lot shall be used exclusively as a private single-family residence. No owner shall use or cause his Lot to be used for any commercial, industrial, storing or other non-residential purposes except citrus or avocado farming.

- Article VIII, Section 5 page 37-Hazardous Activity-No Owners shall permit or suffer anything to be done or kept on his Lot or in the Common Area which will result in cancellation of insurance on the common areas.

- Article VIII, Section 6, page 38- Nuisance. No owner shall permit or do anything on his Lot which will obstruct interfere with the rights of other owners or annoy them by unreasonable noises or otherwise, nor permit any nuisance.

- Article VIII, Section 12, page 40- No derrick or other structure designed for use in boring for water shall be erected, maintained or permitted on any Lot.

- Well within 150' of septic systems

- Metal roof is not approved

- No information submitted for chemical storage close to habitable dwellings.

- Buildings do not conform to the aesthetics of the custom homes in the HOA. The proposed buildings do not look like single family homes, Tuff Shed type structure, not wood or stucco structure. Proposed buildings are inharmonious or out of keeping with the general plan of improvements for the Project or with Improvements erected on neighboring lots.

- Proposed landscaping trees will block views of adjoining homes.

- Proposed Structure does not meet Residence Standards-page 50 set forth in IX section 9

- Sound fencing will block views which is not permitted by the CC&Rs.

- Based upon proposed driveway it appears will need to go into the slope and retaining wall will be required and not proposed.

- Potential over-flowage from the irrigation tank which is to be used if need overflow from the well will exceed the designed flowage from the lot onto the HOA flowage, drainage and equestrian easements.
Hello John,

I am writing as a Crestview shareholder to ask if this project is scheduled to be heard before the Planning Commission. Our HOA CC&R's strictly prohibit the installation of a well and we would like our concerns heard.

If it is scheduled to go before the Planning Commission, how do I go about getting this information?

If it is not going before the Planning Commission, is it possible to provide citizen commentary on the project?

Thank you in advance,
Alma Quezada
310-314-2220
February 11, 2019

Kim L. Prillhart
Planning Director
Ventura County Resource Management Agency
Planning Division
800 South Victoria Ave., L. #1740
Ventura, CA 93009-1740

Re: 191 Alivso Drive Camarillo, CA-Lot 16 of Tract No. 2706

Dear Ms. Prillhart:

My firm represents Las Posas Hills Owners Association (“HOA”). We understand that Crestview Mutual Water Company (“Crestview”) on or about October 2015 purchased a vacant lot located at 191 Alivso Drive in HOA, which is Lot 16 of Tract No. 2706 intending to drill a water well referred to as Well #7 and construct a building structure on the lot and also maintaining chlorine tanks, generators etc. as part of the Project.

This proposed use of the of the property violates numerous sections of the HOA Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CC&Rs) to wit: Article VIII, Sections 1, 6, 9 and 12, and Article IX.

Article VIII, Section 1 provides that each lot shall be used exclusively as a single-family residence or agricultural uses.

Article VIII, Section 6 prohibits nuisances. I am informed that Crestview has advised neighboring property owners that they would need to move out of their homes for a period of time due to noise, vibrations, dust etc. and that could be up to a month or more.

Article VIII, Section 12 prohibits use of a derrick or other structure designed for use in boring water.

Furthermore, any construction of improvements on a lot requires architectural approval by the architectural control committee of the owners association. Article VIII, Section 9 and Article IX. No request to improve the subject lot has occurred and the architectural committee has not approved any improvements on it.
Crestview takes the position that it can condemn the CC&Rs under Public Utilities Code Section 2729, even though it is already a member of the Association by virtue of the legal purchase of the lot. The HOA is not ready to concede this issue. The Board of the HOA has a fiduciary duty to enforce the CC&Rs and the HOA and the individual property owners must be able to provided input on the Project to the County. The zoning for Tract 2706 is RE and was approved for the development of single family homes.

What Crestview is proposing to construct is an identified Project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and as such it needs an Application and review by the County as such. We believe it may require an Environmental Impact Report but we are not sure if any Application has been filed as of the date of this letter. Crestview is currently the legal owner of the property and subject to the CC&Rs, which it received through escrow and knowingly and willfully accepted such by acquiring ownership of the lot in 2015. However, in any event before Crestview can proceed with a condemnation action it must fully comply with County General Plan and zoning requirements and CEQA. The steps required under CEQA must be completed before the decision to acquire via condemnation. Public Resource Code section 21065; 14 Cal Code of Regs section 15004(b)(1).

I am informed that Crestview may have already discussed drilling this water well with Winston Wright. He may have more information concerning this matter. Please advise if an Application has been filed and the corresponding Application Number.

In any event I would like to receive notice of the submittal of any Application by Crestview to drill this well and any hearings that are set to consider the application.

Thank you for your anticipated attention and cooperation. I look forward to hearing from you if an Application has been filed.

Very truly yours,

MYERS, WIDDER, GIBSON,
JONES & FEINGOLD, L.L.P.

by

J. Roger Myers

JRM:vcv