

**ADDENDUM for the  
Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Coast Pump Station Raw Water Pipeline  
Replacement Project (SCH # 201908901)  
As approved by the City Council of Santa Cruz, October 22, 2019.**

**CEQA REQUIREMENTS**

State CEQA Guidelines §15073.5(a) requires that a lead agency re-circulate a negative declaration “when the document must be substantially revised.” A “substantial revision” includes: (1) identification of a new, avoidable significant effect requiring mitigation measures or project revisions and/or (2) determination that proposed mitigation measures or project revisions will not reduce potential effects to less than significance and new measures or revisions must be required. Recirculation is not required when new information is added to the negative declaration which merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications to the negative declaration.

State CEQA Guidelines §15164 states that an addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in §15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent negative declaration have occurred. An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final adopted negative declaration. The decision making body shall consider the addendum with the final adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.

While the adopted CEQA document included collection and trucking offsite of discharged water, sewer line capacity and availability was found during construction set up to be non-viable. Furthermore the impact on roadways and the project site by transport trucks was found to be a concern on the local neighborhood both from a traffic flow and safety standpoint. Alternative discussions including coordination with the City of Santa Cruz brought forth the updated approach to collecting and handling of discharged water. This addendum describes the variation in approach directly to the language put forth in the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.

None of these changes substantially modify the analysis or conclusions of the document, but instead reduce certain impacts within the previously circulated document.

Changes to the text are noted with underline (for added text) or ~~strikeout~~ type (for deleted text).

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

**Microtunneling (Page 11)**

The jacking and receiving pits would be excavated using an excavator or backhoe. The pits would be outfitted with water inflow controls and with watertight shoring to reduce the potential for the pits to collapse during construction. The shoring likely would be installed using a pile driver (vibratory or impact) or an auger with a drill rig. Water encountered during pit excavation would be placed into a settling tank before being ~~trucked~~ pipelined to a nearby sewer main for discharge. A temporary 3-inch PVC dewatering pipeline would be installed above ground from the receiving pit to the settling tank within the secondary staging area on the Santa Cruz Memorial Site, as depicted on Figure 1. The temporary

pipeline would continue above ground to Ocean Street Extension then follow the west side of the roadway against the existing fence line to the intersection where Ocean Street Extension meets Ocean Street. The pipeline would be secured with stakes and largely disguised within the vegetation. There are two locations where the PVC pipeline would be managed subsurface within a trench line so as to avoid traffic, access, and safety issues.

- A 55-foot long by 14-inch wide by approximately 18-inch deep temporary trench would be cut across the Santa Cruz Memorial driveway.
- A 12-foot long by 14-inch wide by approximately 18-inch deep temporary trench segment would be installed at the intersection between the roadway curb and the existing City manhole O9-SM301 (located adjacent to median island). A hole would be cut into the side of the manhole to connect the pipe and discharge the manhole. Non-shrink grout would be installed around the connection to contain the discharge.

The City has confirmed that this manhole and discharge line can accommodate up to 300 gallons per minute during the Coast Pump Station Pipeline project activities. Once each dewatering line is installed within the temporary trench, the excavated material would be backfilled and paved with temporary cold-mix asphalt. Once construction is complete, the temporary patch and dewatering lines would be removed and the Santa Cruz Memorial driveway and road base would be restored to its preexisting conditions. Each trench effort would be completed within a single day to install and a single day to remove. The city would coordinate in advance with the Santa Cruz Memorial operations to avoid, to the extent possible, planned ceremonies or visitations. Traffic control would be in place for the work on Ocean Street Extension. Proposed trenching would close the outgoing lane of Ocean Street Extension, however there is a second outgoing lane from Ocean Street Extension that allows drivers to continue on Ocean Street in either direction. That lane would be retained allowing drivers unencumbered ingress and egress access during the one-day trenching effort and the one-day removal effort.

## **POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE REVISED PROJECT**

These changes to the project description do not result in new impacts that were not substantively addressed in the original CEQA document, change the conclusions of any resource topics or criteria, or the need for new mitigation measures to reduce a potential significant impact, as adopted in October 2019. This section relays the additional or changed analysis to Noise, Transportation, and Utilities and Service Systems. The proposed changes to the project would not result in changes to the analyses completed and adopted to the remaining resource categories or to the Mandatory Findings of Significance analysis.

### **Noise (Page 43)**

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

*The previously adopted analysis and conclusions remain valid. The following discussion is added to that analysis to substantively justify the common finding.*

Water encountered during pit excavation would be placed into a settling tank before being piped to a nearby sewer main for discharge. The construction of this pipe would require the use of heavy construction equipment and a concrete saw within 200 feet of residential land uses. The concrete saw, the loudest piece of equipment required, would generate noise levels of up to 90 dBA  $L_{max}$  at a distance of 50 feet<sup>1</sup>. At 200 feet distance attenuation would reduce this noise level by 12 dBA to 78 dBA  $L_{max}$ . To comply with Section 9.36.010(e) of the City's Municipal Code, the construction activities would be required to occur between the hours of 8 a.m. and 10 p.m.

#### **Transportation (Page 50)**

##### **(a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?**

*The previously adopted analysis and conclusions remain valid. The following discussion is added to that analysis to substantively justify the common finding.*

**Less –Than-Significant Impact.** The proposed change in water discharge process from a trucked disposal to piped discharge would reduce the number of heavy trucks accessing the project site via Ocean Street Extension for an estimated 15 to 20 week period. This impact was found originally to be less-than-significant and would remain as such. This proposed change however would require one day of lane closure on the out-bound lane of Ocean Street Extension at the beginning of the construction period when the discharge line is trenched and one day at the end when the line is removed and the trench is backfilled. Because this isolated closure would not close a full lane and there is another out-bound lane exists, this impact would not substantively alter the circulation system. Traffic control would be in place during this work consistent with local policies and ordinances.

##### **(d) Result in inadequate emergency access?**

*The proposed changes do not change the analysis but result in a minor wording change, as provided below.*

**No Impact.** The proposed project and temporary construction would not result in inadequate emergency access. While the proposed dewatering discharge line would require a one-day lane closure of the primary Ocean Street Extension exit lane to install and connect the line to the existing City manhole, and a second one-day lane closure at the end of the project for removal of the dewatering line, a second exit lane already exists and the ingress lane to Ocean Street Extension would not be affected. Furthermore traffic control would be in place for this effort to facilitate safe entry and exit by all vehicles including emergency vehicles. The proposed project and temporary construction would not result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact.

#### **Utilities and Service Systems (Pages 55-56)**

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/construction\\_noise/handbook/](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/)

- (a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

*The proposed changes do not change the analysis but result in a minor wording change, as provided below.*

**No Impact.** The proposed project would construct a new segment of raw water pipeline that would run under the San Lorenzo River to replace an old pipeline segment that is in need of repair. The old pipeline segment would be capped and decommissioned in place. Dewatering would take place during construction. Water encountered during pit excavation would be placed into a settling tank before being ~~trucked~~ pipel to a nearby sewer main for discharge in accordance with a construction NPDES permit developed by the contractor prior to the start of construction. Because the proposed project is limited to replacing an underground raw water pipeline, it would not result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities during either construction or long-term operations. Therefore, the proposed project would not relocate or expand water or wastewater facilities or other utility facilities, and there would be no impact.

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

*The proposed changes do not change the analysis but result in a minor wording change, as provided below.*

**No Impact.** Water encountered during pit excavation would be placed into a settling tank before being ~~trucked~~ pipel to a nearby sewer main for discharge in accordance with a construction NPDES permit to be acquired by the contractor prior to the start of construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact local wastewater treatment.

## CONCLUSIONS

State CEQA Guidelines §15164(e) requires that an addendum include a brief explanation supported by substantial evidence of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to §15162. Based on the above modifications to the previously adopted analysis, as supported by substantial evidence, this Addendum finds that there would be no substantive increase in impacts, no change in the conclusions reached in the MND previously adopted, and no need for new mitigation measures to offset significant impacts that might require a Subsequent MND. The conclusions contained herein are based on the professional judgments derived in accordance with current standard practices.

City of Santa Cruz Water Department

Heidi Luckenbach, Deputy Water Director

Heidi R Luckenbach 6/10/2020

Signature

Date

Rosemary Menard, Water Director

Rosemary Menard 6/10/2020

Signature

Date



