

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (VOLUME II)

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS AND ERRATA

FOR

TEMPORARY OCEAN WATER DESALINATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

SCH No. 2008011079

LEAD AGENCY:

WEST BASIN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
17140 South Avalon Boulevard, Suite 210
Carson, CA 90746

Contact: Mr. Phil Lauri, Principal Water Resources Engineer

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT:

RBF Consulting
40810 County Center Drive, Suite 100
Temecula, CA 92591-6022

Contact: Mr. Kevin Thomas, Environmental Services Manager (Project Manager)

December 11, 2008

JN 25-102173

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Response to Comments	2
	Response No. 1 – Office of Planning & Research - State Clearinghouse	2
	Response No. 2 – Department of Transportation (District 7)	2
	Response No. 3 – California State Lands Commission.....	2
	Response No. 4 – City of Redondo Beach.....	4
	Response No. 5 – Heal the Bay.....	7
	Response No. 6 – California Coastal Commission	9
	Response No. 7 – Bay Restoration Commission.....	11
	 Late Comment Letters	
	Response No. 8 – National Marine Fisheries Service.....	12
	 Summary of Public Meeting Comments (November 10, 2008)	13
3.0	Errata	14
	Attachment A – Draft EIR Comment Letters	
	Attachment B – Project Renderings	
	Attachment C – Intake Effects Assessment Study Plan	
	Attachment D – Revised Receiving Water Analysis	
	Attachment E – NOP Comment Letters	
	Attachment F – Draft EIR Public Meeting Sign-in Sheets (November 10, 2008 Public Meeting)	

* this study includes minor technical corrections to reflect the reduced intake volumes as noted in the Draft EIR

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code, sections 21000 et seq. (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations, sections 15000 et seq. (State CEQA Guidelines), and the West Basin Municipal Water District (District) policies for implementing CEQA, the District has prepared this Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Temporary Ocean Water Desalination Demonstration Project.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed project was distributed to potential responsible and trustee agencies, interested groups, and organizations. The DEIR was made available for public review and comment for a period of forty five (45) days. The public review period for the DEIR established by the State commenced on October 22, 2008 and ended December 5, 2008.

The following is an excerpt from the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15132:

“The Final EIR shall consist of:

- (a) The Draft EIR or a revision of the draft.
- (b) Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.
- (c) A list of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.
- (d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.
- (e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.”

This Responses to Comments and Errata, together with the original DEIR (as amended by the minor corrections shown in Section 3.0, *Errata*), and District staff report include all of the above required components to make up the Final EIR. Each comment letter is followed by corresponding response(s). A response is provided for each comment raising environmental issues, as received by the District during the DEIR public review period and as required by Public Resources Code section 21092.5 and State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.

Responses to certain comments resulted in clarifications and corrections to the original DEIR text. Added or modified text is shown in Section 3.0, *Errata*, by underlining (example) while deleted text is shown by striking (~~example~~). The additional information, corrections, and clarifications, are not considered to substantively affect the conclusions within the DEIR.

2.0 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Copies of all comment letters are provided as Attachment A to this Responses to Comments document.

Response No. 1

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

- 1.1 This comment is from the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit (State Clearinghouse) and the comment documents that West Basin Municipal Water District has complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental impact reports and that the review period for responsible agency review closed on December 5, 2008.

Response No. 2

Department of Transportation

- 2.1 West Basin Municipal Water District will obtain permits from Caltrans for any transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials, or other special equipment such as for specialty educational purposes or for water desalination, which requires the use of oversized or overweight transport vehicles on State highways. This will be noted in the Final EIR (refer to Section 3, *Errata*).
- 2.2 West Basin Municipal Water District will seek the advice of Caltrans as the construction traffic management plan is drafted to minimize the likelihood of platooning (caravans of trucks) during project construction and/or operational project site deliveries. This will be noted in the Final EIR (refer to Section 3, *Errata*). Project construction is not anticipated to result in "platooning", as most equipment will be delivered individually, and export hauling will occur one load at a time, interrupted for several minutes while each truck is loaded.

Response No. 3

California State Lands Commission

- 3.1 The Draft EIR had a calculation error, which will be corrected in the Final EIR (refer to Section 3, *Errata*). The project's anticipated GHG *operational* impact is estimated at less than 300 metric tons of carbon dioxide (MTCO₂) annually, for a period of up to 3.5 years of operation and maintenance¹. This more closely

¹ Approximately 254.6 MTCO₂, based on 878.71 pounds of CO₂ per MW-hour, as recommended in the *California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol*, Version 3, April 2008 (page 36).

reflects GHG factors used by EPA and others. The DEIR estimate is based on published energy demand and GHG factors, which are generally consistent with the project-specific energy demand estimated by Energy Recovery Inc². The project's estimated GHG operational energy demand, in terms of MTCO₂, falls well below the recently proposed SCAQMD GHG significance threshold of 10,000 MT for industrial sources³. Therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary. The project is also temporary, and will utilize appropriate energy conservation strategies, as noted in the DEIR. The DEIR estimates *construction-related* GHG emissions at approximately 14 pounds/day of CO₂, equating to approximately 1.98 MTCO₂ total (as construction will only require one year). This represents a diminimus impact, and therefore mitigation measures are not necessary. The barge and boat GHG impact is also negligible, as this would occur only for a few days during project construction.

The Final EIR will include a brief discussion regarding cumulative effects of desalination, including GHG and marine resources. The cumulative impact of desalination has been, and continues to be, addressed at the State and Federal level. GHG-related cumulative assessment includes ongoing efforts to implement AB32 provisions, such as reducing GHG from power producers, research into alternative energy for desal (wave energy, solar, wind), and research into more energy-efficient desalination equipment and processes. Marine-resource related cumulative assessment has focused on technological solutions (such as the passive wedgewire intake system being evaluated as part of this project), and alternative intake methods (such as the subsurface intake pilot being evaluated as part of this project). Given desal's relatively small potential cumulative intake volume compared to the coastal power plants, it can be inferred that the cumulative open ocean intake of various proposed coastal desalination plants in the Southern California Bight would also be less than significant. However, as this project is temporary, there will be no long-term cumulative impacts. Also refer to Response No. 4.2.

² Energy Recovery, Inc letter to MWH dated April 30, 2007.

³ SCAQMD, *Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas Significance Threshold* (page 3-12).

Response No. 4

City of Redondo Beach

- 4.1 When originally presented to the City at a December 2006 City Council meeting and a following February 2008 NOP scoping meeting, the project proposed that some of the desalination equipment would be located inside the pumphouse building (including the heavier RO), while other supporting equipment was originally proposed to be located in the South Yard Equipment Area and at the existing intake pump area. However, following more detailed structural engineering and geotechnical analyses conducted from early to mid 2008, the proposed plan was revised to locate the desalination equipment outside the pumphouse building. The outside placement of equipment was necessary to avoid exceeding the structural limitations of the pumphouse building. Additionally, in order to use the pumphouse as originally contemplated, the pumphouse would have required extensive improvements to accommodate the heavy loading from the desalination equipment. These extensive improvements would not be consistent with the temporary nature of the District's demonstration project.

Use of the original pumphouse concept would not have "eliminated" visual and noise concerns. As noted in the DEIR, the original pumphouse concept would have required much more extensive construction impacts due to the installation requirements of the foundation piles, with associated increases in noise, vibration impacts, and offsite truck hauling. Construction-related impacts would therefore have been slightly greater with the original pumphouse concept. In addition, even under the original pumphouse concept, there would have still been equipment located in the South Yard area, so operational visual and noise impacts would have been reduced but not "eliminated".

- 4.2 The District will continue to evaluate renewable energy concepts as part of the final design process, for possible incorporation into the project. Due to the large investment required for alternative energy facilities, these concepts may not be consistent with the temporary nature of the District's demonstration project. In addition, placing solar power panels on the South Yard canopy may not be consistent with the City's interest in limiting the future use of the canopy.
- 4.3 Long-term effects of the South Yard canopy are discussed further below.

The site's "original condition" (current condition) can be considered somewhat blighted, as noted in the DEIR. The proposed project would actually enhance this existing condition by removing older equipment and generally cleaning up the South Yard area and pumphouse building. As shown in the attached additional renderings (Attachment B to this document), the proposed canopy, with its decorative and protective design, has been carefully chosen to be compatible with the existing pumphouse design and surrounding Harbor commercial/industrial area elements. The proposed canopy does not represent a significant visual impact to adjacent Harbor uses or visitors. Additionally, the canopy functions to protect the demonstration test equipment and to provide noise attenuation mitigation. Removal of the canopy would also require additional decommissioning work, and may damage the new concrete mat foundation. The District understands that the City may require appropriate approvals of SEA Lab for any future changes in SEALab operations. Prior to decommissioning, the District has also committed to collaborate with City staff, City Council and SEALab regarding the final disposition of the canopy.

- 4.4 Refer to Response No. 4.3 above regarding the canopy and new renderings. The DEIR did not conclude "less than significant" solely based on the temporary nature of the canopy. Rather, the DEIR concluded that the canopy would have a less than significant visual impact considering several Project Design Features, including site selection (an existing industrial location surrounded by a perimeter wall and much taller pumphouse and AES buildings), substantial aesthetic enhancements to the pumphouse building, and carefully chosen canopy design.
- 4.5 Based on project equipment noise specifications provided by manufacturers and the project engineer, South Yard-related pump and compressor noise would be approximately 82 dBA at the south canopy wall, and approximately 55 dBA or less at the Apartments At King Harbor pool area, which would be the closest residential sensitive receptor. Therefore, the operational noise level is anticipated to fall well within the City's noise standard of 55 dBA for high density residential. The proposed intake pumps (located at the existing SEALab pump area in the northwest corner of the site, adjacent to the perimeter wall) would generate an estimated 80 dBA at 3 feet. At approximately 90 feet from the apartment pool, this noise would attenuate down to approximately 55 dBA. Furthermore, these noise estimates do not account for any attenuation by the canopy wall, intervening structures, intervening equipment, or the SEALab perimeter wall. The noise calculations conservatively assume (worst case) that

all pumps and compressors are operating concurrently, and the noise is combined to a single point at the canopy edge without allowing for any internal attenuation. In reality, some equipment will be intermittent, and certain equipment processes will only occur during the day when the City's noise standard is 60 dBA for high density residential; therefore, the projected noise level is likely overstated. The noise calculations also do not reflect potential noise reductions due to replacing SEALab's existing above-ground pump with a new pump, which will likely result in reduced noise levels. As noted in the DEIR, the District will prepare a construction-level acoustic assessment to document compliance with City noise requirements based on final design plans, and will also conduct preconstruction monitoring, construction noise monitoring, and operational noise monitoring.

- 4.6 Any discrepancies between Table 5.6-3, *Sensitive Receptors* and Exhibit 5.6-2, *Noise Measurement Locations* will be corrected and provided in Section 3.0, *Errata*. The distances were calculated using the ruler measurement tool provided in Google Earth Pro. Google Earth Pro is a virtual globe, web based program that shows the earth by the superimposition of images obtained from satellite imagery, aerial photography and GIS over a 3D globe. Approximate distances will be taken from the approximate center area of the proposed canopy location to the closest portion, corner or boundary of the sensitive receptor discussed in the DEIR.
- 4.7 The proposed Project will comply with applicable City Fire Department requirements in regards to chemical use, storage and transportation, and will transmit copies of required plans to the City prior to construction.
- 4.8 The project will comply with applicable water quality regulations, including NPDES program requirements. The District will implement standard construction practices to minimize potential wind and water erosion, as noted in Section 5.4, *Geology, Soils and Seismicity*. Section 5.4 also notes the various Project Design Features that further avoid or minimize the potential for construction and operational water quality impacts. The project will not change the overall site hydrology, as the site is presently fully developed (impervious) and will remain so following construction. The project will utilize the existing local storm drain system, and will incorporate applicable site containment related to onsite chemical storage.

- 4.9 Refer to Section 3, *Errata*, for the requested modifications to the construction haul route. The project will allow continued public access throughout project construction. Project staging and construction parking was selected at AES to avoid such effects. Project construction activity along North Harbor, particularly during occasional use of the existing North Harbor gate, will be staged to ensure continued vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle access by brief redirection to the northbound side of North Harbor Drive, as necessary. Project construction would not displace any public parking, nor would it occur in or directly adjacent to a public beach or park. Project design has minimized the construction-related traffic, as noted in the DEIR. The District will continue to work closely with the City of Redondo Beach, and has committed to coordinate with the City on the proposed Traffic Management Plan. For these reasons, it is not necessary to preclude construction activity during the peak summer season.
- 4.10 The DEIR is revised in Section 3, *Errata* to include a statement that North Harbor Drive will not be utilized for any construction related parking or staging, other than infrequent access to the North Harbor Drive gate.
- 4.11 The Traffic Management Plan will be transmitted to the City prior to construction. Also refer to Response Nos. 4.9 and No. 2.
- 4.12 The DEIR Section 5.7.4, Mitigation Measures is revised in Section 3, *Errata*, to include a mitigation measure for Construction-Related Impacts that requires a safety program for fire protection that address emergency access to the site, which will be transmitted to the City of Redondo Beach Fire Department prior to construction.

Response No. 5

Heal the Bay

- 5.1 The District appreciates this information and comments from the Heal the Bay, which will be considered during Final EIR and project deliberations. Specific points are addressed below. These and other comments that relate to long-term water supply issues are not relevant to the project, which is a temporary demonstration facility that does not commit the District to any particular desalination site or technology. The District's Water Reliability 2020 Program⁴ specifically identifies an ongoing commitment to expand recycling and

⁴ www.westbasin.org, "Water Reliability 2020".

conservation programs as part of an overall balanced water supply portfolio. As part of this effort, the District is currently examining the feasibility for capturing Dominguez Channel urban stormwater runoff (the “Dominguez Urban Runoff Facility”).

- 5.2 Thank you for your comments, which will be considered by the District during Final EIR and project deliberations. One of the purposes for the project is to evaluate the performance of the passive wedgewire screens at the stated velocities. Wedgewire performance will be evaluated as part of the project, as described in the Intake Effects Assessment Study Plan (Attachment C). In addition, as part of the regulatory compliance reporting to the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the District will be documenting wedgewire system performance.
- 5.3 Reasons for selecting the SEALab site are noted throughout the DEIR, including Section 3, *Project Description* (page 3.0-8), Section 7, *Alternatives*, as well as various impact sections where Project Design Features are described, including those relating to the benefits of collocating at SEALab. There are no other known sites that would provide the benefits identified for the SEALab site, would achieve the project objectives, and be available in a timely manner to allow project implementation. Refer to Response 5.4 below regarding subsurface intakes.
- 5.4 The District appreciates this information and comments from the Heal the Bay, which will be considered during Final EIR and project deliberations. The District is taking the appropriate steps to evaluate this alternative intake technology, rather than constructing a full-scale subsurface demonstration facility which would disrupt the sensitive marine environment of Santa Monica Bay. Furthermore, implementing such a full-scale subsurface demonstration facility would not be reasonable, given that the District has not yet committed to a specific full-scale desalination site, and recognizing the highly site-specific nature and high cost of such subsurface studies.
- 5.5 The District appreciates this information and comments from Heal the Bay, which will be considered during Final EIR and project deliberations. Recycling and conservation are not viable alternatives for a temporary desalination demonstration project intended to study full-scale desalination technologies.

Response No. 6

California Coastal Commission

- 6.1 This is an introductory comment and requires no further response. The District looks forward to working with Coastal Commission staff in the timely review of the District's forthcoming Coastal Development Permit application submittal, and understands that the Commission may have additional questions as part of its permit review process.
- 6.2 The requested change will be reflected in the Final EIR (refer to Section 3, *Errata*).
- 6.3 The Final EIR will include clarifications regarding the proposed intake and discharge tunnels (refer to Section 3, *Errata*). The intake tunnel is an existing AES tunnel that was previously used for AES RBGS Units 1-4 (now decommissioned). This intake tunnel is only used for relatively nominal intake flows for SEALab's marine tanks, as noted in the DEIR, Section 5.0 (AES does not currently use this intake tunnel). The discharge tunnel is the AES RBGS Units 5&6 discharge tunnel, which is presently used by AES and SEALab. As noted in DEIR Section 5, this discharge is used periodically by AES, and on a daily basis for nominal SEALab ocean water discharge. The DEIR's intake effects assessment is based on the project's proposed ocean water intake volumes, which are approximately 1/10 of 1% of AES' permitted intake volume of 890 MGD. The DEIR's receiving water analysis only utilizes the project's proposed intake and discharge volumes, and does not include any discharge dilution that would likely occur from periodic AES discharges (which averaged 31.7 MGD in 2007), or from the nominal daily SEALab discharge (estimated at approximately 300gpm, or up to 432,000 GPD).
- 6.4 The Final EIR will include clarifications regarding the project's proposed intake velocities (less than 0.5 fps for wedgewire screens and approximately 0.083 gpm for the subsurface intake pilot), as well as overall flow volumes (refer to Section 3, *Errata*). The total intake is estimated at 580,000 GPD. Of this, approximately 80,000 GPD (or less) will be withdrawn through the bar screen for the subsurface intake pilot. The remaining 500,000 GPD will be withdrawn through one wedgewire screen at a time, to allow for impingement/entrainment sampling (refer to the revised Intake Effects Assessment Study Plan provided as Attachment C).

- 6.5 This is an introductory comment to the more specific comments that follow, which are responded to below.
- 6.6 The wedgewire performance analysis conducted by Dr. Scott Jenkins used near-field hydrodynamic modeling to predict wedgewire performance. The project will provide a unique opportunity to obtain empirical data for wedgewire performance in an open ocean environment. Please find attached a revised Intake Effects Assessment Study Plan (November 3, 2008), which provides the requested information relative to wedgewire system performance evaluation and monitoring, including impingement/entrainment effectiveness and fouling (Attachment C). The Final EIR will also be corrected to note that the wedgewire intake velocity will be at 0.5 fps or less (see Section 3, *Errata*).
- 6.7 The Final EIR will be corrected to indicate that the Subsurface Intake Pilot will be designed to replicate ocean floor conditions, with intake velocities at approximately 0.083 gpm (see Section 3, *Errata*). As noted above, please refer to Attachment C for a revised Intake Effects Assessment Study Plan.
- 6.8 The DEIR did not calculate APF as the project was found to not have a significant impact on marine resources (DEIR pages 5.3-21 to 5.3-23 and Appendix C). Furthermore, the project is temporary, and any such effects would cease following project completion. As discussed in the EIR and in these responses, one of the purposes for the project is to evaluate wedgewire and SIP performance relative to reducing marine life impacts. A copy of the Entrainment and Source Water Study will be provided with the Coastal Development Permit, as requested.
- 6.9 The project has been designed to comply with the Ocean Plan. The project's Process Flow Diagram (Exhibit 3-7) indicates which process discharges are proposed to be sent to sanitary sewer versus open ocean. This concept will also be subject to regulatory review as part of the project's NPDES permit process through the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- 6.10 Project construction will allow continued public access throughout project construction. Project staging and construction parking was selected at AES to avoid such effects. Project construction activity along North Harbor, particularly during occasional use of the existing North Harbor gate, will be staged to ensure continued vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle access by brief redirection to the northbound side of North Harbor Drive, as necessary. Project construction

would not displace any public parking, nor would it occur in or directly adjacent to a public beach or park. Project design has minimized the construction-related traffic, as noted in the DEIR. The District will continue to work closely with the City of Redondo Beach, and has committed to coordinate with the City on the proposed Traffic Management Plan. For these reasons, it is not necessary to preclude construction activity during the peak summer season.

Response No. 7

Bay Restoration Commission

- 7.1 The District appreciates this information and comments from the Bay Restoration Commission, which will be considered during Final EIR and project deliberations. Specific points are addressed below.
- 7.2 The District appreciates this information and comments from the Bay Restoration Commission, which will be considered during Final EIR and project deliberations. The District has a major commitment toward continued improvements in recycling and conservation, as described in the District's Water Reliability 2020 program.
- 7.3 This comment does not raise any specific objections to the DEIR. No further response is necessary. The District will continue pursuing its strategic goal of improving water reliability by increasing our dependence on local water sources through water conservation, water recycling and smart growth strategies.
- 7.4 The District appreciates this information and comments from the Bay Restoration Commission, which will be considered during Final EIR and project deliberations. The District will evaluate data developed as part of this and other projects prior to development of any full-scale desalination project. In addition, the project proposes an Intake Effects Assessment Study Plan (Attachment C), which will evaluate wedgewire impingement/entrainment performance.
- 7.5 The District appreciates this information and comments from the Bay Restoration Commission, which will be considered during Final EIR and project deliberations. The specifics of the public education/outreach displays will be developed as part of final design.
- 7.6 The District appreciates this information and comments from the Bay Restoration Commission, which will be considered during Final EIR and project

deliberations. The referenced EPA Phase II policy did not apply to desalination plants, and the referenced SWRCB policy is, as noted, proposed, and is still pending SWRCB hearings and additional stakeholder input. Contrary to the comments, the proposed wedgewire system would have exceeded (better than) the previous (suspended) EPA Phase II rules for impingement, and would have been well within (upper end range) of entrainment mitigation.

- 7.7 The District appreciates this information and comments from the Bay Restoration Commission, which will be considered during Final EIR and project deliberations. The District will sample the brine stream prior to recombining with the ocean water. Specific sampling and reporting protocols will be developed as part of the project's regulatory compliance programs, including the NPDES permitting.
- 7.8 The requested corrections will be reflected in the Final EIR (refer to Section 3, *Errata*).
- 7.9 The District appreciates this information and comments from the Bay Restoration Commission, which will be considered during Final EIR and project deliberations.

Response No. 8

National Marine Fisheries Service

- 8.1 The District appreciates this information and comments from the National Marine Fisheries Service, which will be considered during Final EIR and project deliberations.
- 8.2. The District intends to use the air-burst system for periodic intake cleaning approximately once per month, per the Attachment C, Intake Effects Assessment Study Plan. Actual air-burst frequency may vary depending on results of ongoing system performance evaluation (no more than once per day is anticipated to be necessary at this time).

The District will consult with NMFS and address marine mammal issues through the ACOE federal consultation process, and, if necessary, will implement appropriate mitigation to address NMFS concerns, which may include visual observation prior to initiating air burst, or modify air burst operation frequency, or timing, to avoid the need for an Incidental Take Permit, as noted by NMFS.

Summary of Public Meeting Comments (November 10, 2008)

Appendix F contains the agendas and sign-in sheets from two public meetings held on November 10, 2008 (with environmental organizations, and with the general public). This meeting included a brief overview of the project, summary of environmental issues and conclusions, followed by an informal question and answer session. There were no formal DEIR comments received at this meeting, other than a preliminary summary by the City of Redondo Beach staff of their intended comments, which were subsequently submitted to in writing and responded to in this Responses to Comments document (Response No. 4). The majority of the discussion consisted of questions and clarifications by attendees, or statements of concern, most of which were represented in subsequently submitted comment letters contained in this document.

3.0 ERRATA

As noted in the preceding responses, the DEIR text is hereby amended as noted below. The changes to the Draft EIR do not affect the overall conclusions of the environmental document. These errata are in response to Draft EIR comments, and also reflect minor staff-initiated technical corrections to the Draft EIR. These clarifications and modifications do not result in any new or more severe impacts than identified in the Draft EIR, and are not otherwise deemed to warrant Draft EIR recirculation pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15088.5. Changes are listed by page and where appropriate by paragraph. Added or modified text is shown by underlining (example) while deleted text is shown by striking (~~example~~). The following Errata also apply to Draft EIR Section 1, Executive Summary, as well as to the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

CHAPTER 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Page 3.0-16, Fifth Paragraph

“AES Parking Lot (employee/visitor parking and Logistics Trailer) – as shown in Exhibit 3-5, project construction and operation will utilize an approximately 100’ x 100’ area of the AES parking lot (located across North Harbor Drive), for construction staging, construction employee parking, facility parking for employees and visitors, and staging during decommissioning. This area presently has approximately 37 parking stalls, although the parking lot is not in active use, and is used mostly for RV storage. This portion of the AES property has an 8’ tall concrete perimeter wall to provide visual and noise screening from Herondo Street and uses in Hermosa Beach. This AES parking lot area will also include a small logistical trailer (single or double wide, up to approximately 40’x100’ for Temporary Facility staff supplies, storage, office space, etc).”

Page 3.0-24, Third Paragraph

“...the Intake tunnel that SEALab presently uses (intake tunnel previously used for AES Units 1-4, which is no longer in use by AES ~~AES Tunnels 5 & 6~~). AES is currently...”

Page 3.0-25, Fourth Paragraph, Second and Third Sentence

“The test bed will mimic natural infiltration characteristics utilizing seawater gradually drawn through various sand media to ~~simulate replicate~~ ocean floor conditions. The subsurface intake velocities will be approximately ~~0.083 gpm 1.4 fps at the point of~~”

~~intake~~ to simulate replicate seafloor conditions, and will require an estimated 55 GPM of sourcewater (screened only with a 1.5” slot width bar screen to protect marine life).”

Page 3.0-35, Third Paragraph

“

- Replenish chemical day tanks.

The Project will include typical ongoing maintenance operations, including chemical deliveries, equipment maintenance/cleaning, and periodic maintenance of the wedgewire system. Wedgewire system maintenance and/or replacement may include manual cleaning via divers, removing for onshore cleaning or replacement, as well as periodic “air burst” cleaning (anticipated to be typically once per week, but may be more often depending on performance analysis”.

CHAPTER 4 - EXISTING CONDITIONS

Page 4.0-1 Sixth Paragraph

“The Project proposes to use the existing AES ocean intake and discharge tunnels ~~for Units 5 & 6~~, which are approximately 1,600 feet offshore, in the open ocean north of the King Harbor breakwater (these tunnels are less influenced by marina-related contaminants found inside King Harbor). The intake tunnel is an existing AES tunnel that was previously used for AES RBGS Units 1-4 intake (units now decommissioned). The only present intake from this tunnel (former Units 1-4 intake) is nominal intake from SEALab, typically less than 300 gpm. ~~One of the tunnels-~~The other tunnel, the nearshore one, is presently used for SEALab and RBGS Units 5 & 6 discharge. The discharge tunnel receives nominal flows from SEALab (typically less than 300 GPM) and infrequent discharge from RBGS Units 5 & 6.

CHAPTER 5.1 AESTHETICS, LIGHT, and GLARE

Page 5.1-9, Fourth Paragraph

“The area would have temporary fencing, and may also require temporary security lighting. ~~The temporary fencing would have opaque screening along the Herondo Street frontage, and temporary lighting would be directional and limited to the intensity necessary to provide safety and security.”~~

Page 5.1-9, Fifth Paragraph

~~“... , and with implementation of temporary opaque construction fencing for and AES Parking/Staging Area fence along Herondo Street (Mitigation Measure ALG-1),...~~

Page 5.1-14, ALG-1

~~“...and/or staging areas (which is anticipated to only be necessary along Herondo Street frontage of the AES Parking/Staging Area.”~~

CHAPTER 5.2 AIR QUALITY

Page 5.2-25, Sixth Paragraph, Fifth Sentence

“Using the above California Climate Action Registry emission factor of 878.81 pounds per each megawatt-hour of power generated, the proposed Project would result in emissions of approximately 198,756.2 less than 300 metric tons of CO2 per year, for a period of up to 3.5 years of operation and maintenance (as discussed in Section 3, Project Description, actual energy demand is estimated to be between 1,300 Kwh/day and 2,000 Kwh/day). The District recognizes that desalination has the potential to generate significant cumulative GHG emissions, when viewed as a cumulative long-term total of all proposed desalination plants. However, the project itself represents nominal emissions, and would only be a temporary contributor to cumulative emissions. Cumulative long-term effects of desalination are addressed by the California Energy Commission, California Coastal Commission, California Department of Water Resources, California Climate Action Team, California Air Resources Board and others as part of State-wide policy development.”

CHAPTER 5.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Page 5.3-14, First Paragraph, Third Sentence

“The intake tunnel is an existing AES tunnel that was previously used for AES RBGS Units 1-4 (now decommissioned).”

Page 5.3-19, Second Paragraph, Second Sentence

“The Santa Monica Bay Restoration Plan was approved in March 1995, and amended in 2004 (and is currently pending revision again). The goal of this Plan is to reduce

pollutant loadings to the Santa Monica Bay from point and non-point sources in order to prevent degradation of the marine ecosystem, protect beaches, and minimize risks to human ~~health~~ health.”

Page 5.3-16, Fifth Paragraph

“In addition, certain habitats may be protected if they meet certain criteria, including their support of sensitive species or their relatively limited occurrence.

Please refer to Section 5.5, Land Use and Relevant Planning, for a detailed discussion regarding California Coastal Act compliance.”

Page 5.3-25, following Second Paragraph

“Note to the Reader – the following information has been updated in the revised Appendix G (attached to Final EIR Volume II, Responses to Comments), to reflect reduced intake volumes. The revised Appendix G indicates considerably reduced concentrations compared to those identified below.”

CHAPTER 5.6, NOISE

Page 5.6-6, Table 5.6-3, Sensitive Receptors

Receptor	Location	Distance to Project Site
Adjacent to Project site:		
Harbor Cove Apartments	211 Yacht Club Way	370 325 feet
Chart House Restaurant	231 Yacht Club Way	370 350 feet
King Harbor Marina Yacht Clubs	212 Yacht Club Way	150 250 feet
Apartments at King Harbor	208 Yacht Club Way	150 230 feet
Spectrum Athletic Club	819 Harbor Drive	400 500 feet
King Harbor Marine Center	831 Harbor Drive	230 465 feet
King Harbor Marina	King Harbor Marina	220 260 feet
Source: Field Survey conducted by RBF Consulting, March 15, 2007.		

* Noise levels reflect conservative estimates of distance from edge of canopy to nearest edge of sensitive use.

CHAPTER 5.7 PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Page 5.7-9, end of Third Paragraph (PHS-2b)

“The District will also develop a safety program for fire protection that addresses emergency access to the site, which shall be transmitted to the City of Redondo Beach Fire Department prior to construction.”

CHAPTER 5.8, TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

Page 5.8-7, following First Paragraph

“West Basin Municipal Water District will obtain permits from Caltrans for any transportation of heavy construction equipment and/or materials, or other special equipment such as for specialty educational purposes or for water desalination, which requires the use of oversized or overweight transport vehicles on State highways. The District will also contact Caltrans for information regarding methods to minimize truck ‘platooning’.”

Page 5.8-7, First Paragraph, Third Sentence

“The primary construction route will comply with local city ordinances regarding truck routes as noted below is anticipated to be North Harbor Drive to Herondo/Anita/190th to I-405, with other arterials utilized by workers and miscellaneous vendors (equipment and chemical deliveries). The Redondo Beach Municipal Code Section 3-7.902(b) prohibits any commercial vehicle having a fully laden weight of ten (10) tons or more from using Anita Street/190th Street between N. Pacific Coast Highway and Anza Avenue. Therefore, the construction route anticipated for vehicles having a fully laden weight of ten (10) tons or more will be either North Harbor Drive to Herondo Street to Pacific Coast Highway to Torrance Boulevard to I-110, or North Harbor Drive to Herondo Street to Pacific Coast Highway to Aviation Boulevard to Artesia Boulevard or Manhattan Beach Boulevard to I-405. North Harbor Drive will not be used for any construction related parking or staging, other than infrequent access to the North Harbor Drive Gate.”

Page 5.9-10, preceding Fifth Paragraph

“Note to the Reader – the following information has been updated in the revised Appendix G (attached to Final EIR Volume II, Responses to Comments), to reflect reduced intake volumes. The revised Appendix G indicates considerably reduced concentrations compared to those identified below.”

Page 9-1

Michelle ~~Dunn~~ Jung