ERRATA TO MARCH 2018 FINAL EIR/EIS

CalAm Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project

Review of the CalAm Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project Final EIR/EIS by the CEQA/NEPA Lead Agencies and others has resulted in the need for minor corrections and clarifying statements.

This Errata document includes minor edits to the March 2018 Final EIR/EIS, none of which constitutes significant new information that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the proposed project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect. Additionally, information clarified in this Errata to the Final EIR/EIS does not present any feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed in the EIR/EIS, and it does not present a substantial change in the proposed project or alternatives relevant to environmental concerns. All of the revised information merely clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modifications that do not affect the adequacy of the Final EIR/EIS. New information added to the Final EIR/EIS does not present significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action, alternatives, or impact determinations. Therefore, recirculation of the EIR/EIS is not required. The Lead Agencies have reviewed the information in this Errata and have determined that it does not change any of the findings or conclusions of the underlying CEQA/NEPA analysis in the Final EIR/EIS. As such, supplementation under CEQA/NEPA is not required.

Revisions to language as it appears in the Final EIR/EIS are indicated as follows: Quoted language is *italicized*, new language is shown in *underscore*, deleted language is shown in ~~*strikethrough*~~.

ES. Executive Summary

- Page ES-30. The impact conclusion shown in Table ES-1 for Impact 4.15-C (Cumulative impacts related to Cultural and Paleontological Resources) for Alternative 5 is revised from ~~LSM~~ to LS to reflect the conclusion drawn in the analysis in Section 5.5.15.8 on page 5.5-313.

- Page ES-34. The mitigation measure shown in Table ES-2 that is associated with Impact 4.2-10, is revised to reflect the correct numbering of the measure, and to replace the word ~~*Abandonment*~~ with Decommissioning, as follows:

  4.2-9~~1~~0: Slant Well ~~Abandonment~~ Decommissioning Plan

The same revision is made on pages 5.5-9, 5.5-12, 5.5-26, 5.5-27, 6-48 (in Table 6.4-1), 8.5-706 and 8.5-707 (3 instances in response to comment MCWD-149), 8.6-588 (2 instances in response to comment PTA-6), 8.7-264 (in response to comment Parrish-4), 8.7-265 (in response to comment Parrish-7) and 8.7-282 (in response to comment Shriner-4).

Chapter 3, Project Description

Section 3.4.2, Operation of the ASR System

- Page 3-61. The following bullet is added after the bullet at the top of the page, to clarify how the Seaside Groundwater Basin would be operated after achieving protective groundwater levels, which is currently anticipated to take several decades:

  The operating rules for the production of water described above are designed to avoid adverse impacts to the Seaside Groundwater Basin from extracting water in a manner that might exacerbate overdraft or seawater intrusion. If the Physical Solution imposed by the adjudication, or other actions to improve the conditions in the Seaside Groundwater Basin are successful in eliminating the depression(s) and/or achieving protective groundwater levels, the restrictions on which wells may extract ASR water, may no longer be required. Furthermore, if the protective levels are able to be maintained, the Watermaster may be dissolved and oversight of the Seaside Groundwater Basin may be assumed by a successor.

Chapter 4, Environmental Setting (Affected Environment), Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

Section 4.2, Geology, Soils and Seismicity

- Page 4.2-1. The word "Abandonment" in the bullet at the bottom of the page is replaced with "Decommissioning" as follows:

  - *Revisions to Mitigation Measure 4.2-10 (formerly 4.2-9), Slant Well ~~Abandonment~~ Decommissioning Plan, to include reporting requirements, coordination with the property owner, and consideration of the snowy plover nesting season.*

- Page 4.2-71: The word "abandonment" is replaced with "decommissioning" in three instances, starting with the next to last sentence in the sub-section titled "Consistency with Plans and Policies" as follows:

  As discussed in the subsequent paragraphs, ***Mitigation Measure 4.2-10 (Slant Well ~~Abandonment~~ Decommissioning Plan)*** *would require ~~abandonment~~ decommissioning of the subsurface slant wells before coastal retreat migrates the beach inland to the location of the subsurface slant wells. With these measures implemented, the MPWSP would be brought into conformance with the above-noted policies.*

  Impact Conclusion

  The anticipated future presence of the test slant well on the beach due to coastal retreat would result in a significant impact if it were to become exposed. However, ***Mitigation***

Measure 4.2-10 (Slant Well ~~Abandonment~~ Decommissioning Plan) *would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring CalAm to monitor coastal retreat rates and initiate well decommissioning before the beach migrates inland to the location of the subsurface slant wells.*

- Pages 4.2-72 through 4.2-74, and Page 4.2-77: the words "*~~abandon~~*" and "*~~abandonment~~*" are replaced with "*decommission*" and "*decommissioning*" respectively, in multiple instances.

- Page 4.2-72: Mitigation Measure 4.2-10 is revised to include the agency authorizing the Coastal Development Permit (MBNMS) as a recipient of the coastal monitoring data, and as an agency to be coordinated with in the developnment of a well decommissioning plan. The second sentence in Item 1 is revised as follows:

  The data shall be reported no later than June 30 each year to the agency~~y~~ies issuing and authorizing the Coastal Development Permit . . .

  The last sentence of Item 2 is revised as follows:

  The ~~abandonment~~ decommissioning plans shall be prepared in coordination with the property owner and the agencies issuing and authorizing the Coastal Development Permit.

Section 4.3, Surface Water Hydrology and Water Quality

- Page 4.3-93. The first and second sentences of Mitigation Measure 4.3-4 are revised to clarify the acronyms BMZ and ZID at their first mention, as follows:

  To ensure that the operational discharges from the MPWSP are in compliance with the 2 ppt receiving water salinity limitation at the Brine Mixing Zone (BMZ) compliance point required by the California Ocean Plan, the discharger(s) shall implement a Monitoring and Reporting Plan (Plan). The Plan shall, at a minimum, include protocols for monitoring of effluent and receiving water salinity characteristics as well as protocols for determining statistically significant changes in benthic community composition within the maximum extent of the Zone of Initial Dilution (ZID) as compared . . .

  The last parenthetical phrase in the second sentence is revised as follows:

  . . . (with consideration given to natural and seasonal variations and long-term regional trends).

- Page 4.3-105: Mitigation Measure 4.3-5 is revised to acknowledge the name change from MRWPCA (Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency) to Monterey One Water, or M1W, as follows[1]:

[1] Multiple additional changes from MRWPCA to M1W have been made throughout the document. The name change does not have any bearing on any of the impact conclusions.

Compliance with Water Quality Objectives. *Prior to MPWSP operations, and as part of the ~~MRWPCA~~ Monterey One Water (M1W, formerly MRWPCA) NPDES Permit amendment process (Order No. R3-2014-0013, NPDES Permit No. CA0048551) . . .*

Section 4.4, Groundwater Resources

- Page 4.4-38. Footnote 23 in Section 4.4.2.2 is revised as follows:

  The RWQCB regulates ASR operations throughout California under SWRCB Order 2012-0010 General Waste Discharge Requirements for Aquifer Storage and Recovery Projects that Inject Water into Groundwater. However, the MPWMD operates the Seaside Basin ASR wells under an agreed Sampling and Analysis Plan, ~~Permit 20808C,~~ which predates the statewide order.

- Page 4.4-41. The text on line 5 is revised to clarify that *This agreement does ~~not~~ include water recovered under Permit 20808C.*

Section 4.6, Terrestrial Biological Resources

- Page 4.6-182. Mitigation Measure 4,6-1h is revised to clarify the time period for conducting pre-construction surveys for Western Burrowing Owl:

  2. *A qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys of the permanent and temporary impact areas in or around suitable burrowing owl habitat to locate active breeding or wintering burrowing owl burrows ~~not more than~~ less than 14 days prior to construction and/or prior to exclusion fencing installation. The methodology for the preconstruction surveys shall be consistent with the methods outlined in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation.*

- Page 4.6-185. Introductory text in Mitigation Measure 4.6-1i is revised to clarify that this measure does not apply to western burrowing owl:

  This measure applies to all nesting birds protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code, except for western snowy plover and western burrowing owl, which are addressed in Mitigation Measure 4.6-1d and 4.6-1h, respectively.

- Page 4.6-186. Mitigation Measure 4.6-1j (Avoidance and Minimization Measures for American Badger) is revised to include the use of nighttime game cameras to determine if a den is active or not:

  2. *Areas of suitable habitat for American badger in the project area include fallow agricultural and grazing land and non-native grasslands. Surveys shall be conducted wherever these vegetation communities exist within 100 feet of the project area boundary. Along pipeline alignments surveys shall be phased to occur within 14 days prior to disturbance along that portion of the alignment. Game cameras shall be used to record any movements at potentially active dens for no less than three (3) nights.*

Section 4.8, Land Use, Land Use Planning, and Recreation

- Page 4.8-3. Table 4.8-1 is revised to acknowledge that the new Desalinated Water Pipeline (the product water pipeline between the treatment plant on Charles Benson Road and Reservation Road) is not within the coastal zone in the City of Marina. The third column of Table 4.8-1 (Jurisdiction), is revised as follows for the new Desalinated Water Pipeline & Optional Alignment:

Proposed Facility	***Location***	***Jurisdiction***	***Adjacent Land Uses***	***Public Recreational Areas Within 0.25 miles***
New Desalinated Water Pipeline & Optional Alignment	*From the proposed MPWSP Desalination Plant site, west along Charles Benson Road, and south along Lapis Road and Del Monte Boulevard to the boundary between the city of Marina and unincorporated Monterey County.*	*Monterey County (inland ~~and coastal zone~~)*	*Agricultural, Light Industrial, Public / Quasi-Public, Railroad*	*Monterey Peninsula Recreational Trail*

- Page 4.8-23 and 4.8-24. Table 4.8-2 is revised to acknowledge that the new Desalinated Water Pipeline is not within the coastal zone in the City of Marina. The fourth column of Table 4.8-2 (Project Component(s)) is revised as follows for the first six entries in the table:

  Subsurface Slant Wells, new Transmission Main, <u>and</u> Source Water Pipeline~~, and new Desalinated Water Pipeline~~

Section 4.10, Air Quality

- Page 4.10-24. Mitigation Measure 4.10-1c (Construction Fugitive Dust Control Plan) was revised in the Final EIR/EIS as a result of a comment received on the Draft EIR/EIS from the Monterey Bay Air Resources District (Comment MBARD-8); all active construction areas will be watered three times a day instead of twice a day. However, the air quality modeling presented in Appendix G1 did not reflect the additional watering for dust control and therefore, the mitigated impact in the Final EIR/EIS understates the reduction in construction fugitive dust emissions that is provided by the mitigation. The following revision is made to the first paragraph on page 4.10-24, and does not change the significance conclusion of less than significant with mitigation that was presented in the Final EIR/EIS:

  *With regard to reducing PM_{10} emissions of fugitive dust, **Mitigation Measure 4.10-1c (Construction Fugitive Dust Control Plan)**, would require CalAm to implement a comprehensive construction dust control plan. It is estimated that implementation of the Construction Fugitive Dust Control Plan would decrease fugitive dust emissions during earth disturbance activities by <u>at least</u> 65 percent, and would decrease unpaved road travel fugitive dust emissions in the vicinity of the subsurface slant wells at the CEMEX active mining area and the access road to the Castroville Pipeline by ~~as much as~~ <u>more than</u> 75 percent based on mitigation control efficiency factors published by SCAQMD (SCAQMD, 2007; see **Appendix G1** for all mitigation reduction assumptions).*

Section 4.13, Public Services and Utilities

- Page 4.13-26. The Draft EIR/EIS addressed the potential impact for corrosion of the first 100 feet of the offshore portion of the outfall resulting from turbulence caused by the MPWSP brine discharges, and the Draft EIR/EIS prescribed Mitigation Measure 4.13-5a to address the impact. In response to comments on the Draft EIR/EIS received from the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency (MRWPCA, now M1W), M1W agreed that as part of their required inland relocation of the beach junction structure, the lining of the offshore portion of the outfall was no longer required as part of the MPWSP and Mitigation Measure 4.13-5a was revised in the Final EIR/EIS to address the replacement of the WEKO seal clamps. To clarify that the mitigation does not apply to the lining of the offshore portion of the outfall, the last paragraph on page 4.13-26 is revised to eliminate reference to Mitigation Measure 4.13-5a as follows:

  However, the E2 assessment found that some turbulence might be expected to occur in the existing beach junction box at the shoreline and the approximately first 100 feet of the offshore segment of the outfall pipeline when brine is introduced. This turbulence could introduce oxygen into the outfall and increase the potential for corrosion, which would be a significant impact of the project. The assessment recommended that the 100-foot-long segment of outfall pipe immediately downstream of the beach junction box be lined to ensure any oxygen introduced by turbulence does not cause corrosion of the concrete pipe (E2 Consulting Engineering, 2015~~; see Mitigation Measure 4.13-5a, below~~).

- Page 4.13-28. The second paragraph in Mitigation Measure 4.13-5a is revised to ensure all effluent flows continue to be discharged through the outfall and not onto the beach or into the tidal zone; the last sentence in the third paragraph, and the fourth paragraph, are revised to clarify that installation activities may require three working shifts per day. The revisions also eliminate the need to relocate equipment each day, by requiring all equipment to be placed above the reach of tidal waters at the outset.

  Mitigation Measure 4.13-5a: Replacement of WEKO seal clamps, Periodic Inspections, and As-Needed Repairs for Offshore Segment of ~~MRWPCA~~ M1W Ocean Outfall.

  Prior to operation of the MPWSP Desalination Plant, and as part of an agreement with ~~MRWPCA~~ M1W to use the outfall for brine discharge, CalAm shall protect the offshore segment of the ~~MRWPCA~~ M1W ocean outfall from corrosion, by replacing the existing WEKO seal clamps in the nearshore portion of the ocean outfall with new corrosion-resistant clamps.

  Installation of the WEKO seal clamps shall occur prior to relocation of the existing beach junction box to allow for optimal access to the outfall. Construction shall occur in late summer/early fall, during the irrigation season, when flows in the outfall would typically be de minimis; this timing would also be late in the snowy plover nesting season when eggs would have hatched. ~~To allow a~~ Access to the offshore portion of the outfall shall be through the existing beach junction box and de minimis flows will continue to be released through the outfall during the installation process. ~~and to isolate any flow from the ocean outfall, a fabricated accessway shall be constructed within the existing beach junction box. Bypass pumping shall be set up with a surface pump and temporary~~

~~discharge piping buried in sand, and any effluent shall be discharged into the tidal zone. To protect against a~~ Any emergency high effluent flows resulting from process upsets ~~of~~ at the treatment plant or rainfall events ~~an opening~~ shall be stored and then released through the outfall after the divers have safely exited the outfall ~~provided in the fabricated accessway to allow for controlled releases~~.

Construction access shall follow along the existing outfall access road. The staging and work area shall be created on already disturbed ground at the western end of the access road and consist of no larger than a 50 square foot area for divers and diving equipment, a 20-foot container for equipment storage and a 5kw generator (in a sound enclosure) to be used if power is not available onsite. If the beach junction box and discharge pipeline are covered by sand, or if sand needs to be removed for staging, excavation would be accomplished using a backhoe or excavator. Up to one-half acre around the junction structure may be disturbed. ~~Two~~ Three working shifts per day may be required, and the installation would take approximately 6-8 weeks.

During construction, beach access shall remain open, with the potential exception of extreme high tide events. The contractor shall install temporary fencing around the construction site and construction shall be prohibited outside of the defined construction, staging, and storage areas. Construction work shall not be conducted seaward of the mean high water line unless tidal waters have receded from the authorized work areas. Construction vehicles operating on the beach shall be rubber-tired, and while in operation shall remain as high on the upper beach as possible to avoid contact with ocean waters and intertidal areas. Any construction materials and equipment placed on the beach ~~during daylight hours~~ shall be stored beyond the reach of tidal waters. ~~All construction materials and equipment shall be removed in their entirety from the beach area by sunset each day that work occurs, with the exception of the storage of larger materials beyond the reach of tidal waters for which moving each day would be extremely difficult. Any larger m~~ Materials intended to be left on the beach overnight must be approved by the Coastal Development Permit issuing and authorizing agency~~y~~ies and shall be subject to a contingency plan for moving materials in the event of a tidal wave/surge. All accessways impacted by construction activities shall be restored to their pre-construction condition or better within 3 days of completion of construction. Any beach sand in the area that is impacted by construction shall be filtered as necessary to remove construction debris. Construction areas shall maintain good construction site housekeeping controls and procedures (leak/spill clean-up; cover equipment in rain; cover exposed piles of soil/waste; dispose of waste properly; remove construction debris from beach). All construction activities that result in discharge of materials, polluted runoff, or wastes to the beach or the adjacent marine environment are prohibited. All exposed slopes and soil surface in and/or adjacent to the construction area shall be stabilized with erosion control best management practices.

CalAm shall enter into an agreement with ~~MRWPCA~~ M1W to perform periodic inspections of the offshore portion of the ~~MRWPCA~~ M1W outfall and diffuser. Annual inspections shall occur for the first three years after the MPWSP Desalination Plant is

brought online. Thereafter, the offshore portion of the outfall shall be inspected every five years. During each inspection, photo documentation shall be provided for all areas of inspections, regardless of findings, to provide for photographic comparison over time. All inspections shall include documentation of the thickness of scaling, any exposure or corrosion of reinforcing steel, significant cracking or spalling of concrete, and any pitting of metals. Any necessary repairs to the outfall and/or diffuser shall be identified and performed.

- Page 4.13-32; Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The last sentence of the paragraph is revised as follows:

  Mitigation Measures 4.18-1, Construction Equipment and Vehicle Efficiency Plan, and 4.11-1, GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- Page 4.13-34. The following discussion of secondary impacts on Land Use and Land Use Planning resulting from the implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13.5b is inserted just before Farmland:

  Land Use and Land Use Planning

  The land segment of the existing outfall crosses portions of inland and coastal Marina (see Figures 4.13-1). Inland land uses include primarily open space, grazing, row crop farming, and public/quasi-public uses. The portion of the outfall in the Coastal Zone is in an area identified in the City of Marina General Plan as Habitat Reserve and Other Open Spaces and zoned for Coastal Conservation and Development (CD) uses. The City of Marina Local Coastal Program and zoning regulations provide for conditional approval of coastal-dependent industrial land uses with a Use Permit and/or Coastal Development Permit (CDP). According to Marina Local Coastal Program Section 17.43.070.D, repair or maintenance of an outfall is subject to the requirements in a Coastal Development Permit. Since lining the land segment of the outfall would maintain the resiliency of the outfall, CalAm will need to include the land segment outfall lining and associated activities in a CDP application. Based upon the permitted uses of the area, the City of Marina should be able to make findings in support of CDP issuance to include the lining of the outfall, and with the requisite CDP, the outfall lining activities would not conflict with land use plan and zoning designations.

- Page 4.13-36; Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The last sentence of the paragraph is revised as follows:

  Mitigation Measures 4.18-1, Construction Equipment and Vehicle Efficiency Plan, and 4.11-1, GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Chapter 5, Alternatives Screening and Analysis

Section 5.5.6, Terrestrial Biological Resources

During the preparation of the Biological Assessment for consideration by the USFWS, the actual area of disturbance associated with the slant wells at CEMEX has been determined to be minimally increased for Alternative 5a from what was presented in the Final EIR/EIS. However, the characterization of the impacts in the Final EIR/EIS remains unchanged and this would not be a substantial increase in severity of the impact identified in the Final EIR/EIS. The only change being made here is that the effects of Alternative 5a would be similar to, and not less than the proposed project.

- Page 5.5-167; the first paragraph of Construction Impacts is revised as follows:

  Construction of the subsurface slant wells under Alternative 5a would ~~reduce impacts on~~ disturb a total of 8 to 9 acres of sensitive central dune scrub habitat, similar to the proposed project, and would have similar types of impacts on associated special-status species. The temporary disturbance from slant well construction would be 6 to 7 acres (see Operational Impacts for permanent impacts). ~~compared to the proposed project by reducing the area of construction impact at the CEMEX site by approximately 15 percent.~~

- Page 5.5-167; the last sentence in the first paragraph of Construction Impacts is revised as follows:

  *Thus, although impacts ~~would~~ may be slightly reduced compared to the proposed project ~~because of the smaller area of disturbance~~, construction would result in the **same impact conclusion** with respect to adverse effects on special-status species as the proposed project, less than significant with mitigation.*

- Page 5.5-167; the first sentence in the second paragraph of Construction Impacts is revised as follows:

  With respect to effects on riparian habitat, critical habitat, and other sensitive natural communities, Alternative 5a would ~~reduce~~ result in approximately the same overall area of sensitive central dune scrub habitat disturbance, ~~but~~ and potential significant impacts on central dune scrub sensitive natural community, primary habitat/ESHA under the Marina LCLUP, and western snowy plover critical habitat would be the same.

- Page 5.5-168; the first and second paragraphs under Operational and Facility Siting Impacts are revised as follows:

  With respect to operational impacts on special-status species and their habitat, operation of the pumping wells (from both Alternative 5a and 5b) would not produce groundborne vibration and therefore, there would be no impacts on special-status species from vibration. This is the same as described for the proposed project and for Alternative 1. Alternative 5a would result in approximately 2 to 3 acres of permanent loss of sensitive central dune scrub habitat; a reduction from the proposed project's net permanent loss of 7 acres. Disturbance from maintenance of the slant wells and the resulting impact on

western snowy plover habitat would ~~be similar~~ decrease compared to the proposed project under Alternative 5a (CEMEX site) and ~~decreased compared to the proposed project under~~ Alternative 5b (Potrero Road site); under either alternative, significant indirect impacts could still occur and would be reduced to less than significant with ***Mitigation Measure 4.6-1d****. All other components would result in the same potentially significant impacts described for the proposed project, and thus would result in the* ***same impact conclusion*** *as the proposed project, less than significant with mitigation.*

With respect to operational impacts on riparian habitat, critical habitat, or other sensitive natural communities, under Alternative 5a, similar impacts on central dune scrub sensitive natural community, primary habitat/ESHA under the City of Marina LCLUP, and western snowy plover critical habitat would occur at the CEMEX facility subsurface slant wells and source water pipeline during operations and maintenance activities as the proposed project. The area of disturbance would be reduced under Alternative 5a (as described above, permanent impacts would be limited to 2 to 3 acres) but potential significant impacts on central dune scrub sensitive natural community, primary habitat/ESHA under the City of Marina LCLUP, and western snowy plover critical habitat would be the same. Under Alternative 5b, impacts on sensitive natural communities during operations would be the same as described under Alternative 1, and would be potentially significant. Impacts of both Alternatives 5a and 5b would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of ***Mitigation Measures 4.6-1a*** *through* ***4.6-1d****,* ***4.6-1n****,* ***4.6-1p****,* ***4.6-2a****, and* ***4.6-2b****.*

- Page 5.5-170; the following summary paragraph is inserted just before Cumulative Analysis:

Overall Construction and Operational Impacts

Alternative 5a would result in a total of 8 to 9 acres of disturbance within western snowy plover habitat, central dune scrub natural community, and primary habitat/ESHA under the City of Marina LCLUP, comprising 2 to 3 acres of permanent impact with the remainder (6 to 7 acres) considered temporary impact. By comparison, including both construction and operational impacts, the proposed project would result in a total of 9 acres of disturbance, comprising approximately 7 acres of permanent impact and 2 acres of temporary impact. While this is the same total disturbance area as the proposed project, overall, Alternative 5a would result in a decrease in permanent impact area.

Section 5.5.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Page 5.5-185. The last full paragraph on the page is corrected and made consistent with Table 5.6-1 as follows:

Other than portions of the new Transmission Main and ASR Pipelines, no other components of Alternative 5a or 5b would be located on or near the known hazardous material sites at Moss Landing. Therefore, the potential to create a hazard to the public would be ~~increased~~ similar compared to the proposed project and compliance with regulations would ensure Alternative 5a or 5b would have the ***same impact conclusion*** *as the proposed project, less than significant.*

Section 5.6.2, Determination of Environmentally Superior/Environmentally Preferred and NOAA-Preferred Alternative

- Page 5.6-18. The impact conclusion shown in Table 5.6-1 for Impact 4.15-C (Cumulative impacts related to Cultural and Paleontological Resources) for Alternative 5 is revised from LSM to LS to reflect the conclusion drawn in the analysis in Section 5.5.15.8 on page 5.5-313.

Chapter 8, Draft EIR/EIS Comments and Responses

Section 8.2, Master Responses

- Page 8.2-89. The reference in the last paragraph to "*Ward et al. (1987)*" is revised to correctly cite Draper and Smith, as follows:

  Bias in groundwater flow models results when model errors (the difference between model-calculated and measured water levels) do not conform to the assumptions of regression analysis (the assumptions that the model errors are independent, have zero mean, have a constant variance and follow a normal distribution) (~~Ward, et al., 1987~~ Draper and Smith, 1998).

- Page 8.2-90. The second sentence of the last paragraph is revised as shown to reflect the correct value for correlation coefficient. The corresponding figure (4.3d in Appendix E2) already shows the correct value.

  The bias is consistent with the positive correlations shown for Model Layer 4 in Appendix E2 Figure 4.3b and Figure 4.3d (calculated correlation of 0.4~~2~~).

- Page 8.2-97: The references in Section 8.2.12.5 have been revised to include Draper and Smith:

  Draper, Norman R., and Smith, Harry, 1998. Applied Regression Analysis, Third Edition, A Wiley Interscience Publication.

Section 8.3, Federal Agency Comments and Responses

- Page 8.3-59. Text in response to comment USEPA-4 is revised to accurately reflect the revisions to Mitigation Measure 4.11-1, GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, in Final EIR/EIS Section 4.11:

  The Plan shall include a summary of state-of-the-art energy recovery and conservation technologies available for utility scale desalination facilities and shall include a commitment by CalAm to incorporate ~~all~~ available feasible energy recovery and conservation technologies; or, if CalAm finds that any of the technologies will not be feasible for the project, the Plan shall clearly explain why such technology is considered to be infeasible. The carbon footprint estimate for the project shall include consideration of all proposed energy recovery and conservation technologies that will be employed by the project, and shall describe the approximate GHG emissions reductions that will be associated with each technology.

  and

(1) Obtain renewable energy from on-site solar photovoltaic (PV) panels and/or the adjacent Monterey Regional Waste Management District (MRWMD) landfill-gas-to-energy (LFGTE) facility. ~~If renewable energy from the LFGTE facility is secured, CalAm must demonstrate that the associated criteria pollutant emissions, when combined with the other operational criteria pollutant emissions disclosed in EIR/EIS Table 4.10-7, would not exceed the Monterey Bay Air Resources District significance thresholds.~~

Section 8.5, Local Agency Comments and Responses

- Page 8.5-617. Text in response to comment Marina-129 is revised to accurately reflect the revisions to Mitigation Measure 4.11-1, GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, in Final EIR/EIS Section 4.11:

  Although not required to reduce an energy conservation impact, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.11-1, GHG Emissions Reductions Plan, would require CalAm to have a qualified professional prepare a GHG Emissions Reduction Plan that must include a summary of state-of-the-art energy recovery and conservation technologies available for utility-scale desalination facilities and must include a commitment by CalAm to incorporate ~~all~~ available feasible energy recovery and conservation technologies; or, if CalAm finds that any of the technologies will not be feasible for the project, the Plan shall clearly explain why such technology is considered to be infeasible.

- Page 8.5-619. Text in response to comment Marina-129 is revised to accurately reflect the revisions to Mitigation Measure 4.11-1, GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, in Final EIR/EIS Section 4.11:

  See Mitigation Measure 4.11-1 for a discussion of the GHG Emissions Reduction Plan that must include a summary of state-of-the-art energy recovery and conservation technologies available for utility-scale desalination facilities and must include a commitment by CalAm to incorporate ~~all~~ available feasible energy recovery and conservation technologies.

- Page 8.5-715. Text in response to comment MCWD-163 is revised to accurately reflect the revisions to Mitigation Measure 4.11-1, GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, in Final EIR/EIS Section 4.11:

  Although not required to reduce an energy conservation impact, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.11-1, GHG Emissions Reductions Plan, would require CalAm to have a qualified professional prepare a GHG Emissions Reduction Plan that shall include a summary of state-of-the-art energy recovery and conservation technologies available for utility scale desalination facilities and shall include a commitment by CalAm to incorporate ~~all~~ available feasible energy recovery and conservation technologies; or, if CalAm finds that any of the technologies will not be feasible for the project, the Plan shall clearly explain why such technology is considered to be infeasible.

- Page 8.5-769. Text in response to comment MCWD-IW-9 is revised to reference Carollo, 2017, as the source for the inserted material, although this report was appropriately referenced in the list of references in Final EIR/EIS Section 8.5.2. Text in the response to comment MCWD-IW-9, as well as page I1-5 in Appendix I1 is, therefore, revised to accurately reflect the source of information added:

  As noted by Carollo in the February 2017 "Subsurface Desalination Intake Feasibility Study" prepared for the City of Santa Barbara, the Neodren™ HDD intake technology is patented by the Spanish company Catalana de Perforacions. This technology has been used…

Section 8.6, Organizations Comments and Responses

- Page 8.6-590. Text in response to comment PTA-13 is revised to accurately reflect the revisions to Mitigation Measure 4.11-1, GHG Emissions Reduction Plan, in Final EIR/EIS Section 4.11:

  The GHG Emissions Reductions Plan that would be implemented pursuant to Mitigation Measure 4.11-1 would include a commitment by CalAm to incorporate ~~all~~ available feasible energy recovery and conservation technologies; or, if CalAm finds that any of the technologies will not be feasible for the project, the Plan shall clearly explain why such technology is considered to be infeasible.

Appendix I1, Open-Water and Subsurface Intakes

- Page I1-5. Text is revised to add a reference to Carollo, 2017, although this report was appropriately referenced in the list of references in Final EIR/EIS Section 8.5.2, where response to comment MCWD-IW-9 resulted in the addition of clarifying information to this appendix. Text is revised to accurately reflect the source of information added:

  As noted by Carollo in the February 2017 "Subsurface Desalination Intake Feasibility Study" prepared for the City of Santa Barbara, the Neodren™ HDD intake technology is patented by the Spanish company Catalana de Perforacions. This technology has been used…[etc.]