Redwood City Harbor Navigation Improvement Integrated Feasibility Study & EIS/EIR

Appendix K

National Environmental Policy Act/California Environmental Quality Act

Scoping Meeting Summary

December 2014

Contents

1	Р	urpos	se	2
2	S	copin	g Meeting Announcement	2
3	S	copin	g Meeting	2
	3.1	Att	tendance	2
	3.2	Me	eeting Presentations	3
	3	.2.1	Public Comment	6

Attachments

Attachment 1: Notice of Intent

- Attachment 2: Notice of Preparation
- Attachment 3: Scoping Meeting Announcement, Redwood City Tribune
- Attachment 4: Scoping Meeting Read-Ahead
- Attachment 5: Scoping Meeting Sign-in Sheet
- Attachment 6: Scoping Meeting Transcript
- Attachment 7: Scoping Meeting Presentation

1 Purpose

On 10 December 2014, the San Francisco District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Port of Redwood City conducted a scoping meeting in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The purpose of the scoping meeting was to obtain public and agency input on the issues that should be considered in decision making for the Redwood City Harbor Navigation Feasibility Study and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) study process. This document provides a summary of the meeting and its results.

2 Scoping Meeting Announcement

The San Francisco District, USACE, is the lead agency for preparation of the EIS and the Port of Redwood City is the lead CEQA agency. A notice of intent to prepare an EIS (*Attachment 1*) was published in the Federal Register on 25 November 2014. A notice of preparation (*Attachment 2*) was submitted to the California State Clearinghouse on 24 November 2014 by the Port of Redwood City. Note that the form is titled Notice of Completion, but it is the same form used to announce the preparation of an EIR.

The meeting was announced in an ad published in the Redwood City Tribune on 24 November 2014 (*Attachment 3*). Additionally, a read-ahead with a summary of the study and a meeting announcement (*Attachment 4*) was mailed to potentially interested individuals, organizations, and agencies two weeks prior to the scoping meeting.

3 Scoping Meeting

The scoping meeting was held at 7 pm PST on 10 December 2014 at the Redwood City Hall.

3.1 Attendance

A sign-in sheet was provided at the meeting entrance so that meeting participants could provide contact information for subsequent distribution of study information. However, not all participants chose to sign in. The sign-in sheet is provided as **Attachment 5**. Those meeting participants that signed in or announced their names during the meeting are listed below:

San Francisco District, USACE

Major Adam Czekanski, Deputy District Engineer

Katherine Reyes, Project Manager

Arden Sansom, Economist

Jaime O'Halloran, Planning Technical Lead

Frank Sun, Civil Design

Patrick Sing, Hydrologist

Port of Redwood City

Mike Giari, Executive Director Chris Fajkos, Environmental Programs Manager Rajesh Sewak, Finance and Administration Manager Ralph Garcia, Redwood Harbor Commission Chairman Lorianna Kastrop, Redwood Harbor Commissioner Ellen Joslin Johnck, Consultant **HydroPlan Team** Lewis Hornung, Project Manager Susa Gates, GAIA Consulting **Meeting Participants** Greg Greenway, Seaport Industries Matt Leddy Mark Kalnias John Bourgeois, South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project Manager Clem Kloloay

3.2 Meeting Presentations

A transcript and the meeting presentation are provided as Attachments 6 and 7, respectively.

Major Adam Czekanski facilitated the meeting. He started with opening comments describing the purpose of the meeting, outlining the meeting agenda, and introducing the study team. He stated that the purposes of the meeting were to: 1) solicit comments from the participants; 2) obtain stakeholder participation; and 3) answer questions.

Jaime O'Halloran then described the Corps' planning process and how the NEPA/CEQA processes are being integrated with the planning activities. She summarized the six step planning process and how it aligns with the NEPA/CEQA process. We are currently in the scoping phase of the study. It will be followed by alternative formulation and analysis. In that phase, alternatives will be evaluated and compared, and all potential impacts will be identified. If necessary, mitigation plans will be developed to offset any unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. In the next phase, the tentatively selected plan that best meets the study objectives will be identified. A more detailed analysis of this plan's impacts will be performed.

After identification of the tentatively selected plan, a draft integrated feasibility report and EIS/EIR will be released for a 45 day public review. Sometime during the review period in the summer of 2015, another public meeting will be conducted to obtain additional input. All comments received will be addressed in the final report which will be released for a final 30 day public review period. The process culminates with a report of the Chief of Engineers that is submitted to Congress for authorization.

Ms. O'Halloran pointed out that Congress must authorize the recommended plan and provide appropriations before any improvements can be made. The purpose of the NEPA/CEQA process is to insure that all environmental impacts are properly disclosed to the public.

Mike Giari provided a description of the Port of Redwood City and the project setting. The port is the only deep water port on the southwest side of San Francisco Bay. The study is evaluating improvements to the San Bruno Shoals Channel and the Redwood City Harbor Entrance Channel and Turning Basins. Commodities handled at the Port are exports of recycled metals and imports of dry bulk materials, the major import being construction related material such as sand, gravel aggregates, cement, gypsum, etc.

Mr. Giari indicated that the latest Port statistics show that in fiscal year 2014, the Port handled almost 1.8 million tons of commodities. Over the last 15 years, the Port's tonnage has increased at an average annual rate of 4.1 percent. It is projected that in the next 10 years, the Port's tonnage will increase to 2.1 million tons. He emphasized the Port's commitment to the project.

Lewis Hornung provided additional descriptions of the project setting, described the study objectives, identified the alternative plans being considered, and provided evaluation criteria that will be applied. The study area will include all areas that will be directly or indirectly impacted by the project – including the routes and methods for placement of dredged material.

The primary project objective is to provide for more efficient navigation to the Port of Redwood City. A deeper channel will allow shippers to increase their loads each trip thereby reducing transportation costs. This would be a national economic development benefit that could potentially be great enough to justify the cost of channel improvements. Other objectives include reducing the impacts of shoaling in the Redwood City Harbor Channel, support environmental enhancement through the beneficial reuse of dredged material, and to place dredged material in a safe and economically feasible location.

In addition to the No Action alternative, Mr. Hornung described 3 action alternatives; deepening the San Bruno Shoals and Redwood City Channels, addressing shoaling in the Redwood City Channel, and a combination plan. All three action alternatives will require placement of dredged material. The options for managing this material are beneficial reuse to restore wetlands in South San Francisco Bay; passive sediment transport; disposal at a designated disposal site; or a combination of these options. A range of channel depths will be evaluated to identify the depth that provides the greatest net economic benefits. The project team currently estimates that that depth will be between 32 and 37 feet. Two pipelines that cross the San Bruno Shoals Channel have been identified and are being evaluated. If it is determined that relocation of the pipelines could not be safely accomplished or that it would be prohibitively expensive, then the team will consider a plan that does not involve deepening the San Bruno Shoals Channel. Ships would use high tide to cross the shoals and would still have deep enough water to enter the Redwood City Channel.

Currently, excessive shoaling in the Redwood City Channel requires frequent maintenance dredging. A plan to address such shoaling would improve navigation efficiency even with the existing 30 foot authorized depth. Options to be considered are realigning the channel, modifying the cross section, and providing advance maintenance. The team will also consider a combination of channel deepening and addressing shoaling.

Mr. Hornung stated that, during the planning process, the team will avoid adverse environmental impacts; unsafe ship operating conditions, impacts to Bair Island and San Mateo Bridge, and impacts to existing Port infrastructure.

Originally, nine potential dredged material placement sites were identified that were then screened to six. Three of the potential placement sites involve placement of dredged material to raise subsided wetlands as part of the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project. The first and most proximal site is Ravenswood Pond Complex. This site has limited capacity (less than 1 million cubic yards) and will probably not be ready until 2023. The second restoration site is Edens Landing. It has about 3 million cubic yard capacity and should be available in time for the projected 2017 dredging of Redwood City Channel. The third restoration site is the Alviso Pond Complex. It has the largest capacity and could be available by 2018.

The Dumbarton Bridge Passive Sediment Transport option is a new concept that would involve in-bay placement of dredged material at a location south of Dumbarton Bridge. Then, natural processes (tides and currents) would move the material to help restore subsided wetlands and salt ponds. Analysis of this option is underway.

The SF-11 Alcatraz potential placement site is currently used for maintenance dredging. It has limited capacity and its use would require the approval of regulatory agencies.

The deep ocean disposal site (SF-DODS) is available, permitted, and has adequate capacity. However, due to its distance from the proposed dredging, it would be the most expensive.

The evaluation of alternatives will be comprehensive. It will involve assessing national economic development benefits (through benefit to cost ratio and the net economic benefits), regional economic impacts, other social effects, and insuring compliance with applicable regulatory requirements.

3.2.1 Public Comment

Major Czekanski opened the meeting for public comments. He said that the comment period would remain open for two weeks. Comments can be provided at the meeting (the court reporter will record all comments), comments can be mailed to the addresses provided on the handouts, or comments can be emailed to USACE or the Port. The feedback received will be used to prepare the integrated report and EIS/EIR. Another opportunity for public input will be provided when the draft report is released this summer.

Matt Leddy asked whether a cost analysis would be performed for all the different disposal options to determine if they are feasible. Mr. Hornung responded that cost estimates will be developed for the final screened disposal options.

John Bourgeois, Executive Project Manager for the South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Project, indicated that he has been following this project and is encouraged that the Dumbarton Bridge Passive Sediment Transport option is being considered. He said that he believes the restoration community has a lot of interest in this concept. He asked whether it would be possible to perform a small pilot project as part of this study. It might go a long way to identifying a realistic option for future dredging. There would be a lot of support for this kind of assessment.

Ms. O'Halloran responded that it's something that can be considered. Other opportunities for a pilot project would be through the Operations and Maintenance Program. We'll note the comment and discuss it at our next meeting.

Ellen Johnck, Consultant to the Port of Redwood City, stated that USACE contracted with Delta Modeling Associates to perform numerical modeling of how effective the Dumbarton Bridge Passive Transport would be. She is supportive of a pilot project. She's talked to the Colonel about presenting the modeling results to the Long Term Management Strategy Agencies at one of their quarterly meetings. Mr. Giari indicated that the Port would support the idea of a pilot project.

Greg Greenway is Executive Director of the Seaport Industrial Association, which is a business group that includes most of the tenants of the Port and all the users of the channel. His organization is interested in this project and excited that the project is moving forward. The wo biggest comments his organization has are: 1) there's a tremendous need for this project from the view of the channel users; and 2) there's a tremendous demand for the bulk products that come out of the property. The Port serves Silicon Valley and the Peninsula which will grow in the future. The lack of channel depth compared to the potential draft of ships is a huge economic cost for shippers. Mr. Greenway offered assistance with providing data or stories about the particular impacts on business and light-loading, or the impacts of the no action alternative. What are the air emissions and greenhouse gas impacts of not having a deeper channel?

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 pm PST.

3.3 Correspondence

- Scott Morgan, Director of the California State Clearinghouse distributed the NOP to selected state agencies by letter dated 25 November 2014 (*Attachment 8*).
- Diana Hearnley, Secretary of the California State Lands Commission provided a staff comment letter on 22 December 2014 (*Attachment 9*).

AUTHENTIGATED U.S. COVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

70168

Federal Register/Vol. 79, No. 227/Tuesday, November 25, 2014/Notices

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Conduct Scoping Meeting for the Redwood City Harbor Navigation Improvement Feasibility Study and Integrated EIS/EIR Redwood City and County of San Mateo, CA (SPN-2014-125242)

AGENCY: Department of the Army, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, DoD. ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The purpose of this notice is to initiate the scoping process for the preparation of an integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for proposed improvements to the existing navigation project at Redwood City Harbor and San Bruno Shoal.

DATES: A public scoping meeting will be held on December 10, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. (PST). Submit comments concerning this notice on or before December 15, 2014.

ADDRESSES: The scoping meeting location is: the Redwood City Hall, 1017 Middlefield Road, Redwood City, CA 94063. Meeting will be held at the City Council Chamber Meeting Room. Mail written comments concerning this notice to: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District, Project Management Division, ATTN: SPN– 2014–125242, 1455 Market Street, San Francisco, CA 94103–1398. Comment letters should include the commenter's physical mailing address, the project title and the Corps file number in the subject line.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Katherine Reyes, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District, Project Management Division, ATTN: CESPN–PM–B, 1455 Market Street, San Francisco CA 94103–1398, (415) 503– 6847, katherine.m.reyes@ usace.army.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The primary Federal actions under consideration are dredging, channel realignment, dredged material placement, and transport of dredged material for the purpose of ocean placement.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) the Port of Redwood City will serve as Lead Agency in preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Corps and the Port of Redwood City have agreed to jointly prepare a Draft EIS/EIR to optimize efficiency and avoid duplication. The Draft EIS/EIR is intended to be sufficient in scope to address the Federal, state and local requirements and environmental issues concerning the proposed activities and permit approvals.

Project Site and Background Information: The project site is located at Redwood City Harbor (RWC), and San Francisco Bay, CA. The harbor is located in San Mateo County, on the southwest side of San Francisco Bay, approximately 18 miles south of San Francisco. The project site includes the existing Federal navigation channel and turning basins at RWC, extending from the mouth of Redwood Creek to deep water in the San Francisco Bay, as well as the channel at San Bruno Shoal in San Francisco Bay. Both channels are authorized to a depth of 30 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW). It is the only deep-water port in South San Francisco Bay and was completed to its presentday authorized depth in 1965. The Port of Redwood City is the local sponsor and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is the Federal partner. The port maintains three berth facilities at a depth of 34 feet MLLW and a small facility to unload cement and aggregates via barge. Maritime activities include the export of recycled metal and the import of dry bulk building materials such as cement, bauxite, gypsum and aggregates. Proposed Action(s): The proposed

Proposed Action(s): The proposed action is to evaluate alternatives to improve the existing navigation project at RWC and San Bruno Shoal. The study is authorized by House Resolution 2511, adopted May 7, 1997 ". . . in the interest of navigation improvements and related purposes at Redwood City Harbor, California, with particular reference to providing increased depths to accommodate new, larger vessels that now call on the port."

Issues: Potentially significant issues associated with the project may include: aesthetics/visual impacts, air quality emissions, biological resource impacts, environmental justice, geologic impacts related to seismicity, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, traffic and transportation, and cumulative impacts from past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Bair Island and Greco Island are adjacent to RWC and are within the NEPA scope of analysis due to potential project impacts. Bair Island is operated by the USFWS and is the site of an ongoing

wetland restoration effort. The bay water around Bair Island and RWC is within the Don Edwards Marine Protected Area.

Alternatives: Four alternative plans will be evaluated. Alternative 1 would deepen the RWC and the San Bruno Shoal Channels. Alternative 2 would deepen the RWC and San Bruno Shoal channels and implement measures to address shoaling including, realigning the turn into RWC channel, modifying the cross section of the RWC channel entrance and/or conducting advance maintenance. Alternative 3 would address shoaling by realigning the turn into RWC channel, modifying the cross section to the RWC channel entrance and/or conducting advance maintenance. Alternative 4 would be the no-action alternative, which would include continued maintenance of the authorized Federal channels to a depth of 30 feet MLLW at RWC and San Bruno Shoal.

Six dredge material placement sites are being evaluated. Multiple sites may be used depending on the quantity of material dredged from the channels and the capacity of the placement sites. The potential dredge material placement sites include:

1. Ravenswood Pond Complex (Upland Beneficial Reuse Site).

2. Eden Landing Pond Complex (Upland Beneficial Reuse Site).

3. Alviso Pond Complex (Upland Beneficial Reuse Site).

4. SF-11 Alcatraz (In-Bay Aquatic).

5. Dumbarton Bridge—Passive Sediment Transport (In-Bay Aquatic).

6. San Francisco Deep Ocean Disposal Site (SFDODS) (Ocean Aquatic).

Scoping Process: The Corps is seeking participation and input of all interested federal, state, and local agencies, Native American groups, and other concerned private organizations or individuals on the scope of the draft EIS/EIR through this public notice. The purpose of the public scoping meeting is to solicit comments regarding the potential impacts, environmental issues, and alternatives associated with the proposed action to be considered in the draft EIS/EIR. The meeting place, date and time will be advertised in advance in local newspapers, and meeting announcement letters will be sent to interested parties. The final draft Integrated Feasibility Report and EIS/ EIR is expected to be available for public review and comment in the

summer of 2015 and a public meeting will be held after its publication.

Brenda S. Bowen,

Army Federal Register Liaison Officer. [FR Doc. 2014–27787 Filed 11–24–14; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3720–58–P

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Notice of Public Hearing and Business Meeting; December 9–10, 2014

Notice is hereby given that the Delaware River Basin Commission will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, December 9, 2014. A business meeting will be held the following day on Wednesday, December 10, 2014. The hearing and business meeting are open to the public and will be held at the Washington Crossing Historic Park Visitor Center, 1112 River Road, Washington Crossing, Pennsylvania.

Public Hearing. The public hearing on December 9, 2014 will begin at 1:30 p.m. Hearing items will include draft dockets for withdrawals, discharges and other water-related projects subject to the Commission's review, and a resolution adopting the Commission's Water Resources Program FY 2015–17. The list of projects scheduled for hearing, including project descriptions, will be posted on the Commission's Web site, www.drbc.net, in a long form of this notice at least ten days before the hearing date. Written comments on draft dockets and resolutions scheduled for hearing on December 9 will be accepted through the close of the hearing that day. After the hearing on all scheduled matters has been completed, there will be an opportunity for public dialogue.

The public is advised to check the Commission's Web site periodically prior to the hearing date, as items scheduled for hearing may be postponed if additional time is deemed necessary to complete the Commission's review, and items may be added up to ten days prior to the hearing date. In reviewing docket descriptions, the public is also asked to be aware that project details commonly change in the course of the Commission's review, which is ongoing.

Public Meeting. The public business meeting on December 10, 2014 will begin at 1:00 p.m. and will include: Adoption of the Minutes of the Commission's September 10, 2014 business meeting, announcements of upcoming meetings and events, a report on hydrologic conditions, reports by the Executive Director and the Commission's General Counsel, and consideration of any items for which a hearing has been completed or is not required. The meeting will include a resolution honoring Robert F. Molzahn, President of the Water Resources Association of the Delaware River Basin, on his retirement.

There will be no opportunity for additional public comment at the December 10 business meeting on hearing items for which the hearing was completed on December 9 or a previous date. Commission consideration on December 10 of items for which the public hearing is closed may result in either approval of the item (docket or resolution) as proposed, approval with changes, denial, or deferral. When the Commissioners defer an action, they may announce an additional period for written comment on the item, with or without an additional hearing date, or they may take additional time to consider the input they have already received without requesting further public input. Any deferred items will be considered for action at a public meeting of the Commission on a future date.

Advance Sign-Up for Oral Comment. Individuals who wish to comment for the record at the public hearing on December 9 or to address the Commissioners informally during the public dialogue portion of the hearing on December 9 are asked to sign up in advance by contacting Ms. Paula Schmitt of the Commission staff, at *paula.schmitt@drbc.state.nj.us* or by phoning Ms. Schmitt at 609–883–9500 ext. 224.

Addresses for Written Comment. Written comment on items scheduled for hearing may be delivered by hand at the public hearing or in advance of the hearing, either: by hand, U.S. Mail or private carrier to: Commission Secretary, P.O. Box 7360, 25 State Police Drive, West Trenton, NJ 08628; by fax to Commission Secretary, DRBC at 609-883–9522; or by email to paula.schmitt@drbc.state.nj.us. If submitted by email in advance of the hearing date, written comments on a docket should also be sent to Mr. William Muszynski, Manager, Water Resources Management at william.muszynski@drbc.state.nj.us.

Accommodations for Special Needs. Individuals in need of an accommodation as provided for in the Americans with Disabilities Act who wish to attend the informational meeting, conference session or hearings should contact the Commission Secretary directly at 609–883–9500 ext. 203 or through the Telecommunications Relay Services (TRS) at 711, to discuss how we can accommodate your needs. Updates. Items scheduled for hearing are occasionally postponed to allow more time for the Commission to consider them. Other meeting items also are subject to change. Please check the Commission's Web site, www.drbc.net, closer to the meeting date for changes that may be made after the deadline for filing this notice.

Additional Information, Contacts. The list of projects scheduled for hearing, with descriptions, will be posted on the Commission's Web site, *www.drbc.net*, in a long form of this notice at least ten days before the hearing date. Draft dockets and resolutions for hearing items will be available as hyperlinks from the posted notice. Additional public records relating to hearing items may be examined at the Commission's offices by appointment by contacting Carol Adamovic, 609–883–9500, ext. 249. For other questions concerning hearing items, please contact Project Review Section assistant Victoria Lawson at 609–883–9500, ext. 216.

Dated: November 19, 2014.

Pamela M. Bush,

Commission Secretary and Assistant General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 2014–27880 Filed 11–24–14; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 6360–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Certification Notice-230]

Notice of Filing of Self-Certification of Coal Capability Under the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act

AGENCY: Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, DOE. ACTION: Notice of filing.

SUMMARY: On October 21, 2014, Footprint Power Salem Harbor Development LP, as owner and operator of a new base load electric powerplant, submitted a coal capability selfcertification to the Department of Energy (DOE) pursuant to 201(d) of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 (FUA), as amended, and DOE regulations in 10 CFR 501.60, 61. FUA and regulations thereunder require DOE to publish a notice of filing of selfcertification in the Federal Register. 42 U.S.C. 8311(d) and 10 CFR 501.61(c). ADDRESSES: Copies of coal capability self-certification filings are available for public inspection, upon request, in the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Mail Code OE–20, Room 8G–024, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585.

ě	COPY Print Form Appendix C					
	Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal					
	Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613 For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814					
	Project Title: Redwood City Navigation Improvement Study					
	Lead Agency: Port of Redwood City Contact Person: Michael Giari					
	Mailing Address: 675 Seaport Blvd. Phone: 650-306-4150					
	City: Redwood City Zip: 94063 County: San Mateo					
	Project Location: County: San Mateo City/Nearest Community: Redwood City					
	Cross Streets: Seaport Blvd. and Herkner Road Zip Code: 94063					
	Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): ' ' N / ' W Total Acres:					
	Assessor's Parcel No.: Section: Twp.: Range: Base:					
	Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 92 Waterways: San Francisco Bay and Redwood Creek					
	Airports: Railways: Union Pacific Schools:					
	Document Type:					
	CEQA: X NOP Draft EIR NEPA: NOI Other: Joint Document Larly Cons Supplement/Subsequent EIR EA Final Document Neg Dec (Prior SCH No.) Draft EIS Other: Other: Mit Neg Dec Other: FONSI FONSI					
	Local Action Type:					
	General Plan Update Specific Plan Rezone Annexation General Plan Amendment Master Plan Prezone Redevelopment General Plan Element Planned Unit Development Use Permit Coastal Permit Community Plan Site Plan Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) X Other: Joint ElR/ElS					
	Development Type:					
	Residential: Units Acres Office: Sq.ft. Acres Employees Mining: Mineral Industrial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees Beducational: Waste Treatment: Type					
	Recreational: Hazardous Waste: Type					
Water Facilities: Type MGD [] Other:						
	Project Issues Discussed in Document:					
	X Aesthetic/Visual Fiscal Recreation/Parks Vegetation Agricultural Land Flood Plain/Flooding Schools/Universities X Water Quality X Air Quality Forest Land/Fire Hazard Septic Systems Water Supply/Groundwater Archeological/Historical Geologic/Seismic Sewer Capacity Wetland/Riparian X Biological Resources Minerals Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading Growth Inducement Coastal Zone Noise Solid Waste Land Use Drainage/Absorption Population/Housing Balance Toxic/Hazardous Cumulative Effects X Economic/Jobs Public Services/Facilities Traffic/Circulation Other:					
	Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation: Navigation Channel for Industrial Seaport Project Description: (please use a separate page if necessary)					
	See Attached Sheet					

Scanned

Note: The State Clearinghouse will assign identification numbers for all new projects. If a SCH number already exists for a project (e.g. Notice of Preparation or previous draft document) please fill in.
Revised 2010



Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Air Resources Board	Office of Historic Preservation		
Boating & Waterways, Department of	Office of Public School Construction		
California Emergency Management Agency	Parks & Recreation, Department of		
California Highway Patrol	Pesticide Regulation, Department of		
Caltrans District #4	Public Utilities Commission		
Caltrans Division of Aeronautics	x Regional WOCB #2		
Caltrans Planning	X Resources Agency		
Central Valley Flood Protection Board	Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of		
Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy	X S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm.		
Coastal Commission	San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns, Conservancy		
Colorado River Board	San Joaquin River Conservancy		
Conservation, Department of	Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy		
Corrections, Department of	x State Lands Commission		
Delta Protection Commission	SWRCB: Clean Water Grants		
Education, Department of	X SWRCB: Water Quality		
Energy Commission	SWRCB: Water Rights		
Fish & Game Region # 10	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency		
Food & Agriculture, Department of	Toxic Substances Control, Department of		
Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of	Water Resources, Department of		
General Services, Department of			
Health Services, Department of	Other:		
Housing & Community Development	Other:		
Native American Heritage Commission			
ocal Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead age	ency)		
arting Date November 24, 2014	Ending Date December 24, 2014		
ead Agency (Complete if applicable):			
nsulting Firm:	Applicant:		
Idress:	Address:		
y/State/Zip:	City/State/Zip:		
ntact:	Phone:		
one:			

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.



MEETING PURPOSE

- Solicit comments on proposed alternatives and potential impacts
- Obtain participation and input from interested agencies, tribes, private organizations, and individuals
- Answer questions

ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Issues or concerns identified during this process will be addressed in the final draft report and/or a response will be provided. The draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Impact Statement/Report is expected to be available for public review and comment in the summer of 2015. A public meeting will be held after its release and prior to the final recommendation of the study.





HOW TO SUBMIT COMMENTS

Oral and written comments will be collected at the scoping meeting. Written comments can be emailed to Katherine.M.Reyes@usace.army. mil or mailed to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers San Francisco District Project Management Division ATTN: Katherine Reyes 1455 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94103-1398

Comment letters should include the commenter's physical mailing address and the project title in the subject line.

CONTACT US

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Katherine Reyes, Project Manager Phone: (415) 503-6847 Katherine.M.Reyes@usace.army.mil

Port of Redwood City Michael Giari, Executive Director Phone: (650) 306-4150 Mgiari@redwoodcityport.com





US Army Corps of Engineers ® San Francisco District

Redwood City Navigation Improvement Feasibility Study and Integrated EIS/EIR



Union Pacific Railroad. The location allows tenants to save both time and shipping costs. Each year roughly two million tons of commercial goods move through the port, including recycled metal exports and dry bulk building materials imports such as cement, bauxite, gypsum, and aggregates.

The Redwood City channel and channel at the San Bruno Shoal is a federal navigation project maintained at 30 feet mean lower low water (MLLW). This study evaluates options to improve navigation efficiency and accommodate the new larger vessels, which currently call on the port and require more than the current authorized depth. These vessels are currently forced to light load and top off at other ports, significantly adding to the cost of transporting commodities.

To address this problem, four alternatives and six potential dredged material placement sites have been identified for evaluation.

Proposed Alternatives

Detailed descriptions of the alternatives and potential placement sites will be provided at the Scoping Meeting. The alternatives combine various measures to deepen, realign or modify the channel, reduce impacts from shoaling, and perform advanced maintenance in order to meet project objectives.

Potential Placement Sites

- 1. Ravenswood Pond Complex (Upland Beneficial Reuse Site)
- Eden Landing Pond Complex (Upland Beneficial Reuse Site)
- Alviso Pond Complex (Upland Beneficial Reuse Site)
- 4. SF-11 Alcatraz.
- 5. Dumbarton Bridge -Passive Sediment Transport
- San Francisco Deep Ocean Disposal Site (SFDODS)

Redwood City Navigation Improvement Integrated Feasibility Study and EIS/EIR

National Environmental Policy Act and California Environmental Quality Act

Scoping Meeting

If you would like to be added to our mailing list for notification of future meetings and release of documents for review, please provide your contact information below.

Name and Organization (if applicable):
Ellen Johnck
Mailing Address:
101 Lombard St. #ZITE
Email:
CICA (Elleh johner consulting.com
Name and Organization (if applicable):
Mark Kalmins
Mailing Address:
2169-6 E. Francisco Blud. Son Ratal 44/03
Email:
Kaluins @ wra - ca. com
Name and Organization (if applicable):
Charlotte Roche Court Reporter
Mailing Address:
22320 Foothill
Email:
Hayward degos Chayarea courtreportersu co
News and Organization (if analisable)
Name and Organization (If applicable):
Mailing Address:
Free - 14
Email:
S Army Corps of Engineers (S Army Corps of Engineers

San Francisco District

11011

City

Redwood City Navigation Improvement Integrated Feasibility Study and EIS/EIR

National Environmental Policy Act and California Environmental Quality Act

Scoping Meeting

If you would like to be added to our mailing list for notification of future meetings and release of documents for review, please provide your contact information below.

Name and Organization (if applicable):
Matt Leddy
Mailing Address:
275 D street Redwood City CA 94063
Email:
mtleddy e sbcglobal. net
Name and Organization (if applicable):
John Bourgeois Sec
Mailing Address:
1330 Bradney 13th Floor, Oakland
Email:
John. Bourgeois @scc.ca.gov
Name and Organization (if applicable):
Greg Greenway Seaport Industrial Assn.
Mailing Address!
675 Scaport Blud RWC 94065
Email:
segport industrial Cyahoo, com
Name and Organization (if applicable):
Clem tho loay
Mailing Address:
(966 Menelto Ave Meno Park CA 94025
Lemall: Lemolony @men. com
US Army Corps of Engineers San Francisco District Port of Redwood City







USACE Study Phases	USACE Planning Fundamentals	NEPA/CEQA Process	Estimated Schedule	
	Step J. Identify Problems and Opportunities	Publish Notice of Intent (NOI)/Notice of Preparation (NOP) & 30-day agency/public review	Completed	
koping		Conduct scoping process	Completion 2014	
	Step 2. Inventory and Forecast	Prepare Statement of Purpose and Need/Project Objectives Describe existing and future without-project conditions	Completed	
Usernative Sormulation and Inalysis	Step 3. Formulate Alternatives	strate and second to show a second sec		
	Step 4. Evaluate Alternatives	identity reasonable alternatives	Early 2015	
	Step 5. Compare Alternatives	Evaluate impacts Develop mitigation	Spring 2015	
		Compare alternatives		
Feasibility-Level Analysis	Step 6. Select Alternative	Oraft EIR/EIS: public notice and 45-day public review	Summer 2015	
		Final EIR/EIS: respond to public comments	Fall 2015	
Chief's Report		Final EIR/EIS: public notice and 30-day public review	Winter 2015	
		Record of Decision (ROD)/Notice of Determination (NOD)	Spring 2016	











	Dredged Sediment Management
Dredg	ged Sediment Could Be:
1.	Reused for wetland creation (upland beneficial reuse)
2.	Reused to support flood risk management measures, i.e. levee strengthening/reinforcement (upland beneficial reuse)
3.	Reused by placing it in-bay at a passive sediment transport site
4.	Disposed of at a designated dredge material disposal site
5.	Placed at a combination of the above types of sites
	E Contra
-	BUILDING STRONG AND TAKING CARE OF $PEOPLE_{\oplus}$





BUILDING STRONG AND TAKING CARE OF PEOPLE®



No Action/No Project Continue to maintain existing channels at -30 feet MLLW through regular maintenance dredging. Maintain current channel profile and	No Action/No Project Continue to maintain existing channels at -30 feet MLLW through regular maintenance dredging. Maintain current channel profile and footprint. This alternative is compared against all other alternatives	No Act	ion Alternative
Continue to maintain existing channels at -30 feet MLLW through regular maintenance dredging. Maintain current channel profile and	Continue to maintain existing channels at -30 feet MLLW through regular maintenance dredging. Maintain current channel profile and footprint. This alternative is compared against all other alternatives	No Action/No Pro	ject
footprint.	This alternative is compared against all other alternatives	Continue to mai feet MLLW throu dredging. Mainta footprint.	ntain existing channels at -30 ugh regular maintenance ain current channel profile and
This alternative is compared against all other alternatives		This alternative alternatives	is compared against all other
			BUILDING STRONG AND TAKING CARE OF PEOPLE























Edmund G. Brown Jr. Governor STATE OF CALIFORNIA Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Notice of Preparation

November 25, 2014

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: Redwood City Navigation Improvement Study SCH# 2014112062 Port of Redwood City

RECEIVED

DEC - 3 2014

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Redwood City Navigation Improvement Study draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, <u>within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency</u>. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Michael Giari Port of Redwood City 675 Seaport Boulevard Redwood City, CA 94063

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely, legan

Scott Morgan Director, State Clearinghouse

Attachments cc: Lead Agency

Document Details Report State Clearinghouse Data Base

RECEIVED

		-	DEC - 3 2014	
SCH#	2014112062			
Project Title Lead Agency	Redwood City Navigation Improvemen Redwood City, Port of	it Study	Port of Redwood City	
Туре	NOP Notice of Preparation			
Description	The project site includes the existing F from the mouth of Redwood Creek to o San Bruno Shoal in San Francisco Bay Lower Low Water (MLLW). It is the or completed to its present-day authorize the navigation channel and shares the Corps of Engineers (USACE). The po MLLW and a small facility to unload ce export of recycled metal and the impor and construction aggregates.	ederal navigation channel deep water in the San Fran y. Both channels are author ly deep-water port in South d depth in 1965. The Port cost of the feasibility study rt maintains three ship bert ament and aggregates via b t of dry bulk building mater	and turning basins at RCH, extending cisco Bay, as well as the channel at prized to a depth of -30 feet Mean in San Francisco Bay and was of Redwood City is the local sponsor or on a 50/50 basis with the US Army h facilities at a depth of -34 feet barge. Maritime activities include the ials such as cement, bauxite, gypsum	
Lead Agenc	y Contact			
Name	Michael Giari			
Agency	Port of Redwood City			
Phone	650-306-4150	Fax		
email				
Address	675 Seaport Boulevard			
City	Redwood City	State CA	Zip 94063	
Project Loc	ation			
County	San Mateo			
City	Redwood City			
Region				
Cross Streets	Seaport Blvd. and Kerkner Road			
Lat / Long				
Parcei No. Township	Range	Section	Base	
		0001011	2030	
Proximity to): 			
Highways	Hwy 92			
Airports				
Railways	Union Pacific	-1-		
Waterways	San Francisco Bay and Redwood Cre	ek .		
Schools	Novinction Observation Industrial Oc	4		
Land Use	Navigation Channel for Industrial Sear	логт		
Project Issues	Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Biological Resources; Economics/Jobs; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Traffic/Circulation; Water Quality; Wetland/Riparian; Cumulative Effects			
Reviewing Agencies	Resources Agency; Department of Bo Resources, Recycling and Recovery; 3 Department of Water Resources; Dep Commission; State Lands Commission Board; Regional Water Quality Contro Region	ating and Waterways; Depa San Francisco Bay Consen artment ởi [*] Fish and Wildlife n; California Highway Patro I Board, Region 2; Departm	artment of Parks and Recreation; vation and Development Commission; e, Region 3; Native American Heritage I; Caltrans, District 4; Air Resources nent of Fish and Wildlife, Marine	
Date Received	11/25/2014 Start of Review 11	/25/2014 End of Re	eview 12/24/2014	

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

aurie Harnsberge

Fish & Wildlife Region 3

Fish & Wildlife Region 4

Fish & Wildlife Region 5

Leslie Newton-Reed Habitat Conservation Program

Fish & Wildlife Region 6

Tiffany Ellis Habitat Conservation Program

Dept. of Fish & Wildlife M George Isaac Marine Region

Food & Agriculture

Sandra Schubert Dept. of Food and Agriculture

Dept. of General Services

Anna Garbeff Environmental Services Section

Delta Stewardship

Independent

Commissions, Boards

Council Kevan Samsam

Delta Protection Comm Michael Machado

Housing & Comm. Dev.

CEQA Coordinator Housing Policy Division

Other Departments

eff Drongesen

NOP Distribution List

lesources Agency Resources Agency Nadell Gayou Dept. of Boating & Waterways Nicole Wong California Coastal

Commission Elizabeth A. Fuchs Colorado River Board Lisa Johansen

Dept. of Conservation Elizabeth Carpenter California Energy Commission Eric Knight

Cal Fire Dan Foster

Central Valley Flood Protection Board James Herota

Office of Historic Preservation Ron Parsons

- Dept of Parks & Recreation mental Stewardship Section
 - California Department of Resources, Recycling & Recovery Sue O'Leary
 - S.F. Bay Conservation & Dev't. Comm. Steve McAdam

Dept. of Water ources Resources Agency Nadell Gayou

Fish and Game Depart. of Fish & Wildlife

Scott Flint Environmental Services Division

Fish & Wildlife Region Donald Koch

- County: OES (Office of Emergency Services) Dennis Castrillo Fish & Wildlife Region 1E Fish & Wildlife Region 2
 - Santa Monica Bay

 - Agency CalSTA
 - Suzann Ikeuchi Office of Special Projects

- Caltrans, District 3

- Caltrans, District 7

Caltrans, District 8 Mark Roberts Caltrans, District 9 Gavle Rosand

- Caltrans, District 10 m Dumas Caltrans, District 11 Jacob Armstrong
- Caltrans, District 12 Maureen El Harake

Cal EPA

Air Resources Board

- Transportation Projects Nesamani Kalandiyur Industrial/Energy Projects Mike Tollstrup
- State Water Resources Control
- Board Regional Programs Unit Division of Financial Assistance
- State Water Resources Control Board Jeffery Werth Division of Drinking Water
- State Water Resources Control Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit Division of Water Quality
- State Water Resouces Control Board Phil Crader Division of Water Rights
- Dept. of Toxic Substances
- Control CEQA Tracking Center Department of Pesticide
- Regulation CEOA Coordinator

2014112062 SCH#

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

> RWQCB 1 Cathleen Hudson North Coast Region (1)

RWQCB 2

Environmental Document Coordinator San Francisco Bay Region (2)

RWQCB 3 Central Coast Region (3)

RWQCB 4 Teresa Rodgers Los Angeles Region (4)

RWQCB 5S

Central Valley Region (5) RWQCB 5F Central Valley Region (5) Fresno Branch Office

RWQCB 5R Central Valley Region (5) Redding Branch Office

RWQCB 6 Lahontan Region (6) RWQCB 6V

Lahontan Region (6) Victorville Branch Office

Colorado River Basin Region (7) RWQCB 8

Santa Ana Region (8) San Diego Region (9)

Deter DEG MARINE FEBION

Conservance

Last Updated 10/13/2014

Redwood City Navigation Improvement Feasibility Study and Integrated EIS/EIR

- Native American Heritage Comm. Debbie Treadway Public Utilities Commission Leo Wong
 - Restoration Guangyu Wang State Lands Commission
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Cherry Jacques
- Fish & Wildlife Region 6 I/M Heidi Sickler Inyo/Mono, Habitat Conservation Program Cal State Transportation
 - California Highway Patrol

Depart. of General Services Public School Construction Dept. of Transportation

Caltrans, District 1 Rex Jackman

- Caltrans, District 2 Marcelino Gonzalez

Caltrans, District 4 Erik Alm

- Caltrans, District 5 Larry Newland
- Caltrans, District 6 Michael Navarro

Dianna Watsor

Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics Philip Crimmins Caltrans – Planning HQ LD-IGR Terri Pencovic

Eric Federicks – South Susan Zanchi - North

All Other Projects Cathi Slaminski

RECEIVED

DEC 2 2 2014

From: Sent:	Hearnley, Diana@SLC [Diana.Hearnley@slc.ca.gov] Monday, December 22, 2014 12:16 PM	Port of Redwood City
10. Co:	state dearinghouse@enr ea gov: Herzog, Cupthia@SLC:	Sampson Janathan@SLC: Padar
00.	Jessica@SLC	Sampson, Jonaman@SEC, Rader,
Subject:	2014112062 Port of Redwood City_NOP	
Attachments:	2014112062 Port of Redwood City_NOP.pdf	

Please accept the attached electronic copy of the California State Lands Commission staff comment letter on the abovereferenced document.

The original hard-copy has been mailed via postal mail to the lead agency also.



Rita Artist

Diana Hearnley State Lands Commission Secretary Environmental Planning

(916) 574-1890 Work Diana.Hearnley@slc.ca.gov 100 Howe Avenue Suite 1005 Sacramento, CA 95825

)≜¢≑\$≜\$¢≑\$≜¢

RECEIVED

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEC 2.2 2014 Port of Redwood City

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Governor

CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South Sacramento, CA 95825-8202



JENNIFER LUCCHESI, Executive Officer (916) 574-1800 Fax (916) 574-1810 California Relay Service TDD Phone 1-800-735-2929 from Voice Phone 1-800-735-2922

> Contact Phone: (916) 574-1890 Contact FAX: (916) 574-1885

December 19, 2014

File Ref: SCH # 2014112062

Port of Redwood City Attn: Michael Giari 675 Seaport Boulevard Redwood City, CA 94063

Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Redwood City Harbor Navigation Improvement Project, San Mateo County

Dear Mr. Giari:

The California State Lands Commission (CSLC) staff has reviewed the subject NOP for a draft EIR/EIS for the Redwood City Harbor Navigation Improvement Project (Project), which is being prepared by the Port of Redwood City (Port). The Port, as the public agency proposing to carry out a project, is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is the lead agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.). The CSLC is a trustee agency for projects that could directly or indirectly affect sovereign lands and their accompanying Public Trust resources or uses. Additionally, because a portion of the Project involves work on sovereign lands, the CSLC will act as a responsible agency. CSLC staff requests that the lead agencies consult with us on preparation of the draft EIR/EIS as required by CEQA section 21153, subdivision (a), and the State CEQA Guidelines section 15086, subdivisions (a)(1) and (a)(2).

CSLC Jurisdiction and Public Trust Lands

The CSLC has jurisdiction and management authority over all ungranted tidelands, submerged lands, and the beds of navigable lakes and waterways. The CSLC also has certain residual and review authority for tidelands and submerged lands legislatively granted in trust to local jurisdictions (Pub. Resources Code, §§ 6301, 6306). All tidelands and submerged lands, granted or ungranted, as well as navigable lakes and waterways, are subject to the protections of the Common Law Public Trust.

As general background, the State of California acquired sovereign ownership of all tidelands and submerged lands and beds of navigable lakes and waterways upon its admission to the United States in 1850. The State holds these lands for the benefit of all people of the State

December 19, 2014

for statewide Public Trust purposes, which include but are not limited to waterborne commerce, navigation, fisheries, water-related recreation, habitat preservation, and open space. On tidal waterways, the State's sovereign fee ownership extends landward to the mean high tide line, except for areas of fill or artificial accretion or where the boundary has been fixed by agreement or a court. Such boundaries may not be readily apparent from present day site inspections.

Based on the NOP, at least some of the dredging activities for the deepening of the navigation channels in South San Francisco Bay appear to take place waterward of the mean high tide line in the Redwood Creek and San Francisco Bay. Some of this area is within the lands granted to Redwood City (Chap. 1359, Stat. 1945, as amended) and as such, the approval for any portion of the Project within that area would be through Redwood City, as the grantee. However, any dredging activities waterward of the mean high tide line located in the areas not granted to Redwood City would require CSLC authorization prior to commencing those activities. Please contact Jonathan Sampson (see contact information below) at your earliest convenience for further information about CSLC leasing. For questions regarding granted lands, please contact Reid Boggiano at (916) 574-0450, or Reid.Boggiano@slc.ca.gov.

Please also be advised that while some of the waterways involved in the Project may not be under the CSLC's leasing jurisdiction, those waterways are still subject to a public navigational easement. This easement provides that the public has the right to navigate and exercise the incidences of navigation in a lawful manner on State waters that are capable of being physically navigated by oar or motor-propelled small craft. Such uses may include, but are not limited to, boating, rafting, sailing, rowing, fishing, fowling, bathing, skiing, and other water-related public uses. The activities completed under the Project must not restrict or impede the easement right of the public.

This conclusion is without prejudice to any future assertion of State ownership or public rights, should circumstances change, or should additional information come to our attention. This letter is not intended, nor should it be construed as, a waiver or limitation of any right, title, or interest of the State of California in any lands under its jurisdiction.

Project Description

The Project site is located at the Redwood City Harbor (RCH) on the southwest side of San Francisco Bay, and in the San Francisco Bay approximately 18 miles south of San Francisco. The project site includes an existing Federal navigation channel and turning basins at the RCH, extending from the mouth of Redwood Creek to deep water in the San Francisco Bay, as well as the channel at San Bruno Shoal in San Francisco Bay. Both channels are authorized to a depth of -30 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW). The RCH is the only deep-water port in South San Francisco Bay and was completed to its present-day authorized depth in 1965. The Port maintains three ship berth facilities at a depth of -34 feet MLLW and a small facility to unload cement and aggregates via barge.

Although a Preferred Alternative or Proposed Project are not identified within the "Project Description" section of the NOP, under "Summary" it states the following: "The primary

Page 3

December 19, 2014

actions under consideration are dredging, channel realignment, transport and placement of dredged material to sites for beneficial reuse, and/or which may include in San Francisco Bay at SF11 Alcatraz and/or ocean placement at the San Francisco Ocean Disposal Site (SFDODS)." (NOP, page 1)

Environmental Review

CSLC staff requests that the lead agencies consider the following comments when preparing the draft EIR/EIS.

General Comments

- 1. Project Description: The NOP states that four possible alternative "plans" will be evaluated in the draft EIR/EIS. CSLC staff recommends that a "Preferred Alternative" (NEPA) and "Proposed Project" (CEQA) be incorporated into and presented in the EIR/EIS, as CEQA requires that a Project Description be included that identifies a thorough and complete description of the preferred/proposed activities, and then further requires that a range of reasonable alternatives be presented against which the proposed Project can be compared (see generally State CEQA Guidelines §§ 15124, 15126.6). Presenting a proposed Project, and then comparing the remaining three alternatives against the proposed Project, would facilitate CSLC staff's review under CEQA better than simply presenting four alternatives equally without stating which one the Port intends to implement. The Project Description should be as precise as possible in describing the details of all allowable activities (e.g., types of equipment or methods that may be used, maximum area of impact or volume of sediment removed or disturbed, seasonal work windows, locations for material disposal, etc.), as well as the details of the timing and length of activities. Thorough descriptions will facilitate CSLC staff's determination of the extent and locations of its leasing jurisdiction, make for a more robust analysis of the work that may be performed, and minimize the potential for subsequent environmental analysis to be required.
- Permit requirements: Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 6826, the CSLC regulates geophysical survey operations in State waters. Any acoustic-generating geophysical surveys conducted in conjunction with the proposed dredging activities should be carried out only by an operator holding a valid permit under the CSLC's Offshore Geophysical Permit Program (OGPP). Information about the OGPP and a list of permitted survey operators can be found on the CSLC website at: http://www.slc.ca.gov/Division_Pages/DEPM/OGPP/OGPP.html.

Biological Resources

3. <u>Sensitive Species</u>: Due to the Project's location near the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, the draft EIR/EIS should fully disclose and analyze all potentially significant effects on sensitive species and habitats in and around the Project area, including special-status wildlife, fish, and plants, and if appropriate, identify feasible mitigation measures to reduce those impacts. The lead agencies should conduct queries of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) California Natural Diversity

Page 4

December 19, 2014

Database (CNDDB) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) Special Status Species Database to identify any special-status plant or wildlife species that may occur in the Project area. The draft EIR/EIS should also include a discussion of consultation with the CDFW and USFWS, including any recommended mitigation measures and potentially required permits identified by these agencies.

4. <u>Noise</u>: The draft EIR/EIS should also evaluate noise impacts on fish, marine mammals, and birds from dredging and transport activities. Mitigation measures could include a Marine Wildlife Monitoring and Contingency Plan and species-specific work windows as defined by CDFW, USFWS, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Again, staff recommends early consultation with these agencies to minimize the impacts of the Project on sensitive species.

Climate Change

5. <u>Greenhouse Gases</u>: NEPA and CEQA differ with respect to analyzing climate change impacts and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. In order to ensure the EIR/EIS meets the requirements under CEQA, a GHG analysis consistent with the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Assembly Bill [AB] 32) and required by the State CEQA Guidelines should be included in the draft EIR/EIS. This analysis should identify a threshold for significance for GHG emissions, calculate the level of GHGs that will be emitted as a result of the Project, determine the significance of the impacts of those emissions, and, if impacts are significant, identify mitigation measures that would reduce them to the extent feasible. For the proposed Project, the transport of dredged materials, in addition to the actual dredging activities, should be included in the GHG analysis.

Cultural Resources

- 6. <u>Submerged Resources</u>: The draft EIR/EIS should evaluate potential impacts to submerged cultural resources in the Project area. The CSLC maintains a shipwrecks database that can assist with this analysis. CSLC staff requests that the lead agencies contact Assistant Chief Counsel Pam Griggs (see contact information below) to obtain shipwrecks data from the database and CSLC records for the Project site. The database includes known and potential vessels located on the State's tide and submerged lands; however, the locations of many shipwrecks remain unknown. Please note that any submerged archaeological site or submerged historic resource that has remained in State waters for more than 50 years is presumed to be significant. Because of this possibility, please add a mitigation measure requiring that in the event cultural resources are discovered during any construction activities, Project personnel shall halt all activities in the immediate area and notify a qualified archaeologist to determine the appropriate course of action.
- <u>Title to Resources</u>: The draft EIR/EIS should also mention that the title to all abandoned shipwrecks, archaeological sites, and historic or cultural resources on or in the tide and submerged lands of California is vested in the State and under the jurisdiction of the CSLC. CSLC staff requests that the lead agencies consult with Assistant Chief Counsel

Page 5

December 19, 2014

Pam Griggs (see contact information below), should any cultural resources on State lands be discovered during construction of the proposed Project.

Mitigation and Alternatives

- 8. <u>Deferred Mitigation</u>: In order to avoid the improper deferral of mitigation, mitigation measures should either be presented as specific, feasible, enforceable obligations, or should be presented as formulas containing "performance standards which would mitigate the significant effect of the project and which may be accomplished in more than one specified way" (State CEQA Guidelines, §15126.4, subd. (b)).
- 9. <u>Alternatives</u>: Pursuant to section 15126.6, subdivision (e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR shall identify and evaluate both a "no project" alternative, as well as an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. The NOP identifies Alternative 4 as the no project (or "no action") alternative; CSLC staff requests that the lead agencies identify whether the no project alternative is also the environmentally superior alternative, and if so, identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other three alternatives, to ensure that the draft EIR/EIS meets the guidelines for CEQA compliance.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the Project. As a trustee and responsible agency, the CSLC requests that you consult with us on this Project and keep us advised of changes to the Project Description and all other important developments. Please send additional information on the Project to the CSLC staff listed below as the draft EIR/EIS is being prepared.

Please refer questions concerning environmental review to Cynthia Herzog, Senior Environmental Scientist, at (916) 574-1310 or via e-mail at <u>Cynthia.Herzog@slc.ca.gov</u>. For questions concerning archaeological or historic resources under CSLC jurisdiction, please contact Assistant Chief Counsel Pam Griggs at (916) 574-1854 or via email at <u>Pamela.Griggs@slc.ca.gov</u>. For questions concerning CSLC leasing jurisdiction, please contact Jonathan Sampson at (916) 574-0909 or by e-mail at <u>Jonathan.Sampson@slc.ca.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Cy R. Oggins, Chief Division of Environmental Planning and Management

- cc: Office of Planning and Research C. Herzog, CSLC
 - J. Sampson, CSLC
 - J. Rader, CSLC