Chapter 29
CHANGES AND ERRATA

29.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses modifications between the draft EIR/EIS and final EIR/EIS. Modifications in the final document include all revisions related to public comments, updates, and clarifications, as determined necessary by the lead agencies. Section 29.2 references these revisions. None of the revisions result in changes to significance findings from the draft EIR/EIS.

Some of the modifications in the final EIR/EIS are not included in Section 29.2. These changes are discussed below.

In Chapter 1 of the final EIR/EIS, a new Section 1.8 is added to discuss the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes since the publication of the draft EIR/EIS, and the subsequent section is renumbered. Appendix 1-B is also revised to include the notices for the availability and completion of the draft EIR/EIS, and other information relevant to the public hearings. Two new chapters are added to the final EIR/EIS. Chapter 28 includes the comments received during the comment period on the draft EIR/EIS and the responses to those comments. Chapter 29, this chapter, presents the changes and errata to the final EIR/EIS. Table 1-4 is modified to include the new Chapters 28 and 29. Also, a new section is added to Chapter 25 to include Chapter 28 references.

In addition, there are new appendices in the final EIR/EIS as follows:

- Appendices 18-C and 18-D include supplemental traffic analyses completed following the publication of the draft EIR/EIS.
- Appendix 24-A includes the draft 404(b)(1) analysis.
- Appendix 28-A contains all written comments received on the draft EIR/EIS, including supplemental material provided by the commenters, and the complete transcripts of the three public hearings held during the comment period for the draft EIR/EIS.

Revisions to tables and figures are not included in Section 29.2; however, revisions are referenced in Section 29.2, and the reader is directed to the revised tables and figures in the final EIR/EIS to view complete errata. As necessary, the word “draft” before EIR/EIS was removed or revised to “final” throughout the document.

It should be noted that nonsubstantive changes that do not alter the meaning of the text, including errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, and typography, have been corrected for the final documents but are not included in this chapter.

As provided in Section 15088(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, responses to comments may take the form of a revision to a draft EIR or may be a separate section in the final EIR. This chapter complies with the latter

of these two guidelines and provides changes to the draft EIR/EIS. Underlines indicate where additions were made to the original text. Strikeout indicates where the original text was deleted.

29.2 Modifications to the EIR/EIS

Revisions to the text as presented herein are incorporated into the final EIR/EIS. The location of revisions is identified according to section number and/or heading from the draft EIR/EIS; table and figure numbers from the draft EIR/EIS are used where applicable. Readers are referred to the final EIR/EIS to view complete sections.

29.2.1 Executive Summary

The Introduction section, first paragraph, is revised as follows:

> The Clearwater Program is a comprehensive planning effort undertaken by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Sanitation Districts). Under the Clearwater Program, ~~Its purpose is to develop~~ a ~~long-range~~ Master Facilities Plan (MFP) was developed for the Joint Outfall System (JOS), a regional wastewater management system serving ~~over~~ nearly 5 million people in 73 cities and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. The Clearwater Program MFP includes an evaluation of infrastructure needs and will serve to guide the management and development of the JOS through the year 2050.

The Project-Specific Screening Process section, under Level 4: Feasible Alternatives, is revised as follows:

- **Alternative 1:** Begin at the JWPCP East shaft site (working shaft); then beneath Wilmington Boulevard to the Port of Los Angeles (access shaft at the Trans Pacific Container Service Corporation [TraPac] site and working and/or exit shaft at the former Los Angeles Export Terminal [LAXT] site); through the Southwest Marine shaft site (access shaft); and to the SP Shelf diffuser area approximately ~~10~~12.4 miles offshore (from TraPac) at a depth of 200 feet for a total tunnel length of 14.4 miles. Construction would take approximately 8 years at an estimated cost of $1,360 million.
- **Alternative 3:** Begin at the JWPCP West shaft site (working shaft); then beneath Figueroa Street and South Gaffey Street to the Angels Gate shaft site (access shaft); and to the PV Shelf diffuser area approximately 2.2 miles offshore (from Angels Gate) at a depth of 175 feet for a total tunnel length of 8.6 miles. Construction would take approximately 6.5 years at an estimated cost of $910 million.
- **Alternative 2:** Begin at the JWPCP East shaft site (working shaft); then beneath Wilmington Boulevard to the Port of Los Angeles (access shaft at TraPac; construction shaft at LAXT); through the Southwest Marine shaft site (access shaft); and to the PV Shelf riser/diffuser area approximately 7.2 miles offshore (from TraPac) at a depth of 175 feet for a total tunnel length of 9.2 miles. Construction would take approximately 6.5 years at an estimated cost of $980 million.

The Project-Specific Recommendations section, under Project Costs, is revised as follows:

> The total capital cost ~~and equivalent annual capital cost~~ for the modified ocean discharge system ~~are~~is presented below. Although the project cost would be incurred over multiple years in the future, all amounts shown are in 2011 dollars and include design, construction,

and project management. The anticipated total project cost in 2021 dollars (at the end of construction) is approximately $740,000,000.

The Significant Unavoidable Impacts section, under Greenhouse Gas Emissions, is revised as follows:

Under CEQA, significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts would occur during construction and operation of Alternatives 1 through 4. The magnitude of the significance is directly related to the length of the alignment and the duration of construction. Estimates of total metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent (CO_2e) emissions range from largest (Alternative 1) to smallest (Alternative 4). Alternative 4 has the smallest GHG contribution of the four alternatives and would be the preferred alternative based on GHG emissions.

The following section is added to the final Executive Summary after the Environmentally Preferred and Superior Alternative section:

Areas of Controversy and Issues To Be Resolved

CEQA requires that an Executive Summary include a brief summary of areas of controversy known to the lead agency and issues to be resolved. The areas of controversy known to the Sanitation Districts and Corps include potential impacts of tunneling (paleontology, geology, hazards, and noise/vibration), potential impacts near the shaft sites during construction (aesthetics, air quality, geology, GHGs, noise/vibration, and traffic), potential impacts during rehabilitation of the existing ocean outfalls (marine environment), and selection of Alternative 4 as the recommended alternative. These issues are fully discussed in Chapter 28 of the final EIR/EIS. Issues that have yet to be resolved include the potential impacts of various program-wide elements of the Clearwater Program that have not been developed enough to allow for project-specific analysis. These issues, identified in the final EIR/EIS, will be addressed as necessary in supplemental environmental documents prior to implementation of the program-wide elements.

The Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Program-Wide) is revised for Mitigation Measure (MM) AQ-2a as shown in Section 29.2.5.

The Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Program-Wide) is revised for MM NOI-4b as shown in Section 29.2.9.

The Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Project-Specific), under MM AES-3b, Project Alternative 3, is revised as follows:

Angels Gate Shaft Site – ~~SU~~LTS/M

The Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Project-Specific), under MM AES-3b, Project Alternative 4, is revised as follows:

Royal Palms Shaft Site – ~~SU~~LTS/M

The Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Project-Specific) is revised for MM AQ-2a as shown in Section 29.2.5.

The Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Project-Specific), under Greenhouse Gas Emissions, is revised to include MM GHG-1f, MM GHG-1g, and MM GHG-1h as shown in Section 29.2.7.

The Table of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Project-Specific) is revised for MM NOI-1b (same as MM NOI-4b) as shown in Sections 29.2.9.

29.2.2 Chapter 1, Introduction

Table 1-3 is revised to include entries for the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 1918, and the City of Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan/Environmental Impact Report, 1975.

29.2.3 Chapter 2, Existing Facilities

Section 2.2.4.3, under JWPCP Effluent Management, last paragraph, is revised as follows:

> The pesticide, dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT), was manufactured at the Montrose Chemical Corporation plant in Torrance, California, from 1947 through 1983. From ~~the late 1950s to the early 1970s~~1947 to1971, DDT was disposed of into Sanitation Districts' sewers and conveyed to the JWPCP. Local industries also discharged polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) into the Sanitation Districts' sewer system until PCBs were banned in 1976. The JWPCP had no means of removing or containing the DDT or PCBs, which were discharged along with the plant's effluent into the Pacific Ocean approximately 1.5 miles off White Point on the Palos Verdes Shelf. Since the 1970s, the contaminated sediment has been gradually buried by plant effluent and natural sediment, resulting in a layer of cleaner sediment on top of the contaminated sediment. In 1997, the Sanitation Districts entered into a consent decree with the EPA to address DDT/PCB contamination on the Palos Verdes Shelf. The EPA has conducted various studies and investigations to determine the extent of the contaminated area and to evaluate the appropriate remediation measures. In June 2009, the EPA released for public comment their proposed plan to address risks to human health and the environment posed by the contaminated sediment. The proposed plan presented the EPA's preferred alternative, as well as the other alternatives the EPA evaluated to address these risks. On September 30, 2009, the EPA signed an interim record of decision that selected an initial remedial action for the Palos Verdes Shelf of capping, monitored natural recovery, and institutional controls. The cleanup decision will be documented in a record of decision, supported by the EPA's remedial investigation/feasibility study.

29.2.4 Chapter 3, Alternatives Description

Section 3.3.2.1, last paragraph, is revised as follows:

> Two types of TBMs could be used to build the tunnel: earth-pressure balance (EPB) or slurry. These TBMs differ in how the excavated material generated from the tunneling operations is handled, transported, and treated~~removed~~. With an EPB TBM, locomotives convey the excavated material in rail cars back through the constructed portion of the tunnel to the shaft for removal by crane. The excavated material would be retained at the surface to allow any water to separate before removal. With a slurry TBM, a slurry is supplied by pipe from the ground surface of the shaft to the cutterhead of the TBM to suspend the excavated material, which is then~~the excavated material would be blended with a slurry mixture and~~ pumped back to the shaft and up to the surface through pipes. In this case, the excavated

material would be processed at a slurry separation plant at the surface of the shaft site prior to disposal. A bentonite additive is used in the slurry TBM method, which may preclude ocean disposal of the excavated material. For the purposes of evaluating the greatest potentially significant environmental impacts, the tunnel construction was analyzed assuming either an EPB TBM or~~the use of~~ a slurry TBM, depending on the resource area.

Section 3.3.2.3, under Diffuser, second paragraph, is revised as follows:

If the diffuser were constructed of steel or RCP, the diffuser would consist of two legs oriented out of the riser head, 120 or 180 degrees apart. Each leg would be approximately 4,000 feet long. The inner diameter of the steel or RCP diffuser would incrementally decrease in size ranging from approximately 132 inches to 48 inches. Installation of the steel or RCP diffuser would require seafloor grading and possibly trenching or dredging for site preparation purposes. The ~~dredged~~ trenched materials would be sidecast, if feasible. The diffuser installation may also require construction of a roadbed base of ballast rock that would be approximately 25 to 54 feet wide and up to 5 feet thick~~deep~~. The roadbed would be placed either in the trench or on the graded seafloor. The diffuser would be placed on the roadbed with additional ballast rock up to the center of the pipe for stability. The riser and diffuser would cover a seafloor area of approximately 5 to 10 acres, depending on the required roadbed depth. Refer to Section 3.3.2.4 for the estimated quantities of dredged materials and ballast rock for the steel or RCP diffuser.

Section 3.3.2.3, under Existing Ocean Outfalls, second paragraph, is revised as follows:

Alternatives 1 through 4 (Project) would include improvements to the existing ocean outfalls, such as joint repairs and re-ballasting. The re-ballasting work would occur on the existing 72-, 90- and 120-inch outfalls in water depths ranging from approximately 20 to 50 feet. A small derrick barge would be used to place the ballast rock around the outfalls and support the joint repair work. Joint repairs would involve temporarily removing some of the existing ballast rock from around the outfall to fully expose the joint being repaired. A team of divers would repair an estimated 10 to 40 joints and hand-shovel approximately 2 cubic yards of sediment from each joint. Mechanical dredging would not be required. A coupling, which is a giant clamp that wraps around the joint, would be installed and the annular space filled with concrete. The sediment and existing ballast rock would be replaced around the pipe, and additional ballast rock would be placed as needed. ~~c~~Cathodic protection would also be restored or added where necessary. The marine vessels required for this work are listed in Table 3-10. The majority of the construction work would be based on one 10-hour shift per day, 5 days per week. It is estimated that approximately eight to ten construction workers would be needed for the rehabilitation work. Joint repairs and transport of construction workers would require a work vessel and crew vessel operating one daily round-trip for approximately 1 month, which would most likely deploy from the Port of Los Angeles. All of the work including mobilization, construction, and demobilization would take approximately 9 months.

Section 3.4.1.1 is revised as follows:

At the program level, Alternative 1 would include conveyance improvements; plant expansion at the SJCWRP; process optimization at the SJCWRP, POWRP, LCWRP, and LBWRP; WRP effluent management at all the WRPs; and solids processing, biosolids management, and effluent management at the JWPCP. At the project level, Alternative 1

would include the Wilmington to SP Shelf tunnel alignment; the JWPCP East, TraPac, LAXT, and Southwest Marine shaft sites; the SP Shelf riser and diffuser area; and the rehabilitation of the existing ocean outfalls.

29.2.5 Chapter 5, Air Quality

Section 5.4.3.1, under Impact AQ-2, CEQA Impact Determination, Mitigation, is revised as follows:

> Mitigation measures for construction were derived, where feasible, from SCAQMD mitigation measure tables (SCAQMD 2007b), LAHD Construction Guidelines (also part of the Port of Los Angeles' Clean Air Action Plan), and the Sanitation Districts. The following mitigation measures would be implemented at the start of the construction activity to reduce criteria pollutant emissions associated with construction.

MM AQ-2a is revised in Section 5.4.3.1, Impact AQ-2, CEQA Impact Determination, Mitigation, Program; and Tables 5-36, 5-43, 5-51, 5-59, and 5-62, as follows:

> **MM AQ-2a.** All on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks used during construction with a gross vehicle weight rating greater than ~~26,000~~14,000 pounds will ~~include a particulate matter trap or~~ have a 2007 model year engine or newer, or be equipped with a particulate matter trap.

MM AQ-3a (same as MM AQ-2a) is revised in Tables 5-38, 5-44, 5-52, and 5-60 as follows:

> MM AQ-3a (same as MM AQ-2a). All on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks used during construction with a gross vehicle weight rating greater than ~~26,000~~14,000 pounds will ~~include a particulate matter trap or~~ have a 2007 model year engine or newer, or be equipped with a particulate matter trap.

The legend on Figure 5-19 is revised.

29.2.6 Chapter 7, Cultural Resources

Section 7.2.1.6, second paragraph, is revised as follows:

> Shipwrecks off the Southern California coast, in varying states of preservation, represent hundreds of years of history because of the lengthy Southern Californian coast historical maritime period. It has been estimated that there are "upwards of 100 wrecks in the harbors [Los Angeles and Long Beach], which vary in age from significant old wrecks to culturally insignificant modern wrecks" (Weinman and Stickel 1978:76). Approximately 415 vessel losses have been reported within Los Angeles County by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement (BOEMRE), and 156 vessel losses have been identified within Los Angeles County by the California State Lands Commission (CSLC) database (see Section 7.4.1.2 for more information on each of these databases). Only a small fraction of these wrecks has ever been located. A number of reported vessels lost off Los Angeles County are reported to be in excess of 400 feet in length and are primarily freighters and tankers (CSLC 2011). 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.

Sections 7.4.3.2, 7.4.4.2, 7.4.5.2, 7.4.6.2, under Impact CUL-3, CEQA Impact Determination, Residual Impacts, first paragraph, are revised as follows:

> MM CUL-3 would apply to the disturbance of the ~~upper 10 to 15 feet of~~ natural sediment at each shaft site construction area during the use of conventional excavation ~~construction~~ equipment. However, once the shaft ~~construction extends past 15 feet,~~ has been excavated to depths below the groundwater table, conditions would limit effective monitoring and recovery of paleontological resources, and there would be no feasible way to apply MM CUL-3. Furthermore, MM CUL-3 could not be applied during construction of the tunnel. This is because the TBM continually moves forward and offers no opportunity for appropriate monitoring for paleontological resources.

29.2.7 Chapter 9, Greenhouse Gases

Sections 9.4.3.1, 9.4.4.1, 9.4.5.1, and 9.4.6.1, under Impact GHG-1, CEQA Impact Determination, Mitigation, are revised as follows:

> Some mitigation measures that reduce criteria pollutants may also reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, implementation of the following mitigation measures, including those defined in Chapter 5, may ~~also~~ reduce GHG emissions.

MM GHG-1a is revised in Section 9.4.3.1, Impact GHG-1, CEQA Impact Determination, Mitigation, Program; and Tables 9-10, 9-15, 9-20, 9-25, and 9-27; as follows:

> **Mitigation Measure (MM) GHG-1a (same as MM AQ-2a).** All on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks used during construction with a gross vehicle weight rating greater than ~~26,000~~14,000 pounds will ~~include a particulate matter trap or~~ have a 2007 model year engine or newer, or be equipped with a particulate matter trap.

Section 9.4.3.1, Impact GHG-1, CEQA Impact Determination, Mitigation, Project; and Tables 9-10, 9-15, 9-20, 9-25, and 9-27 under project mitigation measures for Impact GHG-1; are revised to include additional mitigation measures as follows:

> **MM GHG-1f.** Use energy efficient lighting systems, such as LED technology, during construction, where feasible.
>
> **MM GHG-1g.** Use lighter-colored pavement during construction, where feasible.
>
> **MM GHG-1h.** Recycle construction debris to the maximum extent feasible.

Sections 9.4.4.1, 9.4.5.1, and 9.4.6.1, under Impact GHG-1, CEQA Impact Determination, Mitigation, Project, are revised as follows:

> Implement MM GHG-1a (same as MM AQ-2a), MM GHG-1b (same as MM AQ-2b), MM GHG-1c (same as MM AQ-2d), MM GHG-1d (same as MM AQ-2f), ~~and~~ MM GHG-1e (same as MM AQ-2g), MM GHG-1f, MM GHG-1g, and MM GHG-1h.

29.2.8 Chapter 13, Marine Environment (Marine Hydrology, Water Quality, Biological Resources, Noise, and Public Health)

Section 13.2.2.1, under San Pedro Shelf, Sediment Quality, second paragraph, is revised as follows:

> The SP Shelf diffuser area is not located within the boundaries of the United States (U.S.) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)–designated DDT/PCB contaminated sediment study area, which is shown on Figure 13-4. DDT and PCBs have been reported in sediments from the SP Shelf, with higher levels of DDT and PCB found closer to the Palos Verdes Peninsula (Eganhouse and Venkatesan 1993; Schiff et al. 2006). In regional sampling conducted in 2003, DDT was detected in sediments of three midshelf depth stations on the SP Shelf, Stations 4026, 4058, and 4122 (Schiff et al. 2006). At the two stations closer to the PV Shelf (Stations 4026 and 4122), DDT levels exceeded the ERL[1] value, but were below the ERM[2] value for total DDT, a range in which effects on biota could occasionally occur. At those same two stations, PCBs were also detected in the sediments, though levels did not exceed ERL values.

Section 13.2.2.1, under Palos Verdes Shelf, Sediment Quality, is revised as follows:

> The PV Shelf includes 19,895 acres between the depths of 100 and 400 feet (30 and 120 meters), generally considered midshelf depths. Soft-bottom sediments are approximately 97 percent of the midshelf depths. The PV Shelf riser and diffuser area is within the boundaries of the EPA-designated Palos Verdes Shelf Superfund Site. The location of the DDT/PCB study area is depicted on Figure 13-4. The extent of the DDT contamination within the PV Shelf Superfund Site Study Area (EPA 2009a:27–28) and the proposed riser/diffuser and re-ballasting locations are shown on Figure 13-7. The extent of the PCB contamination within the PV Shelf Superfund Site Study Area (EPA 2009a:27–28) and the proposed riser/diffuser and re-ballasting locations are shown on Figure 13-8. See the discussion under Existing Ocean Outfalls for more details regarding the DDT/PCB on the PV Shelf, and refer to Appendix 13-A for levels of sediment contamination.

Section 13.2.2.1, under Existing Ocean Outfalls, Location and Geography, is revised as follows:

> The existing ocean outfalls extend from the existing manifold structure at Royal Palms Beach and terminate at a depth of approximately 200 feet (60 meters) as described in Section 2.2.4.3. The ~~rehabilitation work~~ proposed re-ballasting would occur along the existing ocean outfalls at depths of 20 to 50 feet as shown on Figures 13-4, 13-7, and 13-8.

Section 13.2.2.1, under Existing Ocean Outfalls, Biological Resources, Marine Vegetation, is revised as follows:

> Giant kelp beds occur inshore of the existing ocean outfalls, though the sizes of the beds have changed over time. Historic trends for kelp beds in the area of the existing ocean outfalls are presented in Appendix 13-A. In 2008, approximately 150 acres of kelp were reported in the White Point area~~.~~ at water depths ranging from approximately 40 to 70 feet. Areas shoreward

[1] ERL – Effects Range Low; concentrations equal to and above the ERL but below the ERM represent possible effects range within which effects to biota could occasionally occur.
[2] ERM – Effects Range Median; concentrations above the ERM represent a probable effects range within which effects could frequently occur.

of 40-foot depths do not support kelp due to wave action, sea urchin grazing, and the absence of hard substrate. There is no eelgrass located at the existing ocean outfalls or within the general vicinity of the existing ocean outfalls. Eelgrass is usually found at depths between +6.0 and -22.0 feet mean lower low water level (MLLW) (+2.4 and -6.6 meter MLLW) (Phillips 1984:4).

Section 13.4.3.2, under Impact MAR-1, Riser/Diffuser Area – San Pedro Shelf, Construction, CEQA Analysis, fifth paragraph, is revised as follows:

If the diffuser were constructed of steel or RCP, it would have two legs oriented out of the riser head, 120 or 180 degrees apart, with each leg approximately 4,000 feet long. The inner diameter of the steel or RCP diffuser would incrementally decrease in size from approximately 132 inches to 48 inches. The steel and RCP diffuser configurations are shown on Figure 3-25. Installation of the steel or RCP diffuser would require seafloor grading and possibly trenching or dredging for site preparation. The trenched~~dredged~~ materials would be sidecast, if feasible. Sidecasting involves excavating seafloor sediments from the construction site with a clamshell dredge, raising and moving the clamshell away from the excavation site and releasing the sediments above the seafloor. The diffuser installation could also require construction of a roadbed base of ballast rock. The roadbed would be placed either in the trench or on the graded seafloor. The diffuser would be placed on the roadbed with additional ballast rock up to the center of the pipe for stability. The riser and diffuser would cover a seafloor area of approximately 5 to 10 acres, depending on the required roadbed width.

Section 13.4.3.2, under Impact MAR-4, Riser/Diffuser Area – San Pedro Shelf, Construction, CEQA Analysis, Marine Habitat, after the first paragraph, is revised with the addition of the following paragraph:

As discussed in Section 13.2.2.1, kelp can be found in the White Point area at water depths ranging from approximately 40 to 70 feet. The proposed re-ballasting work would occur at water depths ranging between approximately 20 and 50 feet. Thus, there would be some overlap between the general work area and the kelp habitat from approximately 40 feet to 50 feet. As a result, re-ballasting activities could impact kelp growing on the outfall pipes and the adjacent rock ballast. However, the impact would be minimized because the proposed method of placing the new ballast rock ensures that the work would be limited to the existing footprint of the outfalls (i.e., pipeline and adjacent rock ballast). The impact would also be temporary because kelp would be able to recolonize the rock ballast upon completion of construction. Furthermore, replacement of rock ballast would increase hard substrate and thus benefit benthic habitat. Overall, direct and indirect impacts on kelp forests would be minimal and temporary. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Figure 13-4 is revised to include the location of the proposed re-ballasting of the existing ocean outfalls. Figures 13-7 and 13-8 are added, and Figures 13-7 and 13-8 of the draft EIR/EIS are renumbered to Figures 13-9 and 13-10, respectively.

All references to “EPA 2009” are relettered to “EPA 2009b”.

29.2.9 Chapter 14, Noise and Vibrations (Terrestrial)

MM NOI-4b is revised in Section 14.4.3.1, Impact NOI-4, CEQA Impact Determination, Mitigation; and Tables 14-26 and 14-37, as follows:

> **MM NOI-4b.** Prior to construction, initiate a complaint/response tracking program. A construction schedule will be made available to schools, child care facilities, and residents ~~living~~ in the vicinity of the construction areas, and a noise disturbance coordinator will be designated. The coordinator will be responsible for responding to complaints regarding construction noise, will determine the cause of the complaint, and will ensure that reasonable measures are implemented to correct the problem when feasible. A contact telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator will be conspicuously posted on construction site fences and will be included in the notification of the construction schedule.

MM NOI-1b is revised in Tables 14-27, 14-28, 14-33, and 14-36, as follows:

> MM NOI-1b (same as MM NOI-4b). Prior to construction, initiate a complaint/response tracking program. A construction schedule will be made available to schools, child care facilities, and residents ~~living~~ in the vicinity of the construction areas, and a noise disturbance coordinator will be designated. The coordinator will be responsible for responding to complaints regarding construction noise, will determine the cause of the complaint, and will ensure that reasonable measures are implemented to correct the problem when feasible. A contact telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator will be conspicuously posted on construction site fences and will be included in the notification of the construction schedule.

29.2.10 Chapter 17, Recreation

MM REC-1b is revised in Section 17.4.5.2, Impact REC-1, CEQA Impact Determination, Mitigation; and Tables 17-5, 17-6, and 17-8; as follows:

> **MM REC-1b (same as MM NOI-4b).** Prior to construction, initiate a complaint/response tracking program. A construction schedule will be made available to schools, child care facilities, and residents ~~living~~ in the vicinity of the construction areas, and a noise disturbance coordinator will be designated. The coordinator will be responsible for responding to complaints regarding construction noise, will determine the cause of the complaint, and will ensure that reasonable measures are implemented to correct the problem when feasible. A contact telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator will be conspicuously posted on construction site fences and will be included in the notification of the construction schedule.

29.2.11 Chapter 18, Transportation and Traffic (Terrestrial)

Section 18.4.1.1, Baseline, CEQA Baseline, second paragraph, is revised to add footnote "1" to the end of the paragraph:

> [1] A supplemental traffic analysis was also completed to determine if impacts would be different using an existing traffic baseline rather than the future baseline. This supplemental traffic analysis is included as Appendix 18-C. This analysis concluded that the impacts compared to existing traffic were consistent with the impacts compared to the future baseline conditions.

Section 18.4.6.2, under Impact TRT-1, Shaft Site – Royal Palms, Construction, CEQA Analysis, fourth paragraph, is revised to add the following footnote "2" to the end of the paragraph:

[2] Since the time of the project-level traffic analysis of Alternative 4, there was a landslide east of the Royal Palms shaft site that led the city of Los Angeles to close a portion of Paseo Del Mar to through traffic for an indeterminate period. The closure to motorized traffic of the roadway link between Western Avenue and Weymouth Avenue has resulted in localized traffic patterns that differ from those that prevailed when the baseline traffic counts used in the original analysis were collected. Because it is unknown whether this roadway segment would be reopened by the time of construction at the Royal Palms shaft site, an additional traffic analysis was performed to determine whether construction at the shaft site would result in different traffic impacts if Paseo Del Mar remained closed. This additional traffic analysis is included as Appendix 18-D. The analysis concluded that the construction traffic impacts with Paseo Del Mar closed would be consistent with the impacts in the original traffic analysis, and that the impacts at the analyzed intersections would be less than significant. The increase in traffic from the project with Paseo Del Mar closed would not exceed the city of Los Angeles' established thresholds of significance.

Figures 18-1, 18-4, 18-7, and 18-10 are revised to better locate the Pasha Terminal.

29.2.12 Chapter 19, Transportation and Traffic (Marine)

Figure 19-2 is revised to better locate the Pasha Terminal.

29.2.13 Chapter 21, Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts

Section 21.2.2.2, under Alternative 1 Through Alternative 4, Activities for Which No Potentially Significant Cumulative Impacts Would Result, is revised with the addition of the following bullet:

- Concurrent peak day emissions of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ (combined construction and operational impacts) would not exceed the SCAQMD daily emissions thresholds at any time, as described in Chapter 5.

29.2.14 Chapter 24, List of Federal and State Permits for All Alternatives

Table 24-1 is revised to reletter footnote "a" to footnote "b".

Table 24-1 is revised to add footnote "a" to the first row under United States Army Corps of Engineers and the following addition to the footnote section at the end of the table:

[a] The draft 404(b)(1) analysis is included as Appendix 24-A.

29.2.15 Chapter 25, References

Section 25.1.1 is revised by adding the following references:

City of Rancho Palos Verdes. 1975. City of Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan/Environmental Impact Report. Adopted June 26. As amended through September 13, 1988.

City of Rancho Palos Verdes. 2012. General Plan Update. Available: < http://palosverdes.com/rpv/planning/content/General_Plan_Update.cfm>. Accessed: July 13, 2012.

Section 25.13.1 is revised to reletter printed reference "EPA. 2009" to "EPA. 2009b".

Section 25.13.1 is revised by adding the following reference:

EPA. 2009a. Interim Record of Decision Palos Verdes Shelf Operable Unit 5 of Montrose Chemical Corporation Superfund Site. San Francisco, CA. Prepared by U.S. EPA, Region IX. 27–28 p.

29.2.16 Chapter 26, List of Preparers and Contributors

Section 26.1 is revised to include entries for Grace Chan, Robert Ferrante, Raymond Tremblay, Joseph Houghton, Mark Giljum, and Hannah Thames. Section 26.3 is revised to include entries for Donna McCormick and Ron Bass.