1 looking out at the trestle. And the cranes that would
2 be used to remove -- first the crane would dredge down
3 and remove the overburden, the sand on top of the
4 conduits, and then it would remove the individual
5 sections of pipe. The pipe would then be brought back
6 to the beach, loaded on a truck, and trucked back out to
7 the Surf Beach. It would be a major construction
8 operation in the nearshore and onshore environment.
9 And based on that substantial disturbance, over a
10 12-month construction period, these were Class I impacts
11 that were identified that could not be mitigated to
12 marine biological resources to the recreational use of
13 Surf Beach and to transportation of bringing that truck
14 traffic through the beach.
15 The second alternative that was analyzed was the
16 nearshore Components Removal. In other words, we would
17 have the same project that we just described but would
18 only go several hundred feet offshore, and then the
19 offshore portion of the conduits would be retained in
20 place.
21 So all of the onshore activities that we just
22 discussed and the previous alternative would still
23 occur. It would be a slightly shorter duration of nine
24 months, but they would still be significant unmitigable
25 effects on marine biological resources.

1 A third alternative is to crush the conduits in
2 place. We would still put up the sheet piles and the
3 trestle; but instead of removing the pipeline, once the
4 dredging had occurred to expose the pipe, there would be
5 a drop chisel that would be dropped onto the conduit to
6 break it, and the concrete rubble would remain in place.
7 So there would still be a nine-month construction
8 process but the pipe would not have to be trucked back
9 out through Surf Beach.
10 And then the Artificial Reef Alternative, this is
11 one developed during the EIR process. It was not one
12 that Edison had originally evaluated in their
13 engineering study. It would be similar to the proposed
14 project, but would have even fewer effects because there
15 would be no dredging. What we would do is remove the
16 top two rings of each of the terminal structures, rather
17 than the third ring, so there is no dredging needed to
18 expose the base of those terminal structures. And there
19 would not be any removal of the manhole risers. So that
20 as a result, there would be structures that would extend
21 up above the seabed floor approximately 2 to 5 feet, but
22 those would not be navigational hazards. They would not
23 require navigational buoys of any sort, so there would
24 not be a major maintenance issue for that project for
25 that alternative. It would only be a month and a half

1 of duration.
2 For this one we also assume there would be no
3 onshore plugs, concrete plug would not be installed, so
4 that this would be the most suitable for future reuse of
5 the conduits for desalination or other type of use. So
6 with no significant adverse effects is determined to be
7 the environmentally superior alternative.
8 And finally CEQA requires that we look at the
9 no-project alternative, in which case everything would
10 remain in place, the terminal structures as well as
11 marker buoys. So those would remain as structures and
12 buoys to boaters and fishermen in the area, but there
13 would be no significant adverse effects, again an
14 environmentally superior alternative. It would require
15 some sort of maintenance of the buoys and the terminal
16 structures and would not achieve the goals of the
17 project or conform with the lease requirements between
18 State Lands and Edison.
19 So that concludes the presentation about the
20 project and the draft EIR process. We're here to
21 receive oral comments. We'll receive written comments
22 tonight as well as through a week from Friday, the 8th,
23 and then we'll prepare the final EIR based on those
24 comments.
25 MR. GILLIES: Thanks, Tom.

1 We have two speakers that filled out the speaker
2 list. I will ask them to come up.
3 Richard Bell.
4 When you come up, could you please state your name
5 and affiliation for the record.
6 MR. BELL: My name is Richard Bell. I'm with
7 Municipal Water District of Orange County. I am a
8 senior project manager in charge of Ocean Desalination
9 Projects.
10 I want to thank you for the opportunity to provide
11 some brief comments today. We will be submitting next
12 week written comments, so I will try to keep these
13 comments fairly short.
14 A little background on MWDOC, as we are
15 affectionately known. We are a wholesale water agency
16 that serves most of Orange County. We're a metropolitan
17 water district.
18 One of our key functions is regional planning. And
19 in that regard, key area of effort is water supply and
20 water system reliability planning. South Orange County
21 area is served by one regional water treatment plant in
22 Yorba Linda with transmission pipelines. 97 percent of
23 the water supply in South Orange County comes from that
24 plant. That plant sits adjacent to an earthquake fault.
25 It's vulnerable to a major event.

3.10.1

3.10.1

With that in mind, we had been doing some investigations and have over the last several years and issued a reliability plan for South Orange County last September. In that plan we are looking at several projects which would improve system reliability in South Orange County.

Two of those are ocean desalination projects. Two sites we have been looking at are in Dana Point and the other site jointly with the San Diego County Water Authority at Camp Pendleton SONGS site.

Those projects would not only provide system reliability, but would provide supplies to South Orange County and also be an added supply to South Orange County.

In looking at your EIR and the alternatives, we have been anticipating through the process and spoken in the past, we believe that the public potentially would benefit from these facilities for ocean desalination intake and outlet facilities in the future.

So we are urging that the State Lands Commission consider ways to protect those facilities so they can be reused in the future.

So our views are that "No Project" alternative would be superior to the recommended alternative or we would also support perhaps a modification of the

"Artificial Reef" alternative. "No project" alternative would probably have to have some slight modifications to the risers, we know, inlet flows and materials, so that the pipes can be kept sound.

Anyway, that is all I have to say for today.

Any questions?

Thank you.

MR. GILLIES: Thank you, Richard.

3.10.2

Next, Cesar Lopez. Again, please state your name and affiliation.

MR. LOPEZ: My name is Cesar Lopez. I'm with the San Diego Water Authority. I am a senior water resource specialist, a member of the San Diego County Water Authority desalination team.

Again, we thank you for the opportunity that you give us to comment on the Environmental Impact Report for the project titled "Disposition of Offshore Cooling Water Conduits, SONGS Unit 1."

As we have stated in both the written and oral comments we have submitted at the Scoping meeting on July 1st, 2004, the San Diego County Water Authority is very much interested in the preservation of the subject conduits for their potential use as intake and discharge infrastructure for a proposed regional seawater desalination facility that will be located at or near

the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station or SONGS.

A little bit of background on the San Diego County Water Authority agency. The Water Authority is a regional water wholesaler charged by the California Legislature with the responsibility to provide each of its member agencies with adequate supplies of water to meet their expanding and increasing needs. The Water Authority serves 23 member agencies consisting of cities, municipalities, water districts, water districts including Camp Pendleton.

While we cannot say for certain at this time that a desalination facility will be built, however, we have completed an analysis and a feasibility study suggesting that there is a recommendation that a full-blown feasibility study be conducted, and we are currently in the process of preparing the scope of work for that detailed feasibility study that will be anticipated to come underway by summer of 2005.

We do appreciate the report's recognition in section 2.3.11 titled "Potential Future Reuse of Conduits" of planning efforts by our agency, the Water Authority and the Municipal Water District of Orange County regarding the development of the regional seawater desalination facility at Camp Pendleton. This would utilize existing Unit 1 intake and discharge

3.10.2

conduits.

Kind of echoing on what you emphasized earlier, while the Proposed Project would technically allow the conduits to remain in place for future use, the practical use of the conduits would be lost over time as the conduits filled in with sand and sediment. In addition, the construction activities that is contemplated under the Proposed Project would cause considerable disruption to the ocean environment.

Unlike the Proposed Project, the Artificial Reef alternative do not require plugging of the conduits, nor the complete removal of the risers, thereby allowing all preservation of tunnels for future use as intake and/or discharge facilities.

We, therefore, strongly recommend the adoption of this alternative, the Artificial Reef in the proposed project in the EIR. This alternative preserves the conduits for reuse as intake and discharge infrastructure for the seawater desalination facility.

A formal comment is currently being prepared, and we will be submitting it within the next few days before the deadline.

Thank you very much.

MR. GILLIES: I notice someone came in late.

Do they want to speak? Want to make sure that you

sign up on the sign-up sheet in the back to receive any future information on this project.

If there is nobody else to comment, we'll go ahead and close the meeting. We thank you for your participation.

The commission will now work with EDAW Southern California Edison to prepare the final Environmental Impact Report. There will be another chance to comment on this project for our commission in June of this year.

Basically that is it. Closing comments ends.

If you want to come back at 6:00, we'll have another presentation.

Thank you.

(The proceedings concluded at 4:33 p.m.)

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIFORNIA - WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 2005
6:15 P.M.

MR. GILLIES: It's 6:15. No one has arrived from the public, so we're going to open and close the 6:00 o'clock meeting.

(Proceedings concluded at 6:15 p.m.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss

I, Gail E. Kennamer, CSR No. 4583 do hereby declare:

That the above foregoing twenty-six (26) pages contain a full, true and correct transcription of the proceedings.

I further declare that I have no interest in the event of the action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand this _____ day of _____, _____.

_____
Gail E. Kennamer, CSR No. 4583

3.10 Public Hearing March 31, 2005

3.10.1 Please see Responses 3.6.1 through 3.6.6 herein.

3.10.2 Please see Responses 3.5.1 through 3.5.6 herein.

This page intentionally left blank.