

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512



DATE: August 30, 2006

TO: Interested Parties

FROM: Donna Stone, Compliance Project Manager

SUBJECT: AES Huntington Beach Generating Station Retool Project (00-AFC-13C) Huntington Beach Units 3&4 Entrainment and Impingement Study Results, Mitigation Options, Staff and Working Group Recommendations, and AES' Response and Objections to the Recommendation

In May 2001, the Energy Commission granted an emergency certification for the AES Huntington Beach Retool Project, a 450 MW natural gas-fired power plant. The power plant is located in the City of Huntington Beach in Orange County and uses ocean water for once-through cooling. The project retooled and restarted Units 3 and 4, which had been retired in 1995, at the existing Huntington Beach Generating Station (HBGS). The hope was that the project would come online quickly and help alleviate the energy crisis California was experiencing during that period.¹ Due to the expedited permitting process used, there was not sufficient time to complete lengthy studies normally finished prior to certification to determine impacts and needed mitigation. Therefore, the Commission's Decision contained additional conditions required of the project owner, which are in part:

- (1) Prepare a monitoring/study plan and conduct one year of monitoring to determine the actual impingement and entrainment losses resulting from the operation of the once-through cooling water system (**BIO-3**).
- (2) Provide one million five hundred thousand dollars to fund the project's impingement, entrainment, and source water sampling studies (**BIO-4**).
- (3) Provide mitigation/compensation funds to be used for such things as tidal wetlands restoration, creation of artificial reefs, or some other form of habitat compensation that is sufficient to fully address the species impacts identified, if studies determine that project operations result in significant impacts to one or more species of coastal fish. The amount of mitigation/compensation funds and the final application will be determined by the Commission in consultation with the project owner and state, federal and local resource agencies (**BIO-5**).

The project owner provided the study funding required by **BIO-4**, and the study required under **BIO-3** was completed in April 2005. Commission staff, in consultation with the project owner and California Department of Fish and Game, Coastal Commission, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, and National Marine Fisheries Service have been working on an analysis of that study, which was made public July 14, 2006. A Siting Committee workshop was held on July 25, 2006 to discuss the staff analysis, mitigation options and to receive public comment. A copy of the revised final

¹ Due to numerous difficulties the project began commercial operations in a phased approach, with Unit #3 becoming available on January 1, 2003, and Unit #4 available on August 7, 2003.

Staff Analysis of Huntington Beach Entrainment and Impingement Results

August 30, 2006

Page 2

staff analysis of the impingement and entrainment impacts and staff recommended mitigation is attached. Energy Commission staff intends to recommend that AES restore and maintain 104 acres of Huntington Beach wetlands at a cost of \$7,956,00. The full Commission will hear this item at its Business Meeting on September 14, 2006, and make a decision on the mitigation required. The Staff Analysis has been posted on the Energy Commission's webpage at www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/huntingtonbeach/compliance/index.html. The Commission's order will also be posted on the webpage. If you have comments on this item, please submit them to me at the address below no later than **September 11, 2006**.

Donna Stone, Compliance Project Manager
California Energy Commission
1516 9th Street, MS-2000
Sacramento, CA 95814

Comments may be submitted by fax to (916) 654-3882, or by e-mail to: dstone@energy.state.ca.us. If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 654-4745.

Enclosure: Staff Analysis

HUNTINGTON BEACH UNITS 3&4 ENTRAINMENT AND IMPINGEMENT STUDY RESULTS, MITIGATION OPTIONS, STAFF AND WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS, AND AES' RESPONSE AND OBJECTIONS TO THE RECOMMENDATION

Dr. Noel Davis, Dr. Pete Raimondi, Rick York, and Joanna Reinhardt

ABSTRACT

In May 2001, the California Energy Commission published its decision granting emergency certification for the AES Huntington Beach Retool Project. The Retool Project retooled and restarted Units 3 and 4, retired in 1995, at the existing Huntington Beach Generating Station (HBGS). The Energy Commission's approval of the project included Conditions of Certification to identify and mitigate significant impacts that could not be effectively evaluated during the emergency certification.

By retooling and restarting Units 3 and 4, the cooling water intake flow of the HBGS would approximately double the flows for Units 1 and 2. Once-through cooling systems that use ocean water expose marine organisms to the impacts of entrainment and impingement. Because no study of the impacts of entrainment had ever been done at HBGS, staff was unable to make a finding regarding the significance of those impacts or identify appropriate mitigation to offset impacts. Therefore, as Conditions of Certification for the project, AES was required to fund a one-year study of the impacts of entrainment and impingement at HBGS (**BIO-4**) and provide mitigation funds to restore or create coastal habitat to mitigate any identified significant impacts (**BIO-5**). Condition of Certification **BIO-6** required AES to fund a study to determine whether there is a feasible methodology to reduce impingement losses at HBGS.

The entrainment and impingement study required by Condition of Certification **BIO-4** estimated that entrainment in the cooling water used for Units 3 and 4 was equivalent to the loss of productivity of 104 acres of habitat for coastal fishes and 15.35 acres for CIQ gobies. This loss of productivity represents a loss of functional value of native fish, wildlife, and plant habitat and a degradation of the foraging habitat of the endangered California least tern, endangered California brown pelican, and threatened western snowy plover. Overall, the entrainment of all the organisms in the 253.3 millions of gallons per day that AES is permitted to use to cool Units 3 and 4 represents a substantial degradation of the quality of the marine environment. Based on the significance criteria used in this analysis, staff considers entrainment losses due to water withdrawal for Units 3 and 4 to be significant. The commenting resource agencies (California Department of Fish and Game, Coastal Commission, Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, and National Marine Fisheries Service) agree with staff's determination that the losses of marine resources caused by the intake of cooling water for Units 3 and 4 are significant and require mitigation.

Opportunities for habitat restoration in the vicinity of HBGS have been identified that, if implemented, would reduce the impacts of entrainment and impingement to insignificant levels. The most appropriate mitigation opportunity is restoration of the Huntington

Beach Wetlands, which are directly adjacent to HBGS. The impacts of cooling water intake for Units 3 and 4 would be fully mitigated by restoring 104 acres of the Huntington Beach Wetlands. The cost to restore the 104 acres of wetlands and maintain those wetlands for the 10-year life of the AES license for Units 3 and 4 would be \$7,956,000. Therefore, staff recommends that AES contribute \$7,956,000 to the Huntington Beach Wetlands Conservancy to restore wetlands habitat equivalent to an area of habitat production foregone of 104 acres.

BACKGROUND

In December 2000, AES Huntington Beach submitted an Application for Certification to the California Energy Commission to retool retired Units 3 and 4 of the AES Huntington Beach Generating Station (HBGS). Units 3 and 4 had been out of operation since 1995. At the time of the application, California's energy supply situation was declared an emergency (Governor's Executive Order #D-22-01).

By retooling and restarting Units 3 and 4, the cooling water intake flow of HBGS would increase to approximately twice what it was since the units were retired in 1995. Once-through cooling systems that use ocean water expose marine organisms to the impacts of entrainment and impingement. Entrainment refers to organisms being drawn into and through the cooling water system and impingement refers to the trapping of organisms on the intake screens. Because no study of the impacts of entrainment had ever been done at HBGS, staff was unable to make a finding regarding the significance of those impacts and identify appropriate mitigation during the permitting process. There was insufficient time to complete an entrainment impacts analysis prior to certification because of the energy crisis and the immediate need for more energy sources. For purposes of its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis, the Energy Commission assumed there were unmitigated impacts and made findings of overriding considerations. As Conditions of Certification for the project, AES was required to fund a one-year study of the impacts of entrainment and impingement at HBGS (**BIO-4**) and provide mitigation funds to restore or create coastal habitat to offset any identified significant impacts (**BIO-5**). Finally, Condition of Certification **BIO-6** required AES to fund a study to determine whether there was a feasible methodology to reduce impingement losses at HBGS. For reference, those Conditions of Certification are reproduced in **APPENDIX 1**, located at the end of this document.

In July 2003, MBC Applied Environmental Sciences (MBC), biological consultant to AES, submitted a final study plan to conduct the entrainment and impingement study in compliance with Condition of Certification **BIO-4**. The study was overseen by a Biological Resources Research Team (TEAM) that consisted of representatives from the Energy Commission and its consultants, representatives from the applicant and its consultants, and representatives from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), the California Coastal Commission, and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The TEAM provided input into the sampling design and methods for impacts analysis, and approved the final study plan. The methods used for the study were similar to those used in other recent peer-reviewed power plant studies including entrainment studies of the Moss Landing Power Plant, Diablo Canyon Nuclear

Power Plant, Morro Bay Power Plant, and Potrero Power Plant (Tenera 2000a and b, 2001). Fish and target invertebrate larvae in the vicinity of HBGS were sampled regularly over a one-year period. Monthly progress reports were submitted by MBC to keep the TEAM informed of the progress of the study. MBC submitted quarterly data reports that provided preliminary results, and a six-month interim report that summarized all data collected and analyzed up to that point. The six-month interim report also included a preliminary impact analysis. All these reports were reviewed and approved by the TEAM. Members of the TEAM provided input to each report. At the conclusion of the one-year entrainment and impingement study, MBC submitted a draft final report that was reviewed and commented on by members of the TEAM.

In April 2005, AES submitted its final report documenting the results of the entrainment and impingement study required by **BIO-4** and the study of potential methods to reduce impingement required by **BIO-6**. The final report incorporated suggestions made by members of the TEAM. The study used three approaches to estimate the impacts of entrainment losses. These approaches used models as a method of understanding what the impacts of entrainment meant to the affected populations. The approach that most fully addressed the ecological impacts of the entrainment losses used a model (Empirical Transport Model) that estimated the portion of the larvae of each target fish species at risk of entrainment by the once-through cooling system. By multiplying the mean percent of the populations at risk by the mean geographic area from which the fish larvae might be entrained, an estimate can be obtained of the amount of habitat it would take to produce the lost fish larvae. This estimate is referred to as the *area of habitat production foregone* (APF). The other impact analysis methods used in the study expressed entrainment losses in terms of potential losses to the adult populations.

Energy Commission staff, NMFS, CDFG, RWQCB, and the California Coastal Commission used the data and impacts analysis presented in the Final Report to determine the significance of the impacts and to identify appropriate mitigation options and recommendations. The four involved agencies have written letters to the Energy Commission regarding their conclusions about the significance of the impacts identified in the study (Chambers 2005, Luster 2005, Ugoretz 2005, Theisen 2006). More recently, members of the BRRT have met on three occasions (April 27, 2006; June 27, 2006; and July 11, 2006) to discuss the results of this analysis and provide comments. On July 25, 2006, the Energy Commission's Siting Committee conducted a public workshop at which staff, AES, and the state agencies discussed the analysis. AES disagrees with the staff analysis and submitted comments (AES 2006) that are provided following the Response to Comments section found at the end of this analysis. This final report summarizes the results of the entrainment and impingement study, provides the conclusions of staff and the relevant agencies regarding the significance of entrainment and impingement, and describes options for mitigating those losses.

SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The HBGS site is located along the Pacific Coast Highway in the City of Huntington Beach, California. The retooling project was constructed entirely within the boundary of the HBGS site and primarily within the structures of existing Units 3 and 4. The project site is located on relatively flat terrain with little vegetation except for patches of non-

native and native landscaping at the property perimeter. Areas of coastal salt marsh dominated by pickleweed (*Salicornia virginica*) occur approximately 0.5 mile to the northwest and immediately to the southeast of the HBGS. These salt marsh areas are Orange County-protected wetland resources known as the Huntington Beach Wetlands.

Marine habitats near the HBGS consist primarily of sand substrate. A wide sandy beach, broken by various jetties and groin fields, extends from the entrance to Newport Harbor about 6.5 miles southeast of the generating station upcoast to Anaheim Bay. The intake and outfall structures for the cooling water system are located approximately 1,500 feet offshore at a water depth of approximately 27 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW). The seafloor near the study area is a gently sloping sand bottom.

The state- and federal- endangered California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*) nests on the sandy beach a little over a mile south of HBGS adjacent to the Santa Ana River mouth. Least terns nest between April and August and winter in Central or South America. The preferred prey of California least terns is northern anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*) and topsmelt (*Atherinops affinis*). Least terns from the Huntington Beach colony use all the waters near the colony for foraging, but feed most frequently in shallow nearshore waters within 2 miles of the colony (Atwood and Minsky 1983).

The western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*) is a federal threatened species and a California Species of Special Concern. The closest currently used snowy plover nesting site to HBGS is in the Bolsa Chica Wetlands approximately 4.5 miles northwest of the power plant. Snowy plovers nested within the Huntington Beach California least tern colony near the mouth of the Santa Ana River in 1993. Wintering snowy plovers have been observed to forage along the sandy intertidal zone in the vicinity of the HBGS (MEC 1991). Bolsa Chica State Beach and the Santa Ana River mouth recently have been designated as Critical Habitat for the western snowy plover (USFWS 2005). Snowy plovers forage for insects and amphipods along the upper beach and in the wet sand of the lower tidal zones for young sand crabs (Zeiner et al 1990).

The state- and federal- endangered California brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis*) nests on Anacapa and Santa Barbara Islands off southern California, on islands off the Pacific Coast of Baja California, Mexico, and in the Gulf of California, Mexico. California brown pelicans are common in the waters offshore from the HBGS especially during the non-breeding season of July through December. They feed primarily on northern anchovy.

Several marine bird species that are California Species of Special Concern are fairly common in the nearshore waters offshore from the HBGS. These species include the common loon (*Gavia immer*), double-crested cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritus*), California gull (*Larus californicus*), and elegant tern (*Sterna elegans*). With the exception of the California gull, which feeds mostly on garbage and invertebrates, these species feed primarily on fish (Zeiner et al 1990).

The AES Huntington Beach Retool Project retooled and restarted Units 3 and 4 at the existing HBGS. Units 3 and 4 were retired in 1995 because of limited use. Retooled Unit 3 restarted operation in spring 2003 and Unit 4 in summer 2003. Only Units 1, 2

and 5 had been operated for the last several years prior to the Retool Project. The HBGS Retool Project would be expected to increase cooling water intake flow rates similar to pre-1994 levels when all units were operating. Mean daily flow between 1979 and 1993 ranged between 134.6 and 476.2 mgd compared to between 144.1 and 163.8 mgd after 1994. Between January 1, 2003 and the present, the average daily cooling water flow at HBGS has been 330 mgd (P. Hurt, AES, personal communication, 2006).

The HBGS Retool Project uses the HBGS existing cooling water intake system. Cooling water for Units 1 – 4 is withdrawn from the ocean via an intake structure located 1,500 feet offshore in a water depth of approximately 27 feet MLLW. The intake structure rises about 15 feet off the bottom and is fitted with a velocity cap to reduce impingement. Seawater is drawn into the power plant by up to eight circulating water pumps, each capable of delivering about 63.4 mgd for a total permitted maximum of 507 mgd. Units 1 and 2 have a maximum flow of 253.5 mgd. Units 3 and 4 also have a maximum flow of 253.5 mgd. Therefore, restarting of Units 3 and 4 has the potential to double the cooling water flow at HBGS. The flow is directed to an open rectangular forebay and screening facility within the plant. The screen system is composed of vertical bar racks and vertical traveling screens with 3/8 inch mesh designed to remove trash, algae, marine life, and other debris that comes in with the cooling water. After flowing through the screen system, the cooling water is pumped to steam condensers, one per turbine generator. At full load, the temperature increase through the condensers is approximately 18 degrees Fahrenheit. After passing through the condensers the heated water is directed to a single concrete discharge pipe, which extends approximately 1,200 feet offshore. The discharge structure resembles the intake structure, except there is no velocity cap. Discharged water is directed vertically to the surface for dilution and atmospheric cooling.

ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS AND DISCUSSION OF MITIGATION

METHOD AND THRESHOLD FOR DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE

Significant biological resource impacts would occur if state- or federal-listed species, state Fully Protected species, candidates for state or federal listing and/or Species of Concern are likely to be impacted. Interruption of species migration, reduction of native fish, wildlife and plant habitat, causing a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, and disturbance of wetlands, marshes, riparian areas or other wildlife habitat would also be considered significant impacts. These are Mandatory Findings of Significance under the CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 16065(a)(1)). Substantial degradation of the quality of the environment is also a Mandatory Finding of Significance under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 16065(a)(1)). Finally, CEQA Guidelines specify a Mandatory Finding of Significance if the project has possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines Section 16065(a)(3)).

ENTRAINMENT AND IMPINGEMENT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Results of the Entrainment Study

The entrainment and impingement study was designed to estimate losses of fishes and target invertebrates to the AES HBGS cooling water system. The sampling and analysis methodologies were similar to those used for recent peer-reviewed entrainment and impingement studies conducted for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Morro Bay Power Plant, and Moss Landing Power Plant (Tenera 2000a and b, 2001). The small organisms at risk of entrainment by HBGS are members of the plankton community. Plankton are plants and animals that float more or less passively with the currents and include organisms that spend their whole lives in the plankton as well as the larvae of fishes and invertebrates. Because the effort and cost to collect and identify *all* of the organisms in the water column that may be entrained at HBGS would be prohibitive, emphasis was placed on collecting and identifying fish larvae as well as the larvae of several target invertebrate species. The target invertebrate larvae were rock crab (*Cancer* spp.), market squid (*Loligo opalescens*), California spiny lobster (*Panulirus interruptus*), ridgeback shrimp (*Sicyonia ingentis*), and sand crabs (*Emerita analoga*). Samples were collected between September 2003 and August 2004. The final report detailing the results of that study was submitted in April 2005 (MBC 2005).

Source Water Sampling

Source water sampling was conducted to determine the numbers of target taxa in the source water potentially at risk of entrainment. Samples collected at the entrainment station and at six other stations extending 2.5 miles (4 km) upcoast, downcoast, and offshore from the intake structures were used to estimate the source water populations at risk of entrainment. To determine composition and abundance of fish and target invertebrate larvae in the HBGS source water, sampling at these seven stations surrounding HBGS was conducted monthly in September and October 2003, twice per month in November 2003 through July 2004 (during the peak spawning period for fishes in late winter and spring) and once in August 2004. During each sampling event, two replicate tows with a plankton net were made four times per 24-hour period - once every six hours. Sampling cycles were initiated at approximately 1200, 1800, 2400, and 0600.

Entrainment Sampling

To determine composition and abundance of fish and target invertebrate larvae entrained by the generating station, sampling in the immediate proximity of the cooling water intake was conducted twice as frequently as source water sampling. Entrainment sampling was done monthly in September and October 2003, weekly from November 2003 through July 2004, and twice during August 2004. Plankton tows were performed in the same manner as for the source water samples and were done every six hours. Samples taken at the entrainment station in the vicinity of the intake were assumed to be representative of the number of each species that would pass into the intake with the cooling water.

Survey Results

Estimates of daily larval entrainment for the year of sampling were calculated from data collected at the entrainment station. Assessment of entrainment effects were limited to

the most abundant fish taxa that together comprised 90 percent of all larvae identified in the entrainment samples and/or juveniles and adults impinged by the cooling water system. Fish larvae from 57 different taxonomic groups were collected during the entrainment sampling surveys. However, many of these taxa were represented by only one or two individuals. Unidentifiable CIQ gobies (gobies of the genera *Clevelandia*, *Ilypnus*, and *Quietula*) were the most abundant fishes in the entrainment samples, comprising 37 percent of the total entrained individuals. The CIQ gobies complex is used to indicate one or more of several species of nearshore gobies whose larvae cannot be distinguished from each other. The gobies of the CIQ complex include arrow goby (*Clevelandia ios*), cheekspot goby (*Ilypnus gilberti*), and shadow goby (*Quietula y-cauda*). Other larval fish taxa that were abundant in entrainment samples included northern anchovy (18 percent), spotfin croaker (*Roncador stearnsii*, 14 percent), white croaker (*Genyonemus lineatus*, 7 percent), and queenfish (*Seriphus politus*, 5 percent). **BIOLOGY Table 1** compares the percentage of various fish taxa collected in the entrainment and source water samples.

BIOLOGY Table 1
Percentage of Fish Taxa Accounting for More than 1 Percent of the Total
Individuals in the Entrainment and Source Water Samples

Fish Taxon	Common Name	Percent of Individuals in Entrainment Samples	Percent of Individuals in Source Water Samples
Gobiidae (CIQ Complex)	gobies	36.95	36.82
Engraulidae	anchovies	17.98	17.62
<i>Roncador stearnsi</i>	spotfin croaker	13.57	0.37
<i>Genyonemus lineatus</i>	white croaker	6.53	8.65
<i>Seriphus politus</i>	queenfish	4.55	9.90
Sciaenidae	unidentified croakers	3.63	3.78
<i>Hysoblennius</i> spp.	blennies	2.47	3.06
<i>Xenistius californiensis</i>	salema	2.28	0.35
<i>Paralichthys californicus</i>	California halibut	1.46	2.78
Atherinopsidae	silversides	1.44	2.32
<i>Cheilotrema saturnum</i>	black croaker	1.43	0.43
<i>Hypsopsetta guttulata</i>	diamond turbot	1.29	0.85
<i>Paralabrax</i> spp.	kelp/sand bass	0.71	2.85
<i>Chromis punctipinnis</i>	blacksmith	0	1.16
<i>Sardinops sagax</i>	Pacific sardine	0.06	1.03
<i>Sphyraena argentea</i>	California barracuda	0.21	1.01

Six taxa comprised 80 percent of the total fish larvae collected from the *source water* samples: CIQ gobies (37 percent), northern anchovy (18 percent), queenfish (10 percent), white croaker (9 percent), unidentified croakers (4 percent), and combtooth blennies (*Hypsoblennius* spp.) (3 percent).

Five invertebrate taxa were selected for analysis, but only two (sand crab and rock crab) were collected in entrainment samples. Sand crab larvae accounted for nearly 99 percent of the entrained target invertebrate density.

Entrainment Impact Analysis

Because Units 3 and 4 were retired in 1995, entrainment losses incurred as a result of refurbishing the units represent a new source of entrainment. Units 3 and 4 were not operational at the time the application for the HBGS Retool Project was filed. Units 3 and 4 are permitted for the same amount of cooling water withdrawal as Units 1 and 2. Therefore, for the purposes of the impact analysis, Units 3 and 4 account for approximately half of the total cooling water flow and associated entrainment at HBGS.

Three approaches were used to estimate the impacts of entrainment. All approaches assumed 100 percent mortality of organisms entrained in the HBGS cooling water system. Given the uncertainty and the lack of evidence indicating otherwise, 100 percent mortality has been assumed in recent entrainment studies in California (e.g. Tenera 2000a). The TEAM agreed that 100 percent mortality would be assumed in the impact analysis and this assumption was part of the final study plan.

The first two approaches, adult equivalent loss (AEL) and fecundity hindcasting (FH), use demographic data to express entrainment losses in terms of adult fish. The third approach, the empirical transport model (ETM), provides the most comprehensive method to understanding ecosystem impacts of entrainment. It was the results from ETM that were relied upon by staff and the commenting agencies to determine the significance of entrainment impacts. This approach is based on the estimation of larvae lost relative to the number at risk. The ETM model calculates the proportion of the population of target species at risk of entrainment (P_m) within the geographic area (source water body) from which they could be entrained.

Unlike the AEL and FH models, which only estimate losses to a few target taxa and only express those losses in terms of adult fishes, the ETM model provides an estimate of the proportion of larvae lost over the area from which they are at risk of entrainment. The mean P_m of the target fish taxa is considered to be representative of the proportion of larvae lost of non-targeted fish species and also a reasonable estimate of the proportionate loss of all the organisms that are entrained assuming that life histories of targeted species are broad enough to encompass the breadth of species possibly entrained. If the proportion of organisms entrained is multiplied by the area over which they are at risk of entrainment, then one can estimate the equivalent amount of ocean habitat it would take to produce those lost resources. This area is referred to as the area of habitat production foregone (APF) (Stratus Consulting 2004). As an example, if an average of 10 percent of the targeted fish larvae (considered representative of all the planktonic organisms) is entrained in a source water body of 1,000 acres, then those losses are equivalent to the productivity of approximately 100 acres of coastal water.

The source water shoreline distance was determined by the length of time each target taxon is vulnerable to entrainment and available data on current movements in the project area. Because each taxon has a different period of vulnerability to entrainment, shoreline distances used in the analysis are different for each taxon. An estimate of the area of larval production lost due to entrainment (APF) was estimated by multiplying the P_m estimates by the alongshore source water length ($1/P_s$) and width of the source water area sampled (3 miles). Although the Final Entrainment and Impingement Study calculated APF using all the taxa that were abundant in the samples, the APF was recalculated based on comments received during an April 27, 2006, TEAM meeting. The APF for nearshore sandy habitat was calculated using all of the taxa in the assessment except for gobies that do not occur in the nearshore areas around HBGS as adults and northern anchovies that occur over a much larger area than the nearshore source water (Tenera Environmental 2006a). As described below an APF for CIQ copies was calculated separately.

Estimates of APF ranged from 0.04 to 1.17 square miles and averaged 0.3 square miles or 208 acres. This average APF for the target taxa is considered representative of all of the plankton lost to the HBGS intake. The impact analysis in the entrainment and impingement study was based on the permitted volume of water withdrawn by all four units. **BIOLOGY Table 2** summarizes these results for target taxa. Because the permitted withdrawal for Units 3 and 4 is half that of Units 1-4, the average area of habitat production foregone due to the HBGS Retool Project is half of 208 acres or 104 acres.

The ETM calculations for gobies were revised from those in the Final Entrainment and Impingement Study by using Proportional Entrainment estimates that incorporated both nearshore and estuarine larvae (Tenera Environmental 2006). The estimate of APF for CIQ gobies was based on adult habitat in three Orange County estuarine areas: Anaheim Bay/Huntington Beach Wetlands, Santa Ana River/Talbert Marsh, and Newport Bay. A conservative estimate of APF for CIQ gobies based on the total estuarine areas in these wetlands is 30.69 acres. For Units 3 and 4, the APF for CIQ gobies would be 15.35 acres.

This loss of habitat productivity represents a loss of functional value of native fish, wildlife, and plant habitat and a degradation of the foraging habitat of the endangered California least tern, endangered California brown pelican, and threatened western snowy plover. Up to 253.5 mgd of seawater is drawn into the HBGS cooling water system each day to cool Units 3 and 4. This seawater is not just water, it is habitat. A great diversity and abundance of plants and animals live in the water entrained to cool Units 3 and 4. These organisms include the small plants and animals that provide the base of the marine food chain as well as the young of many fish and invertebrate species. The large volume of seawater that is drawn into the power plant on a daily basis is full of living organisms. When the water is discharged back into the ocean, for all practical purposes, everything living in it is killed. The loss of planktonic organisms in hundreds of millions of gallons of seawater every day represents a substantial degradation of the marine environment. Although the water itself may not be physically lost, everything that lives in it is. An analogy would be clearing all the vegetation from a patch of ground and leaving the bare ground remaining or cutting off tidal flow from an

estuary. The State Water Resources Control Board in its recent proposed statewide policy on 316(b) regulations compared entrainment and impingement impacts to marine and estuarine wastewater discharges (SWRCB 2006). Effluent limitations on discharges are designed to prevent acute and chronic toxicity to aquatic life. When fish kills occur as a result of spills or discharges, enforcement actions usually are taken. The HBGS cooling water intake kills billions of organisms a year. If a discharge with similar impacts were proposed, it probably would not be allowed let alone declared insignificant with no mitigation required. Therefore, based on the significance criteria used in this analysis, staff considers entrainment losses due to water withdrawal for Units 3 and 4 to be significant.

The reduction in productivity, including the loss of fish and invertebrate larvae, will occur every day of every year that the HBGS is operating its cooling water system. Because of a lack of knowledge of fish demographics and a lack of understanding of the various factors affecting fish populations, it is not possible to know whether these ongoing entrainment losses, coupled with other environmental stressors, would cause any coastal population to drop below self-sustaining levels. However, some of the species with larvae entrained in greatest numbers have been declining in recent years. For example, Herbinson et al. (2001) showed by analyzing power plant impingement data that the populations of six croaker species (white croaker, yellowfin croaker (*Umbrina roncadore*), black croaker (*Cheilotrema saturnum*), California corbina (*Menticirrhus undulatus*), white sea bass (*Atractoscion nobilis*), and spotfin croaker), have declined in Southern California since 1977. Spotfin croaker and white croaker are among the species whose larvae are entrained in greatest number at HBGS. Therefore, entrainment losses at HBGS are affecting species currently in decline and contributing to cumulative impacts on these species.

BIOLOGY Table 2
Summary of Entrainment Modeling Estimates For
Target Taxa and Estimation of Area of Production Foregone*

Taxon	Estimated Annual Entrainment	P_m Alongshore Extrapolation	Area of Production Foregone (mi ²)
spotfin croaker	69,701,589	0.3% (10.1 mi)	0.085
queenfish	17,809,864	0.6% (50.9 mi)	0.911
white croaker	17,625,263	0.7% (28.7 mi)	0.583
black croaker	7,128,127	0.1% (11.6 mi)	0.039
salema	11,696,960	NA**	NA**
blennies	7,165,513	0.8% (7.7 mi)	0.170
diamond turbot	5,443,118	0.6% (10.1 mi)	0.170
California halibut	5,021,168	0.3% (18.5 mi)	0.131
rock crab	6,411,171	1.1% (15.9 mi)	0.486

*The along shore displacement (mi) used in the alongshore extrapolation of P_m is presented in parentheses next to the P_m estimate.

**Estimate not available due to low abundance in entrainment samples
Source: MBC 2005

One point to make clear about P_m values is that they are essentially meaningless without the context of the source water body. It is simply not informative to indicate that because P_m values are small the impact is small and not significant. Consider the extreme case of species A and B. The estimated P_m and source water bodies for these two species are 50 percent and 100 square meters, and 1 percent and 2,766,280,000 square meters (e.g., the CIQ Gobies). The argument that 50 percent is high and 1 percent is low makes no sense. This is precisely the reason APF estimates were developed. APF estimates for the two species are 50 meters square and 2,764,800 meters square respectively. Clearly, the impact to Species B is worse than that to Species A even though by P_m estimates the reverse would have been claimed. Indeed, in this case the impact to B is approximately 55,000 times that to A (even though the P_m of A is 50 times that of B).

The two other models, AEL and FH, used in the impact analysis expressed entrainment losses in terms of numbers of adult fishes. The AEL model calculates the number of adults that would have been produced from the entrained larvae by using available estimates of larval mortality rates applied to various life stages. The FH model is similar to the AEL model except that it is used to estimate the number of adult females that would have produced the number of larvae entrained.

Because of a lack of demographic data for many of the target entrained species, AEL and FH could only be assessed for a few taxa. AEL estimates were 304,125 individuals for northern anchovy and 147,493 individuals for CIQ gobies. FH estimates were 3,233 adult females for combtooth blennies, 26,745 adult females for northern anchovy, and 101,269 adult females for CIQ gobies. These numbers are for the year during which the entrainment study was conducted.

There is often a temptation to use FH and AEL models to assess impacts because both models yield adult fish lost, a straightforward concept to grasp. When life history data are available, AEL and FH models only provide insight into the entrainment impacts of certain species. Too often, particularly along the west coast, such data are lacking. Even when there are some survivorship data, variability in those estimates leads to very broad ranges in the estimates of impact (this broad range also occurs in ETM estimates) (Raimondi 2005). Mathematically we assume that our estimate of impact becomes more reliable with increasing sample size (meaning the number of species we are able to evaluate) and this underlies the primacy of ETM estimation for all recent entrainment assessments in California.

In addition, AEL and FH generally provide no means of estimating the losses of fish eggs, non-targeted fish larvae, non-targeted invertebrate larvae, phytoplankton, algal spores, and zooplankton species that spend their entire lives in the plankton. Furthermore, AEL and FH do not address the implications to the ecosystem from entrainment losses. The small organisms that are entrained in the once-through cooling system form the base of the coastal food chain. Therefore, entrainment losses represent not only the losses of the planktonic organisms themselves but loss of the

food base for much of the nearshore ecosystem. For these reasons, ETM provides a much better estimate of the true impacts of entrainment.

As discussed previously, the entrainment losses represent a loss not only of target species but also of all planktonic organisms. Therefore, the entrainment losses not only represent fish larvae that will be lost from the adult populations, but losses to all levels of the coastal food chain. Organisms lost to entrainment include species such as northern anchovy that are an important prey species for endangered birds such as the California brown pelican and the California least tern. The Federal Threatened western snowy plover, which forages on beaches near the HBGS, eats young sand crabs, and frequently entrained invertebrates include sand crab larvae. Although entrainment losses do not directly affect sensitive bird species, they represent a degradation of the sensitive species' foraging habitat.

The losses of marine organisms to the HBGS cooling water system are occurring in coastal southern California where the marine environment has been degraded by multiple stresses including impaired water quality, over fishing, and loss of tidal wetlands. Considerable effort, such as improvement in the quality of point and non-point source discharges, fisheries management, and wetlands restoration is being expended to reverse those trends. These efforts include the development of total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) of pollutants and the implementation of various methods to meet those limits, moratoriums on various fisheries as well as the establishment of marine life preserves, and restoration of tidal wetlands including the Bolsa Chica Wetlands in Huntington Beach. Thus, the loss of marine resources to the HBGS cooling water system represents a source of degradation to an environment that a variety of state, federal, and local agencies are trying to maintain and restore.

The commenting resource agencies have concurred with staff's determination that the losses of marine resources caused by the intake of cooling water for Units 3 and 4 is a significant impact that requires mitigation. Section 395 (b)(4)(A) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*) specifies that if NMFS determines that any action undertaken by any state or federal agency would affect any Essential Fish Habitat (EFH), it shall recommend measures that can be taken by such agency to conserve such habitat. NMFS has concluded that an adverse effect to EFH is currently occurring from the entrainment and impingement of fishes by the HBGS cooling water system (Chambers 2005). NMFS also stated that it believes AES is contributing to a cumulative marine fishery loss caused by coastal power generation in southern California. NMFS recommended mitigation, particularly wetland restoration and artificial reef construction, to offset those impacts.

CDFG is a commenting agency regarding the assessment of impacts to California fish and wildlife. CDFG stated, "The Department believes the estimated annual impingement and entrainment losses of juvenile and adult fishes resulting from the operation of the AES meets the criteria as significant. As such, mitigation to offset these losses should be required for the continued operation of the AES" (Ugoretz 2005).

The RWQCB also is a commenting agency on the Energy Commission analysis. The RWQCB stated in an email to the TEAM: "Regional Board staff supports your finding of significance and proposed mitigation" (Theisen 2006).

The California Coastal Commission is charged with determining whether proposed coastal projects are in conformance with the California Coastal Act. Policy 30230 of the California Coastal Act states that marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored and that special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. This policy specifies also that uses of the marine environment be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms. Policy 30231 states that biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of wastewater discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of groundwater supplies and substantial interference with surface water flow, encouraging wastewater reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams. The California Coastal Commission has concluded that the HBGS cooling water intake causes a significant environmental impact, which, if left unmitigated, would be inconsistent with Coastal Act Policies expressed in Public Resources Code Sections 30230 and 30231 (Luster 2005). Thus, based on the findings of the resource agencies, mitigation is required to provide compliance with Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards.

Results of the Impingement Study

For the impingement study, samples were collected from the screening facility within the generating station. Samples collected weekly during normal operations were used to characterize fish losses from the day-to-day operation of the generating station. Normal operations samples were collected over a 24-hour period. Samples also were collected during heat treatments, when waters within the cooling water intake structure were heated and essentially all fishes and invertebrates succumbed to the high temperatures. Heat treatment procedures were carried out at approximately eight-week intervals to control biofouling. Combined normal operation and heat treatment samples were used to estimate the annual loss of fishes and invertebrates due to impingement.

A total of 52 normal operation impingement surveys and 6 heat treatment surveys were conducted between July 2003 and July 2004. A total of 51,082 fishes representing 57 species were impinged during this period with most (75 percent) of the losses occurring during heat treatments. The biomass of fishes lost to impingement was estimated to be 1,292 kg. The fish species impinged in greatest numbers was queenfish, accounting for 70 percent of the impinged fishes. Other fish species impinged in high numbers were white croaker, shiner perch (*Cymatogaster aggregata*), and northern anchovy. A total of 70,638 macroinvertebrates of 37 species were impinged with most (98 percent) of the losses attributable to normal operations. The impinged invertebrates weigh a total of 168 kg. The invertebrate species impinged in the greatest numbers were the nudibranch *Dendronotus frondosus*, yellow rock crab (*Cancer anthonyi*), slender rock crab (*C. gracilis*), and brown rock crab (*C. antennarius*). These impingement losses, although not large, add to the impacts of entrainment because they affect the same ecosystem and many of the same species.

Mitigation Options for Entrainment and Impingement Impacts

Capping cooling water volumes at a level lower than the permitted maximum used in the entrainment analysis would reduce the impacts of entrainment. Since Units 3 and 4 were brought on-line, the average daily cooling water flow of Units 1-4 has been 330 mgd or approximately 65 percent of the permitted flow for all 4 units. AES indicated it would consider (but did not commit to) capping cooling water volumes at an annual average flow of 126.7 mgd for Units 3 and 4, or half their permitted flow of 253.5 mgd. The APF was recalculated based on this volume (Tenera 2006b). AES provided three likely scenarios of seasonal reductions of the 253.5 mgd permitted flow of Units 3 and 4 that were used in the calculations (**BIOLOGY Table 3**).

BIOLOGY Table 3
Flow Reduction Scenarios for Units 3 and 4

Scenario	1st Quarter Percent of Maximum	2nd Quarter Percent of Maximum	3rd Quarter Percent of Maximum	4th Quarter Percent of Maximum	Calculated APF
1	25	50	80	45	66.8
2	30	40	90	40	69.5
3	20	40	100	40	74.7

The recalculation took into consideration the monthly variability of larval abundance. With the lower intake volumes, the APF was 66.8 acres for Scenario 1 to 74.7 acres for Scenario 3. The reduced cooling water flow would result in a reduction in entrainment, but substantial losses of marine life from entrainment and impingement would still occur. During the July 25, 2006 workshop, the Siting Committee indicated that it is reluctant to limit the ability of HBGS to provide power by capping cooling water flows. Staff acknowledges the concern, and therefore, reduction in cooling water flows, although considered, is not a recommended option for the mitigation of Units 3 and 4 entrainment impacts.

The analysis of potential methods to reduce entrapment of larger organisms and subsequent impingement at HBGS included technologies, such as behavioral barriers, screening options, fish return systems, and operational measures such as intake relocation and flow reduction. The HBGS intake already is equipped with a velocity cap that reduces fish entrapment and subsequent impingement by up to 90 percent. Although the velocity cap greatly reduces impingement, tens of thousands of fishes and invertebrates are still impinged at HBGS. No practical method was identified that would further reduce entrapment and impingement at HBGS. There are no known applications of behavioral barriers or devices including sonic stimuli, lights, and bubble curtains that have been proven successful in an offshore marine environment. Offshore screening devices such as barrier nets or aquatic filter barriers are unlikely to be feasible in the open ocean coastal environment of HBGS. Fish return systems have been reasonably successful at other power plants, but a fish return structure at HBGS is complicated by the fact that the structure would need to be directed underground beneath the Pacific Coast Highway and Huntington State Beach and likely would incur substantial mortality of target fish species. Intake relocation and flow reduction have not

been demonstrated to reduce impingement. Several of the potential methodologies, such as modified screens and intake redesign and/or relocation, not only have not been demonstrated to be effective, but also are likely to be prohibitively expensive.

Habitat restoration of a sufficient amount of coastal habitat near HBGS is recommended as the most appropriate mitigation to offset the loss of habitat productivity due to entrainment and impingement. Restoration of coastal habitat to mitigate entrainment and impingement losses is consistent with other recent Energy Commission siting cases such as the Moss Landing Power Plant. In California, there is a history of using restoration of tidal wetlands to mitigate for impacts to coastal species. For example, restoration of the San Dieguito Wetlands was part of the mitigation for entrainment and impingement losses at San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS). Tidal wetlands provide nursery habitat for many nearshore species and export organic matter that enhances coastal food chains.

In recent power plant cases, tidal wetlands restoration proposed to compensate for the loss of productivity due to entrainment and impingement has been at a ratio of 1:1 or 1 acre of wetlands restored for 1 acre of habitat production foregone. These cases have been for power plants that have intakes in wetland or harbor areas. Huntington Beach has a coastal intake. In most instances where mitigation is done in an out-of-kind habitat, the mitigation ratio is greater than 1:1. However, open coast habitats are believed to be less productive than estuarine habitats, although insufficient data exist to make a direct quantitative comparison. For SONGS, wetland restoration was used to compensate for the effects of a coastal intake and in that case resource value resulting from habitat creation was used in the estimation of wetland area to be created. Note that no formal algorithm was used to come up with the mitigation area for SONGS, and that the impacts due to entrainment were assessed using AEL estimation for a small set of species. Tidal wetland restoration has been considered appropriate because tidal wetlands have been found to be productive and provide other benefits to coastal waters in addition to compensating directly for lost productivity. These benefits include cleansing pollutants from run-off before it enters the ocean, providing foraging and resting areas for seabirds such as terns, gulls, and pelicans that may be affected by diminishment of food resources due to impingement and entrainment, and increasing the diversity of coastal habitats. Furthermore, previous wetlands restoration projects in southern California, such as restoration of Batiquitos Lagoon to compensate for fill in the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, have been extremely successful in providing the targeted ecological benefits. Thus, there is an acceptable level of certainty that a tidal wetlands restoration will be successful.

Coastal wetlands restoration costs typically range between \$20,000 and \$100,000 per acre when easy fixes are available, such as removal of dikes and berms, or when projects are based on enhancement of existing wetlands rather than on creation of new wetlands. Wetland restoration costs may significantly exceed that range. Restoration of the Bolsa Chica Wetlands in Huntington Beach (not including acquisition costs) exceeded \$250,000 per acre (B. Hoffman, NOAA Fisheries, personal communication, 2006). Based on the assumption that most wetland mitigation opportunities in southern California are likely to be enhancement, not creation (unlike SONGS), the cost estimate to restore an amount of tidal wetlands equivalent to the mean area of habitat production foregone of 104 acres due to operation of Units 3 and 4 would cost anywhere between

\$2,080,000 and \$26,000,000. Because of the number of constraints encountered in restoring tidal flow to coastal wetlands in highly urbanized southern California, restoration costs for southern California tidal wetlands would be expected to be at the higher end of that range. The cost would be much more if wetlands were created (note that the gain in resources per acre would be much higher also). The reason it is more expensive to restore tidal wetlands in urban areas is because when tidal flows are increased, considerable engineering is usually involved to make sure that the introduction of greater volumes of water does not flood roads, buildings, and other structures. In addition, many southern California wetlands were used for oil and gas development and have contaminants that must be removed.

Restoration of habitat to restore lost habitat productivity is most appropriate if the restoration site is in close proximity to the location of the impacts. This is because a habitat restoration project near the area of habitat loss will directly compensate the area that is suffering the loss. A more distant restoration project may benefit some of the affected resources, but it may not directly benefit the impacted ecosystem. Although a restoration project in the immediate vicinity of HBGS would subject organisms produced within the restored wetlands to risk of entrainment, only a portion of these organisms will be lost while many will survive to repopulate the ecosystem. In addition, coastal wetlands provide many benefits that will not be affected by entrainment. These benefits include the export of nutrients to coastal waters, the production of forage fish such as topsmelt within the estuary to feed species such as least terns, nursery habitats for flatfish, the creation of habitat for sensitive species such as the western snowy plover, and the cleansing of runoff before it enters the ocean. Opportunities have been identified to restore tidal habitat in the immediate vicinity of HBGS.

Huntington Beach Wetlands

The Huntington Beach Wetlands Conservancy recently finalized a plan for restoration of the Huntington Beach Wetlands, which are located immediately down coast and to the northwest of HBGS (Moffatt & Nichol 2006). These wetlands collectively total 191 acres. The restoration plan includes two subtidal basins designed to provide habitat (and nursery habitats) for coastal fishes. The restoration is planned for three phases. The first phase would consist of restoration of 27-acre Talbert Marsh and 43-acre Magnolia Marsh for an estimated cost of about \$5.46 million. The second phase is restoration of 67-acre Brookhurst Marsh for an estimated cost of \$6.05 million. The third phase would be restoration of the 54-acre Newland Marshes, which are in three separate parcels, for a total estimated cost of \$2.75 million. Conceptual restoration alternatives have already been developed by the Huntington Beach Wetlands Conservancy, but no funding source for the restoration has been identified. Preliminary cost estimates to implement Phases 1 through 3 of the Huntington Beach Wetlands restoration plan is approximately \$14.26 million (Moffatt & Nichol 2006). Once the initial restoration of the wetlands is implemented, operation, monitoring and maintenance costs would be \$149,767 per year (Gorman 2006).

Restoration of all or part of the Huntington Beach Wetlands would enhance coastal habitat in the immediate vicinity of HBGS and would benefit, either directly or indirectly, species entrained and impinged on the HBGS intake. For example, the proposed wetlands restoration would enhance existing tidal basins and create new basins that

would provide habitat for fish species that are directly impacted by the HBGS intake. The wetlands would provide foraging and resting habitat for California least terns, western snowy plovers, California brown pelicans and other species whose ecosystem has been degraded by entrainment and impingement losses due to operation of Units 3 and 4.

Compensation must include an understanding of the level of restoration. Wetlands restoration enhances the value of degraded wetlands but does not create new wetlands. For the SONGS wetland restoration, models suggested that the enhancement of existing wetlands would increase their habitat value by about 25 percent. The Huntington Beach Wetlands already have certain wetlands functional values and, therefore, like the SONGS wetlands restoration, enhancement would increase their value by less than 100 percent. The Huntington Beach Wetlands vary in their existing value to species impacted by the HBGS intake so the level of enhancement would vary depending on the area. Talbert Marsh already has tidal flow. Therefore, improvement of this part of the wetlands (by dredging sediment and improving subtidal habitat) would result in a relatively small gain in benefits for coastal species. On the other hand, Magnolia, Brookhurst, and Newland Marshes are currently isolated from tidal flow so the gain would be relatively great although less than the 100 percent benefit of creation. Determination of the proper ratio of enhancement to mitigate for HBGS losses should also consider resources values conferred by the restoration that are in addition to those lost due to entrainment. The highly productive tidal wetlands would export organic material that would stimulate the coastal food chain and compensate for the loss in productivity to entrainment. The wetlands would remove pollutants from urban run-off and, thus, improve the health of the nearshore ocean ecosystem in the vicinity of HBGS. Furthermore, restoration of the Huntington Beach Wetlands has the advantage that restoration plans have already been developed.

In summary, determining the ratio of wetlands restoration to APF for entrainment impacts at Units 3 and 4 must consider several factors. First, the mitigation is out-of-kind. The habitat directly affected by HBGS entrainment would not be created or restored and some impacted species would benefit more than others. However, tidal wetlands probably are more productive than nearshore soft bottom habitat and, also, provide more benefits than subtidal sand bottom habitat. Finally, the proposed restoration would restore degraded habitat rather than create new habitat. Taking all of these factors into consideration, a ratio of one acre of wetlands restoration at Huntington Beach is proposed for one acre of production foregone due to entrainment by Units 3 and 4.

Based on a total wetlands restoration cost of \$14.26 million, the initial costs to restore the Huntington Beach Wetlands is \$74,660 per acre. The cost to operate and maintain the wetlands is \$149,767 per year or \$784 per acre per year. Therefore, the cost to restore the 104 acres of wetlands habitat that would replace the loss of productivity due to entrainment in the cooling water system for Units 3 and 4 and maintain those wetlands for the 10-year life of the AES license for Units 3 and 4 would be \$7,956,000.

Santa Ana River

There is degraded wetlands habitat near the Santa Ana River mouth approximately 2 miles southeast of HBGS that could be restored to tidal flow. However, no plan has been developed for restoration of these wetlands, and the property is privately owned and would need to be purchased.

Artificial Reefs

Creation of artificial reefs near HBGS might increase coastal fish productivity and mitigate for entrainment and impingement losses at HBGS. Again, however, no plans have been developed for artificial reef construction near HBGS. Furthermore, construction of artificial reefs benefit species associated with hard bottom habitat. The species most affected by the HBGS intake are either estuarine species (CIQ gobies), water column species (anchovies), or species associated with soft bottom habitat (spotfin croaker, white croaker, queenfish).

Because of the lack of restoration plans, Santa Ana River Wetlands restoration or artificial reef construction would take longer to implement than restoration of the Huntington Beach Wetlands.

BIOLOGY Table 4 summarizes each mitigation option.

**BIOLOGY Table 4
Summary of Mitigation Options**

Project Name	Acres	Advantages	Disadvantages
Huntington Beach Wetlands <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase I Talbert & Magnolia (70 acres) • Phase II Brookhurst (67 acres) • Phase III Newland (54 acres) 	191 (total)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • close proximity to HBGS • benefits species affected by HBGS • restoration plans already developed • restoration can be done in phases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high total restoration cost for entire wetlands
Santa Ana River Mouth	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restore degraded wetland habitat to tidal flow • close proximity to HBGS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no restoration plans in place • property must be purchased
Artificial Reefs	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential to increase coastal fish productivity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more beneficial to species less affected by HBGS • no planning has been done for design or siting of reefs

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Cumulative impacts refers to two or more individual and similar effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. Entrainment and impingement impacts of HBGS will act in a cumulative fashion with entrainment and impingement at other coastal power plants in southern California. A first-order analysis of cumulative entrainment and impingement impacts from 12 coastal power plants in southern California was performed as part of the HBGS entrainment and impingement study (MBC 2005). Modeling results showed that the average entrainment mortality was 1.4 percent for a larval duration of 40 days using a source water volume out to the 75 meter isobath. Restricting the source water to the 35 meter isobath increased the average estimated mortality to 4.4 percent. HBGS mortality rates were calculated to be between 5.4 and 5.6 percent of the cumulative mortality from the 12 intake locations.

Southern California fish impingement was estimated at nearly 3.7 million fishes weighing over 26,400 kg (58,000 lbs) in 2003, with impingement at the SONGS representing 97 percent of impingement abundance and 83 percent of biomass. Cumulative macroinvertebrate impingement was estimated at over 77,600 individuals with a weight of 1,366 kg (3,005 lbs) in 2003 with HBGS representing 91 percent of the macroinvertebrate impingement but only 12 percent of the biomass. Although macroinvertebrate abundance was highest at HBGS, biomass was not that high compared to other power plants, because the species impinged in greatest numbers at HBGS was a small nudibranch.

In addition to acting cumulatively with entrainment and impingement at other coastal power plants, entrainment and impingement at HBGS acts cumulatively on marine resources with other natural and human stresses to the marine environment. These impacting agents include climate shifts, loss of tidal wetlands, point and non-point source pollution, and fishing.

This preliminary study did not specifically determine the significance of these cumulative losses. However, because entrainment and impingement losses at individual power plants have been found to be significant in recent studies, it can be inferred that cumulative losses also would be significant especially in places where several power plants are located in close proximity to each other. Furthermore, the declining health of California's ocean waters, due to multiple factors, has been the cause of much recent concern (CRA/USEPA 2004). The loss of marine organisms due to the intake of cooling water for Units 3 and 4 of HBGS contributes to this significant degradation. Therefore, once-through cooling of Units 3 and 4 contribute to significant cumulative impacts on the nearshore environment. Restoration of tidal wetlands as identified in this analysis would mitigate the loss of productivity from once-through cooling of Units 3 and 4. The proposed mitigation, thus, would offset Units 3 and 4 contribution to cumulative degradation of the southern California marine environment.

CONCLUSIONS

The entrainment and impingement study required by Condition of Certification **BIO-4** estimated that entrainment by the HBGS cooling water system was equivalent to a

mean APF of 208 acres for coastal fish species and 30.69 acres for CIQ gobies (Tenera Environmental 2006). Of this habitat production foregone, entrainment at the restarted HBGS Units 3 and 4 accounts for half of the total, or 104 acres for coastal fishes and 15.35 acres for CIQ gobies.

To determine the significance of these impacts, staff used Mandatory Findings of Significance under CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 1605 (a)(1)). An impact to biological resources is considered significant:

- if state- or federal-listed species, state Fully Protected species, candidates for state or federal listing and/or Species of Concern are impacted;
- if migration of a species is interrupted;
- if there is a reduction of native fish, wildlife and plant habitat;
- if a fish or wildlife population is caused to drop below self-sustaining levels;
- if a wetlands, marsh, riparian area or other wildlife habitat is disturbed;
- if there is substantial degradation in the quality of the environment.

In addition, CEQA Guidelines specify a Mandatory Finding of Significance if the project has possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable (CEQA Guidelines Section 16065(a)(3)).

This loss of habitat productivity represents a loss of functional value of native fish, wildlife, and plant habitat, a disturbance to wildlife habitat, and an overall substantial degradation of the coastal environment in the vicinity of HBGS. Although entrainment losses do not directly affect sensitive bird species, they represent a degradation of the foraging habitat of the endangered California least tern, endangered California brown pelican, and threatened western snowy plover. Therefore, based on CEQA Mandatory Findings of Significance, the entrainment impacts of the cooling water intake for Units 3 and 4 are significant. Furthermore, once-through cooling of Units 3 and 4 contributes to significant cumulative impacts on the nearshore environment. Impingement impacts are relatively small but contribute to the impacts of entrainment because many of the same species are affected. Condition of Certification **BIO-5** requires that if the study determines that significant impacts are occurring, the project owner will provide funds for mitigation/compensation for impacts to Southern California Bight aquatic resources. Restricting water intake to a level below the permitted amount, if feasible, would reduce entrainment impacts, although even with reduced flow there would still be a substantial loss of marine life to entrainment and additional losses to impingement. Several opportunities for habitat restoration in the vicinity of HBGS have been identified that, if implemented, would reduce the impacts of entrainment and impingement to insignificant.

Condition of Certification **BIO-6** required that the project owner conduct a study to determine if there was a feasible methodology that would greatly reduce the number of fishes trapped in the intake forebay. The study was conducted as required. Staff agreed with the conclusions of the study that there was no feasible method proven to be effective in the southern California coastal environment that would reduce impingement losses at HBGS. The HBGS intake already has a velocity cap, which is estimated to reduce entrainment and subsequent impingement by up to 90 percent.

The impacts of cooling water intake for Units 3 and 4 would be fully mitigated by restoring 104 acres of the Huntington Beach Wetlands. The cost to restore the 104 acres of wetlands and maintain those wetlands for the 10-year life of the AES license for Units 3 and 4 would be \$7,956,000. Therefore, staff recommends that AES contribute \$7,956,000 to the Huntington Beach Wetlands Conservancy to restore wetlands habitat equivalent to an APF of 104 acres. This recommendation will satisfy Condition of Certification **BIO-5**.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON APRIL 27, 2006 DRAFT ANALYSIS

AES HUNTINGTON BEACH, L.L.C.

AES-1: The results of the IM&E Study do not support a finding of significant impacts, even applying the staff's criteria. The methodology applied by staff seeks to rely on an evaluation (that includes unsubstantiated assumptions) and incorporates considerations outside the scope of the study as required by Condition of Certification BIO-5. Moreover, it appears staff is interpreting all entrainment losses as a significant impact requiring mitigation.

Response: The Staff Analysis is a CEQA equivalent process and, therefore, uses significance criteria defined by CEQA. By those criteria, the losses of the planktonic organisms in the hundreds of millions of gallons a day that is entrained to cool Units 3 and 4 is a significant impact. Although entrainment does not result in a physical loss of habitat, it results in the loss of virtually all of the organisms that are small enough to be entrained in the large volumes of cooling water that are used on a daily basis. The physical, chemical, and biological interactions within a habitat define the habitat's functions. Biological functions include providing habitat for reproduction, feeding, and resting. When plankton in a large volume of water are killed by entrainment, that water will have lost part of its function as reproductive habitat by killing the output of reproduction (i.e. larvae and spores) and part of its function as feeding habitat because the small planktonic organisms that form the base of the food chain are killed. Hence, that water will have suffered a functional loss. Loss of native fish habitat is a mandatory finding of significance under CEQA. Under CEQA, loss can include functional as well as physical loss. Secondly, although direct impacts to listed species attributable to the power plant are not occurring, the AES intake is killing fishes and invertebrates on which listed species feed. In some years, the Huntington Beach colony of the state- and federal-listed California least tern has failed because of inadequate food supplies. Therefore, the entrainment and impingement of fishes and invertebrates at AES is contributing to the degradation of foraging habitat for listed species. Thirdly, the intake of hundreds of millions of gallons a day of seawater and the killing of virtually everything that lives in that water clearly are a substantial degradation of the environment, a mandatory finding of significance under CEQA. Finally, the health of coastal ecosystems and many fish species is a cause of extreme concern. The entrainment of marine organisms in power plants is contributing to significant cumulative effects on coastal species, also a finding of significance under CEQA.

AES-2: Staff should take the following factors into consideration: (1) incorporate demographics into the analysis; (2) recognize habitat differences between the nearshore coastal waters and the wetlands recommended for restoration; and (3) utilize correct APF estimates and actual flow from Units 3 & 4; and (4) consider the life of the project.

Response: As explained in the analysis, demographics, although considered, were not relied upon as heavily as the ETM approach in determining impact significance and identifying mitigation requirements because the information needed for demographic models is only available for a few fish species and because demographic analyses do not address the ecological losses to fish habitat incurred by entrainment. The analysis does recognize the habitat differences between nearshore coastal waters and the wetlands recommended for restoration. The APF estimates have been revised, but are still based on permitted flow. It was agreed in the approved study plan that permitted flow would be used. Because AES has been permitted to take up to 253.5 mgd to cool Units 3 and 4, that is the appropriate volume to use unless AES is willing to commit to a lower daily maximum. Unless impacts can be characterized as temporary, Findings of Significance under CEQA do not consider the life of a project. The impacts of Units 3 and 4 have been occurring for several years and will occur for at least several more years; they are not temporary. Based on Mandatory Findings of Significance under CEQA, these impacts have been determined to be significant, and therefore, mitigation is required.

AES-3: We do not believe that the evidence presented in the staff report supports the finding of significant impacts. Condition of Certification BIO-4 required a one-year study of entrainment and impingement at the AES Huntington Beach Generating Station. Condition of Certification BIO-5 required AES Huntington Beach to provide funds for mitigation/compensation for impacts to Southern California Bight fish populations *"if the entrainment and impingement study determines that significant impacts to one or more species of coastal fish is occurring"*.

Response: Please see the response to Comment **AES-1**. The Staff Analysis is the Energy Commission's CEQA-equivalent impact analysis and as such, must use significance criteria that are consistent with the CEQA guidelines. By those guidelines, substantial degradation of the environment and loss of the planktonic organisms in the seawater that is entrained to cool Units 3 and 4 is a significant impact. Loss of the entrained plankton constitutes a loss to the food web and a loss of reproductive output, hence, a functional loss of the seawater habitat that is entrained. The fishes and invertebrates that are lost to entrainment are part of the food base for endangered and threatened bird species and, thus, the operation of Units 3 and 4 is degrading their foraging habitat. Indirect effects on other species are an appropriate measure of the significance of a direct effect on a target species. Clearly, entrainment of organisms in coastal power plants is contributing to cumulative degradation of the California coastal environment and, as such, meets the Mandatory Findings of Significance under CEQA.

The commenter's contention that entrainment impacts are not significant is inconsistent with current thinking about entrainment and impingement impacts. Under the new rules for Section 316(b) of the Clean Water Act, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recognizes the adverse impacts of once-through cooling by effectively prohibiting new

power plants from using once-through cooling systems and by requiring existing facilities to reduce entrainment by 60 to 90 percent. Similarly, on April 13, 2006, the California State Lands Commission proposed a resolution discouraging once-through cooling in coastal power plants because "once-through cooling significantly harms the environment by killing large numbers of fish and other wildlife, larvae and eggs as they are drawn through the screens and other parts of the power plant cooling system." (California State Lands Commission 2006).

AES-4: Commission staff did not define "functional value", nor did they present the line of logic that led to the conclusion that functional value is being lost due to entrainment. Furthermore, foraging habitat could not be significantly impacted when estimated losses to the source population of larvae due to entrainment averaged less than one percent.

Response: Please see the response to Comments **AES-1** and **AES-3** above for an explanation of functional value. The AES intake entrains the larvae of fish species that are eaten by listed bird species and impinges adults of these species. The intake also entrains the food of the fishes that are eaten by listed bird species. The loss of prey organisms is a degradation of the foraging habitat. As discussed in the revised staff document, the assertion that a low P_m means a low level of impact is deceptive. P_m values are essentially meaningless without the context of the source water body. It is simply not informative to indicate that because P_m values are small the impact is small and not significant. Consider the extreme case of species A and B. The estimated P_m and source water bodies for these two species are 50 percent and 100 meters square, and 1 percent and 2,766,280,000 square meters (e.g., the CIQ Gobies). The argument that 50 percent is high and 1 percent is low makes no sense. This is precisely the reason APF estimates were developed. APF estimates for the two species are 50 meters square and 2,764,800 meters square respectively. Clearly, the impact to Species B is worse than that to Species A even though by P_m estimates the reverse would have been claimed. Indeed, in this case the impact to B is approximately 55,000 times that to A (even though the P_m of A is 50 times that of B).

AES-5: The current Empirical Transport Model (ETM) calculations do not include adjustments for compensation. It is difficult to perceive a situation where there would be absolutely no compensation for a mortality source that occurs during the larval stage when the processes of natural mortality are so high. This is especially true when the estimated mortality is so low relative to the variation in the natural sources of mortality.

Response: The concept of increased reproduction or survival to "compensate" for the losses incurred by entrainment and impingement has been raised and rejected many times, for example by the EPA in its formulation of new rules for power plant cooling water intakes under 316(b) (USEPA 2001, 2004). Nisbet et al (1996) concluded, "Optimistic outcomes (of compensation) all appear to demand mechanisms that have not been proved in *any* marine fish *anywhere*." The USEPA (2004) reviewed compensation as it might apply to entrainment and impingement impacts, and concluded that the potential for compensation may, in conjunction with other impacts such as fishing, be compromised by once-through cooling systems. With multiple impacts including entrainment and impingement, "depensation," the opposite of compensation, may occur reducing the ability of populations to recover after their abundance has been reduced. In addition, recruitment of coastal marine fishes and

invertebrates is highly variable, but once-through cooling systems operate without any consideration of variations in larval recruitment. Cooling-water volumes do not "compensate" by reducing flows when natural larval survival is low.

AES-6: During the one-year Entrainment and Impingement Study, an insignificant number of sand crab megalopae were collected in entrainment samples (during one survey in April 2004). Direct effects on juvenile/adult sand crabs could not be estimated based on the lack of necessary life history information. Therefore, there is no basis for asserting effects on bird populations and this should not be the subject of staff's analysis."

Response: Prey items of listed bird populations are killed by the intake of seawater to cool Units 3 and 4. Loss of food resources is degradation of foraging habitat. Whether loss of some portion of the prey population would have any measurable effects on the bird populations probably depends on multiple factors and varies from year to year. However, food resources are critical to these bird species and often are in short supply. Although only two sand crab megalops were collected during the entrainment and impingement study, many Stage 1 sand crab zoea were collected. The entrainment estimate for the study period was 465,806,877 zoea. What this means to the foraging base of the threatened western snowy plover is unknown, but, clearly, large numbers of sand crab larvae are being lost to entrainment.

AES-7: The IM&E Study did not demonstrate that any of these criteria were met. For all of the reasons above, a finding of significant impact to coastal fish or any other habitat is not justified.

Response: Please see the responses to Comments **AES-1** and **AES-3**.

AES-8: It is inappropriate to scale a coastal wetland restoration project based on nearshore sampling assuming a 1:1 replacement ratio....If restoration is required for the HBGS, a similar Habitat Equivalency Approach (HEA) should be used.

Response: The HEA approach was never discussed by the TEAM and was not part of the final study plan. A HEA was done for the Morro Bay Power Plant, but the results were not relied upon in the decision making process. The analyses done here are consistent with what was done at the Moss Landing Power Plant.

AES-9: Commission staff should not ignore the results of the demographic modeling, which was required by the Commission. The results for omitting these estimates from the mitigation recommendations should be explained.

Response: Please see the response to Comment **AES-2**. Also, as explained in the revised analysis, AEL and FH models only provide insight into the entrainment impacts of certain species. Too often, particularly along the west coast, such data are lacking. Even when there are some survivorship data, variability in the estimates lead to very broad ranges in the estimates of impact (this broad range also occurs in ETM estimates). Mathematically we assume that our estimate of impact becomes more reliable with increasing sample size (meaning the number of species we are able to evaluate) and this underlies the advantage of ETM estimation, which can be done for

many more species. Analysis using AEL and/or FH was only done for three species in the HBGS study. ETM has been the primary tool for assessing impacts and determining mitigation for all recent entrainment assessments in California.

In addition, AEL and FH generally provide no means of estimating the losses of fish eggs, non-targeted fish larvae, non-targeted invertebrate larvae, phytoplankton, algal spores, and zooplankton species that spend their entire lives in the plankton. Furthermore, AEL and FH do not address the implications to the ecosystem from entrainment losses. The small organisms that are entrained in the once-through cooling system form the base of the coastal food chain. Therefore, entrainment losses represent not only the losses of the planktonic organisms themselves, but loss of the food base for much of the nearshore ecosystem. For these reasons, ETM provides a much better estimate of the true impacts of entrainment.

AES-10: The APF estimates presented in the Entrainment and Impingement Study Final report averaged 1.5 km², which is equivalent to 370.6 acres not 384 acres. This average includes values for CIQ gobies and northern anchovy whose spawning habitat lies outside the nearshore source water areas used in the APF estimates.

Response: The APF estimates in the document have been revised to address these comments.

AES-11: The entrainment estimates were also derived using a conservative set of assumptions, including maximum cooling water flow and 0% survival on passage through the cooling water system. Recent entrainment survival data indicate there is some survival of larval fishes on passage through the cooling water system.

Response: Those assumptions were agreed upon by the TEAM in the study plan. Those assumptions also are standard in all recent entrainment studies in California. Although some studies have indicated that some entrained organisms are alive when they exit the cooling water system, there are no studies of the subsequent survivorship and reproduction of these individuals in nature versus the survivorship and fecundity of similar individuals that are not entrained. Because of this uncertainty and the lack of evidence indicating that entrained organisms survive to reproduce, 100 percent mortality has been assumed in all recent California entrainment studies, and was agreed upon by the TEAM for this study plan.

AES-12: Units 3 and 4 account for one-half of the maximum flow permitted at AES Huntington Beach. However, it is incorrect to assume that repowered Units 3 and 4 account for one-half of the actual cooling water flow.

Response: The assumption that the maximum cooling water flow would be used in the Entrainment and Impingement Study was agreed upon by the TEAM. Because AES has the authority to use up to the permitted volume to cool these units, it is the appropriate volume to use for the analysis.

AES-13: The value of APF is that it converts the somewhat abstract concept of larval mortality into the more tangible concept of habitat. Although APF may be a useful model for conceptualizing the magnitude of the impact implied by ETM it should *not* be

interpreted literally. The APF estimate is the size of an area that would be impacted if all effects were concentrated into a single site that received 100 percent larval loss. First, there is no such area where all the larval fish died or where there is no recruitment. The effects of entrainment are widespread and diluted over a large area.

Response: While the APF does not represent a physical loss of habitat, it provides a context for the losses by identifying the amount of habitat it would take to replace those losses. Whether the losses are concentrated in one area or spread out over a larger area, the losses to the populations still occur.

AES-14: Second, after HBGS entrainment ceases the effects will diminish over time at a rate dependent upon the species life history (i.e., age of maturity, fecundity)... Populations can recoup from the loss of individuals, while habitat loss is much more difficult to recover. The APF concept has the tendency to equate individual loss with habitat loss, and this is a misperception.

Response: Consideration for the limited license for Units 3 and 4 was addressed in response to Comment **AES-2**. CEQA does not consider project life in determining significance. A finding of significance was made using CEQA criteria and because impacts were determined to be significant, mitigation is required. Populations may or may not recover from losses of individuals. At this time, the losses are occurring on a daily basis. Every day all the small organisms in hundreds of millions of gallons of seawater are being killed to cool Units 3 and 4. This is not a one-time scattered loss but an ongoing degradation of the environment. The APF, although not a physical loss, helps to visualize the magnitude of those losses, and, most importantly, the amount of area that is needed to compensate for the losses.

AES-15: Third, any reasonable model of zoogeography would suggest a low-grade larval mortality over a wide region would have less of a population effect than a complete decimation of a specific subpopulation as suggested by this approach. The migration of individuals within a population will more readily fill the open niches left by scattered individuals than it will complete voids left by decimated subpopulations.

Response: Losses of organisms are losses of organisms no matter how the losses are distributed. The point of the APF is that it scales the losses to an area equivalent to 100 percent loss, and provides an indication of the equivalent amount of habitat that suffered that loss and that would need to be created to compensate for the loss. Although entrainment may not have literally caused a loss of habitat, it was responsible for a loss of *function* equivalent to the APF. Because an impact is spread over a larger area, does not mean that the impact is small. Furthermore, the commenter does not consider the entrainment losses of all of the organisms that were not counted (in fact most of them). The use of APF allows for estimation of both the direct and indirect consequences of entrainment and provides an understanding of the amount of habitat that would be needed to offset this impact. The assertion that losses over a larger area are greater than losses concentrated within a small area would only be true if there were no other impacts to the species, which is clearly wrong. The truth is that the larger the source water body the more likely it is that there are other impacts to the species. For a small area there may be only a few sources of impact but as the area gets larger the number of impacts increases.

AES-16: Fourth, APF implies absolutely no compensatory mortality associated with larval entrainment when the actual model of Production Foregone (Rago 1984) uses estimates of larval survival and adult fecundity that are derived from real field data that incorporate compensatory mechanisms that may be operating on the subject populations.

Response: Please see response to Comment **AES-5**.

AES-17: Fifth, the AES Huntington Beach Retool Project has a limited project timeline. The project was certified for a total of ten years, five of which have already passed.

Response: Please see response to Comment **AES-2**.

AES-18: We believe the recommended mitigation is not only unjustified, but was calculated incorrectly by staff. If Commission staff continues to recommend mitigation, the analysis needs to be done fairly and take the following factors into consideration: (1) incorporate demographics into the analysis; (2) recognize habitat differences between the nearshore coastal waters and the wetlands recommended for restoration; and (3) utilize correct APF estimates and actual flow from Units 3 and 4 and consider the life of the project.

Response: (1) For the consideration of demographics, please see the response to Comment **AES-9**. FH and AEL models rely on estimates of survivorship rates between early life history stages. These estimates often vary among studies. Furthermore, FH and AEL do not address impacts to any species but a very few target species and, thus, do not address the full extent of ecological impacts; (2) the analysis does recognize the difference between nearshore coastal waters and wetlands. The greater value of wetlands compared to nearshore coastal habitat is the reason that a mitigation ratio of 1:1 is recommended. Although wetlands are more valuable than nearshore soft bottom, the wetlands that would be restored already have considerable functional value. If wetlands were being created from uplands a ratio of fewer wetlands acres per acre of production foregone would be justified. However, the proposed mitigation would be to enhance and restore existing wetlands; and (3) the APF estimates have been corrected in the revised documents but permitted flow is still used as agreed to in the study plan. Energy Commission staff has completed its analysis and does not find it necessary to undertake a HEA or any other additional analysis. This analysis is consistent with what was done for the Moss Landing Power Plant.

AES-19: As a start, the staff should acknowledge that one-third of an APF of 370.6 acres is 123 acres and assuming a scaling of 20:1 (approximately one-half of the range documented at Morro Bay) results in a 6-acre restoration project to coastal wetlands. A scaling of 20:1 is at the conservative end of the actual results from Morro Bay, and based on the results of the demographic modeling, this would be a more accurate restoration area to account for entrainment losses. In addition, if restoration is required, the staff should maintain consistency with other CEC-required restoration projects and follow the HEA approach, which factors in services and functions of different habitat types, which would further reduce the restoration area.

Response: Permitted flow, not actual flow, is the correct volume to use in the assessment as agreed to in the study plan. Using the ratio of larval fish densities in Morro Bay to larval fish densities along the Morro Bay open coast is not a valid scaling factor for Huntington Beach mitigation. This scaling fails to account for the fact that wetlands that would be restored for mitigation are not starting from a value of 0 but already have functional value. For the reasons for not doing a HEA, please see the response to Comment **AES-8**.

AES-20: Finally, AES Huntington Beach submitted its 316(b) Proposal for Information Collection to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board in July 2005, and is currently preparing the necessary studies to submit the Comprehensive Demonstration Study as soon as possible....A final determination on mitigation for Units 3 and 4, if any is required, should not be made until the legal process is concluded.

Response: The Energy Commission process is separate from the 316(b) process. AES was granted an expedited certification because of emergency energy conditions at the time. Under normal circumstances, the entrainment and impingement study, impacts analysis, and mitigation determination would have been required *before* AES would have been permitted to construct Units 3 and 4. Therefore, the Energy Commission's process already has been delayed much longer than usual.

NOAA FISHERIES

NOAA-1: The only potential impact to 'plant habitat' would be to kelp or other algae, assuming they were present. Since they are not, I would suggest eliminating that specific functional loss from the statement.

Response: Phytoplankton and, probably, algal spores are entrained with water used to cool Units 3 and 4.

NOAA-2: Pete Raimondi is cited as indicating wetland restoration costs range between \$20K and \$100K per acre. I believe that is on the low end.

Response: The document has been revised to explain that the lower costs are for wetlands where easy fixes are available. The Bolsa Chica costs are added to the range.

SANTA ANA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD

RWQCB-1: AES would like to address mitigation for CEQA under your process and the CWA Section 316b with one proposed mitigation plan that meets both requirements. This may not be possible because AES claims that the CEC only requires mitigation for impacts to Coastal Fish, while 316b does not make such a distinction. Section 316b may require mitigation for all aquatic life impacts.

Response: The intent of the Energy Commission Condition of Certification was to include aquatic life in general not just fishes. However, the Energy Commission process is different from the 316(b) process. Therefore, mitigation requirements potentially could be different.

RWQCB-2: The AES proposal to claim only 10 acres of impacts and propose 10 acres of mitigation does not adequately mitigate the loss of the millions of aquatic organisms killed by the AES intake every year. AES has not proposed a reasonable alternative to the foregone habitat acreage methodology. Claiming that the killed fish only have a market value of \$2000 is not a very scientifically rigorous method, when compared to the method used by the CEC's consultants, because it only places value on commercially fished species and ignores the beneficial uses of all the other species.

Response: The Energy Commission requires mitigation for all of the significant ecosystem losses, not just losses to commercially important fish species.

RWQCB-3: While the CEC can only address environmental impacts caused by the re-powering of 2 units, 316b requires mitigation for the impacts of the existing units as well.

Response: The comment is correct. The Energy Commission can only require mitigation for the impacts of the repowered units.

RWQCB-4: If AES has to mitigate between 192 and 384 acres, and the costs of the mitigation is \$100k to \$200k per acre, then they will have to spend almost as much as it would cost to replace the once through system with cooling towers. While AES claims the City would not allow them to build these cooling towers, the City must also consider the destruction of aquatic life and balance that impact with aesthetic impacts. Has anyone asked the City?

Response: Because the Energy Commission licensed Units 3 and 4 with once-through cooling, it cannot go back now and require another cooling system. The mitigation specified in the conditions of certification is for habitat restoration to offset significant impacts of once-through cooling. The City does not have permitting jurisdiction over Units 3 and 4.

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION - PRE-MEETING COMMENTS

CCC-1: The AFC review for this project did not include the analysis necessary to make findings regarding the feasibility of alternative cooling methods, and that analysis has not been done as part of any more recent review. Absent that analysis, we recommend that statement be deleted from the report and that alternative forms of cooling be kept as part of the potential mitigation options.

Response: The discussion of alternative cooling as a mitigation option has been deleted from the revised analysis.

CCC-2: For any of those restoration options, however, we will need more information about what functions are intended to be restored and more details about the existing habitat, the measures needed to complete the restoration success criteria and the likelihood of success, proposed monitoring measures, etc. Additionally, the mitigation discussion in the report appears to be based more on project costs rather than on ensuring that the mitigation is adequate to replace the ecosystem functions lost due to entrainment. Similar to the issue above, determining a maximum cost for mitigation

requires a feasibility study that for this project has not yet been completed, so it is not yet appropriate to establish a mitigation cap based on cost.

Response: A feasibility study with preliminary engineering and costs has been completed for the restoration of the Huntington Beach wetlands. The fact that such a study, which answers questions posed by the CCC in its comments, has been completed is one of the reasons that the Energy Commission staff feels restoration of the Huntington Beach wetlands would be appropriate for the entrainment impacts of Units 3 and 4. For other potential mitigation options, the information is not yet available to determine to what extent potential restoration would address the impacts of cooling Units 3 and 4.

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION - POST-MEETING COMMENTS

CCC-3: Regarding alternative cooling methods and feasibility: As noted previously, I recommend the report not weigh in on this issue, as there is insufficient site-specific data on which to develop the necessary analysis.

Response: Please see response to **CCC-1**.

CCC-4: Re: determining “significance” in the entrainment/impingement study: Given the difficulties expressed with defining “significance” on a numerical or statistical basis, I recommend either or both of the following approaches:

- First, if any sensitive species are entrained or impinged, the impacts should be considered significant.
- Second, any impacts to fish that result in non-compliance with applicable laws and regulations should be considered a significant impact. By definition, non-compliance with a requirement meant to avoid significant impacts is in itself a significant impact.

These policy-based determinations of significance are reasonable and provide more clarity than trying to determine, for instance, that an 11% loss of a species is significant while a 9% loss is not.

Response: Impingement or entrainment of a listed species would be consistent with the significance criteria used. The only marine listed species with larvae is the white abalone. Because of the dearth of rocky habitat in the project area, entrainment of abalone larvae is unlikely. Because abalone larvae were not a target species, if any were entrained, the impact would not appear in the Entrainment and Impingement Study. No listed species were impinged during the one-year entrainment and impingement study. It is possible that a sea turtle could be impinged, but we do not have the information to know if that has ever occurred at Huntington Beach. The Energy Commission does include an analysis of compliance with laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS), although it is not a CEQA-mandated threshold of significance. Based on agency comments, mitigation for impingement and entrainment impacts is required to comply with LORS.

CCC-5: Re: definition of “fish”: Since the CEC does not have its own definition of “fish” or “coastal fish”, I concur with the recommendation to use the DFG definition.

Response: Energy Commission staff concurs with the DFG and CCC recommendation that the word fish in the Conditions of Certification be inclusive to include marine life in general. Impacts to the marine ecosystem and not just the targeted fish species was always the intent of the Energy Commission in drafting this Condition of Certification.

CCC-6: Re: mitigation: It is appropriate to use conservative (i.e., more protective) assumptions in coming up with necessary levels of mitigation, given that the study identifies only some of the likely adverse effects caused by the once-through cooling system. For example, it measures losses of only some of the many species subject to entrainment, and it does not identify any of the cascading effects to the local marine community that may be due to entrainment mortality. One of the appropriate assumptions to use is that mitigation should be no less than 1:1 replacement, as determined using the appropriate ETM and HPF numbers.

Response: For those reasons and also the fact that the mitigation would restore wetlands that already have some functional value, Energy Commission staff believes that the 1:1 habitat restoration mitigation ratio is appropriate.

STATEMENT BY AES HUNTINGTON BEACH, L.L.C (AES 2006)

The following statement by AES was received via email to Roger Johnson (Siting Office Manager) on July 13, 2006, in anticipation of the Siting Committee Workshop held in Huntington Beach on July 25, 2006. AES' statement has not been edited.

It should be noted that members of the AES Huntington Beach Generating Station Entrainment and Impingement Study Biological Resources Research Team, including Shane Beck, MBC Applied Environmental Sciences, John Steinbeck, Tenera Environmental, and Paul Hurt, AES Huntington Beach, are in substantial disagreement with the methods and findings of significance reported by the CEC staff. The following concerns were raised but inadequately addressed and/or largely ignored:

- The interpretation of Condition of Certification BIO-5
 - There is insufficient evidence to support the finding of significant impacts to coastal fish or any other habitat. To the contrary, the data supports a finding that coastal fish are not significantly impacted.
 - The Entrainment and Impingement Study was designed to provide the data necessary to make a finding of significant/insignificant impacts to populations of fishes and invertebrates. The results do not support the CEC staff's determination that HBGS once-through cooling impacts are significant due to habitat degradation. The study was not designed to assess habitat degradation and cannot be interpreted to have done so, much less provide the basis for conclusions regarding habitat degradation.
- The criteria used for determining significance stated in BIO-5 are misapplied.
 - The levels of entrainment mortality for HBGS were very small (an average of <0.2% with expected rather than maximum cooling water flow) relative

to the size of the source water populations used in the calculations. There is no scientific validity to the argument that this level of mortality to larval populations is significant. Much higher levels of CWIS at other facilities have been shown to result in no adverse effects on adult fish populations, and there is no direct evidence from any power plant in California that larval mortality due to CWIS entrainment has resulted in changes in adult fish populations.

- The hypothetical indirect effect of entrainment on the foraging habitat of listed bird species could have been studied as part of this project. It was not. It is inappropriate to use this hypothetical effect as a point of uncertainty to arrive at a finding of significance.
- CEQA requires an analysis of "direct physical change in the environment which is caused by and immediately related to the project." To this end, the CEC should look at the historical operations and a reasonable forecast of our expected run profile over the next 5 years to determine expected impacts.
- The Area of Production Foregone (APF) is misapplied.
 - This approach for scaling restoration projects to help compensate for entrainment mortality has only been applied to estuarine and rocky nearshore reef habitats where the area estimate from APF can be translated into adult habitat. It should not be applied to open coastal habitats where the primary habitat is the water column.
- Demographic modeling estimates were ignored
 - The AEL and FH estimates should be used to put the APF estimates in context. While these estimates could only be calculated for CIQ gobies and northern anchovies, these were the most abundant species found in the source water and represent over 50 percent of the fishes collected.
- The AES Huntington Beach Retool Project has a limited project timeline.
 - The project was only certified for a total of ten years. Typical power plant permits do not have an expiration date, and it is inappropriate, if not arbitrary, to require HBGS to provide the same relative level of mitigation as facilities that will operate three to four times longer than this project. The relatively short duration of the permit must be considered as to any proposed restoration approach.

RESPONSE TO AES' AUGUST 4, 2006, COMMENTS ON JULY 14, 2006, STAFF ANALYSIS AND JULY 25, 2006, STAFF PRESENTATION

AES-21: The APF approach to scaling restoration projects to help compensate for entrainment mortality has only been applied to estuarine and rocky nearshore reef habitats because the area estimate from APF for such habitat can be translated into

adult habitat. This is how APF was applied at the Morro Bay and Moss Landing Power Plants. It should not be applied to open coastal habitats, as the staff has done here, where the primary habitat is the water column.

Response: The commenter is correct that to date APF approaches have only been used for projects where the primary losses were mainly to species that are estuarine or associated with rocky reefs. For estuarine projects, APF calculations have been used to estimate the amount of new estuarine habitat needed to compensate for entrainment losses (examples: Moss Landing, Morro Bay, Potrero). For the project (Diablo) where most losses were to rocky reef species, APF estimates have been used as part of a model that yields the amount of additional rocky reef (artificial reef) needed to compensate for entrainment losses. Of these approaches, the nexus is higher for the estuarine projects. There has not been a case where APF approaches have been used to estimate habitat compensation for a project where most entrained species are associated with open coast sandy bottom habitat. However, this is not a difficult estimation. Indeed, in many ways such an estimation is less problematic than that for rocky reef species because of the patchiness of rocky reef habitats. The difficulty is in applying the estimate to mitigation. Unlike estuarine habitats, where there are typically opportunities for habitat creation or enhancement or even rocky reefs, where artificial reefs provide a direct mitigation opportunity, impacts to sandy bottom habitats provide no obvious direct mitigation opportunities. There are no feasible ways to create or restore open coast soft bottom habitat. The lack of such direct opportunities **does not suggest** (as AES does) that mitigation for such impacts is either infeasible or unattainable. If this were truly the case, the only reasonable approach would be to stop once-through cooling. Instead, such impacts require a broader view of mitigation and environmental compensation. This is what was done for the Huntington Beach case where staff used APF estimates for open coast sandy bottom habitat and a conversion formula (acres of sandy habitat ~ acres of estuarine habitat) to provide a model for compensation for the effects of entrainment.

Although APF has not previously been used to estimate the amount of estuarine habitat that would be needed to compensate for impacts to soft bottom habitat, restoration of estuarine habitat has been used previously to mitigate for impacts to soft bottom habitat in Southern California. For example, restoration of the San Dieguito wetlands was used as mitigation for entrainment and impingement impacts of the SONGS. As explained in the staff analysis, restoration of estuarine habitat directly benefits some species (California halibut, gobies, atherinids) impacted by the HBGS intake and indirectly benefits the habitat in a number of ways (e.g., export of nutrients from the wetlands to the ocean and removal of pollutants in run off before it enters the ocean). Therefore, staff recommended restoration of tidal wetlands as appropriate mitigation for the impacts of the HBGS cooling water intake.

AES-22: Since the ETM is based on ratio estimates of daily entrainment mortality, large ETM estimates can occur even if the underlying abundances of the fish larvae in the entrainment and source water samples are very low. For example, entrainment for white croaker, under maximum flow for all Units 1-4, was estimated at 17.6 million larvae, but an older fully mature white croaker may release almost 900,000 eggs per year. Queenfish, with an entrainment of 17.8 million larvae, can release more than 2 million eggs per year. The fecundity of other species is even higher. For example, the

total entrainment of California halibut by all four units of the HBGS assuming maximum permitted flow is equivalent to the annual spawning of a single individual fish. Thus, by using APF alone, instead of also considering demographic modeling that expresses entrainment losses in terms of adult fish, the staff presentation greatly distorts the impact of the operations of Units 3 & 4.

Response: Three points need to be made to respond to this comment:

- 1) As noted repeatedly by staff, the demographic approaches (AEL and FH) used in the Huntington Beach Entrainment and Impingement Study are flawed. These demographic approaches are only valid for species (such as the east coast striped bass) whose life history information is well studied. For most of the species entrained at HBGS, there are no AEL or FH estimates because the necessary life history information is unknown. Does AES suggest that for these species there are no impacts? Moreover, parameter estimates for the three species where AEL or FH estimates were provided are suspect because of the lack of site or time specific estimates for survivorship for any of the species.
- 2) The argument that you could have high ETM values for species where there are low numbers of larvae in the entrainment or source water samples is also flawed:
 - a. If the species are truly rare then you would expect low numbers in the water column and high ETM values would indicate a severe problem (high take of a rare species).
 - b. If the numbers are high but the sample estimates are low (but yielding a high ETM value) then either the sampling protocols yield inaccurately low but unbiased numbers (not really a problem because the P_m values would be accurate) or the values are inaccurate and biased yielding unreliable P_m values.

The bottom line is that this argument lends itself to the conclusion that the sampling program was flawed.

- 3) Any argument that links eggs to larvae entrained assumes a size specific (size at entrainment) hindcast demographic model, which does not exist.

Furthermore, the comment that entrainment represents an extremely small portion of the reproductive output of the entrained species does not consider all the other impacts to fish eggs and larvae. Eggs produced by coastal fishes experience high mortality rates and few survive to adulthood. High fecundity rates are an adaptation by these fishes to the low overall egg survival rates. The entrainment losses from the HBGS cooling water system are contributing to the already high mortality rates of the eggs and larvae of these species. In fact, the populations of most of these species are declining rather than increasing, indicting that production and survival to adulthood is not adequate to offset mortality and maintain the populations.

AES-23: Slide #33 of the July 25, 2006, staff presentation shows the importance of interpreting the proportion of larvae lost over the area from which they are at risk of entrainment (" P_m ") within the context of the source water. The definition of the source water population is critical to the interpretation of the results since it is the best estimate of the population of larvae potentially affected by entrainment and P_m is the best

estimate of impact. To argue that the loss is more or less important based on APF misses the point if the P_m is very small then the process of entrainment is likely to have very little effect on the population. Just because the APF translates into a seemingly large value does not make the impact any more significant.

The effects on the population level for the species entrained by HBGS are negligible. ...Therefore, the implication in slide #35 that the effects in Scenario 2 are much worse is not correct...

Response: Staff has responded to previous comments by AES that a low P_m indicates a lack of impact. The argument that a low value for P_m means impacts are insignificant is unfounded. AES' suggestion that P_m is really the value that represents risk or significance is unsubstantiated. AES argues that large P_m in small source water bodies are more important than small P_m in large source water bodies. The basis of the argument seems to be a demographic one, rather than one based on absolute numbers (if impacts are assessed based on absolute numbers then APF is always a better indicator of impact than P_m).

The demographic argument is based on the idea that a small loss to a large population does not affect the viability of the population.

- 1) One problem with this argument is the implicit assumption that source water bodies are proxies for populations. If this were true then large impacts to small source water bodies would mean large impacts to a population, which is obviously problematic. But such an assumption is clearly wrong. Populations and source water bodies are unlinked (in open coast areas).
- 2) The second problem is that the AES argument assumes no other impacts in the source water body. While this might be true for a very small area – it is not true for large areas. Most likely, the likelihood of other impacts is directly related to the size of the source water body – again an argument for the primacy of APF. If the AES argument were true, then it would follow that as long as the impacts are spread they will not be significant; hence, 50 impacts of 1 percent would not yield even one conclusion of significance. However, as the decline in coastal fisheries and other information on nearshore fish populations demonstrates, the populations of many fish species may be at a point where they can not tolerate additional incremental losses. As explained above in response to Comment **AES-22**, losses of larvae and other small organisms to the HBGS intake are contributing to all of the natural and anthropogenic impacts on these species. Because many of these species, including fish species entrained at HBGS, are in decline, losses clearly are exceeding the ability of these species to reproduce. If populations could sustain these losses, nearshore fish populations would be increasing or at least remaining stable. However, the available evidence indicates that many, if not most, populations are declining.

AES-24: Commission staff arbitrarily omitted the revised APF estimates from their restoration recommendations. The multiple problems with the Commission staff proposal are especially disturbing since additional work was done by AES at the request of the Commission staff under the direction of the technical workgroup to calculate a value of APF for gobies.

Response: Staff used the revised APF estimate for coastal fishes as the basis for its mitigation recommendation. The Final Entrainment and Impingement Study contained a calculation of APF that included gobies and northern anchovy. AES argued that the APF should not include gobies and northern anchovy because gobies are produced in wetlands, not the nearshore habitat, and northern anchovy have a source water body that is much larger than the area around the HBGS intake. Therefore, staff requested that AES recalculate APF without gobies and northern anchovies. Because the goby and coastal fish calculations cannot be combined, AES did one calculation of APF for gobies (15.35 acres) and one for coastal fishes, minus anchovies (104 acres). Because mitigation must be appropriate to compensate for losses to all the marine resources affected by the intake, staff recommended that AES mitigate for the revised APF of 104 acres for coastal fishes. Based on the analysis done by AES, 104 acres would mitigate for the lost productivity of coastal species and would certainly mitigate for the losses of gobies. On the other hand, mitigating only for the APF for gobies, as suggested by AES, would not adequately compensate for the loss of productivity of coastal species.

AES-25: By replacing habitat, production is compensated assuming that the new habitat will be occupied by adults at the same density. In these cases, there is an understanding that there is some limitation on the population due to the availability of habitat. There is no indication that in open coastal pelagic there is any limitation on habitat that could affect productivity.

Response: This assertion is simply wrong. The basis of compensation is not to provide essential habitat critical to a limited population; it is to mitigate for lost productivity. Again, if the assertion were true then once-through cooling could not be allowed. AES also is making the argument here that populations are unaffected by loss through compensatory mechanisms. AES has introduced the idea of compensatory mortality in previous comments (Comment **AES-5** in response to the April 27, 2006, Draft Analysis), and staff has responded that compensatory mortality has been rejected repeatedly in regards to entrainment and impingement mortality.

AES-26: Gobies were the most abundant fish larvae in the entrainment samples accounting for almost 40 percent of the total.

Response: Mitigation must also be provided for the 60 percent of fish larvae that were not gobies.

AES-27: The APF estimate for wetlands would result in mitigation that directly benefits other fishes that occupy wetland areas for all or a portion of their life - another 10-15 percent of the total entrainment. The APF estimate for wetlands would result in mitigation that provides indirect benefits to other fishes in the nearshore areas as larvae produced in the wetlands are transported out into nearshore areas where they provide forage for larger larval and juvenile fishes.

Response: Staff is concerned with the total losses to entrainment. While staff agrees with AES that wetlands will benefit directly or indirectly species entrained by HBGS, the proper APF to use is the calculation done for most of the target species, not the smaller APF calculated only for gobies. Based on the analysis done for this project, the APF

for coastal fishes (which includes all the target species in the analysis except gobies and anchovies) is 104 acres. Staff considers 104 acres the appropriate area to use for mitigation because it would be more than adequate for gobies and would also address the other losses.

AES-28: The APF estimate for gobies is conservative since the entrainment losses occurred to larvae in the nearshore areas that have been transported out of their natural habitat and as a result will experience almost 100 percent mortality.

Response: Nearly 100 percent mortality is standard for larvae. If goby larvae do not return to their adult habitat and reproduce (thus being contributing members to the population), they should not be used in any impact analysis. This does not mean there is not an entrainment impact – it simply means that the impact to coastal species is more important (which supports our use of those species in staff's impact and mitigation determinations). The AES argument here weakens their argument for the use of gobies as the species by which to determine mitigation.

AES- 29: There was greater confidence in the ETM estimate for gobies and a few other species, which were collected from both entrainment and source water stations during most of the surveys. Other nearshore fishes such as queenfish, spotfin and black croakers, and salemas were only collected from a few source water surveys.

Response: The fact that some nearshore fishes were only collected in a few surveys should not suggest that impacts to these species is zero – rather that they have sporadic reproduction – and are perhaps much more vulnerable to recruitment failure than gobies. Sporadic reproduction, therefore, would make them more sensitive to entrainment.

AES-30: The revised APF for gobies is 15.35 acres, so 15.35 acres of wetlands restoration makes perfect sense as a mitigation measure for the entrainment impacts of Units 3 & 4. Restoring 15.35 acres of wetlands would restore the foregone production of gobies. Therefore, that is the only scientifically defensible scope of wetland restoration in response to the operation of Units 3 & 4.

Response: Only restoring 15.35 acres of wetlands to compensate for the APF of goby production leaves the productivity losses of all the other species unmitigated. Restoration of 104 acres as recommended by staff would address the APF of coastal species as well as of gobies.

Furthermore, AES may have underestimated the APF for gobies. Although the larval duration indicated that goby larvae could be transported a distance of up to 61 km, AES assumed in calculating the goby APF that the larvae primarily came from the estuarine areas in the immediate vicinity of the HBGS.

This was the rationale for the selection of the three estuarine areas as the source populations for gobies. There is a big problem here that could have a substantial impact on the APF calculation. APF is simply $P_m \times \text{habitat}$. Habitat is simply the areal extent of the source water body, which is typically estimated as $1/P_s \times (\text{constant cross shore distance})$. $1/P_s$ is the best estimate of the distance the species could have come

from and be entrained (for gobies it is 61 km at HB). However, in the revised APF calculation for gobies, APF was calculated as P_m x the habitat of open water and wetland habitat for Newport Bay, Santa Ana River/Talbert Marsh, and Anaheim Bay/Huntington Harbor. Together these span a distance of about 25 km, less than one half of the estimated length of the source water body. This is a major departure from normal APF calculations. AES' rationale for this was "Although the larval duration indicated that goby larvae could be transported a distance of up to 61 km, it was assumed that the larvae primarily came from the estuarine areas in the immediate vicinity of the HBGS." This is a big and untested assumption with huge implications to calculation of APF.

APF for gobies should be the product of the current estimate (15 acres) and an areal modifier that accounts for the whole source water body. The best way to do this would be to calculate the estuarine habitat in the area, but in the absence of this an estimate of the modifier is $1 / (25/61) = 2.44$. Using this, the APF would be approximately $15 \times 2.44 = 36.6$ new acres of wetland.

AES-31: Although Commission staff point out that the number should be increased to account for the fact that the projects would only supplement habitat that is already partially functioning as wetland habitat, this argument has to be balanced with the other long-term benefits that the wetlands are providing to numerous other species including birds, and the conservative estimate of entrainment mortality on which the APF estimate is based. In the case of gobies, the entrainment losses do not translate into lost production, because, the larvae entrained have already been lost from the wetland habitat where they could settle and grow as adults.

Response: Staff has considered the many values of wetlands in recommending a 1:1 mitigation ratio. If it were not for these other wetlands values, out-of-kind mitigation would be at a ratio of greater than 1:1. AES' contention that goby entrainment losses do not translate into lost production seems to contradict their assertion that AES should only mitigate for the APF for gobies.

AES-32: In sharp contrast, the 104 acres of wetland restoration recommended by staff was calculated using coastal species that will never be produced in the restored wetlands. As we have pointed out before and reiterate below, there is no evidence that the impact on other species of coastal fish is significant. Thus, the staff's application of APF to coastal species in order to scale wetland restoration yields a surplus of 88.65 acres of habitat that the impacted coastal species would never use to replenish larvae lost to entrainment.

Response: Because there is no feasible way to restore or create nearshore coastal habitat, restoration of coastal wetlands is the most appropriate mitigation because wetlands do provide benefits to nearshore species. AES made that very point above in Comment **AES-27**. If wetlands restoration did not benefit nearshore coastal habitat, the only mitigation for HBGS impacts would be to switch to a cooling system that does not involve the intake of seawater.

AES-33: The scope of mitigation should be proportionate to actual estimated entrainment and impingement, not the amount estimated based on maximum permitted

water intake. Again, in an apparent effort to generate the maximum number of wetland acres, Commission staff have used half of the total maximum permitted cooling water intake for AES Huntington Beach and used that number to estimate entrainment, APF, and their 104 acre estimate. Since Units 3 & 4 have not, and most likely will never use half the maximum permitted intake of water, it would be arbitrary, capricious, and contrary to law for the Commission to adopt the staff recommendation of 104 acres, which was estimated based on maximum permitted flow.

Response: The use of permitted flow in the Entrainment and Impingement Study was specified in the Final Study Plan and was agreed to by the TEAM, which included AES and their consultants. AES did not raise objections to this assumption at the time. Use of permitted rather than actual flows is consistent with other recent entrainment studies.

AES-34: The certification only permits Units 3 & 4 to operate for 10 years, hence construction of permanent tidal wetlands should be scaled to mitigate impacts from 10 years to operation.

Response: Staff addressed this comment previously in response to Comment **AES-2** on the April 27, 2006, Draft Staff Analysis. Unless impacts can be characterized as temporary, Findings of Significance under CEQA do not consider the life of a project. The impacts of Units 3 & 4 have been occurring for several years and will occur for at least several more years; they are not temporary. Based on Mandatory Findings of Significance under CEQA, these impacts have been determined to be significant, and therefore, mitigation is required. Restoration of the Huntington Beach Wetlands will require on-going monitoring and maintenance to keep the wetlands fully functional. Staff has only recommended that AES be responsible for maintenance and monitoring for 10 years, which is consistent with the length of the HBGS certification.

AES-35: Entrainment and impingement may be reduced by changes mandated by EPA's 316(b) Final Phase II Rule, thus mitigation measures should be scaled to account for reductions due to technological or operational measures.

Response: The 316(b) Phase II Final Rule mandates the use of Best Technology Available (BTA) to reduce impingement and entrainment impacts and is an entirely different process than the Energy Commission's CEQA-equivalent process. The Energy Commission cannot rely on a different regulation administered by another agency to address impacts it is mandated under CEQA to mitigate. Presently, staff is not aware of any technology except alternate cooling that can feasibly reduce entrainment impacts in nearshore coastal environments. Furthermore, the 316(b) Phase II Final Rule has provisions that could result in HBGS not being required to meet the specified entrainment reductions if they can demonstrate it would be too expensive to do so or if they can demonstrate that the costs would far outweigh the benefits. Therefore, there is no assurance that entrainment impacts will be reduced by some technological means as part of the 316(b) process. Furthermore, even if AES is required to install some technology to reduce entrainment, it likely will be several years before any changes mandated by the 316(b) regulations are implemented at HBGS. As staff stated in response to Comment **AES-20** on the April 27, 2006, Staff Analysis, AES was granted an expedited certification because of emergency energy conditions at the time. Under normal circumstances, the entrainment and impingement study, impacts analysis, and

mitigation determination would have been required *before* AES would have been permitted to construct Units 3 & 4. Therefore, the Energy Commission's process already has been delayed much longer than usual and should not wait for the completion of the 316(b) process.

AES-36: Condition BIO-5 contemplates mitigation of significant impacts on coastal fish, not coastal birds. Commission staff, however, has expanded consideration of significance to the hypothetical and admittedly indirect impact of Units 3 & 4 on coastal birds. Additionally, the staff members have linked effects on bird habitat by considering entrainment of invertebrate larvae. Condition BIO-5 does not mention coastal birds or coastal invertebrates, but focuses instead on coastal, Southern California Bight fish populations.

Response: **BIO-5** focused on coastal fish populations because the entrainment and impingement study required by **BIO-4** focused on coastal fishes. The entrainment and impingement study focuses on coastal fishes because it would be too time consuming and expensive (in fact, it would be impossible) to sample, count and identify all the organisms entrained. That does not, however, mean that fishes are the only organisms that are important in the ecosystem or the only organisms that should be considered in determining significance. Focusing the study on fishes is appropriate because fishes are at the center of the ecosystem (i.e. they feed on smaller plankton organisms and they in turn are fed upon by birds and marine mammals). The assumption is that the impacts to the target species of larval fishes are an appropriate surrogate for other planktonic organisms that are not studied. In determining the significance of impacts, Commission staff is required to consider Mandatory Significance criteria under CEQA because the staff analysis is a CEQA-equivalent process. Staff cannot ignore potential impacts of food web losses to endangered and threatened bird species.

AES-37: Condition BIO-5 imposes an obligation on AES Huntington Beach to mitigate and/or compensate for losses to one or more species of coastal fish if, and only if, the entrainment and impingement study determines that actual operation of Units 3 & 4 will have "significant impacts" on one or more species of coastal fish. AES Huntington Beach has demonstrated that there are no significant impacts. At most, the only species of coastal fish to suffer a recognized impact are the various species of goby. Thus, the only impact that could conceivably merit compensation would result in AES Huntington Beach restoring 15.35 acres of coastal wetlands, which serve as habitat and breeding grounds for gobies.

Response: Staff disagrees that AES has demonstrated that the intake of seawater to cool Units 3 & 4 has no significant impact. Staff believes that the daily intake of large volumes of seawater represents a substantial degradation of the environment, a functional loss of native fish, wildlife and plant habitat, a degradation of the habitat of listed bird species, and that it is contributing to significant cumulative impacts on coastal ecosystems that clearly are in decline. These criteria are all Mandatory Findings of Significance under CEQA. AES' proposal to mitigate only for the losses to gobies does not address all of the other impacts to the coastal ecosystem. Staff's recommendation of the restoration of 104 acres of coastal wetlands to offset the APF to coastal species is the minimum acreage that would offset the entrainment losses to cool Units 3 & 4.

REFERENCES

- AES. 2006. E-mail to Roger Johnson from Paul Hurt of AES Huntington Beach LLC, July 13, 2006.
- AES and URS. 2000. Huntington Beach Generating Station Retool Project, Application for Certification. Submitted to the California Energy Commission.
- Atwood, J. L. and D. E. Minsky. 1983. Least tern foraging ecology at three major California breeding colonies. *Western Birds* 14: 57-72.
- California Resources Agency and California Environmental Protection Agency (CRA/CEPA). 2004. Protection our Ocean - California's Action strategy. California resources Agency, Sacramento. 39 pp.
- California State Lands Commission. 2006. Resolution by the California State Lands Commission Regarding Once-through Cooling in California Power Plants Proposed - April 13, 2006.
- CEC. 2001. Huntington Beach Generating Station Retool Project Application for Certification (00-AFC-13) Commission Decision. May 2001.
- Chambers, V.L. 2005. Letter to Rick York, California Energy Commission from Valerie L. Chambers, Assistant Regional Administrator for habitat Conservation, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service.
- Davis, N., S. Koslowsky, M. Foster, and R. York. 2001. Biological Resources. Final Staff Assessment for Huntington Beach Generating Station Retool Project.
- Gorman, G. 2006. Property Analysis Record: Habitat Planning in Perpetuity. Huntington Beach Wetlands
- Herbinson, K. T., M. J. Allen, and S. L. Moore. 2001. Historical Trends in Nearshore Croaker (Family Scianidae) Populations in Southern California from 1977 through 1998. In S. B. Weisberg, ed. Southern California Coastal Water Research Project Annual Report 1999-2000: 253-264.
- Luster, T. 2005. E-mail to Noel Davis from Tom Luster of the California Coastal Commission, December 16, 2005.
- MBC Applied Environmental Sciences. 2005. AES Huntington Beach Generating Station Entrainment and Impingement Study Final Report April 2005. Prepared for AES Huntington Beach LLC.
- MEC Analytical Systems, Inc. 1991. Ecological Descriptions and Evaluation of Proposed Enhancement/Restoration for Eight Southern California Wetlands Final Report for Southern California Edison Company.

- Moffatt & Nichol 2006. Huntington Beach Wetlands Conceptual Restoration Plan Revised Final Report. Prepared for the Huntington Beach Wetlands Conservancy and California State Coastal Conservancy for the Wetlands Recovery Project
- Nisbet, R.M., W.W. Murdoch, and A. Stewart-Oaten. 1996. Consequences for adult fish stocks of human-induced mortality on immatures. In R.J. Schmitt and C.W. Osenberg eds. Detecting Ecological Impacts - Concepts and Applications in Coastal Habitats. Academic Press. San Diego: 257-277.
- Raimondi, P. 2005. Review of Mirant-Potrero 316B Determination.
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2006. Scoping Document: Proposed Statewide Policy on Clean Water Act Section 316(b) Regulations
- Stratus Consulting Inc. 2004. Research on Estimating the Environmental Benefits of Restoration to Mitigate or Avoid Environmental Impacts Caused by California power Plant Cooling Water Intake Structures. PIER Final Project Report. Prepared for California Energy Commission.
- Tenera Environmental Services. 2000a. Moss Landing Power Plant Modernization Project 316(b) Resource Assessment. April 28, 2000. Prepared for Duke Energy Moss Landing LLC.
- Tenera Environmental Services. 2000b. Diablo Canyon Power Plant 316(b) Demonstration Report. March 1, 2000. Document Number E9-055.0.
- Tenera Environmental Services. 2001. Morro Bay Power Plant Modernization Project: 316(b) Resource Assessment. Prepared for Duke Energy Morro Bay LLC.
- Tenera Environmental Services. 2006a. Huntington Beach Generating Station Empirical Transport Model Estimates for Area of Production foregone. Prepared for California Energy Commission.
- Tenera Environmental Services. 2006b. Huntington Beach Generating Station Empirical Transport Model Estimates for Area of Production foregone Using Seasonal Flow Reduction. Prepared for AES Southland.
- Theisen, K. 2006. E-mail to TEAM, July 11, 2006.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2001. 40 CFR Parts 9, 122 et all National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Regulations Addressing Cooling Water Intake Structures for New Facilities. Final Rule. Federal Register 66 (243): 65256-65343.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2004. Part II. 40 CFR Parts 9, 122 et all National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System - final regulations to establish requirements for cooling water intake structures at Phase II existing facilities. Final Rule. Federal Register 69 (131): 41576-41693.

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2005. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Pacific Coast Population of the Western Snowy Plover; Final Rule. Federal Register Vol. 70 No. 188:56970-57119.

Ugoretz, J.. 2005. Letter to Rick York, California Energy Commission. From John Ugoretz, Central Marine Region Manager, California Department of Fish and Game.

Webb, C. 2005. Personal communication with Dr. Noel Davis. November 1, 2005.

Zeiner, D.C., W.F. Laudenslayer, Jr., K.E. Mayer, and M.White. 1990. *California's Wildlife Volume II Birds*. California Statewide Habitat Relationships system. California Department of Fish and Game.

APPENDIX 1

BIO-4 The project owner will provide a check for \$1,500,000 (One million and five hundred thousand) to the Center for Natural Lands Management to establish the Huntington Beach Generating Station Trust Account to be used to fund the project's impingement, entrainment, and source water sampling studies. The CEC will authorize the project owner's expenditures from the fund for the field study protocol development and implementation (impingement, entrainment and source water sampling), data analysis, draft and final report preparation, and implementation of mitigation measures.

Verification: No later than 30 days prior to the start of commercial operation, the project owner will provide written verification to the CEC CPM that 1) a check for \$1,500,000 has been provided to the Center for Natural Lands Management and 2) that the Huntington Beach Generating Station Trust Account has been established. Any unspent funds, plus all accumulated interest, will be returned to the project owner upon completion of the studies.

[With the submittal of the Final Report in April 2005, **BIO-4** was completed.]

BIO-5 If the entrainment and impingement study determines that significant impacts to one or more species of coastal fish is occurring, the project owner will provide funds for mitigation/compensation for impacts to Southern California Bight fish populations. In consultation with the project owner, those funds should be used for such things as tidal wetlands restoration, creation of artificial reefs, or some other form of habitat compensation that is sufficient to fully address the species impacts identified in the final report required by Condition of Certification **BIO-4**, above. The CEC CPM in consultation with the project owner and state, federal and local resource agencies will determine the amount and final application of those funds. When appropriate mitigation is determined, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) will be prepared by the project owner and signed with the entity that will receive the compensation funds. The MOU will clearly identify acceptable uses of the funds, including an accounting of how the funds will be spent.

Verification: The CPM will review the draft MOU to ensure the wording is clear, meets the terms of the mitigation, and that it is enforceable. The CPM will ensure the MOU is completed within 120 days of determination of the need for mitigation/compensation. The project owner will provide written verification to the CEC CPM that the mitigation/compensation funds have been paid within 30 days after signing the MOU for the disposition of required compensation funds.

[In approving the project, the Energy Commission adopted findings of overriding considerations to the effect that the benefits of the project outweighed the potential harm to marine life.

Staff was also concerned about the number of adult and juvenile fishes trapped in the forebay of the cooling water intake system and whether there was a feasible method

available to reduce those losses. In response, the Commission imposed the following Condition of Certification.]

BIO-6 The project owner shall conduct a study to determine if there is a feasible methodology that would greatly reduce the number of fishes trapped in the intake forebay. If the study determines that a feasible method(s) exists to reduce the number of fishes trapped in the cooling water system the project owner shall implement those methods.

Verification: The project owner will submit a draft study plan to the CEC CPM and resources agencies within 60 days of the date of certification for review and approval. CEC and resource agency staff will provide comments on the draft study plan, and within 90 days of project certification a CEC and resource agency approved final study plan will be provided to the CEC CPM. The project owner will submit an interim report on the progress of the study within 90 days following commencement of the study.

The project owner will submit a draft report that discusses the results of the study within 45 days following completion of the study and will submit a final report within 3 months of completion of the study. If the study determines that a feasible method(s) exists to greatly reduce fish losses in the intake, the project owner will implement the selected methodology upon CEC Huntington Beach Generating Station Project long-term operation reassessment and/or NPDES permit renewal June 30, 2005, and provide verification to the CEC CPM that the agreed to improvements have been implemented.