

Attachment 1: Response to Comments - State Water Resources Control Board

Comment 1: Page 3 of the document mentions that a Plant Master Plan Environmental Impact Report (PMP EIR) was prepared in 2008. Is this IS/MND tiered off of that document? If so, please provide copies of the draft and final PMP EIR, the resolution certifying the PMP EIR, and the County Clerk and State Clearinghouse Notices of Determinations to the State Water Board.

Response 1: The IS/MND was not tiered off the PMP EIR, as the proposed Project was not within the scope of the EIR. Instead, PMP EIR was incorporated by reference into the IS/MND pursuant to Section 15150 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Page 20 of the IS lists the City's web site where the PMP EIR is available for review. The PMP EIR is listed on the City's Completed EIR page: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/index.aspx?nid=2435>.

Comment 2: Tables 2-1 and 2-2 give construction and operational air quality emission estimates in pounds per day. Please note that the CWSRF program requires estimate units to be in tons per year in the environmental application.

Response 2: Table 2-1 has been revised to include annual construction emissions in tons per year and is identified in this letter under **Attachment 2**. Table 2-2 does already include annual operational emissions, as well as daily emissions.

Comment 3: Is the geotechnical study referenced on page 43 the same as Appendix D-3: Geotechnical Boring Logs in the Cultural Report? If not, please provide a copy of the geotechnical study to the State Water Board.

Response 3: Yes, the boring logs in Appendix D-3 of the Cultural Report are from the geotechnical study referenced on page 43 of the IS. Appendix D-3 also contains boring logs from previous geotechnical investigations by Dames & Moore (1969), and Woodward-Lundgren & Associates (1974).

Comment 4: Please provide the Hazardous Materials Survey Report and the Process Hazard Analysis, each of which are mentioned on page 51 to the State Water Board.

Response 4: The Hazardous Materials Survey Report and the Process Hazard Analysis are included under **Attachment 3** and on a CD which is attached to this letter.

Comment 5: Please provide a FEMA floodplain map displaying where the 100-year flood zone is in relation to the RWF.

Response 5: The FEMA floodplain map is also included under **Attachment 3** and in the attached CD.

Comment 6: Page 63 mentions that the new structures will be protected from the 100-year flood. Do any of these structures have the possibility to redirect flood flows to areas that flows previously had not reached? If yes, please explain and provide supporting information that was used to make this determination.

Response 6: As discussed on page 63 of the IS, the 100-year floodplain is wide and expansive in the vicinity of the Project area, as illustrated on the FEMA floodplain map (see **Attachment 3** and attached CD). The Project does involve upgrade of existing facilities and construction of limited new facilities. The City shall comply with relative provisions of the Municipal Code 17.08 for floodproofing new non-residential structures (Control Measure I4), which will entail elevating the lowest floor level of most new structures to 13.00 feet or one-foot above the 100-year flood level. The equipment pads around the digesters will not be elevated above the flood level due to creation of access and maintenance issues, nor will the new dissolved air floatation thickener pumps, as suction conditions and overall design would be affected. Impacts relative to impeding or redirecting flood flows, as discussed under Significance Criteria I8 and I9 in page 63 of the IS, are negligible and less than significant. Note that the South Bay Shoreline Project will provide protection to the Project area from the 100-year flood event.

Comment 7: Page 68 states that question one for Population and Housing is less than significant, but the discussion for the section states no impact. Please explain.

Response 7: The checklist for significance criterion M1 should be No Impact, not Less than Significant Impact, which is a typographical error. As discussed on page 69 of the IS/MND, the project would be located at the RWF and would not affect the population growth of the City.

Attachment 2: Errata

Table 2-1. Construction-Related Air Quality Project Impacts (Revised)

Source of emissions	Daily emissions, lb/day			
	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀ ^a	PM _{2.5} ^b
Construction equipment	3.78	33.45	1.75	1.75
Mobile sources	0.05	1.78	0.01	0.01
Total	3.83	35.23	1.76	1.76
BAAQMD threshold	54	54	82	54
Exceed threshold?	No	No	No	No

Source of emissions	Annual emissions, tons/year			
	ROG	NOx	PM ₁₀ ^a	PM _{2.5} ^b
Construction equipment	0.08	0.73	0.04	0.04
Mobile sources	0.01	0.32	0.002	0.002
Total	0.09	1.05	0.042	0.042
Federal Conformity Threshold	100	100	-	100
Exceed threshold?	No	No	No	No

Source: Ray Kapahi, Air Quality Consultant, September 2015

a. BAAQMD's construction-related significance thresholds for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} apply to exhaust emissions only and not to fugitive dust.

Note: Emissions were modeled using the latest offroad 2007 version.

Attachment 3: Referenced Documents

- 1. Hazardous Materials Survey Report**
- 2. Process Hazard Analysis**
- 3. FEMA Floodplain Map**