

### 3. Errata Sheet

#### Revisions, Corrections and Clarifications to the Draft EIS

#### Chapter 1: Summary

##### Section 1.2 History and Background, SEPA Procedures and Public Involvement

Correct the number of rafts in the original (1996) proposal (page 1-1) as follows:

Taylor Shellfish submitted an application for a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit accompanied by an Environmental Checklist to Thurston County Development Services on November 13, 1996, for expansion of their existing mussel farm in Gallagher Cove from 21 rafts to 42 rafts, and for development of an additional mussel growing site on ~~58~~ 108 rafts proposed at the North Totten Inlet site, north of Gallagher Cove.

*Note:* This correction has been made in the Final EIS Summary (Chapter 1, Section 1.2, page 1-1).

##### Section 1.6 Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Revise Table 1.6-1, ANIMALS: Macroinvertebrates – Benthos section (page 1-11) as follows:

<i>Potential Impacts</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>
Compared to similar calculations for the raft units in Alternative 1, Alternative 2 could <u>temporarily</u> have up to 45 to 48% greater effects on benthic organisms than Alternative 1, ranging from approximately 1.33 to 2.28 acres. <u>If, however, the proposed mitigation actions for Alternative 2 were implemented, this alternative would have less long-term effect on benthos in the vicinity of the North Totten Inlet Mussel Farm compared to Alternative 1.</u>	An off-setting management feature of Alternative 2 to relocate raft units every 2 to 3 years would allow the infaunal community to be restored down-current from the former raft unit locations. This procedure, <del>however,</del> will still result in a similar <del>amount</del> type of effect; <del>The effect would,</del> however, <u>the effect would</u> be temporary and would occur at different locations and at different times. As with Alternative 1, technical studies indicate that no additional mitigation for benthic organisms would be required.

*Note:* These clarifications have been made in Final EIS Table 1.6-1 (Chapter 1, page 1-19).

#### Chapter 2: Proposal and Alternatives

##### Section 2.3 Location

Revise the first sentence of the second paragraph (page 2-2) as follows:

The aquatic lands proposed as the site for the North Totten Inlet Mussel Farm encompass submerged lands approximately 600 feet waterward of the mean lower low water (MLLW) mark of the ~~west shoreline of Steamboat Island~~ east shore of Totten Inlet, between approximately 85th Avenue NW and 90th Avenue NW (see Figure 2-2).

##### Section 2.4 Alternative 1, the Preferred Alternative

Figure 2-4. Principal Features of Proposed North Totten Inlet Mussel Farm (Alternative 1) (page 2-7).

The mussel raft array shown on Draft EIS Figure 2-4 was not correctly positioned in relation to the bottom contours.

*Note:* This correction has been made to Figure 1-4 included in the Final EIS Summary (Chapter 1, page 1-8).

## **Section 2.4.6 Permits and Approvals Required**

### *2.4.6.3 Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers Permit for Commercial Shellfish Aquaculture Activities*

Insert at the end of paragraph one in Subsection 2.4.6.3 (page 2-13):

The Corps of Engineers will evaluate the proposal pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and will conduct a public interest evaluation prior to taking action on the Section 10 permit application.

*Note:* This information has been added to the Final EIS Fact Sheet list of Permits and Approvals required (page ii).

## **Section 2.5 Other Alternatives Considered**

### **Section 2.5.1 Alternative 2, the Two-Row Raft Alternative**

Figure 2-7. Principal Features of Two-Row Raft Alternative (Alternative 2) (page 2-16).

The mussel raft array shown on Figure 2-7 was not correctly positioned in relation to the bottom contours.

*Note:* This correction has been made to Figure 1-7 included in the Final EIS Summary (Chapter 1, page 1-13).

### **Section 2.5.2 Alternative 3, the No Action Alternative**

Modify the third sentence in paragraph two (page 2-17) for clarification as follows:

As described in the technical studies performed for the proposed action, summarized in Draft EIS Chapter 3, Totten Inlet is ~~becoming increasingly eutrophic~~ in the “moderate concern” category in relation to its susceptibility to eutrophication (see Newfields 2009, pages 26 and 40).

### **Section 2.5.3 Alternatives Considered and Eliminated from Detailed Study**

#### *2.5.3.1 Gallagher Cove Expansion.*

Correct the first sentence in Subsection 2.5.3.1 (page 2-17) as follows:

The original Taylor, Inc. Shoreline Substantial Development Permit application (November 13, 1996) for expanding their mussel culture operations in Totten Inlet was a proposal to increase the number of rafts at the Gallagher Cove site from 21 rafts to 42 rafts, and add ~~58~~ 108 rafts further north, at the North Totten Inlet site that is the subject of the current proposal.

**Section 2.6 Benefits and Disadvantages of Reserving Project Implementation to Some Future Time**

Revise Table 2.6-1, ANIMALS: Operation section (page 2-22) as follows:

<p align="center"><b>Alternative 1: Preferred Alternative</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Alternative 2: Two-Row Raft Alternative</b></p>
<p>Subtidal infaunal community (i.e., benthic) effects are likely to extend between 45 m (148 ft) and 75 m (246 ft) down-current with the Alternative 1 mussel raft configuration, each row of eight, 34-foot wide raft units could be envisioned as resulting in triangular “zones” of effects to the benthos, both up-current and down-current on areas ranging between 0.92 acre to 1.54 acres. The low sulfide and total volatile solids (TVS) concentrations observed during the Deepwater Point study indicate that natural attenuation of substrate chemistry toward baseline conditions occurred very quickly with no evidence of cumulative effects. This suggests there would be no adverse long-term effect on benthic invertebrates arising from the proposed North Totten Inlet mussel farm.</p>	<p>Compared to similar calculations for the Alternative 1 raft units, the Alternative 2 configuration could temporarily have up to 45 to 48% greater effects on benthic organisms than Alternative 1, ranging from approximately 1.33 to 2.28 acres. An off-setting management feature of Alternative 2 would relocate raft units every 2 to 3 years to allow the infaunal community to be restored down-current from the former raft unit locations. This procedure, however, will still result in a similar type-amount of effect. The effects would, however, the effect would be temporary and would occur at different locations and at different times.</p>

*Note:* A comparable clarification has been made to Final EIS Table 1.6-1, as indicated above.

**Chapter 4: References**

Add the following:

Newton, J.A., S.L. Albertson K. Van Voorhis, C. Maloy, and E. Siegel. 2002. Washington State Marine Water Quality, 1998 through 2000. Washington State Department of Ecology, Environmental Assessment Program. Olympia, WA. 111 pp.

