

Comments on the Monterey Bay Aquarium Initial Study Submitted by the Monterey Bay Aquarium

Page ¹	Paragraph	Comment	Response
56	4	Total Zinc. Reference to Table 6 is confusing as there is no Table 6 in this document. We believe this should reference Table II.4.	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Changes have been made in the document.
56	4	Total PAH. Reference to Table II.4 should actually reference Table II.2.	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Changes have been made in the document.
60	Table II.7	MBA Ocean Receiving Water. Data for 2/27/06 Nitrate-N should read ND for non-detected (not ----). Data for 3/6/06 pH should read 7.92 (not blank).	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Changes have been made in the document.
62	2	Throughout the Initial Study reference is made to the MBA Near Shore Wing (NSW). Beginning on page 62 the word "Near" has been replaced with "North". This is also true in Table II.11. We have no North Shore Wing; just the Near Shore Wing which is the original Aquarium building.	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Changes have been made in the document.
64	Table II.11	We request State Board review the Acute Toxicity results presented in Table II.11. We believe that some of these results are presented incorrectly as follows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NSW Storm water is correct: >1.0TUa(or 1.02YUa by survivability calculation). • NWS Receiving Water should read: 0TUa (or 0.23TUa by survivability calculation). • Corporation Storm Water should read: 0TUa (or 0.23TUa by survivability 	Staff rechecked the original data sets provided by Pacific Ecorisk. However, we did not make the requested changes to the document as this reflects what was provided in the Pacific Ecorisk report. Since the acute toxicity tests were not performed according to EPA dilution series protocol, a more precise TUa is not reported. On the other hand, a survivability calculation

¹ Page numbers are relevant to the original Initial Study.

		<p>calculation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporation Receiving Water should read: 0TUa (or 0.23TUa by survivability calculation). • Survivability in the last three samples listed was the same as in the Control samples (i.e., 97.5%) 	<p><i>could have been</i> performed if survivability was 100%. However, in this case, survivability was less than 100%.</p> <p>Staff did make some changes to the text which clarified that the laboratory control result was 97.5%. The NSW runoff had significant reduction in survival compared to the laboratory control. The other acute toxicity results for runoff and receiving water had the same survival as the control.</p>
65	2	<p>This paragraph does not correctly summarize the data presented in Table II.12. Only three of the six samples listed had concentrations of Ocean Plan metals above the 6-month median objective. MBA Receiving Water did <u>not</u> exceed the 6-month median objective for <u>any</u> metals. MBA Corporation Yard storm water runoff exceeded the Ocean Plan 6-month median for the metals arsenic, hexavalent chromium, copper, lead, nickel, and zinc. The Near Shore Wing (NSW) roof drain also exceeded the 6-month median for copper and zinc.</p>	<p>Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Changes have been made in the document.</p>
67	1	<p>This paragraph is difficult to read and contains erroneous or confused sampling data and site descriptions. We request that this paragraph be replaced with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water samples collected and analyzed from the 	<p>Thank you for bringing this to our attention. Changes have been made in the document. We re-wrote this section to clarify this information.</p>

		<p>Corporation Yard Storm Drain on 2/27/06 and 3/6/06 had Total PAHs of 0.065 µg/L and 0.0662 µg/L respectively, which exceeded the Ocean Plan objective of 0.0088 µg/L. TCDDs concentrations measured in the same samples were 9.40×10^{-8} and 8.39×10^{-7} µg/L which exceed the Ocean Plan objective of 3.9×10^{-9} µg/L. Total PAHs were not detected in water samples collected at the MBA Ocean Receiving Water station on 2/27/06 and 3/6/06. Total TCDDs concentrations in the same samples were 2.11×10^{-7} and 3.81×10^{-7} µg/L respectively, which exceed the Ocean Plan objective of 3.9×10^{-9} µg/L. Water was sampled at the MBA Ocean Reference station only on 2/27/06. Total PAHs in the NSW Roof Drain sampled only on 3/6/06 were 0.0041 µg/L which is under the Ocean Plan objective of 0.0088 µg/L. The Total TCDDs concentration in this sample was 4.31×10^{-8} µg/L which exceeds the Ocean Plan objective of 3.9×10^{-9} µg/L.</p>	
--	--	---	--