

# **TM 2.1 – Identification and Characterization of Potential Environmental Impacts Mitigation and Measures Related to Intake and Discharge Facilities of Seawater Desalination Plants**

## **Variable Salinity Desalination Demonstration Project City of Corpus Christi**

**10 July 2015**

**by**

**Greg Stunz, Tara Topping, and Jason Williams (intakes),  
Paul Montagna and Katherine Lavelle (discharges)  
Harte Research Institute for Gulf of Mexico Studies  
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi**

### **Introduction**

A preliminary overview of the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures of several pre-determined sites as potential locations for intake and discharge facilities of seawater desalinization plants has been conducted. Below is a summary of those results. Also included in these analyses are matrices that further detail how the recommendations were derived, and there are lists of common species that would likely be impacted based on the current literature available. Certainly, as candidate site selection is conducted and refined, detailed assessments of species impacts as well as thorough site-specific analyses would need to be performed.

### **Intake Site Assessment**

When considering locations for a desalinization intake site, multiple factors have to be examined. From an ecological standpoint, the biggest concerns are related to impacts that the desalination plant will have on the resident fauna. Two factors that have the most impact are impingement and entrainment. Impingement of larger fish, marine mammals, and sea turtles can reduce the spawning stock biomass due to an increased mortality rate. In addition, entrainment of smaller ichthyoplankton and eggs can reduce recruitment. Despite the known ecological impacts that construction of a desalinization plant creates, directed sampling pre- and post-construction is required in order to determine the actual environmental impacts to the selected site. While specific detailed mitigation measures are beyond the scope of this report, all sites with the exception of 2A and 2B (the most environmentally diverse locations) will likely have similar mitigation measures.

Specifically for this study, six candidate intake assessment locations were chosen by Freese and Nichols, Inc. The Harte Research Institute was contracted to identify potential environmental impacts of specific intake structures listed for the following locations: two chosen near Broadway WWTP, two near the La Quinta Channel Extension, one off-shore in the Gulf of Mexico, and one in the Viola Turning Basin in the Inner Harbor (Figure 1). In the following assessment, the key environmental intake topics of concern will be discussed:

- Impingement of marine life on screens
- Entrainment of marine life in desalinization plant
- Impacts on sea-grass and other sensitive marine areas
- Visual impacts and disturbance of coastal uses
- Impacts on coastal wetlands
- Other environmental issues

*Overall Recommendations:* This section summarizes our biological opinions on the proposed designs and locations, focusing on those that would minimize the impact to resident fauna and limit degradation or loss of high quality habitat. Under the current proposed plan, it is our biological opinion that the best intake type would be either the subsurface directional drilled or subsurface infiltration gallery intakes. Logistical limitations prevent all sites as candidates for these subsurface methods, and our recommendation considers these limitations. While benthic organisms will be impacted during the creation of the subsurface system, once created there is no freestanding source from which fauna could be impinged or entrained. When taking into account both the sites proposed and the intake types at those locations, we recommend a directional drilled intake at site 3A as the overall preferred location/intake type. Since the location is outside of Corpus Christi Bay, there will be less impact on ship navigation during construction. This site and intake type combination also will likely have the lowest overall effect on mortality (construction and daily operations). However, we do make alternative recommendations and provide our biological opinion on the pros and cons of each location. Overall, we recommend the following sites and intake type combinations (in order of preference):

1. Site 3A as a directional drilled intake
2. Site 3A as an infiltration gallery intake
3. Site 1A as a directional drilled intake
4. Site 1A as an infiltration gallery intake
5. Site 3A as a wedgewire intake
6. Site 1A as a wedgewire intake
7. Site 4A, onshore open intake
8. Site 1B, onshore open intake

9. Site 2A is not recommended for development due to significant environmental impacts
10. Site 2B is not recommended for development due to significant environmental impacts

#### Site Specifics Recommendations

The following is a site by site breakdown of the potential environmental impacts due to the construction of a desalinization intake. An intake selection matrix (Table 1) contains site-specific details and other criteria used to determine these recommendations. A list of the marine nekton species in Corpus Christi Bay has also been included (Table 2). Clearly, as facilities siting becomes more refined, detailed assessments will be needed to further elucidate site-specific impacts. These recommendations are presented by site number and not in order of preference.

#### **Site 1: Near Broadway WWTP**

Site 1A is located in the Corpus Christi Bay near Inner Harbor with submerged wedgewire, subsurface filtration gallery, or subsurface directional drilled intakes as the proposed types.

- **Impingement of marine life on screens**

Constructing a submerged wedgewire intake would have a greater potential for impinging marine fauna as compared to a subsurface intake. A subsurface intake (either filtration gallery or directional drilled) would have the least amount of overall mortality since it does not protrude from the seafloor, so there is no concern of impingement for this type of intake.

- **Entrainment of marine life in desalinization plant**

The wedgewire intake would have significantly higher marine life mortality on a daily operating basis as opposed to a subsurface intake. With a subsurface intake the water is drawn through the sand/gravel so most of the larvae and eggs in the water column will not filter through the seafloor and are not at risk for entrainment.

- **Impacts on seagrass and other sensitive marine areas**

This location does not appear to have any type of limiting habitat (i.e., seagrasses) that would negatively impact the resident benthic fauna. If a subsurface intake was constructed it is possible that the motile species will be able to avoid the area during construction and potentially re-settle upon its completion.

- **Visual impacts and disturbance of coastal uses**

Since it is submerged offshore, either of the intake options (wedgewire or submerged) present no concern regarding any type of visual or navigational disturbances upon completion.

- **Impacts on coastal wetlands**

There are no concerns about coastal wetlands due to the intake being submerged and offshore.

- **Other environmental issues**

No other environmental issues have currently been identified at this time.

Site 1B is located in the Corpus Christi Bay Turning Basin - proposed to be an onshore surface intake using traveling screens.

- **Impingement of marine life on screens**

The onshore traveling screen intake will impact the surrounding marine fauna. Depending on construction location and depth, fish and invertebrates are likely to become impinged in the screen and occasional cleaning will be necessary to ensure proper operation. The use of fish buckets will help limit this problem, but there are still problems with macroalgae potentially fouling the screens.

- **Entrainment of marine life in plant**

Larval fish, eggs, and plankton will be entrained in a traveling screen intake. However, the habitat quality in this area is likely already impacted by industrialization, so it is unlikely that the mortality from entrainment will be enough to substantially impact any local populations.

- **Impacts on seagrass and other sensitive marine areas**

This location does not appear to have any type of sensitive habitat types (i.e., seagrasses) to an extent that would negatively impact the resident benthic fauna, so it is possible that the motile species will be able to avoid the area during construction and potentially re-settle upon completion.

- **Visual impacts and disturbance of coastal uses**

As with all surface intakes, this unit (or building housing the unit) will be visible. Most of the area surrounding the proposed site is heavily industrialized so despite the construction of the new intake, the general aesthetics of the area will not change. One other consideration is the addition of any debris or sedimentation to

the barge canal during construction. A portion of the canal might need to be narrowed or closed, which could create problems for ships attempting to unload/load cargo in the surrounding area.

- **Impacts on coastal wetlands**

While the shoreline will be impacted, there are no wetlands in the area proposed for intake placement so there is no potential for impacts on coastal wetlands.

- **Other environmental issues**

No other environmental issues have currently been identified at this time.

## **Site 2: La Quinta Channel Extension**

Site 2A is located west of Spoil Island with suggested intake types that include submerged infiltration gallery and submerged directional drilled.

- **Impingement of marine life on screens**

No concerns due to submerged intakes.

- **Entrainment of marine life in plant**

No concerns due to submerged intakes.

- **Impacts on seagrass and other sensitive marine areas**

During construction, the mortality of benthic organisms will be the most catastrophic change in this system. The Spoil Island area is known to have seagrass habitats, sensitive for economically important species of sciaenids and paralichthys. This area is also adjacent to sensitive fish nursery habitat and other areas that are important for a variety of marine life, including possible feeding areas for sea turtles and nesting sites for colonial waterbirds. Thus, these physical and geographical concerns lead to a non-recommendation of these areas as candidate sites.

- **Visual impacts and disturbance of coastal uses**

Since it is submerged, either of the intake options (infiltration gallery or directional drilled intake) present no concern regarding any type of visual or navigational disturbances upon completion. However, during construction of the infiltration gallery the shipping channel will be affected, since pipes need to be laid down in order to bring the water from the intake to the plant. A directional drill intake might be a better option since drilling can occur without impact to the shipping channel.

- **Impacts on coastal wetlands**

While the area isn't considered coastal wetlands, there are concerns about negatively impacting the seagrass and Spoil Island habitat if an intake were to be placed in this area.

- **Other environmental issues**

Spoil Islands have the potential to be a feeding and resting place for migrating birds, including the federally endangered Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*). Altering the island or surrounding shoreline area could decrease the suitability for this area to provide necessary resources for migrating birds.

Site 2B is an onshore surface intake located on the shoreline of the channel extension.

- **Impingement of marine life on screens**

With the close proximity to seagrasses, it is likely that a traveling screen intake will be a source of mortality for recreationally important species such as sciaenids (e.g. red drum, spotted seatrout) and paralichthys (flounders).

- **Entrainment of marine life in plant**

In this location, larval fish, eggs, and plankton will be entrained in a traveling screen intake. This area has the potential to significantly impact the recruitment of recreationally important species (e.g. sciaenids and paralichthys) due to the relatively high habitat quality of the surrounding area.

- **Impacts on seagrass and other sensitive marine areas**

This location is in close proximity to seagrass. Since many species use seagrass beds as recruitment areas, this site is not recommended for development. Like site 2A, this area is also adjacent to some of the most sensitive fish nursery habitat and other areas that are important for a variety of marine life. Thus, these physical and geographical concerns lead to a non-recommendation of these areas as candidate sites.

- **Visual impacts and disturbance of coastal uses**

As with all surface intakes, this unit (or building housing the unit) will be visible. A portion of the canal might need to be narrowed or closed, which could create problems for ships attempting to unload/load cargo in the surrounding area.

- **Impacts on coastal wetlands**

The shoreline in this area isn't as heavily developed as Sites 1A and 1B, so creating a surface intake would impact the coastal wetlands.

- **Other environmental issues**

No other environmental issues have currently been identified.

### **Site 3: Mustang or Padre Islands**

Site 3A is proposed to be located 2 miles offshore, with proposed intake types including submerged wedgewire, submerged infiltration gallery, and submerged directional drilled.

- **Impingement of marine life on screens**

Constructing a submerged wedgewire intake would have a greater potential for impinging marine fauna as compared to a subsurface intake. Since this location is outside of the Corpus Christi Bay, there is a greater variety of species that may become impinged in the intake. Although there will be mortality associated with the initial creation of a subsurface intake (either filtration gallery or directional drilled) there is no concern about impingement since it does not protrude from the seafloor. It is our biological opinion that this area would have the least impact based on our criteria; however, it is also the least studied. If chosen, further detailed assessment would need to be performed at this area.

- **Entrainment of marine life in plant**

The wedgewire intake would have significantly higher marine life mortality on a daily operating basis, compared to a subsurface intake where water that is absorbed into the sediment is used. Since the water from a subsurface intake is drawn through the sand/gravel, larvae and eggs in the water column will not filter through the seafloor and are not at risk for entrainment.

- **Impacts on seagrass and other sensitive marine areas**

During construction, the mortality of benthic organisms will be the most catastrophic change in this system. This location does not appear to have any type of limiting habitat (i.e., seagrasses) that would negatively impact the resident benthic fauna, so it is possible that the motile species will be able to avoid the area during construction and potentially re-settle once construction is complete.

- **Visual impacts and disturbance of coastal uses**  
Since it is submerged offshore, either of the intake options (wedgewire or submerged) present no concern regarding any type of visual or navigational disturbances upon completion.
- **Impacts on coastal wetlands**  
Since this site is outside of Corpus Christi Bay, there are no concerns about negative impacts on coastal wetland.
- **Other environmental issues**  
No other environmental issues have currently been identified.

#### **Site 4: On Stevens WTP**

This site is proposed to be located in the Viola Turning basin as an onshore traveling screen surface intake.

- **Impingement of marine life on screens**  
This location is at the end of the Viola Turning basin, which is not a favorable habitat for most species of recreational importance. Impingement will be a concern, but it is likely to be of mostly lower trophic level species (e.g. anchovies, silversides) which can be found throughout the Corpus Christi Bay system. The potential for macroalgae to become impinged is a more serious concern.
- **Entrainment of marine life in plant**  
The abundance of eggs, larval fish, or plankton that get entrained in the surface intake likely will not be as high as the other sites, since the location is so far from any source of inflow. This water may already be slightly more saline than other locations due to evaporation and extended flushing cycles, making it a harsher environment than the other listed sites.
- **Impacts on seagrass and other sensitive marine areas**  
This location does not appear to have any seagrass in the surrounding area.
- **Visual impacts and disturbance of coastal uses**  
As with all surface intakes, this unit (or building housing the unit) will be visible after construction. This channel was created as a shipping lane, so most of the area is already industrialized.



- **Impacts on coastal wetlands**  
Depending on location, the coastal wetlands might be impacted during the creation of the surface intake.
- **Other environmental issues**  
No other environmental issues have currently been identified.

## **Discharge Facilities Assessment**

When considering the locations for desalination plant discharge facilities, several factors need to be considered. The addition of brine concentrate can have environmental impacts on the marine community. As a result, the salinity tolerance of marine organisms should be considered when determining the locations for Corpus Christi desalination plant discharge locations (Figure 2). Changes in salinity and temperature can have deleterious effects on many marine species, particularly those in early developmental stages. See Table 3 for a list of the marine species of bottom dwellers in Corpus Christi Bay.

Biomass, abundance, and diversity of the benthic community can be affected by salinity changes (Montagna et al. 2002, Van Diggelen 2014). The average salinity of the Corpus Christi Bay system is about  $35 \pm 7$  ppt. The estuarine macrobenthic community of Corpus Christi Bay will likely not be affected by a salinity increase within this range (Table 4, Montagna et al. 2013). However, brine plumes can create hypoxic or anoxic zones which disturb benthic communities and organisms in the water column. It is known that there is an interaction between salinity and dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration in Corpus Christi Bay, such that benthic communities decline dramatically as salinity increases to around 42 ppt and DO decreases to around 3 mg/L (Ritter and Montagna 1999). This effect could be heightened due to depressions in Corpus Christi Bay, which constrain mixing of bottom water, leading to hypoxia (Nelson 2012). Directed sampling before and after the construction of a discharge facility is recommended in order to determine the actual environmental impacts to the selected sites.

Some of the proposed discharge sites are recorded as having evidence of contaminant-induced degradation of sediment quality from storm-water outfalls. Sampling should be conducted post-construction to monitor if there is any change in contaminant-induced degradation of sediment quality (Carr et al. 2000).

In the assessment the following key environmental intake issues will be discussed:

- Salinity tolerance of identified marine organisms in the mixing zone
- Marine organism salinity tolerances
- Target acceptable discharge salinity
- Mixing of brine concentrate and ambient seawater issues

- Ion imbalance of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues
- Toxicity of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues
- Estimate maximum velocity at edge of mixing zone safe for aquatic life
- Concentrate disposal impacts, diffusion, and transport

*Overall recommendations:* To limit the environmental impacts on resident fauna, it is our opinion that the best discharge type would be either submerged jet diffusers or a submerged pipe. Submerged jet diffusers would be the quickest method for dilution of effluent and the best way to avoid hypoxia. We recommend site 3A with submerged jet diffusers as the best location for a discharge facility. This combination would have the least environmental impact because the discharge would be entering into a deeper and more dynamic body of water. This site and discharge type combination also appears to have the lowest overall effect on mortality (construction and daily). Overall we recommend the following sites and discharge type combinations (in order of preference):

1. Site 3A as submerged jet diffusers
2. Site 3A as a submerged pipe
3. Site 1B as submerged jet diffusers
4. Site 1B as a submerged pipe
5. Site 4A as a surface open discharge pipe
6. Site 1A as a surface open discharge pipe – drainage ditch
7. Site 2A as submerged jet diffusers
8. Site 2A as a submerged pipe

The following is a site by site assessment of the key environmental issues from construction of discharge facilities. Discharge selection matrix (Table 5) contains site-specific details and other criteria regarding to how these recommendations were determined.

### **Site 1: Near Broadway WWTP**

Discharge location 1A is located in the Inner Harbor of Corpus Christi Bay. Corpus Christi Inner Harbor has been subject to refinery process water effluent discharge for over fifteen years. The proposed type of discharge infrastructure is a surface open discharge pipe – drainage ditch. Brine concentrate in an open-air ditch could evaporate further and become even more saline. Considering salinity alone, a discharge salinity of 2.0 parts per thousand (ppt) above ambient salinity will not have an effect on the marine community in the Inner Harbor. However, the conclusion from Hodges' 2015 report is that desalination brine in the ship channel will likely result in extended periods of hypoxia and anoxia. This location does not appear to have seagrass or other limiting habitat.

- **Salinity tolerance of identified marine organisms in the mixing zone**

The salinity tolerance of marine organisms in the mixing zone is between approximately 28 and 42 ppt, with an average around 35.

- **Marine organism salinity tolerances**

The Corpus Christi Bay system has natural salinities ranging from 28 - 42 ppt, with an average around 35 ppt. We know that the resident marine species can tolerate salinities within this range; however, further studies are needed to determine the effects of a localized salinity increase greater than 42 ppt.

- **Target acceptable discharge salinity**

The target acceptable discharge salinity should be 35- 42 ppt, just above the average salinity of the bay system.

- **Mixing of brine concentrate and ambient seawater issues**

It is unknown how the mixing of warm brine concentrate will affect the bay system, but it could lead to hypoxia. It is recommended that the concentrate is brought as close as possible to ambient seawater temperature before being released.

- **Ion imbalance of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues**

The concentration of copper, calcium, chlorine, and anti-scalants in the brine concentrate needs to be determined before its impact can be assessed. Fish, plankton, and benthic fauna can experience toxic effects from the bioaccumulation of metals. Research is needed to verify the potential impacts of brine concentrate mixing with seawater.

- **Toxicity of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues**

Warm temperatures of brine plumes may affect marine species, particularly animals in early developmental stages. This site does not appear to have seagrass habitat, so there is little concern for brine concentrate affecting sensitive nursery grounds.

- **Estimate maximum velocity at edge of mixing zone safe for aquatic life**

At the seafloor there are sluggish currents ranging from 0.01 - 0.25 m/s. The current velocity in Corpus Christi Bay is variable and wind driven at the surface. Current speed is probably very sluggish at this particular site. Brine discharged at a high velocity would promote more mixing but could negatively impact flora and fauna. We estimate the maximum velocity at the edge of mixing zone safe to aquatic life to be no more than 0.5 m/sec.

- **Concentrate disposal impacts, diffusion and transport**

The acceptable discharge salinity should be close to 35 ppt, and no higher than 42 ppt. Field and laboratory studies should be conducted to investigate the environmental

impacts of warm brine plumes with high concentration of heavy metals. A brine plume at this site would probably lead to hypoxia.

Discharge location 1B is located in Corpus Christi Bay in the Ship Channel near Harbor Bridge. The proposed types of discharge infrastructure are submerged pipe and submerged jet diffusers. This site has previously been described as a depositional zone for material coming from the Inner Harbor (Carr et al. 1998). A submerged pipe would release a brine plume at the sediment surface of the bay. This pipe would be subject to fouling by sessile marine organisms such as serpulid worms and tunicates. Discharge location 1B may experience more wind-driven mixing than location 1A, potentially mixing up the brine plume released from a submerged pipe. However, hypoxia could still develop from the brine plume. Submerged jet diffusers are an alternative discharge type that prevents the formation of dense brine plumes. Turbidity from jet diffusers can cause developmental and filtration problems in bivalves.

- **Salinity tolerance of identified marine organisms in the mixing zone**

The salinity tolerance of marine organisms in the mixing zone is between approximately 28 and 42 ppt, with an average around 35.

- **Marine organism salinity tolerances**

The Corpus Christi Bay system has natural salinities ranging from 28 - 42 ppt, with an average around 35 ppt. We know that the resident marine species can tolerate salinities within this range; however, further studies are needed to determine the effects of a localized salinity increase greater than 42 ppt.

- **Target acceptable discharge salinity**

The target acceptable discharge salinity should be 35- 42 ppt. It would be easier to reach the target acceptable discharge salinity using submerged jet diffusers.

- **Mixing of brine concentrate and ambient seawater issues**

It is unknown how the mixing of warm brine concentrate will affect the bay system. It is recommended that the concentrate is brought as close as possible to ambient seawater temperature before being released. A submerged pipe would create a brine plume at the sediment surface, which could lead to hypoxia if not thoroughly mixed in. Submerged jet diffusers would be the preferred option to achieve optimal mixing of brine concentrate and seawater.

- **Ion imbalance of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues**

The concentration of copper, calcium, chlorine, and anti-scalants in the brine concentrate needs to be determined before its impact can be assessed. Fish, plankton, and benthic fauna can experience toxic effects from the bioaccumulation of metals. Sessile organisms

would be subject to stress from ion imbalance as they cannot relocate. Submerged jet diffusers would be the preferred option to promote mixing and dilution of brine concentrate and seawater.

- **Toxicity of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues**

Warm temperatures of brine plumes may affect marine species, particularly animals in early developmental stages. This site does not appear to have seagrass habitat, so there is little concern for brine concentrate affecting sensitive nursery grounds at this site.

Research is needed to verify the toxicological effects of brine concentrate mixing with seawater.

- **Estimate maximum velocity at edge of mixing zone safe for aquatic life**

We estimate the maximum velocity at the edge of mixing zone safe to aquatic life to be no more than 0.5 m/sec. Although marine life would only be exposed to diffuser jet turbulence for short bursts of time, on the order of seconds, we recommend conducting laboratory studies to determine a velocity that minimizes shear stress mortality (Foster et al. 2013).

- **Concentrate disposal impacts, diffusion, and transport**

The acceptable discharge salinity should be close to 35 ppt, and no higher than 42 ppt. Field and laboratory studies should be conducted to investigate the environmental impacts of warm brine plumes with high concentration of heavy metals. A brine plume at this site could lead to hypoxia. Submerged jet diffusers would be the preferred option to achieve optimal mixing of brine concentrate and seawater.

## **Site 2: La Quinta Channel Extension**

Discharge location 2A is located southwest of La Quinta Channel Extension in Corpus Christi Bay. The proposed types of discharge infrastructure are submerged pipe and submerged jet diffusers. Nearby tidal flats, salt marshes, and seagrass beds are inhabited by protected bird species and used as recruitment areas by recreationally important fish species. Green sea turtles, bottlenose dolphins, and manatees have been observed in La Quinta Channel. Hypoxia or anoxia would occur as a result of submerged pipe brine plume discharge. This site would have the most severe environmental impacts and is not recommended for the construction of a discharge facility.

- **Salinity tolerance of identified marine organisms in the mixing zone**

The salinity tolerance of marine organisms in the mixing zone is between approximately 28 and 42 ppt, with an average around 35.

- **Marine organism salinity tolerances**

The Corpus Christi Bay system has natural salinities ranging from 28 - 42 ppt, with an average around 35 ppt. We know that the resident marine species can tolerate salinities within this range; however, further studies are needed to determine the effects of a localized salinity increase greater than 42 ppt.

- **Target acceptable discharge salinity**

The target acceptable discharge salinity should be 35 - 42 ppt. It would be easier to reach the target acceptable discharge salinity using submerged jet diffusers.

- **Mixing of brine concentrate and ambient seawater issues**

Submerged jet diffusers dilute and disperse brine through rapid mixing, decreasing the possibility or extent of hypoxic zones.

- **Ion imbalance of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues**

The concentration of copper, calcium, chlorine, and anti-scalants in the brine concentrate needs to be determined before its impact can be assessed. Fish, plankton, and benthic fauna can experience toxic effects from the bioaccumulation of metals. Sessile organisms would be subject to stress from ion imbalance as they cannot relocate. Submerged jet diffusers would be the preferred option to promote mixing and dilution of brine concentrate and seawater.

- **Toxicity of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues**

Warm temperatures of brine plumes may affect marine species, particularly those in early developmental stages. This site has seagrass habitat that is potentially a recruitment area for many estuarine species. Discharge from a submerged pipe could be particularly detrimental by causing hypoxia. Submerged jet diffusers could create turbidity, affecting the phytoplankton community and shading out seagrass. A discharge facility at this site could have severe environmental impacts. More research is needed to verify the toxicological effects of brine concentrate mixing with seawater.

- **Estimate maximum velocity at edge of mixing zone safe for aquatic life**

If the submerged jet diffuser was installed at the bottom of the 35' trench, as proposed, a velocity of 2 - 3 fps at the edge of the mixing zone would be acceptable. However, if the submerged jet diffuser was installed at the average seafloor depth of ~3 m, there could be severe environmental impacts, as mentioned above. We estimate the maximum velocity at the edge of mixing zone safe to aquatic life to be no more than 0.5 m/sec. Although marine life would only be exposed to diffuser jet turbulence for short bursts of time, on

the order of seconds, we recommend conducting laboratory studies to determine a velocity that minimizes shear stress mortality (Foster et al. 2013).

- **Concentrate disposal impacts, diffusion, and transport**

The target discharge salinity should be close to 35 ppt, and no higher than 42 ppt. Field and laboratory studies should be conducted to investigate the environmental impacts of warm brine plumes with high concentration of heavy metals. A brine plume at this site would probably lead to hypoxia. A submerged pipe is also subject to fouling by sessile marine organisms such as serpulid worms and tunicates. Submerged jet diffusers would be the preferred option to achieve optimal mixing of brine concentrate and seawater.

### **Site 3: Mustang Island or Padre Island**

Discharge location 3A is located 2 miles offshore of either Mustang Island or Padre Island. The proposed types of discharge infrastructure are submerged pipe or submerged jet diffusers. This is the best choice for a discharge site because the brine effluent would be rapidly mixed into the ambient seawater and have the least environmental impact. Kemp's ridley, loggerhead, green and leatherback turtles as well as bottlenose dolphins have been recorded at this site. It is unlikely that these species will be affected by the discharge.

- **Salinity tolerance of identified marine organisms in the mixing zone**

The salinity tolerance of marine organisms in the mixing zone is between approximately 32 and 36 ppt, with an average of 35 ppt.

- **Marine organism salinity tolerances**

The Gulf of Mexico has natural salinities ranging from 32 - 36 ppt, with an average around 35 ppt. We know that the resident marine species can tolerate salinities within this range; however, further studies are needed to determine the effects of a localized salinity increase greater than 36 ppt.

- **Target acceptable discharge salinity**

The target acceptable discharge salinity should be 35 - 38 ppt. It would be easier to reach the target acceptable discharge salinity using submerged jet diffusers.

- **Mixing of brine concentrate and ambient seawater issues**

The discharge of brine concentrate from a submerged pipe is expected to mix well with ambient seawater. Submerged jet diffusers would be the best option for quickest dilution and least environmental impact.

- **Toxicity of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues**

It is not anticipated that there will be issues with brine concentrate toxicity at this site. Effluent would be thoroughly mixed in through wind-driven mixing and tidal currents.

- **Ion imbalance of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues**

The concentration of copper, calcium, chlorine, and anti-scalants in the brine concentrate needs to be determined before its impact can be assessed. Fish, plankton, and benthic fauna can experience toxic effects from the bioaccumulation of metals. Sessile organisms would be subject to stress from ion imbalance as they cannot relocate. Submerged jet diffusers would be the preferred option to promote mixing and dilution of brine concentrate and seawater.

- **Estimate maximum velocity at edge of mixing zone safe for aquatic life**

The average current velocity near Bob Hall Pier is between 0.5 and 1 m/sec. The current velocity at this discharge site changes every day. We estimate the maximum velocity at the edge of mixing zone safe to aquatic life to be no more than 1.5 m/sec.

- **Concentrate disposal impacts, diffusion and transport**

The target discharge salinity should be close to 35 ppt, and no higher than 36 ppt. Field and laboratory studies should be conducted to investigate the environmental impacts of warm brine plumes with high concentration of heavy metals. A submerged pipe is also subject to fouling by sessile marine organisms such as serpulid worms and tunicates. Submerged jet diffusers would be the preferred option to achieve optimal mixing of brine concentrate and seawater.

#### **Site 4: ON Stevens WTP**

Discharge location 4A is at the Tule Lake Turning Basin in the Inner Harbor of Corpus Christi Bay. The proposed discharge infrastructure is a surface open discharge pipe. Considering salinity alone, a discharge salinity of 2.0 parts per thousand (ppt) above ambient salinity will not have an effect on the marine community in the Inner Harbor. However, the conclusion from Hodges' 2015 report is that desalination brine released in the ship channel will likely result in extended periods of hypoxia and anoxia. This location does not appear to have seagrass or other limiting habitat.

- **Salinity tolerance of identified marine organisms in the mixing zone**

The salinity tolerance of marine organisms in the mixing zone is between approximately 28 and 42 ppt, with an average around 35.



- **Marine organism salinity tolerances**

The Corpus Christi Bay system has natural salinities ranging from 28 - 42 ppt, with an average around 35 ppt. We know that the resident marine species can tolerate salinities within this range; however, further studies are needed to determine the effects of a localized salinity increase greater than 42 ppt.

- **Target acceptable discharge salinity**

The target acceptable discharge salinity should be 35 - 42 ppt.

- **Mixing of brine concentrate and ambient seawater issues**

A surface open discharge pipe would release brine concentrate directly into the bay. The dense concentrate would settle at the bottom of the harbor and cause hypoxia.

- **Ion imbalance of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues**

The concentration of copper, calcium, chlorine, and anti-scalants in the brine concentrate needs to be determined before its impact can be assessed. Fish, plankton, and benthic fauna can experience toxic effects from the bioaccumulation of metals. Sessile organisms would be subject to stress from ion imbalance as they cannot relocate.

- **Toxicity of brine concentrate and ambient seawater mixing issues**

Warm temperatures of brine plumes may affect marine species, particularly animals in early developmental stages. This site does not appear to have seagrass habitat or recreational fish species, so there is little concern for brine concentrate affecting sensitive nursery grounds.

- **Estimate maximum velocity at edge of mixing zone safe for aquatic life**

At the seafloor there are sluggish currents ranging from 0.01 - 0.25 m/s. The current velocity in Corpus Christi Bay is variable and wind driven at the surface. Current speed is probably very sluggish at this particular site. Brine discharged at a high velocity would promote more mixing but could negatively impact flora and fauna. We estimate the maximum velocity at the edge of mixing zone safe to aquatic life to be no more than 0.5 m/sec.

- **Concentrate disposal impacts, diffusion, and transport**

The acceptable discharge salinity should be close to 35 ppt, and no higher than 42 ppt. Field and laboratory studies should be conducted to investigate the environmental impacts of warm brine plumes with high concentration of heavy metals. A brine plume at this site would probably lead to hypoxia.

## References

- Allan, E.L., P.W. Froneman, and A.N. Hodgson. 2006. Effects of temperature and salinity on the standard metabolic rate (SMR) of the caridean shrimp *Palaemon peringueyi*. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 337:103-108.
- Carr, R. S., P.A. Montagna, and M.C. Kennicutt. 1998. Sediment quality assessment of storm water outfalls and other selected sites in the Corpus Christi Bay National Estuary Program study area. Corpus Christi Bay National Estuary Program. Corpus Christi, Texas. CCBNEP-32. 105 pp.
- Carr, R.S., P.A. Montagna, J.M. Biedenbach, R. Kalke, M.C. Kennicutt, R. Hooten, and G. Cripe. 2000. Impact of storm-water outfalls on sediment quality in Corpus Christi Bay, Texas, USA. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 19(3):561-574.
- Chadwick, M.A., and J.W. Feminella. 2001. Influence of salinity and temperature on the growth and production of a freshwater mayfly in the Lower Mobile River, Alabama. *Limnology and Oceanography* 46:532-542.
- Chollett, I., and D. Bone. 2007. Effects of heavy rainfall on polychaetes: Differential spatial patterns generated by a large-scale disturbance. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 340:113-125.
- Dahms, H.U. 1990. Salinity, temperature, pH tolerance and grain-size preference of *Paramphiascella fulvofasciata* (Copepoda, Harpacticoida). *Biol Jb Dodonaea* 58:48-62.
- Drake, P., A.M. Arias, F. Baldo, J.A. Cuesta, A. Rodriguez, A. Silva-Garcia, I. Sobrino, D. Garcia-Gonzalez, and C. Fernandez-Delgado. 2002. Spatial and temporal variation of the nekton and hyperbenthos from a temperate European estuary with regulated freshwater inflow. *Estuaries* 25:451-468.
- Ferraris, J.D., K. Fauchald, and B. Kensley. 1994. Physiological responses to fluctuation in temperature or salinity in invertebrates - Adaptations of *Alpheus viridari* (Decapoda, Crustacea), *Terebellides parva* (Polychaeta) and *Golfingia cylindrata* (Sipunculida) to the mangrove habitat. *Marine Biology* 120:397-406.
- Finney, C.M. 1979. Salinity stress in harpacticoid copepods. *Estuaries* 2:132-135.
- Foster, M.S., G.M. Cailliet, J. Callaway, K.M. Vetter, P. Raimondi, and P.J.W. Roberts. 2013. Desalination Plant Entrainment Impacts and Mitigation. State Water Resources Control Board. SWRCB - 11-074-270, Work Order SJSURF 11-11-019. 6 pp.
- Kalke, R.D. and P.A. Montagna. 1991. The effect of freshwater inflow on macrobenthos in the Lavaca River Delta and Upper Lavaca Bay, Texas. *Contributions to Marine Science* 32:49-71.
- Montagna P.A., E.D. Estevez, T.A. Palmer, and M.S. Flannery. 2008. Meta-analysis of the relationship between salinity and molluscs in tidal river estuaries of southwest Florida, USA. *American Malacological Bulletin* 24:101-115

- Montagna, P.A., R. D. Kalke, and C. Ritter. 2002. Effect of restored freshwater inflow on macrofauna and meiofauna in upper Rincon Bayou, Texas, USA. *Estuaries* 25:1436-1447.
- Montagna, P.A., T.A. Palmer, and J Beseres Pollack. 2013. Hydrological Changes and Estuarine Dynamics. Springer Briefs in Environmental Science. 94 pp.
- Montague, C.L., and J.A. Ley. 1993. A possible effect of salinity fluctuation on abundance of benthic vegetation and associated fauna in northeastern Florida Bay. *Estuaries* 16:703-717.
- Nelson, K. 2012. The relative roles of salinity stratification and nutrient loading in seasonal hypoxia in Corpus Christi Bay, TX. Ph.D. Dissertation, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. 161 pp.
- Normant, M., and I. Lamprecht. 2006. Does scope for growth change as a result of salinity stress in the amphipod *Gammarus oceanicus*? *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 334:158-163.
- Ritter, C., P.A. Montagna. 1999. Seasonal hypoxia and models of benthic response in a Texas Bay. *Estuaries* 22:7-20.
- Rozas, L.P., T.J. Minello, I. Munuera-Fernandez, B. Fry, and B. Wissel. 2005. Macrofaunal distributions and habitat change following winter-spring releases of freshwater into the Breton Sound estuary, Louisiana (USA). *Estuarine Coastal Shelf Science* 65:319-336.
- Rutger, S.M., and S.R. Wing. 2006. Effects of freshwater input on shallow-water infaunal communities in Doubtful Sound, New Zealand. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 314:35-47.
- Saoud, I.P., and D.A. Davis. 2003. Salinity tolerance of brown shrimp *Farfantepenaeus aztecus* as it relates to postlarval and juvenile survival, distribution, and growth in estuaries. *Estuaries* 26:970-974.
- Tolley, S.G., A.K. Volety, M. Savarese, L.D. Walls, C. Linardich, and E.M. Everham. 2006. Impacts of salinity and freshwater inflow on oyster reef communities in Southwest Florida. *Aquatic Living Resources* 19:371-387.
- Van Diggelen, A.D. 2014. Is Salinity Variability a Benthic Disturbance. M.S. Thesis, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. 80 pp.
- Zein-Eldin, Z.P. 1963. Effect of salinity on growth of postlarval penaeid shrimp. *Biological Bulletin* 125:188-196.
- Zein-Eldin, Z.P., and D.V. Aldrich. 1965. Growth and survival of postlarval *Penaeus aztecus* under controlled conditions of temperature and salinity. *Biological Bulletin* 129:199-216.

Figure 1. Intake Assessment Locations



Figure 2. Discharge Assessment Locations



Table 1. Intake type and site location recommendations. A total impact score is given for each intake and the sites are color coded by recommendation level.

Intake Matrix	Site 3A Mustang or Padre Islands	Site 1A CC Bay by CC Harbor	Site 4A Viola Turning Basin	Site 1B CC Turning Basin, Inner Harbor	Site 2A West of Spoil Island	Site 2B Shoreline near La Quinta Channel
<b>Subsurface Intake</b>			N/A	N/A		N/A
Impingement of Marine Life	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
Entrainment of Marine Life	0	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
Impacts on Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	2	2	N/A	N/A	3	N/A
Impacts on Other Sensitive Marine Areas	0	0	N/A	N/A	3	N/A
Visual Impacts	0	0	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
Disturbances of Coastal Uses	1	2	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
Impacts on Coastal Wetlands	0	0	N/A	N/A	3	N/A
Other Environmental Issues	0	0	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
<b>Total Impact Score</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>15</b>	N/A
<b>Off-shore, Open Intake</b>			N/A	N/A		N/A
Impingement of Marine Life	2	2	N/A	N/A	3	N/A
Entrainment of Marine Life	2	2	N/A	N/A	3	N/A
Impacts on Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	2	2	N/A	N/A	3	N/A
Impacts on Other Sensitive Marine Areas	0	0	N/A	N/A	3	N/A
Visual Impacts	0	0	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
Disturbances of Coastal Uses	1	2	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
Impacts on Coastal Wetlands	0	0	N/A	N/A	3	N/A
Other Environmental Issues	0	0	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
<b>Total Impact Score</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>21</b>	N/A
<b>On-shore, Open Intake</b>	N/A	N/A			N/A	
Impingement of Marine Life	N/A	N/A	3	3	N/A	3
Entrainment of Marine Life	N/A	N/A	3	3	N/A	3
Impacts on Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	N/A	N/A	1	1	N/A	3
Impacts on Other Sensitive Marine Areas	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	3
Visual Impacts	N/A	N/A	2	2	N/A	3
Disturbances of Coastal Uses	N/A	N/A	0	1	N/A	3
Impacts on Coastal Wetlands	N/A	N/A	2	2	N/A	3
Other Environmental Issues	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	2
<b>Total Impact Score</b>	N/A	N/A	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	N/A	<b>23</b>
Impact Factor:					Recommendation Key (based on the impact factor scores)	
0 - No Impact					Preferred	
1 - Minimal Impact					Alternative	
2 - Moderate Impact					Not Recommended	
3 - Severe Impact					Not Applicable	

Table 2. Preliminary list of fish and invertebrates that could potentially be impacted by local intake systems. Further study is needed before a site specific list can be created.

Fish		Crustaceans	
Common Name	Scientific Name	Common Name	Scientific Name
American Halfbeak	<i>Hyporhamphus meeki</i>	Blue Crab	<i>Callinectes sapidus</i>
Atlantic Brief Squid	<i>Lolliguncula brevis</i>	Gulf Crab	<i>Callinectes similis</i>
Atlantic Bumper	<i>Chloroscombrus chrysurus</i>	Brown Shrimp	<i>Penaeus aztecus</i>
Atlantic Croaker	<i>Micropogonias undulatas</i>	Pink Shrimp	<i>Penaeus duorarum</i>
Bay Anchovy	<i>Anchoa mitchilli</i>	White Shrimp	<i>Penaeus setiferus</i>
Black Drum	<i>Pogonias cromis</i>	Cleaner Shrimp	<i>Hippolytidae</i>
Blue Fish	<i>Pomatomus saltatrix</i>	Grass Shrimp	<i>Palaemonidae</i>
Code Goby	<i>Gobiosoma robustum</i>	Mysid Shrimp	<i>Mysidae</i>
Darter Goby	<i>Ctenogobius boleosoma</i>		
Feather Blenny	<i>Hypsoblennius hentz</i>		
Green Goby	<i>Microgobius thalassinus</i>		
Gulf Flounder	<i>Paralichthys albigutta</i>		
Gulf Menhaden	<i>Brevoortia patronus</i>		
Hogchoaker	<i>Trinectes maculatas</i>		
Inshore Lizardfish	<i>Synodus foetens</i>		
Ladyfish	<i>Elops saurus</i>		
Lizardfish	<i>Synodontidae sp.</i>		
Naked Goby	<i>Gobiosoma bosc</i>		
Pinfish	<i>Lagodon rhomboides</i>		
Pipefish	<i>Syngnathidae sp.</i>		
Puffer Fish	<i>Tetradontidae sp.</i>		
Red Drum	<i>Sciaenops ocellatus</i>		
Sand Seatrout	<i>Cynoscion arenarius</i>		
Sand Seatrout	<i>Cynoscion arenarius</i>		
Sea Robin	<i>Triglidae sp.</i>		
Shrimp eel	<i>Ophichthus gomesii</i>		
Silver Perch	<i>Bairdiella chrysoura</i>		
Silversides	<i>Menidia sp.</i>		
Skilletfish	<i>Gobiesox strumosus</i>		
Southern Flounder	<i>Paralichthys lethostigma</i>		
Spot Croaker	<i>Leiostomus xanthurus</i>		
Spotfin Mojarra	<i>Eucinostomus argenteus</i>		
Spotted Seatrout	<i>Cynoscion nebulosus</i>		
Striped Mullet	<i>Mugil cephalus</i>		
Stripped Burrfish	<i>Chilomycterus schoepfi</i>		
Stripped Mullet	<i>Mugil cephalus</i>		
Tarpon	<i>Megalops atlanticus</i>		

Table 3. Marine species list of bottom dwellers for Corpus Christi Bay. Adapted from Table 12 of Sediment Quality Assessment of Storm Water Outfalls and other Selected Sites in the Corpus Christi Bay National Estuary Program Study Area. Corpus Christi Bay National Estuary Program - CCBNEP-32, September 1998.

Phyla	Class/Order	Species
<b>Anthozoa</b>		unidentified Anthozoans
<b>Turbellaria</b>		unidentified Turbellaria
<b>Nermertinea</b>		<i>Phoronis architecta</i>
<b>Mollusca</b>	Gastropoda	<i>Acteocina canaliculata</i>
		<i>Cyclinella tenuis</i>
		<i>Crepidula</i> sp
		<i>Crepidula plana</i>
		unidentified Vitrinellidae
		<i>Caecum pulchellum</i>
		<i>Nassarius acutus</i>
		<i>Nassarius vibex</i>
		<i>Anachis obesa</i>
		<i>Pyrgiscus</i> sp.
<b>Mollusca</b>	Pelecypoda	unidentified Pelecypoda
		<i>Nuculana acuta</i>
		<i>Aligena texasiana</i>
		<i>Mysella planulata</i>
		<i>Mulinia lateralis</i>
		<i>Abra aequalis</i>
		<i>Cumingia tellinoides</i>
		<i>Tagelus divisus</i>
		<i>Anomalocardia auberiana</i>
		<i>Chione cancellata</i>
		<i>Lyonsia hyalina floridana</i>
		<i>Periploma margaritaceum</i>
		<i>Malmgreniella taylori</i>
		<i>Paleanotus heteroseta</i>
<b>Annelida</b>	Polychaeta	<i>Paramphinome jeffreysii</i>
		<i>Mystides rarica</i>
		<i>Eteone heteropoda</i>
		<i>Cabira incerta</i>
		<i>Ancistrosyllis groenlandica</i>
		<i>Sigambra</i> sp.
		<i>Gyptis vittata</i>
		<i>Microphthalmus aberrans</i>
		<i>Syllis cornuta</i>
		<i>Exogone</i> sp.
		<i>Brania clavata</i>
		<i>Sphaerosyllis</i> sp. A

Phyla	Class/Order	Species
Annelida	Polychaeta	unidentified Syllidae
		<i>Ceratonereis irritabilis</i>
		<i>Laeonereis culveri</i>
		unidentified Nereidae
		<i>Glycinde solitaria</i>
		<i>Lysidice ninetta</i>
		<i>Diopatra cuprea</i>
		<i>Onuphis eremita</i>
		<i>Lumbrineris parvapedata</i>
		<i>Drilonereis magna</i>
		<i>Schistomeringos rudolphi</i>
		<i>Schistomeringos</i> sp. A
		<i>Polydora ligni</i>
		<i>Paraprionospio pinnata</i>
		<i>Apoprionospio pygmaea</i>
		<i>Prionospio heterobranchia</i>
		<i>Scolecopsis texana</i>
		<i>Spiophanes bombyx</i>
		<i>Spio pettiboneae</i>
		<i>Polydora socialis</i>
		<i>Streblospio benedicti</i>
		<i>Polydora caulleryi</i>
		<i>Polydora</i> sp.
		<i>Magelona pettiboneae</i>
		<i>Magelona phyllisae</i>
		<i>Magelona rosea</i>
		<i>Spiochaetopterus costarum</i>
		<i>Tharyx setigera</i>
		<i>Cossura delta</i>
		<i>Haploscoloplos foliosus</i>
		<i>Scolopus rubra</i>
		<i>Haploscoloplos</i> sp.
		<i>Naineris</i> sp. A
		<i>Aricidea fragilis</i>
		<i>Cirrophorus lyra</i>
		<i>Aricidea catharinae</i>
		<i>Paraonis fulgens</i>
		<i>Armandia agilis</i>
		<i>Armandia maculata</i>
		<i>Capitella capitata</i>
		<i>Notomastus latericeus</i>
		<i>Notomastus</i> cf. <i>latericeus</i>



Phyla	Class/Order	Species
<b>Annelida</b>	Polychaeta	<i>Mediomastus ambiseta</i> unidentified Capitellidae <i>Branchioasychis americana</i> <i>Clymenella torquata</i> <i>Asychis elongata</i> <i>Euclymene</i> sp. B <i>Axiothella mucosa</i> <i>Axiothells</i> sp. A unidentified Maldanidae <i>Isolda pulchella</i> <i>Melinna maculata</i> unidentified Terebellidae <i>Fabricia</i> sp. A <i>Chone</i> sp. <i>Megalomma bioculatum</i> <i>Pomatoceros americanus</i> <i>Eupomatus dianthus</i> <i>Eupomatus protulicola</i> unidentified Oligochaetes
<b>Oligochaeta</b>		
<b>Sipuncula</b>		<i>Phascolion strombi</i>
<b>Crustacea</b>	Branchiopoda	<i>Latonopsis occidentalis</i>
<b>Crustacea</b>	Ostracoda	<i>Sarsiella texana</i> <i>Sarsiella zostericola</i>
<b>Crustacea</b>	Copepoda	<i>Pseudodiaptomus coronatus</i>
<b>Crustacea</b>	Branchiura	<i>Argissa hamatipes</i>
<b>Crustacea</b>	Malacostraca	<i>Pagurus annulipes</i> <i>Pagurus longicarpus</i> <i>Pinnixa</i> sp. Megalops
<b>Crustacea</b>	Cumacea	<i>Leptocuma</i> sp.
<b>Crustacea</b>	Amphipoda	unidentified Amphipoda <i>Ampelisca</i> sp. B <i>Ampelisca abdita</i> <i>Synchelidium americanum</i> <i>Erichthonias brasiliensis</i> <i>Corophium ascherusicum</i> <i>Corophium louisianum</i> <i>Microprotopus</i> sp. <i>Grandidierella bonnieroides</i> <i>Batea catharinensis</i> <i>Listriella clymenellae</i> <i>Caprellidae</i> sp.

Phyla	Class/Order	Species
<b>Crustacea</b>	Isopoda	<i>Amphilochus</i> sp.
		<i>Xenanthura brevitelson</i>
		<i>Idotea montosa</i>
<b>Crustacea</b>	Tanaidacea	<i>Leptochelia rapax</i>
<b>Echinodermata</b>	Ophiuroidea	unidentified Ophiuroidea
	Holothuroidea	<i>Thyome mexicana</i>
<b>Chordata</b>	Urochordata	unidentified Ascidiacea
	Hemichordata	<i>Schizocardium</i> sp.

Table 4. Selected references for salinity effects on estuarine macrobenthic and epibenthic organisms.

Authors	Organism(s) Studied	Study Location	Salinity Tolerance Results
Chadwick & Feminella (2001)	Burrowing mayfly <i>Hexagenia limbata</i>	USA (Alabama)	Laboratory bioassays showed that <i>H. limbata</i> nymphs could survive elevated salinities (LC50 of 6.3 ppt at 18 °C, 2.4 ppt at 28 °C). Similar growth rates at 0,2,4, & 8 ppt.
Saoud & Davis (2003)	Juvenile brown shrimp <i>Farfantepenaeus aztecus</i>	USA (Alabama)	Growth significantly higher at salinities of 8 & 12 ppt than at salinities of 2 and 4 ppt.
Tolley et al. (2006)	Oyster reef communities of decapod crustaceans & fish	USA (Florida)	Upper stations (~20 ppt) and stations near high-flow tributaries (6-12 m <sup>3</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> ) were typified by decapod <i>Eurypanopeus depressus</i> & gobiid fishes. Downstream stations (~30 ppt) and stations near low-flow tributaries (0.2-2 m <sup>3</sup> s <sup>-1</sup> ) were typified by decapods <i>E</i>
Montagna et al. (2008a)	Southwest Florida mollusc communities	USA (Florida)	<i>Corbicula fluminea</i> , <i>Rangia cuneata</i> , & <i>Neritina usnea</i> only species to occur < 1 psu. <i>R. cuneata</i> good indicator of mesohaline salinity zones with tolerance to 20 psu. Gastropod <i>N. usnea</i> common in fresh to brackish salinities. <i>Polymesoda caroliniana</i> prese
Montague & Ley (1993)	Submersed vegetation & benthic animals	USA (Florida)	Mean salinity ranged from ~11-31 ppt. Standard deviation of salinity was best environmental correlate of mean plant biomass and benthic animal diversity. Less biota at stations with greater fluctuations in salinity. For every 3 ppt increase in standard

Authors	Organism(s) Studied	Study Location	Salinity Tolerance Results
Rozas et al. (2005)	Estuarine macrobenthic community	USA (Louisiana)	Increased density and biomass with increases in freshwater inflow and reduced salinities. Salinity ranged from 1-13 psu.
Finney (1979)	Harpacticoid copepods <i>Tigriopus japonicus</i> , <i>Tachidius brevicornis</i> , <i>Tisbe sp.</i>	USA (Maryland)	All species tested for response to salinities from 0-210 ppt. <i>Tigriopus</i> became dormant at 90 ppt died at 150 ppt. <i>Tachidius</i> became dormant at 60 ppt, died at 150 ppt. <i>Tisbe</i> died shortly after exposure to 45 ppt.
Kalke & Montagna (1991)	Estuarine macrobenthic community	USA (Texas)	Chironomid larvae & polychaete <i>Hobsonia florida</i> : increased densities after freshwater inflow event (1-5 ppt). Mollusks <i>Mulinia lateralis</i> & <i>Macoma mitchelli</i> : increased densities & abundance during low flow event (~20 ppt). <i>Streblospio benedicti</i> & <i>Medioma</i>
Keiser & Aldrich (1973)	Postlarval brown shrimp <i>Penaeus aztecus</i>	USA (Texas)	Shrimp selected for salinities between 5-20 ppt.
Montagna et al. (2002b)	Estuarine macrobenthic community	USA (Texas)	Macrofauna increased abundances, biomass & diversity with increased inflow; decreased during hypersaline conditions. Macrofaunal biomass & diversity had nonlinear bell-shaped relationship with salinity: maximum biomass at ~19 ppt
Zein-Eldin (1963)	Postlarval brown shrimp <i>Penaeus</i>	USA (Texas)	In laboratory experiments with temperatures 24.5-26.0 °C, postlarvae grew equally well in salinities of 2-40 ppt.

Authors	Organism(s) Studied	Study Location	Salinity Tolerance Results
	<i>aztecus</i>		
Zein-Eldin & Aldrich (1965)	Postlarval brown shrimp <i>Penaeus aztecus</i>	USA (Texas)	In laboratory experiments with temperatures < 15 °C, postlarval survival decreased in salinities < 5 ppt.
Allan et al. (2006)	Caridean shrimp <i>Palaemon peringueyi</i>	South Africa	At constant salinity of 35 ppt, respiration rate increased with increased temperature. At constant temperature of 15 °C, respiration rate increased with increased salinity.
Ferraris et al. (1994)	Snapping shrimp <i>Alpheus viridari</i> , Polychaete <i>Terebellides parva</i> , sipunculan <i>Golfingia cylindrata</i>	Belize	Organisms subjected to acute, repeated exposure to 25, 35, or 45 ppt. <i>A. viridari</i> hyperosmotic conformer at decreased salinity, but osmoconformer at increased salinity. <i>G. cylindrata</i> always osmoconformer. <i>T. parva</i> always osmoconformer; decreased survival.
Lercari et al. (2002)	Sandy beach macrobenthic community	Uruguay	Abundance, biomass, species richness, diversity & evenness significantly increased from salinity of ~6 ppt to salinity of ~25 ppt.
Chollett & Bone (2007)	Estuarine macrobenthic community	Venezuela	Immediately after heavy rainfall (~25 psu), spionid polychaetes showed large increases in density & richness versus normal values (~41 psu).
Dahms (1990)	Harpacticoid copepod	Germany (Helgoland)	After 2 hours, no mortality in salinities of 25-55 ppt. Almost all displayed dormant

Authors	Organism(s) Studied	Study Location	Salinity Tolerance Results
	<i>Paramphiascel la fulvofasciata</i>		behavior < 20 ppt and > 55 ppt.
McLeod & Wing (2008)	Bivalves <i>Austrovenus stutchburyi</i> & <i>Paphies australis</i>	New Zealand	Sustained exposure (> 30 d) to salinity < 10 ppt significantly decreased survivorship.
Rutger & Wing (2006)	Estuarine macroinfaunal community	New Zealand	Infaunal community in low salinity regions (2-4 ppt) showed low species richness & abundance of bivalves, decapods, & Orbiniid polychaetes, but high abundance of amphipods & Nereid polychaetes compared to higher salinity regions (12-32 ppt).
Drake et al. (2002)	Estuarine macrobenthic community	Spain	Species richness, abundance, and biomass decreased in the upstream direction, positively correlated with salinity. Highly significant spatial variation in macrofaunal communities along the salinity gradient. Salinity range: 0-40 ppt.
Normant & Lamprecht (2006)	Benthic amphipod <i>Gammarus oceanicus</i>	Baltic Sea	Low salinity basin (5-7 psu). Physiological performance examined from 5-30 psu. Feeding & metabolic rates decreased with increasing salinity; nutritive absorption increased. Faeces production & ammonia excretion rates decreased strongly from lowest to

Table 5. Discharge matrix

Discharge Matrix		Site 3A Mustang or Padre Islands	Site 1B CC Turning Basin, Inner Harbor	Site 4A Tule Lake Turning Basin	Site 1A CC Bay by CC Harbor	Site 2A SW of La Quinta Channel
<b>Surface Open Discharge Drainage Ditch</b>						
	Marine Species in Estimated Mixing Zone	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A
	Organisms in Water Column	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A
	Bottom Dwellers	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A
	Endangered Species	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A
	Salinity Tolerance of Identified Organisms in Mixing Zone	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
	Target Acceptable Discharge Salinity	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	N/A
	Mixing of Brine Concentrate and Ambient Seawater Mixing Issues	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
	Ion Imbalance of Brine Concentrate and Ambient Seawater Mixing Issues	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
	Toxicity of Brine Concentrate and Ambient Seawater Mixing Issues	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	N/A
	Estimate Maximum Velocity at Edge of Mixing Zone, Safe to Aquatic Life	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A
	Other Environmental Issues	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	N/A
	<b>Total Impact Score</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	17	N/A
<b>Off-shore, Submerged Discharge</b>						
	Marine Species in Estimated Mixing Zone			N/A	N/A	
	Organisms in Water Column	0	1	N/A	N/A	3
	Bottom Dwellers	1	1	N/A	N/A	3
	Endangered Species	0	0	N/A	N/A	1
	Salinity Tolerance of Identified Organisms in Mixing Zone	1	1	N/A	N/A	3
	Target Acceptable Discharge Salinity	1	1	N/A	N/A	3
	Mixing of Brine Concentrate and Ambient Seawater Mixing Issues	0	2	N/A	N/A	3
	Ion Imbalance of Brine Concentrate and Ambient Seawater Mixing Issues	0	1	N/A	N/A	3
	Toxicity of Brine Concentrate and Ambient Seawater Mixing Issues	1	2	N/A	N/A	3
	Estimate Maximum Velocity at Edge of Mixing Zone, Safe to Aquatic Life	0	1	N/A	N/A	2
	Other Environmental Issues	1	1	N/A	N/A	3
	<b>Total Impact Score</b>	5	11	N/A	N/A	27
<b>Surface Open Discharge Pipe</b>						
	Marine Species in Estimated Mixing Zone	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A
	Organisms in Water Column	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A
	Bottom Dwellers	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A
	Endangered Species	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A
	Salinity Tolerance of Identified Organisms in Mixing Zone	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A
	Target Acceptable Discharge Salinity	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A
	Mixing of Brine Concentrate and Ambient Seawater Mixing Issues	N/A	N/A	3	N/A	N/A
	Ion Imbalance of Brine Concentrate and Ambient Seawater Mixing Issues	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A
	Toxicity of Brine Concentrate and Ambient Seawater Mixing Issues	N/A	N/A	3	N/A	N/A
	Estimate Maximum Velocity at Edge of Mixing Zone, Safe to Aquatic Life	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A
	Other Environmental Issues	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A
	<b>Total Impact Score</b>	N/A	N/A	17	N/A	N/A
Impact Factor:					Recommendation Key (based on the impact factor scores)	
0 - No Impact					Preferred	
1 - Minimal Impact					Alternative	
2 - Moderate Impact					Not Recommended	
3 - Severe Impact					Not Applicable	