

Chapter 10

# **Responses to Comments from Public Hearings**

## Chapter 10 Public Hearing Comments on Draft EIR/EIS

Oral comments received during public hearings have been summarized and responses are provided below. Copies of the full transcripts for all meetings held in September 2003 as listed below are available at the FRWA offices (1510 J Street, #140, Sacramento, CA 95814). A link to the video of the December 9, 2003 Sacramento City Council meeting is available at the Freeport Regional Water Project website ([www.FreeportProject.org](http://www.FreeportProject.org)) or on video at the City of Sacramento main library.

September 4, 2003 – Meadowview Community Center, Sacramento, CA

September 9, 2003 – Herald, CA, Herald, CA

September 10, 2003 – East Bay Municipal Utility District, Oakland, CA

September 11, 2003 – Wildhawk Golf Course Clubhouse, Sacramento, CA

September 24, 2003 – Private Residence on El Rito Way, Sacramento, CA

September 29, 2003 – Lisbon Elementary School, Sacramento, CA

December 9, 2003 – Sacramento City Council Hearing Room, Sacramento, CA

### **September 04, 2003—Sacramento, CA (Meadowview Community Center)**

#### **Kurtis Tilletschal, Antioch Baptist Church, 7650 Amherst Street, Sacramento**

*Comment:* What are the long-term and short-term impacts of the project to this community and how long will those impacts last?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* What construction-related mitigation measures will be implemented for the Sacramento community and who will implement them? The document says no mitigation.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Why is the intake facility located so close to a populated area?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Why didn't you choose the alternative that ran the pipeline through the unpopulated, agricultural area?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Keith Herron, Meadowview Development Committee, 1036 E. Landing Way, Sacramento**

*Comment:* What are the current water district areas and zones and the demands for those areas?

*Response:* The boundaries and water demands for each of the FRWA member agencies are described in Chapter 1 of the draft EIR/EIS.

*Comment:* Are there any pending current agreements with regard to compensation for the use of water and payment for construction? Is the City of Sacramento receiving any compensation for that agreement?

*Response:* FRWA is negotiating with the City of Sacramento for the acquisition of the portion of the city property proposed to be used for the intake facility. In addition, FRWA will fully comply with city requirements regarding construction-related mitigation measures. The water supplies to be used by the FRWA member agencies are not owned or controlled by the City; therefore, no compensation is appropriate.

*Comment:* The project eventually takes the majority of the water to the southwest area. Why did you choose the Freeport water facility—was it just based on cost or was there some other reason?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* What are the connection constraints with regard to the Folsom Canal? Do you have to connect in the northernmost portion of the Folsom Canal since you are taking the water south?

*Response:* The current proposed connection location is the most appropriate location. The distance between the Sacramento River and the Folsom South

Canal increases substantially farther south, and connecting at a more southerly location would result greatly increased pipeline length and associated greater disruption and environmental effects.

*Comment:* What were the factors in determining the alternatives? You listed them there, but it was very vague and it was not very specific.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Regarding public review and comment, I want to make sure that the document is available everywhere. I tried to get one at the City Planning Commission and I could not get one. Also I'd like to see more information on the public participation schedule. Some local residents did not know about the public meetings.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

*Comment:* The document does not mention the specific length of the construction period, the number of working days, and the hours of operation.

*Response:* The likely construction periods are discussed in Chapter 2 of the draft EIR/EIS (pages 2-34). In addition, FRWA has committed to a number of measures as part of the project description (see Environmental Commitments on pages 2-44 through 2-51) that will ensure that construction-related effects are minimized to the maximum extent practicable.

*Comment:* The project appears to disproportionately impact low-income and minority environmental justice populations. There was a brief paragraph in Chapter 10 on environmental justice but I don't think it addressed environmental justice adequately. Federal law states that you have to avoid, if possible, and disclose if not possible, if you're going to have a disproportionate impact on minority or low-income residents, and I didn't see that in the report.

*Response:* See the master response for Environmental Justice Issues.

*Comment:* With regards to noise level, the document shows existing noise levels but does not predict expected noise levels.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* If new noise levels are greater than 5 decibels, that could be an issue. Studies have shown that property values that are affected by noise level, particularly if it's an increase of five decibels or more, would depreciate in value by 6%. I want to know how you plan to mitigate for those changes in property values.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Paul Olmstead, SMUD, P.O. Box 15830, Sacramento**

*Comment:* I am concerned with water quality for our new Cosumnes Power Plant near Rancho Seco. SMUD uses American River water and we are concerned that water coming from Sacramento over to the canal, where SMUD will take water for its new power plant, will be of poor quality since it will be coming from the Sacramento River.

*Response:* See responses to written comments from SMUD (Letter L11).

## **Bob Nelson, SMUD, 6301 S Street, MSB355, Sacramento**

*Comment:* I am concerned with water quality for new power plant near Rancho Seco (Cosumnes Power Plant): SMUD uses American River water; concerned that water coming from Sacramento over to FSCC, where SMUD will take water for new power plant, will be of poor quality since coming from Sacramento River. These issues are not addressed in the document.

*Response:* See responses to written comments from SMUD (Letter L11).

## **Georgia Crane, Resident, 7749 El Douro Drive, Sacramento**

*Comment:* I am concerned about the impact of this project on my property value. This issue needs to be addressed.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The freeway noise around my property has increased over the last 15 years and this project will increase noise levels even further.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* During flood season, we've had problems with potential flooding in the area where the intake facility will be located. That area, at the levee bend, is very vulnerable and weak. I'm concerned about that the project will increase erosion in that area and, therefore, increase the risk for flooding.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* This project will supplement the East Bay area during dry periods, taking water from our area. What impact is that going to have on our water supply? Is it going to create rationing for us now?

*Response:* The City of Sacramento's water rights are senior to Reclamation's. Therefore, the city generally has access to its full water supply even during dry periods. The FRWP will not affect the availability of water for the city.

## **Nathan Cox, Resident, 7767 El Rito Way, Sacramento**

*Comment:* This project played a role in my neighbors selling their property over issues related to the future effect of the project on local water quality. The future effect of the project on current property values was not addressed in the document.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* With respect to the issue of the flooding and the potential liability involved, I think this project is being done at the lowest cost to the City and the relative agencies. There should be more flexibility involved here and concern for the project's impact on local residents.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Jocelyn Graves, Resident, 7557 Skelton Way**

*Comment:* I want to know how you were doing your notification because I live in the community and I never got a notice that these meetings were going on.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

*Comment:* If there is a leak in that treatment plant, what's going to happen?

*Response:* The intake facility will be continuously monitored. Any mechanical malfunctions will be rapidly detected and repaired. Because no water will be stored at the site and most of the facilities will be underground, it is unlikely that any facility failure would result in surface flows.

*Comment:* I also had a concern about the flooding and I want to know what you're going to do for this community for all the disruption during construction. Construction through 2010 is a long time. And whatever you decide to do for this community, I would like it to be in writing.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I would like to know if you are going to put any type of sound wall around the treatment plant or other mitigation to address noise impacts.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* It seems as though you've already decided that this project is going to happen. If the community doesn't want this, at what point, if you had to, would you intervene with eminent domain rights?

*Response:* FRWA is negotiating with the city for acquisition of the necessary property to construct and operate the project. FRWA does not plan to exercise its eminent domain authority.

*Comment:* After you gather all this information, are you going to come back to us and have a community meeting to answer questions?

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

## **Ken McGhee, CALFED Environmental Justice Coordinator/Meadowview Resident, 761 Minnie Way, Sacramento**

*Comment:* I am concerned about potential environmental justice issues related to project. Environmental justice is a concept that protects everyone from undue impacts of projects, and I think it's important to take that deep into consideration in this part of the community that's been impacted by the project.

*Response:* See the master response for Environmental Justice Issues.

## **Sedrick Ghosten, Resident, 2175 Florin Road, Sacramento**

*Comment:* What does significant mean? What does it mean in relation to mitigation.

*Response:* Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), public agencies generally may not approve a project with one or more impacts identified as "significant," unless those impacts are mitigated to a less-than-significant level, or such mitigation is found by the public agency to be infeasible. Under CEQA, lead agencies are responsible for determining what degree of impact should be considered "significant."

*Comment:* It is best that we do as much communication and informing up front to explain the project and the issues to the community. You need to involve the members of the community rather than presenting the project as though it's already approved. It is a very beautiful community and they want to embrace it, but they need to understand what's going on.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

## **Janine Kelly, Resident, 7719 Los Rancho Way, Sacramento**

*Comment:* I'm concerned about rodents during construction. We live very close to the river and we have rats, we have mice, we have all kinds of critters that are coming and going. And if you disrupt their environment, they're going to spread and they're going to come over to our houses. So you need to address the rodent problem.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I'm concerned about the dust control. We live in an area with a lot of open fields so we already get a lot of dust. And I'm concerned about how much that will be increased.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I'm concerned about the noise level during construction and operation. What kind of type of noise will be made and how loud will it be? Also, the existing freeway noise should have been checked during a peak traffic period. Calling something significant and unavoidable tells me that the project proponents are not concerned about the impact and its effect on local residents.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Will the levee bike path be kept open during construction? My husband uses it daily.

*Response:* During portions of the construction period, the path will be inaccessible, but a temporary detour will be provided. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Will the integrity of the levee be maintained to prevent flooding?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Why did you choose to build the project in a populated area versus an unpopulated portion along the Sacramento River?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Marcine Crane, Resident, 7749 El Douro Drive, Sacramento**

*Comment:* I am concerned about noise pollution.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I am concerned about visual impacts.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I am concerned about the impact of the project on my property value. Will the project proponents compensate me for the decrease in value due to this project? Community impacts need to be addressed.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* What are the other state/federal funding sources that we would be working with as interested residents if we need to address the funding issues to stop the project, if we have to get to that point?

*Response:* No federal or state funds are currently anticipated to be used for the FRWP. The project will be entirely locally funded by EBMUD and SCWA.

## **Yvette Jones, Resident, 7705 Los Rancho Way, Sacramento**

*Comment:* The benefits, other than to groundwater, are unclear. The document is too difficult to understand.

*Response:* The purpose of the project is described in Chapter 1 of the draft EIR/EIS. As noted in that section, the purpose of the project is to provide facilities to SCWA to allow the conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater to meet the demands within the Zone 40 and to provide facilities to reduce the effects of severe droughts within the EBMUD service area.

*Comment:* Is this project really about urban sprawl and funding suburban development?

*Response:* The project purpose, as described in Chapter 1 of the draft EIR/EIS, is to provide surface water facilities to be used in conjunction with groundwater to meet projected water demands within the Zone 40 area, consistent with the Sacramento County General Plan growth projections.

*Comment:* The alternatives really don't vary that much. You need to reasonably look at other areas that are unpopulated.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Robert Lorbeer, Resident, 7751 El Rito Way, Sacramento**

*Comment:* You've not talked to our community about this project. You've had some private meetings but have not met with the affected community.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

*Comment:* From looking at the document, I cannot understand what the impacts are going to be. You do not care about the community.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process. The Executive Summary of the draft EIR/EIS described the anticipated impacts of the project alternatives in a simplified format.

*Comment:* The EIR did not address impacts on recreational facilities. You have not addressed the walkway. People go up there and walk up and down that all of the time. The EIR shows picture of boats going up and down the river.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* You're talking about a dam. I have no idea where that dam is.

*Response:* A new dam would be constructed only under Alternative 6. This new dam would be located on the Mokelumne River immediately downstream of EBMUD's existing Pardee Dam.

## **Greg Lauck, Resident, 7722 Los Rancho Way, Sacramento**

*Comment:* How many eyesores can we put in this space? We already have the water tower.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* You're asking people to make comments, but the details that we've been given so far are so vague that we can't make comments because we're not educated enough on this thing to be able to make a comment.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process. See also Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS. Substantial public outreach was conducted for the project and the public review period was extended twice and encompassed approximately 5 months, significantly longer than required by law. FRWA is committed to minimizing effects to the extent feasible and has incorporated additional measures into the project as described in Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS.

## **Gwen Jackson**

*Comment:* I did not get notified about the meeting.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

*Comment:* I have a concern certainly about a disproportional amount of burden for construction. With the light rail, widening Cosumnes River Boulevard and then this project. It would be a lot of construction. All of these projects have traffic issues, pollution and dust. In addition, these projects will all affect property values during construction.

*Response:* See the master response for Environmental Justice Issues and Intake Facility Issues. FRWA is aware of these other projects and has been coordinating with the agencies on a regular basis. FRWA is committed to minimizing any combined effects to the extent feasible. However, the construction schedules for all of these projects have not yet been finalized and it is speculative to predict the timing of construction at specific locations at this time.

## **Shari Kawelo, Resident, 7755 El Rito Way, Sac**

*Comment:* I am concerned about the decrease in my property value as a result of the project and my overall quality of life. There will be visual impacts from the project as viewed from my home. There will be dust, noise, and more rodents.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The six alternatives don't list an alternate location for the intake facility; just pipeline alignments.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I am concerned about integrity of the levee.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Cheryl Stith, Member, Antioch Progressive Baptist Church, Sacramento**

*Comment:* The document is very difficult to review, even when you work in the field. It's an awful lot of detail, and awful lot of charts, an awful lot of information. You need to improve the way you communicate the project's risks and benefits to people.

*Response:* Projects such as the FRWP are inherently complex. FRWA made every effort to make the documents as reader-friendly as possible. FRWA is committed to ongoing communication with the community and welcomes additional opportunities to further explain the project.

*Comment:* Improve communication about the project in general.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

*Comment:* Improve communication regarding funding for this project

*Response:* The project is entirely locally funded by SCWA and EBMUD.

## **Matt Kelly, Sacramento Building and Construction Trades Council, Sacramento**

*Comment:* Sacramento Building and Construction Trades Council supports project; it will provide jobs for Sacramento area residents.

*Response:* FRWA appreciates the support of the council.

## **Josephine Blick, Resident, 2257 Pierre Avenue, Sacramento**

*Comment:* Will local people benefit from this project? Will there be jobs for the people in this community, or will people commute from Folsom and everywhere else?

*Response:* FRWA is committed to providing jobs for local residents. The details of such a program are currently in the development phase.

## September 9, 2003—Herald, CA (Herald Fire Department)

### Bob Nelson, SMUD, 6301 S Street, MSB355, Sacramento

Comments are similar to those made on September 4, 2003.

See responses to written comments from SMUD.

### Gene Robinson, 9980 Calvine, Sacramento

*Comment:* How are the funds generated for the Freeport Regional Water Authority Agency?

*Response:* Funding for the FRWP is from SCWA and EBMUD.

*Comment:* It looks like you're selecting a route that goes along streets that are less developed than others that are more developed, so that you're not tearing up a lot of paving that the taxpayers have already paid for. I approve of that.

*Response:* The commentor's preferences are noted.

*Comment:* I would suggest that you obtain the treatment plant property before someone else gets there ahead of you.

*Response:* SCWA has obtained options for two parcels suitable for the treatment plant. See Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS for additional details.

### Georg Kuhnke

*Comment:* I'm particularly concerned about traffic and transportation, not only during the construction timeframe, but potentially afterwards, because of maintenance that has to be going on at the terminus facilities. The trucks that are going to be using the roads in the local area are going to be doing significant damage to all of the roadways. They're going to be impacting school routes, not just bicycle routes, and school routes are not specifically mentioned. So that's a very major safety issue.

*Response:* FRWA recognizes the importance of safety during construction. FRWA has incorporated environmental commitments into the project (draft EIR/EIS page 2-45) that would minimize construction hazards. FRWA will also

coordinate and comply with all normal local agency requirements regarding construction activities.

*Comment:* I'm concerned about noise impacts a couple thousand feet away from the future plant during operation. The noise level will be higher than the current background noise level.

*Response:* See Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS. FRWA has incorporated additional mitigation into the project to ensure that changes in noise levels at nearby residences will be less than significant.

## **Ruth Mulrooney, 27300 Elliott Road**

*Comment:* The document does not address the benefits and impacts to San Joaquin County.

*Response:* Potential impacts within San Joaquin County are disclosed in the appropriate chapters of the draft EIR/EIS. FRWP-related issues within San Joaquin County are related primarily to project construction. Chapters 7 through 17 disclose construction related effects as appropriate.

*Comment:* I am in favor of Alternative 6 because of its recreational benefits. This is the first time it has been discussed - why was it not mentioned in earlier meetings?

*Response:* Alternative 6 was discussed during the scoping meetings for the FRWP held during spring 2002.

## **Kathy Diaz-Cretsu, McKinley Road, Sacramento**

*Comment:* Under Alternative 6, If Pardee is expanded we would not have to bring water from the Canal down to the lakes, which would mean significant savings. What are the benefits to Sacramento County residents to share this water and engage in this partnership with EBMUD?

*Response:* The projected costs of Alternative 6 are higher than the projected costs for Alternatives 2–5. By engaging in a joint project, both SCWA and EBMUD realize cost savings.

*Comment:* The residents in the northern part of the county are probably paying more of this expense. And as you mentioned, any water going south of the Bradshaw facility is not going to be really benefiting them. So why are we doing this? I want transparency about that.

*Response:* The FRWA member agencies have agreed on an equitable cost allocation that shares the costs of joint facilities, while each member agency is responsible for its independent facilities.

*Comment:* The document does not discuss the impacts to the Herald area. It should discuss how the canal looks now and how it will look once the new facility is in place.

*Response:* Visual impacts of the canal pumping plant are disclosed in Chapter 16 of the draft EIR/EIS. Any impacts would be highly localized and would not affect the visual character of the general vicinity. FRWA is committed to designing facilities that are consistent with the surrounding areas to the extent feasible.

*Comment:* I would like to know if there are any comparable pumping facilities like the one you're proposing to build off Clay Station that we could visit so we can hear it. I want to have more details on how this facility is going to affect this part of the county.

*Response:* FRWA has identified the Carmichael Water District pump and water treatment plant facility. This facility is a local facility within a residential neighborhood and immediately adjacent to single-family houses. This facility includes water pumps, compressors, air surge tanks, electrical transformer, and chemical storage facilities. EBMUD also operates a pump plant in Danville that would serve as an example of a reasonably similar facility.

*Comment:* I would like to have information on the details of the construction and operation process, such as access roads that will be used by equipment and machinery.

*Response:* Construction aspects of the project are described in Chapter 2 of the draft EIR/EIS. Additional details will be developed during final design. FRWP is committed to maintaining communication with local residents during project construction.

*Comment:* I don't think the format that has been used to present the project is user friendly.

*Response:* Projects such as the FRWP are inherently complex. FRWA made every attempt to simplify the information and is committed to continuing to work with local residents during project design and construction.

## **September 10, 2003—Oakland, CA (East Bay Municipal Utility District)**

### **Colin Taylor, SMUD, Sacramento**

*Comment:* If you take Sacramento River water and pump it into the Folsom South Canal, the quality of the water used by SMUD's facilities will be significantly impacted. There's a lot of solids, dissolved solids and other things in Sacramento River water that are not in the Canal water from the canal itself and from the south fork of the American River. If our water quality is decreased, we will not be able to use this water and we would not be able to maintain our NPDES permit. I would think we may have to close Rancho Seco Lake and our new Cosumnes power plant relies on clean water.

*Response:* See responses to written comments by SMUD (Letter L11) in this final EIR/EIS.

## September 11, 2003—Sacramento, CA (Wildhawk Golf Course Clubhouse)

### David Hu, USFWS

*Comment:* Why does the water have to go through the Mokelumne Aqueduct? This is a lot of water, and there's an impact throughout the delta.

*Response:* The purpose of and need for the project are described in Chapter 1 of the draft EIR/EIS. FRWA explored numerous alternatives as part of the environmental documentation process (see Appendix B in Volume 2 of the draft EIR/EIS). Alternatives involving diversions farther downstream were found to be infeasible and would not reduce potential environmental effects compared to the alternatives considered in the draft EIR/EIS.

### Paul Olmstead, SMUD, P.O. Box 15830, Sacramento

*Comment:* The project will have an adverse economic impact on SMUD's operations. Because of the project's impact on the water that will be used by the new power plant, the plant may need to be shut down, which could affect regional power generation supplies and power reuse opportunities.

*Response:* See responses to written comments by SMUD (Letter L11) in this final EIR/EIS.

### George Waegell

*Comment:* What impacts will the sewage treatment plant have on the quality of the water coming out of the Freeport plant? Because of high tide and low flow, the tides may bring up sewage from the discharge on the sanitation pump.

*Response:* Issues related to water quality, including the possible effects of the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District outfall on FRWP diversions, are disclosed in Chapter 4 of the final EIR/EIS. Overall, based on the analysis in the draft EIR/EIS, no significant impacts related to the outfall are anticipated.

### Sandy Need

*Comment:* The Wildhawk Silver Springs area uses groundwater. Will residents from the Vineyard Road area receive water from the pipeline? There are wells proposed in the Wildhawk area that will use Rancho Cordova water and we are

concerned about quality of the well water in Wildhawk/Silver Springs. People don't know they are on wells in that area already. They might think the pipeline being built in their area is for their use.

*Response:* The Wildhawk area is within the Zone 40 area. The area will therefore be served surface water from the FRWP facilities.

## September 24, 2003—Sacramento, CA (Private Residence on El Rito Way)

### Councilman Robbie Waters

*Comment:* To mitigate impacts associated with noise, land use, and property values, move sediment tanks and settling ponds to different area of site; leave “structure” (i.e. water tower) where it is.

*Response:* Please see Figure 2-1 of the final EIR/EIS for revised intake site layout.

### Jack Lawson

*Comment:* Since the soccer field would be relatively cheap to construct, you could move the facility further south and relocate the soccer field.

*Response:* This option has been discussed with the City of Sacramento. The city has determined that it is not acceptable.

### Yvette Jones

*Comment:* I see that we’re going to distribute water down to the South Bay, but how does it truly benefit Sacramento, how does it benefit the local residents?

*Response:* As described in Chapter 1 of the draft EIR/EIS, the project will prevent potential groundwater overdraft in Sacramento County and provide surface water to support development consistent with the Sacramento County General Plan.

*Comment:* Why can’t the intake structure be moved further south, into the delta, or into agricultural areas that don’t affect local residents?

*Response:* Alternatives involving a Delta diversion were discussed in Appendix B, Volume 2 of the draft EIR/EIS. Such alternatives were found infeasible and were not environmentally preferable to the alternatives considered in the draft EIR/EIS. In addition, only EBMUD’s portion of the FRWP could be met with such an alternative. SCWA needs would still require a diversion and pipeline facility similar to the FRWP.

## Ernie Hidalgo

*Comment:* Address why an alternative in a populated area that would disrupt residents is “preferred” over an alternative that would impact a recreational area. I think the interests of the populated area needs to be considered more so than an area that is only going to be used a fraction of the time, where the homeowners are there a hundred percent of the time.

*Response:* It is important to note that Alternative 6 includes a diversion facility at the Freeport intake location. Only EBMUD’s needs would be met by enlarging Pardee Reservoir. An SCWA-only facility would result in impacts essentially identical to a joint project intake facility.

## Kim Stepanick

*Comment:* The EIR/EIS does not address noise generated from intake facility and its affect on local residents.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The EIR/EIS does not address the project’s impacts on local property values.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues

*Comment:* Mitigation is needed to lessen the severity of the noise and property value impacts on local residents.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues

## Mike Hieronimus

*Comment:* The EIR/EIS does not consider an underlying line break for the pipeline. If there is no isolation in the valves, the water in the pipeline could drain into the Pocket area.

*Response:* The pipeline will be designed to meet all current engineering design standards and practices. Isolation valves will be provided at appropriate locations along the pipeline as will outlets to drain water remaining in the pipeline. A berm also exists between the intake site and the Pocket area. Water will not be allowed to flow into the Pocket area in the event of a pipeline failure.

## Eleanor Alvarez

*Comment:* I am concerned about the project's impact on noise levels in the local area. The intake facility is going to add to the existing noise level from I-5.

*Response:* As described in Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS, FRWA has committed to additional engineering design measures that will ensure that the intake facility will not increase noise levels at nearby residences as compared to ambient levels.

*Comment:* I am also concerned about odor from intake facility.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues

*Comment:* You seem to have already made a decision on the project without our input.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## Leonor Alvarez

*Comment:* Real estate agents should have disclosed the impacts of this project when we were sold our home; the real estate agent should also disclose information to potential homebuyers.

*Response:* Real estate rules of disclosure are not a CEQA or NEPA issue. Regarding the potential effect on property values, see the master response for Intake Facility Issues

*Comment:* This project will impact my property value.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues

## September 29, 2003—Sacramento, CA (Lisbon Elementary School)

### Bob Nelson

*Comment:* The EIR/EIS did not address significant impacts of the project on water quality in the Folsom South Canal. These significant impacts will adversely affect our facilities at Rancho Seco and Rancho Seco Lake and our Cosumnes Power Plant for which groundbreaking is imminent.

*Response:* See responses to written SMUD comments in this final EIR/EIS.

### Bill Scott

*Comment:* FRWA is using an inflated baseline for noise to measure it against ambient noise. Will that be taken into consideration? Vibrations from additional noise from the project are going to have a significant impact on local residences.

*Response:* As described in Chapter 14 of the draft EIR/EIS, noise measurements were taken continuously over a 3-day period (including a weekend) to capture the full range of ambient noise. Subsequent measurements were taken during the public review period and all recorded higher noise levels than those reported in the draft EIR/EIS. The measurements used for the analysis are therefore considered reasonable and appropriate. Both noise and vibration effects were considered in the draft EIR/EIS analysis. Through detailed engineering analysis completed during the public review period, FRWA has identified, and committed to implement, additional measures that would reduce noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. See Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS for additional details.

### Denis Ishisaka

*Comment:* How many chemicals will be released in the air in the event of an accident at the intake facility? Many kids participate in activities in Marriott Park, which is less than a quarter mile away from the facility.

*Response:* The only chemical to be stored at the site would be sodium hypochlorite. This chemical is a liquid and would be stored in a triple-containment facility in compliance with all state and federal regulations. It would not be possible, even in a catastrophic incident, for this chemical to be discharged from the intake facility site. See Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS for additional details.

*Comment:* What is the noise impact on residents that live 0.5 miles away from intake facility?

*Response:* FRWA has committed to implement additional measures that have been identified during the public review period to ensure that noise from the intake facility will not exceed ambient noise levels. See Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS for additional details.

*Comment:* You have not done enough to communicate with local residents.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

## Catherine Pisani

*Comment:* I am concerned about drilling at the bend in the levee, which could affect the levee at its weakest point.

*Response:* Project construction will require the approval of the state Reclamation Board, which is responsible for the integrity of the levee at the project site. FRWA will be required to demonstrate that the project will not result in reduced flood protection or weakened levees. The current plan is to build a new levee around the intake facility prior to the start of construction to ensure that the integrity of the levee is maintained.

*Comment:* I am concerned about the use of chemicals at the intake facility and the potential for the use of something stronger than chlorine and ammonia sulfate in the future. We won't be notified if stronger chemicals are used and the chemicals could have effects on children in area.

*Response:* There is no potential to introduce chemicals other than sodium hypochlorite at the intake site. The sole purpose of any chemicals is to inject into the pipeline to prevent biological growth within the pipeline, similar to the use of chlorine in potable water. The water is ultimately to be used as drinking water and therefore excessive chemical usage is not desirable. Also, see master response for Intake Facility Issues.

The only chemical to be stored at the site would be sodium hypochlorite. This chemical is a liquid and would be stored in a triple-containment facility in compliance with all state and federal regulations.

## Mary Savage

*Comment:* Draft EIR ignores impact on property values, neighborhood quality of life, effect of possible mosquitoes from holding pools, and odors from holding pools at intake facility.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues

## Alan Hockenson

*Comment:* The local residents receive all the impact but none of the benefit.

*Response:* As noted in Chapter 1 of the draft EIR/EIS, one of the primary purposes of the project is to prevent groundwater overdraft in Sacramento County, which benefits the entire population.

*Comment:* Why are local residents being sacrificed when there are plenty of alternatives that won't affect people?

*Response:* FRWA considered well over 100 alternatives to the FRWP. These alternatives are discussed in Appendix B, Volume 2 of the draft EIR/EIS. FRWA is fully committed to working with the local community to resolve as many issues as possible.

## Rebecca Baumann

*Comment:* I am concerned about the intake facility's impact on local noise, aesthetics and quality of life.

*Response:* These issues are discussed in Chapters 14 and 16 of the draft EIR/EIS. FRWA is committed to reducing impacts at the intake site to the extent feasible. See Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS for additional details.

*Comment:* The document does not adequately address impacts to recreationalists who use the bike path along levee.

*Response:* This issues was discussed in Chapter 6 of the draft EIR/EIS. Because any such impacts would be temporary and because FRWA has committed to maintaining a detour around the project construction site, the impact was found to be less than significant.

*Comment:* The benefits of this project will be realized by East Bay residents but the adverse effects are on Sacramento residents.

*Response:* It is important to note that SCWA will receive approximately three times as much water (68,000 acre-feet) on an average annual basis as EBMUD (23,000 acre-feet). As noted in Chapter 1 of the draft EIR/EIS, one of the primary purposes of the project is to prevent groundwater overdraft in Sacramento County, which benefits the entire population.

## Yvette Jones

*Comment:* The benefits of this project will not be realized by people who are affected by the project. You did not look at impacts on a neighborhood level, especially the impacts on property values.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## Robert Lorbeer

*Comment:* The document states that impacts will be on a rural agricultural area and are mitigated. But the impacts are on populated areas and are not mitigated.

*Response:* The draft EIR/EIS notes numerous impacts on both rural and urban areas. FRWA is committed to reducing impacts at the intake site to the extent feasible and has identified additional measures to reduce impacts since publication of the draft EIR/EIS. See Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS for additional details.

*Comment:* The project should take the tide schedule into account and shut off the pumps when the water flows up the river.

*Response:* Potential effects of reverse flows on water quality were described in Chapter 4 of the draft EIR/EIS. In addition, FRWA has proposed an environmental commitment in the draft EIR/EIS (page 2-51) that requires coordinated operations between the FRWP and the Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District's operations. No significant impacts were identified.

*Comment:* The document should visually represent all of the proposed facilities and buildings.

*Response:* See Chapter 2 and Figure 2-1 of this final EIR/EIS for additional details regarding project facilities at the intake site.

## Kim Stepanick

*Comment:* The intake facility could be located south of the preferred site where you wouldn't impact people. You picked one study site and rushed to make a decision on it.

*Response:* The proposed intake site was selected based on detailed engineering and environmental evaluations. See Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS for additional information.

*Comment:* Provide additional detail on what 60 or 80 decibels sounds like so that I can judge the document's conclusions on existing noise near the intake facility.

*Response:* Additional information on noise levels was provided in Appendix C of the draft EIR/EIS (Figure 1). That figure indicates that 60 dBA is equivalent to the noise level created by the movement of people inside a residence with no TV or radio; 70 dBA is equivalent to normal speech heard at a distance of 15 feet; while 80 dBA is equivalent to a typical home garbage disposal in operation. It is important to note that higher sound levels will occur sporadically and intermittently only relatively close to the site and only when numerous pieces of heavy equipment are operated simultaneously. As noted in Chapter 14 of the draft EIR/EIS, construction-related noise impacts at the intake facility site were identified as significant and unavoidable. FRWA has proposed mitigation measures to reduce such impacts to the extent feasible.

## **Kathi Windheim**

*Comment:* The Final EIR/EIS should have a summary that describes the anticipated noise due to the project and demonstrate the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures (e.g., noise shielding, moveable barriers, etc.).

*Response:* Anticipated construction noise levels were discussed in Chapter 14 of the draft EIR/EIS. Although these impacts were identified as significant and unavoidable, FRWA has committed to reducing these impacts to the extent feasible. Because implementation and effectiveness of these measures will vary widely depending on the specific circumstance, it is not possible to determine the precise effectiveness of these measures. Regarding operational noise, see the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Al Duran**

*Comment:* I am concerned about operational impacts, such as noise and odors, given the project's proximity to residences. The Draft EIR/EIS does not clearly demonstrate the project's impacts on local residences and how it will mitigate such impacts.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **December 9, 2003—Sacramento City Council**

### **Butch Hodgkins, SAFCA**

*Comment:* Because of the concrete materials used to construct the intake, the intake will improve the integrity of the levee in that area.

*Response:* The commentor's opinion on the flood control aspects of the project is noted.

### **Keith De Vore, SCWA**

*Comment:* I am in favor of the project because of its benefits to the customers served by my agency and EBMUD.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

### **Cyrus Apar, City Engineer, Rancho Cordova**

*Comment:* I support the project on behalf of Rancho Cordova.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

### **Leo Winternitz, Executive Director, Water Forum**

*Comment:* I recognize the neighborhood concerns regarding the construction and operation of the project and I believe that site-specific impacts should be mitigated.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I am in favor of the project because it will stabilize the groundwater basin in Sacramento County; which could benefit the Cosumnes River and protect the American River.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project and recommendation to protect American River resources are noted.

## **Joe Sullivan, Sacramento County Tax Payers League**

*Comment:* I support the project and the Water Forum. We should strive to protect the groundwater in Zone 40.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

## **Mary McDonald, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* I oppose the intake location. The size of the facility is unprecedented in residential neighborhoods - the city has never put an industrial site so close to homes. The pumps are the horsepower of 9 locomotives and 40 ft. high.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Emma Jimenez, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* I oppose the intake location.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The poor communication by FRWA resulted in public ignorance because the project was described as "near the community of Freeport".

*Response:* See the master responses for Public Outreach Process and Intake Facility Issues.

## **Michael Chan, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* The document's alternatives analysis is inadequate. It does not consider alternate locations for the intake and Site A is not thoroughly analyzed in the DEIR. The DEIR, therefore, does not meet CEQA requirements for the contents of an alternatives analysis.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The Pocket Neighborhood is not against the project. It is against the location chosen for the intake facility.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## Laura Knepple, Pocket Resident

*Comment:* I oppose the intake location.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The project, including its size, encourages future development; it is, therefore, growth-inducing. Growth-inducement is an issue that should be considered in the EIR. Why do you need such a large facility if you aren't taking the water every year?

*Response:* Growth-related effects are addressed in Chapter 20 of the draft EIR/EIS.

## Robert Lorbeer, Pocket Resident

*Comment:* I oppose the intake location. Construction is not short-term – it will take years to construct and the noise and smells will continue throughout the operation of the project.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The project has environmental justice impacts - why was it relocated from the gated communities of American River to a minority community? Also, the DEIR leaves out census tract 40.12.

*Response:* See the master response for Environmental Justice Issues.

*Comment:* The document is inadequate and should be redrafted and resubmitted to the public.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The project should be built in Yolo County to give people jobs.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The City needs to mitigate for impacts to residents.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Ron Stork, Friends of the River**

*Comment:* I am glad that FRWA delayed the review period of the DEIR and listened to community concerns; this shows that FRWA is working to try and make the site location an asset to the community.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

## **Clyde MacDonald, Interested Party**

*Comment:* It would be great if the project could end the 30-year fight with between SCWA and EBMUD.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

*Comment:* I support the project and doing what you can to take care of neighbors. American River Parkway users will thank you.

*Response:* The commentor's support of the project and recommendation to protect American River resources are noted.

## **Frank Cirill, SARA**

*Comment:* The City Council participated in the EBMUD lawsuit and urges support of project.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

*Comment:* The Consultant will address community concerns through mitigation of environmental impacts.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* FRWA should provide residents with the answers that are requested.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

## **Earl Withycombe, Water Forum Delegate from Environmental Council**

*Comment:* I support the WF Agreement principles and think that the DEIR is adequate.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

## **Jim Jones, SARA Board Member**

*Comment:* I commend the City Council for recognizing the importance of protecting the American River and I support the project.

*Response:* The commentor's support of the project and recommendation to protect American River resources are noted.

*Comment:* The residents that will be affected by the project have legitimate concerns and those need to be addressed.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

*Comment:* The City and County should have been more proactive in reaching out to the community.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

## **Yvette Jones, Pocket resident**

*Comment:* Environmental justice is a concern and was not adequately addressed in the DEIR; census tract information was omitted in Draft and public participation was sacrificed. Residents will be disproportionately impacted.

*Response:* See the master response for Environmental Justice Issues.

*Comment:* There are short-term construction impacts with no benefit.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Property values will decrease during construction phase and during operation.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The project will have impact the area's visual quality because the intake facility will detract from views.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Shari Kawelo, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* I did not receive advanced notice of the project when I purchased my home last year.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

*Comment:* I am concerned about the chemicals that will be used to construct and operate the project. If it's not dangerous, why do you need triple containment? The DEIR does not address what chemicals will be used or stored, which is a violation of CEQA. Also, if sodium chloride is not dangerous why do you need to triple contain it?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The Draft should be re-circulated because it is inadequate.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Raul Jimenez, Jr., Interested Party**

*Comment:* I am not against the project but I am opposed to the location of the intake facility in a residential neighborhood. The project will create noise and vibration during pile driving and construction traffic.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Sarah McClatchy Kane, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* I am concerned about security for my neighborhood during construction; vehicle and residential alarms will be activated due to construction/vibration, which will eventually effect police response times due to enormous calls for service.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The project site will invite criminal activity in neighborhood.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Bonnie Bartholomew , Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* FRWA conducted poor public outreach for this project.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

*Comment:* I oppose the intake location.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Frank Albert, Alma Vista Neighborhood**

*Comment:* Although construction will be an inconvenience, FRWA is doing a pretty good job of mitigating concerns of neighborhood residents.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* FRWA should address security of site.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Alan Wade, SARA President**

*Comment:* I support the project because the benefits of the American River need to be protected at any cost.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project and recommendation to protect the American River resources are noted.

## **Jack Sole, Water Forum Environmental Caucus**

*Comment:* If this project doesn't go forth, EBMUD can go back to the American River near Nimbus.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I understand residents' concerns of construction noise and dust, but the benefits of the project outweigh its disruption.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Michelle McCormick, Vice Chair, Sacramento County Parks Commission**

*Comment:* The biggest injustice would be if the American River Parkway were to be disturbed as a result of project implementation.

*Response:* The recommendation to protect American River resources is noted.

*Comment:* You need to give Pocket residents the utmost consideration and address their concerns.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master responses for Public Outreach Process and Intake Facility Issues.

## **Bill Kelly, Local 39**

*Comment:* I urge the Council to support the project because of its benefits to the community, including the jobs it will create.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

## **Leonor Alvarez, Pocket resident**

*Comment:* The name of the project is misleading.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I will lose money in home by \$35,000 and I am trapped by the location of the project.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The dimensions of the intake facility are too large to put in a residential neighborhood.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The project will result in economic, Sacramento River, and environmental impacts.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* There was no public participation for this area. We were misinformed.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

*Comment:* I support the project, but want FRWA to find another location for the intake facility.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Ted Woodward, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* The proposed intake location has a Sac River Parkway access point; this should be looked at.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The Principles of Agreement for the intake facility location between the city and FRWA should be negotiated in a public forum.

*Response:* All necessary aspects of the Principles of Agreement are included in the final EIR/EIS.

*Comment:* I do not think FRWA should be involved in mitigation monitoring.

*Response:* FRWA is the CEQA lead agency, and mitigation monitoring is its legal responsibility.

*Comment:* The land (where the intake facility will be built) should be leased, not sold, to FRWA.

*Response:* The comment is noted.

*Comment:* The DEIR should be re-circulated because it is inadequate.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Manny Hernandez, Interested Party**

*Comment:* I am against the proposed location of the intake facility site. Locating the facility farther north could avoid a highly populated area.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Would the levees be weakened during construction of the intake facility?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Impacted homeowners should be compensated due to property values being lowered.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The DEIR's alternatives analysis is inadequate because it did not consider or thoroughly explain other intake sites. A case hasn't been made for this intake location; neighborhood concerns have not been taken into consideration during the selection of this location.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Lesley Cox, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* I don't support the project in its current location.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The FRWA did a poor job of considering economic impacts in the DEIR; property values could decrease 6-10% as a result of this project.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Will there be compensation for residents during construction?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I am concerned about construction impacts, like noise, dust, and chemicals, especially for residents with medical conditions.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Keith Herron, Meadowview Development Committee**

*Comment:* I don't support the project location.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The project and the DEIR is a violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and Executive order 12898, which requires project proponents to consider disparate impacts to minorities. Businessmen and white people are supportive of this project whereas 65% of the homes within a mile of the project are owned by minorities.

*Response:* See the master response for Environmental Justice Issues.

*Comment:* I am concerned about the project's traffic, including the impact to levels of service, property values, aesthetic impacts, noise, vibrations, and destruction of man made or natural resources.

*Response:* For concerns regarding the intake facility, see the master response for Intake Facility Issues. More generally, impacts associated with aesthetics, noise and vibration, and traffic, and associated mitigation measures are fully disclosed in Chapters 16, 14, and 12, respectively, of the draft EIR/EIS.

## **Dave Butler, Sac Metro Chamber**

*Comment:* I support this project.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

## **Jim Ray, McKay and Soms**

*Comment:* I encourage support of the project.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

*Comment:* The FRWA should resolve residents' issues.

*Response:* See the master responses for Public Outreach Process and Intake Facility Issues.

## **Matt Kelly, Sacramento Building Trades Council**

*Comment:* I support the project.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

*Comment:* Residents need to realize this is a short-term construction project with short-term impacts.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

## **James Morgan, 9459 Alcosta Way**

*Comment:* I support the project and understand that EBMUD could go back to taking water from the American River if this project doesn't work out.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I appreciate the concerns of local residents who will be affected by the project. Residents should try and work with FRWA to come up with best design possible.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted. See the master responses for Public Outreach Process and Intake Facility Issues.

## **Rena Atise, Vice President of Meadowview Neighborhood Committee**

*Comment:* I do not approve project because it will impact neighborhoods and children.

*Response:* The draft EIR/EIS fully analyzes the impacts on people and the environment. In particular, see Chapters 13, "Air Quality," 14, "Noise," 15, "Public Health and Safety." Additionally, FRWA has included numerous environmental commitments in the project description to minimize potential impacts (see Chapter 2 of the draft EIR/EIS). Also, see master responses to Environmental Justice Issues and Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I oppose the location of the pipeline, which will be on Meadowview; why do we need that?

*Response:* See the master response for Environmental Justice Issues.

*Comment:* Eight thousand homes are located within a half mile of the Freeport Project but there are no plans currently to compensate impacted homeowners; home values will decrease.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The levees are weak and this project will weaken them further.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I have noise and dust concerns.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* FRWA is not telling us the whole story.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

## **Steve Benson, President of Meadowview Neighborhood Committee**

*Comment:* Benefits will go to project proponents, but not to local residents. We want some benefit for the inconvenience the project will cause.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The project will create noise, dust, and traffic impacts in Meadowview area.

*Response:* The draft EIR/EIS fully analyzes the impacts associated with noise, dust, and traffic. Please see Chapters 14, “Noise,” 13, “Air Quality,” and 12, “Traffic and Transportation.” Additionally, FRWA has included numerous environmental commitments in the project description to minimize potential impacts (see Chapter 2 of the draft EIR/EIS). Also, see master responses to Environmental Justice Issues. It should also be noted that the preferred alternative substantially avoids developed portions of the Meadowview community, thereby avoiding and minimizing potential impacts.

## **Paul Hutton, South Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* I am against the intake location but not against the project.

*Response:* The commentor’s support for the project is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The analysis of the intake facility’s impacts in the DEIR was inadequate.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I am concerned about the reverse flows issue. What does “infrequent” flows mean?

*Response:* Impact 4-2 in the draft EIR/EIS (page 4-15) describes the issues associated with and potential frequency of reverse flows. Additionally, FRWA’s technical team set a target criterion of finding a site where treated wastewater would reach the site on no more than 20% of the occasions when reverse flow occurs. This would allow the FRWA member agencies to operate the intake facility in a manner that would still meet their purpose and need while not

breaching their duty to protect the public's health or be forbidden by regulatory agencies such as the Department of Health Services. Computer modeling revealed that this distance is at least 3,500 feet upstream. Therefore, the 3,500 feet of river closest to and upstream of the SRCSD outfall was excluded from further analysis.

*Comment:* FRWA should consider other intake facility locations based on the feedback received from the public.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Rebecca Baumann, South Pocket Area**

*Comment:* The Pocket area is rich in natural resources (wildlife and habitat) and I want to preserve what is left of open space. We need to protect animals and preserve river views.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The project will cut off a bike trail from continuing on to Isleton.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I don't want "people trees/landscaping" (redwood trees, etc.), but what is indigenous to the area.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Sharon Jensen, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* Where was the public process for our neighborhood? We should form a Save the South Pocket area.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

*Comment:* The project will result in environmental impacts - the sheer size of intake is incompatible with the existing land uses in the local neighborhood because of noise impacts, chemical storage, and habitat impacts.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Bill Camp, Executive Secretary of Sacramento Central Labor Council**

*Comment:* It is important to move forward on the proposal/project.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

## **Phil Reynolds, Member of Partners Local 46/Member of Carmichael Planning Commission**

*Comment:* I appreciate the concerns of local residents as well as FRWA representatives and I support moving the project forward.

*Response:* The commentor's support for the project is noted.

## **Kenneth Koyama, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* The DEIR does not adequately address air quality impacts during the construction phase. The level of diesel emissions is not quantified in DEIR. The DEIR needs to include specific levels of engine emissions from heavy-duty vehicles (idling times, plume dispersion and grams of emissions at the site).

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* The DEIR fails to adequately estimate truck trips to the site – there is a gross discrepancy between average (6 trips) and peak trips (120 trips). The DEIR should use a worst case scenario to estimate impacts.

*Response:* As noted on page 12-12 (last paragraph under “Freeport Intake Facility”) of the draft EIR/EIS, the analysis assumes that overall round-trip truck trips at the intake site would average 22 trips per day throughout the duration of construction. The highest number of construction-related truck trips daily would occur during the discharge piping/other structures phase of activities, averaging 120 round-trips per day for 5 days' duration. The analysis did not directly consider the “worst case” because of the short duration of such an event and because the environmental commitments adopted by FRWA would minimize potential effects. As noted in the draft EIR/EIS, FRWA is committed to minimizing traffic disruptions as much as possible and intends to adopt the environmental commitments outlined in Chapter 2 of the draft EIR/EIS, which include implementation of a traffic control plan (page 2-45). It is important to note that truck traffic associated with the intake facility will access the site from Freeport Boulevard and will not be directed through the Pocket area neighborhood.

*Comment:* DEIR does not adequately address impacts during the construction phase of project and the mitigation measures are not enough to address the impacts.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **W.A. (Bill) Scott, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* The DEIR should include more information and detail on mitigation measures.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I am concerned about noise impacts, including constant vibrations. How will these impacts be mitigated?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Will the settling basins be lined? How will you prevent seepage?

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I am opposed to shortening the bike path. You could put in stairway for residents.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Property values will be affected by the project at least during next 3 years.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

## **Ken McGhee, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* You should go back and host facilitated stakeholder meetings with community members.

*Response:* See the master response for Public Outreach Process.

## **Ernie Hidalgo, Pocket Resident**

*Comment:* I oppose the intake location.

*Response:* The comment is noted. See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I am concerned about noise, visual impacts, chemicals, traffic, safety, air pollution, odor, graffiti, mosquitoes, private party and residential impacts, bike path disruption, and increase in terror threats in community.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* Money shouldn't be used as criteria to determine site location.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.

*Comment:* I want FRWA to provide a full list of pros and cons regarding each site analyzed.

*Response:* See the master response for Intake Facility Issues.