

**Chapter 10**  
**Public Hearing Comments on the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS**

---

**Public Meeting Comments—Oakland, California  
(December 1, 1997)**

**PHO1-1 (Richard Denton)**

**Comment:** *New Bay-Delta projects should follow the principle that everyone gets better together. There should not be any redirected impact on other water users.*

**Response:** See the responses to the following major issues in Chapter 3 of this document: “Delta and Sacramento River Alternatives,” “Relationship to CALFED,” and the “Area of Origin.”

**PHO1-2 (Richard Denton)**

**Comment:** *Any new Bay-Delta project should improve fisheries, provide net improvements to the ecosystem, and provide water quality benefits.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Delta and Sacramento River Alternatives” and the “Area of Origin” major issues in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHO1-3 (Richard Denton)**

**Comment:** *New Bay-Delta projects should support the Bay-Delta Accord, CALFED, the long-term stability of the Delta, and any long-term Delta solutions.*

**Response:** See the responses to the following major issues in Chapter 3 of this document: “Delta and Sacramento River Alternatives,” “Relationship to CALFED,” and the “Area of Origin.”

**PHO1-4 (Richard Denton)**

**Comment:** *More detail is necessary on the availability of water to EBMUD during the second and third year of a drought. A comparison on corresponding water shortages between EBMUD and other water users should be completed.*

**Response:** See the response to CCWD comments in this document (L20).

**PHO1-5 (Richard Denton)**

**Comment:** *The Draft EIS/EIR does not fully analyze Sacramento or Delta Diversion points. A Delta Diversion point would add additional flexibility in times of emergencies. This can be included in an emergency permit for the project.*

**Response:** See the response to “Delta and Sacramento River Alternatives” major issue in Chapter 3 in this document.

**PHO1-6 (Richard Denton)**

**Comment:** *Since the project relies on CALFED and CVPIA for impact mitigation, there needs to be more discussion of their role.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Relationship to CALFED” major issue in Chapter 3 in this document and Chapter 1 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS.

**PHO1-7 (Richard Denton)**

**Comment:** *Any Bay-Delta project should not impact water quality in the Delta. We believe a change of 30 mg/L chlorides and even less than 30 mg/L should be considered significant. Under Alternative 3, the change in chlorides is up to 45 mg/L and goes beyond the significance criteria adopted in the EIS/EIR.*

**Response:** See the response to CCWD comments in this document (L20).

**PHO1-8 (Richard Denton)**

**Comment:** *More analysis should be made on diverting American River water during periods other than dry years.*

**Response:** The operations and environmental analysis presented in the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS for Alternatives 2 and 3 includes wet- and dry-year deliveries.

**PHO1-9 (Richard Denton)**

**Comment:** *Perhaps EBMUD cannot go to a complete Final EIS/EIR by Spring of 1998. The project may evolve significantly during the permitting process and this information should be included in the Final EIS/EIR.*

**Response:** Comment noted.

**PHO2-1 (Chuck Brydon)**

**Comment:** *The members of WATER support any alternative that recognizes the environmentally sensitive needs of the American River.*

**Response:** Chapter 2 of this document presents the current status of the project with respect to a preferred alternative.

**PHO2-2 (Chuck Brydon)**

**Comment:** *The members of WATER support the use of 70,000 AF rather than 150,000 AF as long as the 70,000 AF is based on an enforceable agreement.*

**Response:** Comment noted.

**PHO3-1 (John Gledhill)**

**Comment:** *Alternative 2; Alignment 4 is inappropriate for engineering, economic and environmental reasons.*

**Response:** EBMUD's water contract with Reclamation stipulates the use of a turn-out near Grant Line Road as the diversion point on the Folsom South Canal. The 1997 Draft EIR/EIS includes two pipeline alignments (1 and 4) that begin at the contract turn-out. The 1997 Draft EIR/EIS also includes two pipeline alignments (2 and 3) that begin at the south end of the Folsom South Canal. Taking delivery of water at the end of the Folsom South Canal may require amending the water service contract with Reclamation. See response to Comment Ind24.

**PHO3-2 (John Gledhill)**

**Comment:** *The method used to calculate impacts to agricultural property is incorrect and unfair. The impact is based on the actual width of the right-of-way of the proposed pipeline. However, other impacts, such as the method of irrigating a property after the pipeline is installed, are not considered.*

**Response:** The specific alignment for the Folsom South Canal Connection pipeline route (Alignments 2 and 4) through agricultural lands in southern Sacramento County and northern San Joaquin County would be established in such a way as to minimize impacts on ongoing agricultural activities along the route and to reduce property acquisition expenses. EBMUD has conducted extensive outreach activities to contact land owners and residents along the entire length of the proposed pipeline. Informal community meetings have been held to allow land owners the opportunity to express their concerns over the project as it relates directly to their property. The outreach has been effective in addressing the concerns of property owners and residents.

Since the agricultural analysis was conducted for the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, some areas along the pipeline pathway that were grazing lands have been planted with vineyards. As a result, EBMUD has had to alter plans for some of the proposed property easements and acquisitions along the pipeline corridor. The pipeline route presented in the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS traverses vineyard rows with drip irrigation lines and passes over newly drilled water wells. Through informal discussions with individual property owners, these impacts can be avoided with slight alterations in the proposed route. See the response to "Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation" major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHO4-1 (Barry Lipsky)**

**Comment:** *The American River is an exceptional recreation opportunity. I support the diversion of water as far down towards the Sacramento River as possible.*

**Response:** At this time, no preferred alternative has been selected, nor has Alternative 2 or 3 been determined to be environmentally superior.

**PHO4-2 (Barry Lipsky)**

**Comment:** *This project intends to increase water supply but EBMUD still allows an infinite number of new hookups. Consider limiting customers because the population growth will continue to create more demand for water supply.*

**Response:** The Updated WSMP program-level EIR analyzes in depth the methods available to meet projected water demands within EBMUD's ultimate service boundary (USB). EBMUD cannot prevent population growth but rather has an obligation to plan for reasonable growth estimates within the USB. The Updated WSMP EIR analyzed several methods of meeting future demand, including significant reclamation and conservation efforts. In addition, EBMUD is opposed to expanding the USB borders.

**Public Meeting Comments—Galt, California  
(December 3, 1997)**

**PHG1-1 (Carol Manning)**

**Comment:** *Alternative 2, Alignment 4 will have a lasting aesthetic impact on our family farm because the pipeline will sever our 180 acre parcel in half.*

**Response:** See response to Carol Manning's written comment, Ind34. In addition, the specific alignment for the Folsom South Canal Connection pipeline route (Alignments 2 and 4) will be established in such a way as to minimize impacts on ongoing agricultural and ranching activities along the route. Following construction activities, impacted lands will be restored to pre-construction conditions, including irrigation systems and access roads.

**PHG1-2 (Carol Manning)**

**Comment:** *The project will have a significant impact on our farm's market value.*

**Response:** As a public agency, EBMUD is required to fairly compensate property owners for property and property values, should such values be affected. EBMUD would work closely with affected landowners to minimize effects on property values and fairly compensate any such unavoidable effects.

**PHG2-1 (Tim Reinarts)**

**Comment:** *Alternative 2, Alignment 4 will take about 100 yards out of my front pasture.*

**Response:** See the response to Tim Reinart's written comments, Ind42. See also response to Comment Ind46. Following construction activities, impacted lands would be restored to pre-

construction conditions, including irrigation systems and access roads.

**PHG2-2 (Tim Reinarts)**

**Comment:** *Traffic on Clay Station Road in Twin Cities will be impacted. Construction activities will route traffic such as school buses and emergency service vehicles through this section and may be a potential safety concern. The EIS/EIR does not address these issues.*

**Response:** See response to Comment Ind42-4.

**PHG2-3 (Tim Reinarts)**

**Comment:** *The EIS/EIR should include an analysis of noise generated by the pumping plants.*

**Response:** See response to Comment Ind42-7.

**PHG2-4 (Tim Reinarts)**

**Comment:** *The design of the pumping plants should compliment the rural atmosphere.*

**Response:** See response to Comment Ind42-5.

**PHG2-5 (Tim Reinarts)**

**Comment:** *Please consider placing additional fire hydrants on Clay Station Road as part of the pipeline upgrade.*

**Response:** See response to Comment Ind42-3.

**PHG2-6 (Tim Reinarts)**

**Comment:** *I would like to have some type of access to the water.*

**Response:** See response to Comment Ind42-2.

## **Public Meeting Comments—Lodi, California (December 4, 1997)**

### **PHL1-1 (Rex Barnes)**

**Comment:** *I have your assurance from previous conversations at this public hearing that the pipeline will be placed underground.*

**Response:** The Folsom South Canal Connection alignment alternatives are each designed to be entirely underground.

### **PHL2-1 (Wilbert Rulh)**

**Comment:** *The diversion of water from the American River during dry years is a primary concern. The EBMUD pipeline will divert water from other groups entitled to the water and will impact the American River. I would like to suggest the option of using ocean water.*

**Response:** The Updated WSMP EIR, completed in 1993, evaluated several methods of obtaining supplemental water, including desalination plants. The American River supplemental supply option has moved forward through several levels of alternatives screening within the WSMP EIR and Supplemental Water Supply Project EIR analysis processes and has proven to be the most viable option available to the District. See the response to “Alternatives Considered” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

### **PHL3-1 (James B. Moore, Jr.)**

**Comment:** *The North San Joaquin Water Conservation District finds the proposed project to demonstrate no benefit to the District. The District has filed its protest, Supplement Number 1, before the U.S. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The District would like EBMUD to give serious consideration to the basin-wide solution as set forth in the District’s Supplement Number 1 filed with the FERC.*

**Response:** See the responses to L5 and the “San Joaquin County Conjunctive Storage” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

### **PHL4-2 (Tom Zuckerman)**

**Comment:** *Consider using the existing EBMUD Bixler Diversion Point as the means of appropriating the water from the American River. Please incorporate this alternative in the EIS/EIR.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Alternatives Considered” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document. Delta diversion alternatives were evaluated in the screening process as described in the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS appendix. See also the REIR/SEIS.

### **PHL5-1 (Ann Steib)**

**Comment:** *The light rail transportation and the Folsom South Canal Alignments are both not viable. Why didn’t EBMUD consider more viable alternatives?*

**Response:** See the response to the “Alternatives Considered” major issue in Chapter 3 in this document.

### **PHL5-2 (Ann Steib)**

**Comment:** *How will the project affect private property values?*

**Response:** As a public agency, EBMUD is required to fairly compensate property owners for property and property values, should such values be affected. EBMUD would work closely with affected landowners to minimize effects on property values and fairly compensate any such unavoidable effects.

### **PHL5-3 (Ann Steib)**

**Comment:** *When applicable, will EBMUD be using local businesses for project work?*

**Response:** During the final engineering design and construction phase, local businesses will be notified during the procurement process.

**Public Meeting Comments—Sacramento, Rosemont  
12/9/97**

**PHR1-1 (Charles Bennett, Individual)**

**Comment:** *California Air Resources Board indicates that a state 24-hour average PM10 health standard is violated in the Rosemont community. The environmental impact should look not only at the emissions that come from the fugitive dust, but also at the impact of slowing down diesel traffic within the Rosemont community.*

**Response:** See response to Comment Ind6.

**PHR3-1 (Joe Biskey, Individual)**

**Comment:** *We have a small business in the Rosemont Plaza, and I know that this project will hurt our business. I hope you can bypass Kiefer Boulevard.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR4-1 (Gail Slater, Individual)**

**Comment:** *If the pipeline goes through our neighborhood, we should get a share of the water.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR4-2 (Gail Slater, Individual)**

**Comment:** *The pipeline should be tunneled beneath the community.*

**Response:** At this time, tunneling through the Rosemont community is not anticipated. See the responses to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” and “Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation” major issues in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR4-3 (Gail Slater, Individual)**

**Comment:** *Jackson Highway should be used instead of Kiefer Boulevard. Caltrans works for us and we don't want it going through our neighborhood.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR4-4 (Gail Slater, Individual)**

**Comment:** *Kiefer will never be the same. It will be a patched roadway.*

**Response:** See the responses to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” and “Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation” major issues in Chapter 3 of this document. EBMUD has committed to implementing a Road Resurfacing Plan following construction activities to repair roadways deteriorated as a result of the construction activities, including detour routes (see Chapter 12, page 12-7, of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS).

**PHR4-5 (Gail Slater, Individual)**

**Comment:** *Provide landscaping in front of Lucky's.*

**Response:** EBMUD has committed to returning the pipeline corridor to its pre-construction condition. EBMUD will continue to work with the community and the City and County of Sacramento to develop appropriate measures to address temporary construction impacts if Alternative 3 is implemented.

**PHR5-1 (Jack Sohl, Save the American River Association)**

**Comment:** *Alternative 3 in the EIR will protect the American River. I hope that the short-term impacts from the routing of the pipeline will not cause members of the Rosemont community to oppose the project.*

**Response:** Comment noted.

**PHR6-1 (Tim Johnston, Individual)**

**Comment:** *I oppose the routing of this pipeline. My business depends upon the daily walk-in traffic. There would be tremendous economic hardship. We would probably not survive the 50 or 60 days where the*

road was impassable. Someone must look at that and say how we can mitigate the traffic problems.

**Response:** See the response to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” major issue and the “Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation” major issues in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR6-2 (Tim Johnston, Individual)**

**Comment:** *Jackson Highway is probably a better alternative.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR7-1 (Karen McPherson, Individual)**

**Comment:** *The recreational boater access to the mouth of the American River may be impacted. The depth of the river will be too low for boating.*

**Response:** The recreational impact assessment was based, in part, on the results of the PROSIM hydrologic modeling effort. A comparison of the frequency that river flows are above recreation thresholds between existing conditions and no-action conditions can be made based on the information shown in Table 6-3 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS. Table 6-3 clearly shows that only very small changes in flows at the mouth of the American River are expected.

The assumptions used in the hydrologic modeling are described in Chapter 3 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, “Hydrology, Water Supply, and Power.” More detailed hydrologic output is shown in Appendix C to the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS.

**PHR7-2 (Karen McPherson, Individual)**

**Comment:** *There’s no mitigation for noise or visual impacts associated with the pumping station. Please consider impacts of noise and visual impacts.*

**Response:** See response to Comments Ind42-5 and Ind42-7. The potential for noise and visual impacts resulting from construction and operation of the proposed pumping plants are described in

Chapters 14 and 16 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, respectively. Based on these analyses and EBMUD’s commitments to address such issues during final design, no significant impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation is required.

**PHR8-1 (Barbara Renzi, Individual)**

**Comment:** *If Kiefer Boulevard is closed off or narrowed, everybody has to go somewhere as an alternative route. They’re going to come through our neighborhood.*

**Response:** If necessary, temporary detour routes will be assigned through the Traffic Control Plan. This plan will be reviewed and approved by the City and County of Sacramento. See the response to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” major issue and the “Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR9-1 (William McCartney, Individual)**

**Comment:** *Tunnel under the vernal pools and take the route out of our community.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” major issue and the “Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR10-1 (Sandra Lanceford, Individual)**

**Comment:** *The County of Sacramento should trade the easement of Kiefer for a share of the water to take care of potential shortages that might happen here in the area.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR11-1 (John Mogannam, Business Owner)**

**Comment:** *More people would have attended the meeting if they had informed the community through more of a mass mailing.*

**Response:** EBMUD advertised the public meeting in Sacramento-area newspapers and sent several thousand notices in the mail. EBMUD held five separate public hearings to listen to public concerns over the proposed project in addition to holding several scoping meetings in the spring of 1997. See the response to the "Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing" major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR11-2 (John Mogannam, Business Owner)**

**Comment:** *Our community businesses need Kiefer Boulevard. Residents need Kiefer Boulevard to keep traffic off residential side streets. When Kiefer Boulevard is closed off what are we supposed to do?*

**Response:** Closure of Kiefer Boulevard during construction is not anticipated. See the response to the "Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing" major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR12-1 (Pete Pelucca, Individual)**

**Comment:** *What will happen to the Sacramento River once the water has been diverted from the American River?*

**Response:** Chapters 3, 4, and 5 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS discuss issues related to water quality. Based on the PROSIM hydrology modeling, no significant impacts on the Sacramento River are anticipated.

**PHR12-2 (Pete Pelucca, Individual)**

**Comment:** *You better start thinking about putting the diversion point up in Auburn and start saving some of that water.*

**Response:** The Auburn dam project under federal authority has been put on indefinite hold.

**PHR13-1 (David Freeman, Individual)**

**Comment:** *The public health people should step in and mitigate the impacts to air quality from dust and traffic associated with this project.*

**Response:** The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District has provided comments to the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS (see response to Comment L1). The Traffic Control Plan will be reviewed and approved by the City and County of Sacramento. See also response to Comment Ind6-1.

**PHR13-2 (David Freeman, Individual)**

**Comment:** *What is the traffic count on Kiefer right now. What will the impacts be for pedestrian crossings when Kiefer is closed?*

**Response:** The Traffic Control Plan will be prepared based on evaluations of current traffic conditions along the length of the pipeline. The construction zones will include safety barriers, and the Trench Safety Plan outlined in Chapter 2 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS will be implemented to avoid safety hazards. Construction zones will comply with OSHA safety regulations. The Traffic Control Plan will be fully developed once detailed design is underway.

**PHR13-3 (David Freeman, Individual)**

**Comment:** *The highway patrol should block off trucks of excessive weight from residential neighborhoods during detours caused by the project.*

**Response:** The Traffic Control Plan will assign detour routes if necessary to avoid construction zones. These detour routes will be approved by the City and County of Sacramento in coordination with community groups. Trucks will not be routed through areas not designated as truck routes. See the responses to the "Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing" and "Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation" major issues in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHR13-4 (David Freeman, Individual)**

**Comment:** *What's going to happen with the Watt Avenue bridge construction and the installation of storm drains on Kiefer Boulevard going on about the same time?*

**Response:** As discussed in Chapter 10 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, the installation of the pipeline will be coordinated with planned construction projects along the length of the pipeline. Table 10-1 lists the known projects currently planned by local jurisdictions. As stated in Chapter 2 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, a Project Planning, Coordination, and Communication Plan will be implemented to avoid conflicts with other improvement plans.

**PHR-14-1 (Brian Rosebrock, Business Owner)**

**Comment:** *I have concerns for the safety of children walking along Kiefer Boulevard during construction. Jackson Highway would avoid impacts to these children.*

**Response:** See the responses to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” and “Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation” major issues in Chapter 3 of this document and the response to Comment PHR13-2.

**PHR-15-1 (Cheryl Terpack, Individual)**

**Comment:** *If we rip up Kiefer Boulevard, a lot of businesses are going to go out of business. We may be a small group, but we’re a strong group, and we don’t want to be stepped on.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Kiefer Boulevard Pipeline Routing” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

## **Public Meeting Comments—Sacramento, 12/11/97**

### **PHS1-1 (Frank Cirill, Save the American River)**

**Comment:** *SARA is willing to work with the City, the County, and EBMUD providing the water goes down the river first. We don't want anything to do with taking it out of Lake Natoma.*

**Response:** Comment noted. Chapter 2 of this document presents the current status of the project with respect to a preferred alternative.

### **PHS1-2 (Frank Cirill, Save the American River)**

**Comment:** *The pipeline route should avoid city streets wherever possible.*

**Response:** Chapter 2 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS outlines the two proposed action alternatives. The proposed pipeline route for Alternative 3 is shown in Figure 2-6a (included in this document as Figure 2-1). This figure includes bypass options for avoiding specific city streets. However, city street easements provide the most efficient pipeline locations and cannot be avoided entirely. Short-term construction impacts associated with the pipeline installation in city streets are discussed in the "Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation" major issue response in Chapter 3 of this document.

### **PHS2-1 (Marcus LaDuca, Sanburg & LaDuca)**

**Comment:** *We would like written confirmation that Alignment 4 of Alternative 2 has been shifted to the east side of Clay Station Road.*

**Response:** See the response to Comment Ind33-1.

### **PHS3-1 (Christina Cristobal, Rusty Duck)**

**Comment:** *Our restaurant will be impacted by intake number one. Our "million-dollar" view will be impacted. Needless to say, it's going to cut our business.*

**Response:** Comment noted. As discussed in Chapter 16 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, the impact on visual resources at intake Sites 1, 2, and 3 is significant and unavoidable. At this time, no preferred intake site has been selected.

### **PHS4-2 (Connie Miotel, Capital Station District)**

**Comment:** *This project will impact the hospitality industry and retail in the district.*

**Response:** See response to the "Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation" major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

### **PHS4-3 (Connie Miotel, Capital Station District)**

**Comment:** *We would like to see coordination with the other major construction projects proposed for the near future such as the light rail bridge and the 7<sup>th</sup> Street connection.*

**Response:** As discussed in Chapter 10 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, the installation of the pipeline will be coordinated with planned construction projects along the length of the pipeline. Table 10-1 lists the known projects planned by local jurisdictions. As stated in Chapter 2 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, a Project Planning, Coordination, and Communication Plan will be implemented to avoid conflicts with other improvement plans.

### **PHS5-1 (Charlie Klein, Individual)**

**Comment:** *I am concerned that the construction along C Street will destroy our front yards.*

**Response:** The construction zones will be returned to their pre-construction condition. See response to the "Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation" major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

### **PHS5-2 (Charlie Klein, Individual)**

**Comment:** *I'm concerned about the possibility of pipeline leaks and about the impacts to the 100-year old trees.*

**Response:** See the response to the “C Street Pipeline Routing” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document. The pipeline design will be reviewed and approved by the City and County of Sacramento Utility Departments as well as CalTrans. In addition, the pipeline will be designed to meet stringent seismic standards.

**PHS5-3 (Charlie Klein, Individual)**

**Comment:** *Route the pipeline through Sacramento along the railroad right-of-way rather than down C Street.*

**Response:** See response to “C Street Pipeline Routing” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHS6-1 (Margaret Buss, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association)**

**Comment:** *C Street is a truck route. If you were to construct along there, you would be diverting a fair amount of traffic into the neighborhood. We would appreciate mitigations if that were to happen.*

**Response:** The Traffic Control Plan will assign detour routes if necessary to avoid construction zones. These detour routes will be approved by the City and County of Sacramento in coordination with community groups. Trucks will not be routed through areas not designated as truck routes.

**PHS6-2 (Margaret Buss, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association)**

**Comment:** *You must comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act which requires you to identify any other historic properties along your route.*

**Response:** Chapter 17 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS discusses requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act and identifies listed historic properties along the proposed pipeline route.

**PHS6-3 (Margaret Buss, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association)**

**Comment:** *The project could disrupt the B Street Theatre.*

**Response:** See the response to the “Construction-Related Environmental Commitments and Mitigation” major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHS6-4 (Margaret Buss, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association)**

**Comment:** *There should be aesthetic considerations for the intake facility and the pipeline in the planned Sutter Landing Park.*

**Response:** As noted on page 16-11 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, the intake facility design will be reviewed and approved by the City and County of Sacramento with aesthetic considerations in mind. Conflicts with planned improvements in the area will be avoided through the implementation of the Project Planning, Coordination, and Communication Plan as noted on page 2-7 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS.

**PHS6-5 (Margaret Buss, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association)**

**Comment:** *Twenty four-hour construction would not be acceptable within residential areas.*

**Response:** Construction schedules will be established in the construction plan, which will be prepared in coordination with the City and County of Sacramento. The anticipated schedule through residential areas will be designed to minimize disruption.

**PHS6-6 (Margaret Buss, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association)**

**Comment:** *I favor anything that preserves the American River.*

**Response:** Comment noted.

**PHS7-1 (Ed Cox, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association)**

**Comment:** *It would make sense that we coordinate the water intake with the light rail bridge and a pedestrian bridge.*

**Response:** At this time, the intake structure is not designed to be a light rail bridge, and no preferred alternative has been selected.

**PHS7-2 (Ed Cox, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association)**

**Comment:** *Will the pipeline go under the 14<sup>th</sup> Street bike tunnel? I would advocate not destroying the 14<sup>th</sup> Street tunnel. I would advocate a park-like bike trail in the open space area known as the Centrage site and bike trails as mitigations where ever possible.*

**Response:** Comment noted. While temporary closures of the tunnel might be required during construction, no long-term closures are anticipated.

**PHS7-3 (Ed Cox, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association)**

**Comment:** *Can this work be combined with the City's storm sewer replacement project?*

**Response:** As discussed in Chapter 10 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, the installation of the pipeline will be coordinated with planned construction projects along the length of the pipeline. Table 10-1 lists the known projects planned by local jurisdictions. As stated in Chapter 2 of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS, a Project Planning, Coordination, and Communication Plan will be implemented to avoid conflicts with other improvement plans.

**PHS7-4 (Ed Cox, Boulevard Park Neighborhood Association)**

**Comment:** *Could the project provide new street lighting in this neighborhood?*

**Response:** EBMUD will continue to work with the community and the City and County of Sacramento to develop appropriate measures to address temporary construction impacts if Alternative 3 is implemented. See response to the "Construction-Related

Environmental Commitments and Mitigation" major issue in Chapter 3 of this document.

**PHS8-1 (Carl Seymore, Individual)**

**Comment:** *Notify the neighborhood more effectively.*

**Response:** EBMUD advertised the public meetings in Sacramento-area newspapers and sent several thousand notices in the mail. EBMUD held five separate public hearings to listen to public concerns over the proposed project in addition to holding several scoping meetings in the spring of 1997.

**PHS8-2 (Carl Seymore, Individual)**

**Comment:** *Consider routing the pipeline through the parkway.*

**Response:** The American River Parkway was considered for a pipeline route prior to the preparation of the 1997 Draft EIR/EIS but was not carried forward due to impacts on biological resources, geotechnical factors, and access difficulties during high flow conditions.

**PHS9-1 (Jim Hastings, East Sacramento Newspaper)**

**Comment:** *How will this project impact the Olympic trials? Planning efforts need to include coordination with Olympic trials.*

**Response:** The Olympic trials were completed during summer 2000.

**PHS9-2 (Jim Hastings, East Sacramento Newspaper)**

**Comment:** *Access to Cannery Business Park would be totally denied during construction.*

**Response:** The Traffic Control Plan will maintain access to all businesses along the proposed pipeline route.

**PHS9-3 (Jim Hastings, East Sacramento Newspaper)**

**Comment:** *Can we put a road on top of the water intake facility?*

**Response:** At this time, the intake structure is not designed to be a light rail or roadway bridge. EBMUD will continue discussions

with the local planning agencies to evaluate the potential for combining the two projects. The levee trail will pass over the intake pipeline, as discussed in response to Comment L15-42.

