

Pianess Inc.
Alta Valley
Sacramento



Corporate Offices
GNP Holding Company
7820 Alta Valley Way
Sacramento, CA 95823
916-423-3050 Telephone
916-689-7886 Fax

RECEIVED
AUG 22 2003

Sirip Corp.
Stockton Blvd.
Sacramento



Letter Sp9

Kurt Kroner
Freeport Regional Water Project
1510 J St #140
Sacto., CA 95814

Aug 20, 2003

Dear Mr. Kroner:

I enjoyed peaking with you this afternoon and discussing the pipe routing for the project. As a business person in the Mack Road area, and having been active with the Mack Road Business Group, I am in favor of routing pipe under the Cosumnes River Extension and not disrupting the Mack Rd. business corridor.

Sp9-1

Sincerely


George Pollis

Response to Comments of the GNP Holding Company (Letter Sp09)

- Sp09-1.** FRWA and Reclamation recognize the support for the preferred alternative that utilizes the Cosumnes River Boulevard alignment.

RECEIVED
DEC 10 2003

December 8, 2003

Letter Sp10

December 8, 2003

Kurt Kroner
Freeport Regional Water Authority
1510 J Street, #140
Sacramento, CA 95814

December 1, 2003

Dear Mr. Kroner,
We are the Clay West Homeowners Association. Our properties lie within the proposed pumping plant and pipeline construction area of the Freeport Regional Water Project. This project will cut through the only access to our properties. As residents of the area affected by construction, we would like our comments known. We oppose this project on the basis that it is environmentally destructive, it destroys our roads, disturbs the peacefulness of the country, endangers our wellbeing, and we believe that a better alternative exists.

People come to the country for peace and quiet, and to get away from the city. In the country, noise carries over great distances. A constant noise such as that of a pumping plant pollutes the quiet of the countryside. It is not fair to force city noise pollution on us, just so EBMUD can sell water to San Joaquin County, while offering us no benefit.

According to EBMUD representatives, the proposed pumping station will be an artwork, and just as quiet as a refrigerator. As a demonstration, our homeowners' association representative went to the pumping station in Orinda where he experienced the noise level of that particular pumping station. That station however has an adjacent freeway, which masks the real noise level, and we still do not know what the proposed plant will look like. A fair demonstration of noise would rather demonstrate a pumping plant, with its electrical generators operating, in a quiet country setting like ours. As an added attraction, the pumping plant will need security lights, another intrusion into our habitat. Any building will detract from the natural view, and we worry that this eyesore will hurt our property values.

From the beginning, representatives told us the pumps would operate three or four days in a typical year, more often in case of drought, and on those rare instances when maintenance on the main pipelines is needed. It would be foolish for EBMUD to spend half a billion dollars for a pumping plant and pipeline to lay idle. Realistically, the plant will support the water contracts EBMUD already sold to San Joaquin County, and will run much more often than we are being told. It is our contention that a year-round operation will realistically result.

Heavy trenching machines and pipe, as well as filling and paving materials must be temporarily stored and delivered all along the pipeline route during this project. Equipment must be shuttled from site to site and labor shuttled in and out. Our fragile country roads, which were never built to withstand this abuse, will be heavily damaged. No provision for

reinforcement of the road network has been addressed. Local residents must deal with potholes and washouts after the heavy trucks have gone. EBMUD's customers do not rely on these roads to get them to work and school, only local residents suffer the aftermath.

Sp10-5
cont

This project also potentially endangers our wellbeing by trenching through our neighborhood, disrupting the only access route to our homes. Should we require emergency service, vehicles trying to reach our properties may fail to reach us in time.

The soil here is mostly decomposed granite, very slippery and unstable when wet. It is why the name of the road we live on is named Clay Station Road. Construction will likely bog down with the third rain of the season. We witness construction equipment stuck in the mud every winter. Unfinished construction in December could remain so until May. If our road is obstructed when flooding begins, we could be prevented from returning home, or from sending our children to school on some days, because of construction. Those of us returning from work or school will be encumbered with obstacles or detours during construction. Sacrifice of our wellbeing is a high price for us to pay for EBMUD's water contracts with San Joaquin County.

Sp10-6

Rather than benefit us at all, the Freeport Project will instead cause traffic problems, deteriorating country road grids, dust, denial of access to home and property, property endangerment and an end to the peace and beauty of our neighborhood. This project will also harm the environment by disrupting subsoil, causing erosion, destroying vernal ponds and harming other habitats. SMUD, our utility company, opposes this plan, and anticipates deterioration of the quality of water for users of Rancho Seco Park when the plant is operating.

Sp10-7

Not only is there no local benefit for us, but also this project diverts water that would otherwise help refill the California Aquifer. Denying help to recharge the California Aquifer is a much larger concern than EBMUD's San Joaquin County dealings.

Sp10-8

A final significant point of concern for our neighbors is the fact that in this multi-year project, in the planning stage since before 1998, there appears to be deliberate attempts to manipulate information. Alternative Six remained undisclosed to us until the September 9, 2003 meeting. This Alternative, the enhancement of Pardee reservoir, would increase water storage capacity as it replenishes ground water. It also would also increase recreational area, and augment local revenues. Alternative Six is constructive, rather than destructive. We believe Alternative Six is a better choice, and we urge EBMUD to pursue Alternative Six.

Sp10-9

Sincerely,
Naomi Burns
Naomi Burns, President
Clay West Homeowners Association

Jim and Rhonda Bergum
12354 Clay Station Road

Georg and Naomi Kuhnke
12360 Clay Station Road

Sp10-1

Sp10-2

Sp10-3

Sp10-4

Sp10-5

December 8, 2003

Jeff and Naomi Burns
12362 Clay Station Road

Ray and Mary Ellen Harrell
12366 Clay Station Road

Hani and Ruth Hassouneh
12370 Clay Station Road

Ramiro and Erica Gallegos
12372 Clay Station Road

Robert and Susanne Neely
12376 Clay Station Road

Randy Mayberry and Lori Thompson
12382 Clay Station Road

Farrell and Joanne Reis
12386 Clay Station Road

Brett and Cathy Durfey
12390 Clay Station Road

Tim and Cindy Reinarts
12394 Clay Station Road

Response to Comments of the Clay West Homeowners Association (Letter Sp10)

- Sp10-1.** This general comment is covered in more detail by subsequent comments and, therefore, more detailed responses are provided below.
- Sp10-2.** Since publication of the draft EIR/EIS, FRWA has modified the design of the canal pumping plant to incorporate noise control measures so that noise generated by the facility at the nearest existing sensitive receptor (e.g., residence) will not exceed 5 dBA above existing background noise. Furthermore, the purposes of the project are fully described in Chapter 1 under “Purpose and Need” (page 1-3). The purposes are to provide water to SCWA and EBMUD. San Joaquin County is not part of the FRWP and there are currently no plans for use of the unused capacity of the FRWP facilities other than the small quantities described in Chapter 2 of this final EIR/EIS. These facilities may provide additional regional benefits in the future by enabling regional water supply solutions. However, no such plans have been identified at this time, and any such future plan will be required to provide a new source of water (EBMUD’s CVP contract does not allow for diversion of water in normal and wet years, when excess capacity would generally be available) and will undergo appropriate separate environmental review.
- Sp10-3.** As described in the draft EIR/EIS under mitigation measure 16-1, several measures will be implemented during project design and construction to reduce visual intrusion, including those posed by new structures and security lighting. Buildings will be designed in a manner consistent with the structures that already exist

in the area and lighting will be kept to a minimum and directed away from neighboring residences and structures. There will be no exterior lighting at night, aside from security lighting that would only be activated by motion detectors. The building will be located behind a berm, thus only the roof of the building would be visible to neighbors.

- Sp10-4.** As described in Chapter 1 of the draft EIR/EIS, EBMUD only requires water from the FRWP during periods of drought. On average this would be approximately 3 out of every 10 years. During these periods, the canal pumping plant would operate periodically for several months during the year. During nondrought years, the canal pumping plant would only operate for purposes of maintenance and very infrequently for scheduled major maintenance at Pardee Dam and Reservoir. As described above in response Sp10-2, San Joaquin County is not part of the FRWP.
- Sp10-5.** 5–7. The draft EIR/EIS has appropriately evaluated potential impacts on resources within the project and service areas for the project alternatives as required by CEQA and NEPA. The concerns raised in the comment have been considered during project development and are addressed in the draft EIR/EIS. CEQA requires, and NEPA strongly encourages, the incorporation of appropriate measures to avoid or reduce significant impacts into the description of a proposed project, where feasible, as a means to ensure implementation of the measures and to reduce unnecessary environmental analysis. FRWA and Reclamation are committed to minimizing short-term disruption effects during construction. By incorporating these measures into the basic description of the project, FRWA and Reclamation

have provided a firm commitment to address or to avoid these potential effects. Chapter 2 of the draft EIR/EIS presents an extensive list of environmental commitments that have been incorporated into the project alternatives and that will be implemented along with the project. These commitments are industry standards and are typically implemented on projects of this type. These commitments include a traffic control plan to avoid significant construction-related effects on roadways during pipeline construction. Because final project design has not been completed, many of the site-specific details associated with the traffic control plan have not yet been developed. However, implementation of standard construction traffic control methods would ensure that no significant impacts would result. Generally, the traffic control plan would address issues such as hours of operation, lane closures, safety, and access.

Sp10-6. Other construction-related environmental commitments described in Chapter 2 include the following:

- general construction measures,
- erosion and sediment control plan,
- storm water pollution prevention plan,
- dust suppression plan,
- fire control plan,
- Phase I and II hazardous materials studies,
- hazardous materials management plan,
- channel and levee restoration plan,
- hydrologic simulation modeling and scour analysis,
- agricultural land restoration plan,
- spoils disposal plan,
- environmental training,
- access point/staging area plan,

- trench safety plan,
- private property acquisition an access,
- noise compliance, and
- project planning, coordination, and communication plan.

Sp10-7. Once an alternative is selected and implemented, and as the final design progresses, site-specific details will be developed for each of these commitments. FRWA and Reclamation will coordinate closely in the development of these details. Additional meetings will be held with affected groups and individuals to ensure ample opportunity for concerns to be addressed and for solutions to be developed for site-specific issues. For construction within their areas of jurisdictions, each city and county will have a substantial role in determining the scope and contents of the plans and programs listed above and agreement on appropriate actions will be reached with each city and county. More specifically, roads will be repaired to existing conditions after construction is complete. Access will be ensured by keeping at least one lane open at all times and using a flagger to direct traffic. Emergency agencies such as police and fire departments will be notified of construction sites as the project progresses, so that there should be no disruption of emergency services due to construction activities. Flaggers would direct traffic so as to provide the highest priority to emergency vehicles. Construction traffic would primarily consist of workers; large equipment would stay on the construction site overnight and would not be shuttled back and forth.

Sp10-8. Impacts on hydrology and water supply, including cumulative impacts, are fully discussed in Chapter 3 of the draft EIR/EIS. Additional cumulative impact

analysis is included in Chapter 19 of the draft EIR/EIS. The draft EIR/EIS fully discloses the potential environmental effects of using CVP surface water to meet the purpose and need of the project. As the results of the analysis indicate, the amount of water diverted by FRWA would result in very little change to the hydrology of the overall system. Recharge of the California aquifer relies on numerous sources of water, with the Sacramento River being just one of them. There is no basis to expect that the FRWP will result in a measurable change in aquifer recharge.

Sp10-9. Alternative 6, and more specifically the Enlarged Pardee Reservoir component, was most recently identified during the FRWP scoping process and evaluated through the alternatives screening process. The alternatives screening process is presented in the Alternatives Screening Report in Volume 2, Appendix B, of the draft EIR/EIS. The Enlarged Pardee Reservoir component of the FRWP was formally presented to the public with the publication of the draft EIR/EIS on August 8, 2003. FRWA did not identify Alternative 6 as the preferred alternative in the draft EIR/EIS for environmental, technical, jurisdictional, and cost factors.

Letter Sp11

Kroner, Kurt

From: VickeyLScott@aol.com
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2003 6:47 PM
To: k.kroner@frwa.com
Cc: lhammond@cityofsacramento.org; rwaters@cityofsacramento.org; ssheedy@cityofsacramento.org; bpannell@cityofsacramento.org; djones@cityofsacramento.org; scohn@cityofsacramento.org; jye@cityofsacramento.org; rretheway@cityofsacramento.org
Subject: COMMENTS TO DRAFT EIR, FREEPORT REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY

December 13, 2003

Kurt Kroner
Freeport Regional Water Authority

By e-mail to k.kroner@frwa.com

RE: COMMENTS TO DEIR FREEPORT REGIONAL WATER AUTHORITY

Dear Mr. Kroner:

I wish to address some concerns pertaining to the above-mentioned proposed project and the option of going down Cosumnes River Blvd.

1. This past year, the federal government approved funding for improvements to our creek, Union House Creek. The improvements did not take into consideration another large pipeline going down Cosumnes River Blvd. and could put us at further risk of flooding. Union House Creek is attached to the storm drains for at least 1500 homes, if the creek backflows, or is going to over flow, it comes onto our streets and into our homes. In 94/95, after the two lanes of roadway and a huge sewer interceptor were placed in this corridor, many homes in our area had over 6 feet of water in them. The City was sued for this negligence. Has SAFCA been consulted on this project? This project may make our improvements inadequate and put us at further risk of flooding.

Sp11-1

2. Has the Regional Sewer District approved a pipeline, going through the buffer land that must be maintained for flood purposes, of the sewer plant? Is there any room to place EBMUD water pipeline thru this corridor, from Franklin to Center Parkway?

Sp11-2

12/16/2003

3. Cosumnes River Blvd. between Franklin Blvd and Center Parkway becomes very narrow around Essen Way, has anyone checked to see if there is enough room for the pipeline, and, is it OK to place it next to a sewer interceptor that is large enough to drive a semi-truck through? The pipeline cannot impede on the creek in any way or it endangers thousands of homes with potential flooding.

Sp11-3

4. There is also a concern of being able to obtain the federal funding for light rail on top of a sewer interceptor and a large water main. This, according to a light rail engineer at a meeting I attended last year.

Sp11-4

For these reasons, Valley Center Neighborhood Association opposes the placement of this water line down Cosumnes River Blvd.

I would like my concerns placed as an attachment to the DEIR.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Vickey Scott

Valley Center Neighborhood Assn

5880 Hollyhurst Way

Sacramento CA 95823

916-422-8888

VickeyLScott@aol.com

12/16/2003

Response to Comments of Vickey Scott (Letter Sp11)

- Sp11-1.** FRWA is actively coordinating the pipeline location within the existing and proposed Cosumnes River Boulevard corridor projects including Phase 2 of the South Sacramento Corridor Light Rail project, widening of Cosumnes River Boulevard, widening of Union House Creek by the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA), Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District (SRCSD) sewer trunks, a City of Sacramento water transmission pipeline, and other utilities. Recently, the location of the new pipeline in the Cosumnes River Boulevard extension was coordinated with the SRCSD Lower Northwest Interceptor and the City's proposed new road section. That coordination is ongoing. Additionally, the location of the pipeline relative to the proposed light rail and SAFCA projects is actively being coordinated. Currently, the SAFCA and light rail projects are not completely defined, and FRWA is actively participating in coordination efforts with the various project teams. These efforts are expected to continue throughout the implementation process for all of the projects in that portion of the corridor. FRWA's goal is to work with these other agencies and project teams to cooperatively use the existing corridor to everyone's mutual benefit while minimizing impacts on the public and the surrounding neighborhoods. The FRWP will not increase the risk of flooding. The new levee constructed for the project will be at least as strong as the existing levee. The engineering design will be reviewed and approved by the State Reclamation Board.
- Sp11-2.** As described above in response Sp11-1, a great deal of coordination is underway with agencies having

jurisdiction and/or projects within the FRWP area, including the SRCSD. Preliminary coordination and design work indicate that the preferred alignment will accommodate the pipeline, including the Cosumnes River Boulevard corridor between Franklin Boulevard and Center Parkway.

Sp11-3. See response Sp11-1 above.

Sp11-4. During coordination with Regional Transit regarding Phase 2 of the South Sacramento Corridor Light Rail project, feasible preliminary design solutions have been identified for many of the issues posed by having multiple projects in the same corridor. Additionally, there has been no indication that the presence of the FRWP would compromise federal funding for Phase 2 of the South Sacramento Corridor Light Rail project.

Sp11-5. Opposition to the preferred alignment, and in particular the Cosumnes River Boulevard corridor, is noted.

Letter Sp12

Kroner, Kurt

From: Walt Seifert [bikesaba@pacbell.net]
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2003 12:26 PM
To: k.kroner@frwa.com
Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) for the Freeport Project

Kurt Kroner,
Freeport Regional Water Authority
1510 J Street #140, Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Kroner:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR/EIS for the project.

Chapter 12 Transportation does not address all the impacts to bikeways. By the time of construction of the water intake, there will be a Class I bike trail on the Sacramento River levee top connecting to the south. This bikeway will be impacted by the water intake construction.

We recommend that a detour around the project site be provided during construction. In addition, as additional mitigation for the air quality and transportation impacts of the project, we recommend the major public access, called for in the Sacramento River Parkway Plan, be provided as part of the project.

The construction of the cross county pipeline will cause disruption to motor vehicle and bicycle traffic on a number of streets. In addition, the project will create significant air quality impacts. As additional mitigation for these transportation and air quality impacts, we urge construction of the pipeline be considered as an opportunity to improve existing bikeways, and, perhaps, create new bike trails on the surface above the pipeline.

The Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates is a nonprofit corporation with more than 700 members. We represent bicyclists. Our aim is more and safer trips by bike. We're working for a future in which bicycling for everyday transportation is common because it is safe, convenient and desirable. Bicycling is the healthiest, cleanest, cheapest, quietest, most energy efficient and least congesting form of transportation.

Walt Seifert
Executive Director
Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (SABA)
(916) 444-6600
saba@sacbike.org
www.sacbike.org

Sp12-1

Sp12-2

Sp12-3

**Response to Comments of Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates
(Letter Sp12)**

- Sp12-1.** The potential impact on the levee-top bicycle trail adjacent to the intake facility is fully described in Chapter 6, “Recreation,” (page 6-18). The analysis includes the City’s proposal to extend this trail across Freeport Boulevard to the Bill Conlin Sports Complex. As described in the analysis, detour routes will be provided during the construction period, and full bicycle/recreation access will be restored following the construction period.
- Sp12-2.** The air quality mitigation described in Chapter 13 of the draft EIR/EIS is adequate for purposes of NEPA and CEQA, and no additional mitigation is required. However, opportunities to include major public access at the intake facility, as called for in the Sacramento River Parkway Plan, is dependent on the outcome of the design competition for the intake site. FRWA is open to working with the City of Sacramento and the community to determine the appropriateness of public access/recreational components within the intake site area.
- Sp12-3.** As described above in response Sp12-2, air quality mitigation described in Chapter 13 of the draft EIR/EIS is adequate for purposes of NEPA and CEQA, and no additional mitigation is required. Additionally, the pipeline generally follows public rights-of-way that, in many cases, include bicycle lanes. Furthermore, as described in Chapter 2 under Environmental Commitments, General Construction Measures, FRWA is committed to coordinate with other planned improvements. FRWA is committed to participate in

various community improvements, including bicycle trails, to the extent that there is a connection to the FRWP and impacts caused by the project. FRWA will continue to coordinate with local jurisdictions to identify these opportunities.



North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association
 P.O. Box 233375
 Sacramento, California 95823-3127

North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association
 RE: Freeport Water Project Draft EIR
 Page 2

December 15, 2003

Kurt Kroner
 Freeport Regional Water Authority
 1510 J Street, #140
 Sacramento, CA 95814
 (916) 326-5480
 k.kroner@frwa.com

Mr. Kroner,

The concerns and comments generated by this community are because of the direct impacts that the Freeport Regional Water Authority's proposed project will generate within and around to our Association's boundaries.

Location:

This association's service area are located in south Sacramento county within the City of Sacramento and adjacent to the unincorporated portions of the County of Sacramento (East & West) and the City of Elk Grove (South). The NLCNA is generally bounded by North: Cosumnes River Boulevard; South: Sheldon Road/ City of Sacramento line; West: Franklin Boulevard; East: Highway 99.

Scheduling Coordination:

Of high concern for our community is the coordination and timing of all pre-construction and construction phasing. The use of the Cosumnes River Boulevard corridor, and its major cross collectors and arterials offers unique problems. The north and south traffic flows on Franklin Boulevard, Center Parkway and Bruceville Road will be significantly impaired. The most critical of these is Bruceville Road for our residents and the commuters which transit our boundaries on a daily basis.

For Educational institutions these transit routes are a *critical access point* for Cosumnes River College, Valley High School and key safe access to schools within our mandated attendance boundary which are east of highway 99 include Monterey Trails High School and Edward Harris Middle School (both opening August of 2004).

Elementary school car access and pedestrian traffic will be impacted also by newly routed excess traffic using neighborhood streets and collectors to circumvent traffic slow downs and traffic jams caused by the construction. Those schools will include at a minimum: Barbara Comstock Morse Elementary, Irene B. West Elementary, Anna Kirchgater Elementary, and Prairie Elementary School. Many of our elementary and middle schools are year-round with a minimum average of over 800 and 1200 students respectively.

Hospital, clinic, fire station and emergency room services are located north of Cosumnes River Boulevard. Those ER's, clinics and medical services are located along the Bruceville health care corridor those facilities include: Methodist Hospital, Kaiser Hospital & Clinics & Pharmacies, Timberlake Clinics & Pharmacy, Bruceville Terrace Convalescent Hospital, Sierra Vista Mental Health Clinic and Hospital, Russell Manor Senior Housing.

Anticipated growth as reported in the Sacramento Bee Metro 12/13/03, the city of Elk Grove is building in excess of 3000 new homes per year. The city of Elk Grove has a newly planned community that includes another 7000 plus homes to the south of us along Bruceville Road. Bruceville Road. Much of the traffic using Bruceville Road does not have any other viable alternative route to access the services and located to the north and eastward along transit routes which include Power Inn Road, Calvine Road and Highway 99.

The city of Sacramento's "south new growth area" is a primary area for new development of housing and commercial services. Bruceville Road is a major target for that growth within the city of Sacramento's boundaries. The Freeport Regional Authority's preferred alignment traverses nearly the entire width of this designated area. Fortunately most construction disruptions, with the exception of the Sacramento River intake pump station, will be limited in real terms to the Cosumnes River Boulevard continuing to the east and all of the direct cross traffic for the involved streets.

Requests and Recommendations:

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Use of west of Interstate 5 prior to crossing under (tunneling under) to vacant Delta Shores vicinity to open trench to Cosumnes River Boulevard. | Sp13-1 |
| 2. Cosumnes Boulevard cross points recommend tunneling under (Franklin Boulevard & Center Parkway). | Sp13-2 |
| 3. Cosumnes Boulevard should permit open trench <u>only if</u> adequate room is left to allow the flow of two way traffic (simultaneous movement) between Franklin and Bruceville Road. | Sp13-3 |
| 4. Do not disrupt flood protection channels, detention basins and creeks. | Sp13-4 |
| 5. Timing to prevent school disruptions and traffic impacts (non-peak hours construction and summer session break construction should be utilized fully and as preferred planning options.) | Sp13-5 |
| 6. Staging area of construction trucks, loading, excavation and all other material and equipment should be kept off the public roadway. | Sp13-6 |
| 7. Routes for trucks & equipment must not include neighborhood feeder streets & collectors. | Sp13-7 |

8. Temporary Sound Wall should be constructed the entire length of the Cosumnes River Boulevard construction zone once any construction begins at or along the Boulevard to mitigate against noise of impacted traffic as well as construction noise. | Sp13-8
9. No morning or evening construction during peak hours. Use CalTrans model of freeway construction which utilizes night and non-peak hours... for Cosumnes River Boulevard, Bruceville Road, Center Parkway and Franklin Boulevard. | Sp13-9
10. Traffic study should be performed during peak school use days and hours for the college, high schools and elementary schools. | Sp13-10
11. Have a master coordinating of flagging traffic program through the major intersection. (Current projects have caused 23 minute delays in traffic crossing of Bruceville Road and Cosumnes River Boulevard. | Sp13-11
12. Tunnel under highway 99 | Sp13-12
13. Use East Stockton Boulevard to Rangeview Rd or Stevenson St. to move pipeline to Power Inn Road. | Sp13-13
14. Build the non-direct impacts (no housing, no road traffic) first from both ends of the project. | Sp13-14
15. Give advance notice of traffic disruptions and alternate route planning for area road users within Franklin Boulevard to Highway 99 from ValleyHi Drive south to Sheldon Road. | Sp13-15
16. Build or improve existing bicycle marked lanes and pedestrian side walk access fully improved to cross highway 99 to Power Inn for students and cyclists. | Sp13-16
17. Development of an effective traffic and noise mitigation program to reduce air quality threats from passenger vehicles and construction traffic emissions, dust, and noise. | Sp13-17

Sincerely,

Pat Shelby
NLCNA President Elect

Monica Rothenbaum
NLCNA President

Response to Comments of North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association (Letter Sp13)

- Sp13-1.** As described in the draft EIR/EIS for Alternatives 4 and 5 (pages 2-18 and 2-20, respectively), the pipeline would travel southeast along the west side of I-5, crossing under I-5 to the east side before reaching the intersection with the future extension of Cosumnes River Boulevard. From this intersection, the pipeline alignment follows the proposed future extension of Cosumnes River Boulevard between I-5 on the west and Franklin Boulevard on the east.
- Sp13-2.** A final decision on how the pipeline would cross Franklin Boulevard and Center Parkway will not be made until the final design stage. However, because of constraints at both sites, tunneling at these intersections is probable. Regardless of the methods used, the traffic control plan described in Chapter 2 under Environmental Commitments would ensure that traffic impacts during construction are minimized to the extent practicable.
- Sp13-3.** As described in Table 12-2 of the draft EIR/EIS (following page 12-20), it is anticipated that the existing two lanes of Cosumnes River Boulevard between Franklin and Bruceville Roads will remain open during construction regardless of construction methods. Furthermore, if some portion of the existing two lanes is needed for construction purposes, traffic control devices would be used to ensure that one lane in each direction is available.
- Sp13-4.** The disruption of flood protection channels, detention basins, and creeks will be avoided, minimized, and/or mitigated. It would be necessary for some flood control

channels and/or creeks to be crossed by the pipeline. The type of crossing to be used (e.g., tunneling or open cut trench) depends on site-specific conditions and will be determined during the final design stage. Additionally, as described in Chapter 2 under Environmental Commitments, the erosion and sediment control plan and channel and levee restoration plan will be implemented to ensure that flood protection channels and creeks are restored to their preconstruction condition and that associated natural resources are protected during construction.

- Sp13-5.** As described in Chapter 2 under Environmental Commitments, the traffic control plan will be developed and implemented in coordination with local jurisdictions to reduce construction-related effects on the roadway system. This includes coordination with affected jurisdictions on construction hours of operation and lane closures. As described in the Master Response to Intake Site Selection Process, FRWA will establish a community ombudsman to ensure that community concerns are addressed during the final design and construction process.
- Sp13-6.** As described in Chapter 2 under Environmental Commitments, the traffic control plan will be developed and implemented in coordination with local jurisdictions to reduce construction-related effects on the roadway system. Staging activities and areas will be included in the plan. Additionally, an access point/staging area plan (Chapter 2 under Environmental Commitments) also will be developed to further address this issue.
- Sp13-7.** Construction traffic in residential neighborhoods will be minimized to the extent practicable. Pipeline alignments

generally follow major roadways and construction traffic will generally be kept on those major roadways.

- Sp13-8.** As described in Chapter 14, “Noise,” of the draft EIR/EIS, there will be significant short-term increases in construction-related noise levels as a result of construction activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 14-1 (page 14-25) could minimize these impacts but not to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure 14-1 includes the provision for public notice of proposed activities and noise shielding to the extent feasible. Possible noise shielding may include, but is not limited to, features such as movable noise barriers, noise-reducing “blankets,” hay bale shield walls, and similar features.
- Sp13-9.** As described in Chapter 2 under Environmental Commitments, the traffic control plan will include actions such as limiting lane closures during peak commuting hours to the extent possible.
- Sp13-10.** Development of the traffic control plan will include coordination with affected school districts.
- Sp13-11.** Traffic control devices, including flagging, will be fully coordinated through preparation and implementation of the traffic control plan.
- Sp13-12.** The pipeline will be tunneled under SR 99.
- Sp13-13.** The exact routes for material hauling are not yet known, but the suggested roadways will be included for consideration of haul routes. Final decisions will be made during the final design phase in coordination with development of the traffic control plan.
- Sp13-14.** Construction of the pipeline will likely entail multiple headings (i.e., construction will take place in several locations simultaneously). The construction locations and sequence will be determined during the final design phase, and traffic/community considerations will be a part of the decision process.
- Sp13-15.** The traffic control plan will include actions such as coordination with the affected jurisdictions on construction hours of operation and lane closures and providing notification of road closures. There will be extensive public outreach regarding these and other matters during project construction.
- Sp13-16.** FRWA will restore all bicycle lanes and sidewalks damaged during project construction. FRWA is also committed to participate in various community improvements, including bicycle trails, to the extent that there is a connection to the FRWP and specific impacts caused by the project. FRWA will continue to coordinate with local jurisdictions to identify these opportunities.
- Sp13-17.** The numerous Environmental Commitments described in Chapter 2, including the traffic control plan and dust suppression plan, in combination with the noise mitigation described above under response Sp13-8, will provide a thorough and effective mitigation program for the issues raised in this comment. It should be noted that Mitigation Measure 14-1 for construction-related noise includes a noise disturbance coordinator who will be responsible for responding to complaints regarding construction noise. In addition, as described in the Master Response to Intake Site Selection Process,

FRWA will establish a community ombudsman to ensure that community concerns are addressed during the final design and construction process.

Letter Sp14 RECEIVED

JAN 15 2004



December 17, 2003

Mr. Kurt Kroner
Freeport Regional Water Authority
1510 J Street, Suite 140
Sacramento, CA 95814

FOLLOW-UP Comments on DEIR/DEIS For The Freeport Regional Water Project

Dear Mr. Kroner,

On December 15, 2003, I submitted a letter containing the comments of the Sierra Club - Mother Lode Chapter comments on the Freeport Regional Water Project DEIS/DEIR. Upon reviewing documents this morning, I realized that there is need to revised and recirculate the DEIR/EIS to address issues raised in the comment letters of Sierra Club and others.

An issue of particular concern is the lack of discussion of the measures to finance this very expensive proposed project. In particular, the DEIR/EIS must disclose, describe, and quantify the amount of new urban development that would be needed to generate enough revenues from developer and ratepayer fees sufficient to pay for the project, analyzed separately as to SCWA's share of the cost, and as to EBMUD's cost share.

My clients are apprehensive that the Freeport project, and other costly infrastructure projects (such as roadways and Regional Sanitation's Interceptor Master Plan) may have significant growth-inducing impacts arising from the necessity for local government to approve new development to generate developer fees and new ratepayer revenues to pay for the Freeport project. This EIR/EIS must contain detailed financial analysis to assist the decision-makers and public in determining how much and what type of new urban growth would be needed to generate revenues sufficient to pay for the project.

Another financial issue affecting the environment is whether the financing plan will generate revenues sufficient to implement the mitigation measures proposed by the DEIR/EIS. Detailed financing information must be in the DEIR/EIS so that the decision-makers and public can determine whether mitigation measures promised by the EIR/EIS are feasible and will be implemented.

Very Truly Yours,

JAMES P. PACHL, Attorney
on behalf of Sierra Club - Mother Lode Chapter

Sp14-1

Sp14-2

Responses to Comments of the Sierra Club, Mother Lode Chapter (Letter Sp14)

Sp14-1. The FRWP facilities are designed to meet the identified objectives of each FRWA member agency. These needs are described in Chapter 1 of the draft EIR/EIS. As noted on pages 1-3 and 1-4 of the draft EIR/EIS, the FRWP facilities are intended to support the acquisition and delivery of surface water to the Zone 40 area, consistent with the Sacramento Area Water Forum Agreement and County of Sacramento General Plan policies and projected development. The project is sized to deliver the projected surface water demands to serve the Zone 40 area at full buildout of the County's General Plan. The project financing is based on projected development consistent with the General Plan. No additional development would be required to finance the project.

As discussed in Chapter 20 of the draft EIR/EIS, the EBMUD service area is generally built out. New development generally will consist of densification within currently developed areas. The EBMUD-portion of the project would be financed by all EBMUD ratepayers.

As fully disclosed in Chapter 20 of the draft EIR/EIS, the FRWP is considered growth inducing under CEQA because, although the project is consistent with the Sacramento County General Plan, it would remove a potential obstacle to growth. The environmental effects of growth are discussed in Chapter 20

Sp14-1. Mitigation measures proposed as part of the draft EIR/EIS will not necessarily be funded by project-

specific financing. FRWA and its member agencies have the ability to fund the implementation of mitigation measures separately from project financing. In addition, most of the mitigation measures proposed to be implemented are measures that will be required in the early stages of project construction and will not rely on long-term financing. Finally, FRWA is required to adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting plan under CEQA, which will require the implementation and monitoring of mitigation measures included in the project.

Letter Sp 15



TO AID, ENCOURAGE AND PROMOTE EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT

Alameda County Taxpayers Association, Inc.

893-3341 1305 FRANKLIN STREET SUITE 408 OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612

Incorporated
June 17, 1938

November 12, 2003

Mr. Kurt Kroner
Freeport Regional Water Authority
1510 J Street, #140
Sacramento CA 95814

RECEIVED

DEC 01 2003

Dear Mr. Kroner:

Alameda County Taxpayers Association believes that the Draft EIR/EIS for the Freeport Regional Water Project answers all environmental and other questions concerning Project impacts, and should be adopted.

Residents and businesses in the East Bay must be able to count on a reliable water supply, especially in times of drought. The Freeport Regional Water Project assures that supply. It protects customers in dry years and provides much needed system flexibility.

Sp 15-1

Sincerely,

Arthur B. Geen
Executive Vice President

**Responses to Alameda County Taxpayers Association, Inc.
(Letter Sp15)**

Sp15-1. The commentor's support for the project is noted.