

**COMMENT LETTER 59 - DARRELL R. AND CLOTILDA KLEIN (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996), RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 26, 1996**

**Response to Comment 59-1**

*Comment Summary: The comment indicates opposition to whatever is necessary to bring reclaimed water to the West County.*

The comment provides a statement of opposition to the West County Project.. Refer to Master Response 2, located in Section 6.2 of this document, which addresses opinions regarding project selection.

**Response to Comment 59-2**

*Comment Summary: The comment indicates opposition to the following potential impacts which could result from the West County Reclamation Alternative: 1) compromising or condemning wells, 2) adverse impacts on local septic systems, 3) adverse impacts on air quality due to reservoir construction, 4) adverse impacts on dwellings and streams, 5) potential odors due to sludge production, 6) the loss of marsh and stream habitat and ponds, 7) adverse impacts on the Estero Americano, and 8) adverse impacts on Bloomfield in the event of a dam break, all as described in the Draft EIR/EIS.*

The Draft EIR/EIS acknowledges that a West County Project would have unavoidable significant impacts; however, many of the impacts cited in the comment can be reduced to less than significant with mitigation. The Draft EIR/EIS provides mitigation for potential effects to wells in the vicinity of reservoir sites. Refer to Mitigation Measure 2.3.12: Provide Replacement Water Supply for Affected Wells, on page 2-85 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Mitigation is also provided for any adverse effects to septic systems. Refer to Mitigation Measure 2.5.9: Implement Septic System Monitoring and Replacement Program, on page 2-136 of the Draft EIR/EIS. With implementation of these measures these groundwater impacts are found not to be significant. Although, even with mitigation, construction-period air quality impacts are significant, there will be no significant operational air quality impacts. Odor impacts of sludge handling are associated with headworks expansion, which is a part of all alternatives, and will occur at the treatment plant. The Draft EIR/EIS does not evaluate the application of sludge to West County agricultural fields. Also refer to Response to Comment 128-19. The Draft EIR/EIS acknowledges that loss of dwellings will be a significant impact for several reservoir sites. Seepage from reservoirs causes significant water quality impacts for a short segment of stream below each dam, but this is mitigated with Mitigation Measure 2.5.3: Control Program for Hydrogen Sulfide, Ammonia, and Dissolved Oxygen (refer to page 2-125 of the Draft EIR/EIS). Lost aquatic habitat will be replaced under Mitigation Measure 2.3.11: Sensitive Resource Conservation Program (refer to page 2-76 of the Draft EIR/EIS). Impacts to the esteros are considered significant primarily because any change is considered significant, even if the change is an improvement in water quality.

Safety measures incorporated in dam design reduce the potential risk of dam failure to less than significant.

### **Response to Comment 59-3**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that flooding in west county is currently a problem and that, if irrigation causes groundwater level to rise in the irrigation season, flooding frequency or depth might be worsened.*

Project irrigation will not cause saturated soil conditions nor a groundwater level rise. Measure 2.2.3: Restrict Surface and Subsurface Irrigation Water Runoff, on page 2-23 of the Draft EIR/EIS, identifies specific irrigation practices that will prevent creation of saturated soil conditions. Comparison of Tables B3S and B6S in Appendix I-10 (Baseline Hydrology and Irrigation Drainage Evaluation for West and South County Reclamation Alternatives), shows that the amount of runoff during a wet year under existing and project conditions is 50,211 and 46,821 acre-feet per year, respectively. The reason for the decrease in runoff, as explained on page 19 of Appendix I-10, is the result of improved soil and riparian corridor conditions that are expected to result from the project.

### **Response to Comment 59-4**

*Comment Summary: The comment indicates opposition to deliveries of reclaimed water to the West County or the Bloomfield, Valley Ford areas.*

The comment provides an opinion regarding project selection., Refer to Master Response 2, located in Section 6.2 of this document.