

**COMMENT LETTER 72 - WILLIAM AND MARY DIAZ-ROMERO (OCTOBER 1, 1996), RECEIVED OCTOBER 3, 1996**

**Response to Comment 72-1**

*Comment Summary: This comment asks how accurate the data regarding land classification can be when old maps were used, which did not identify all creeks, springs, residences, and structures.*

Methods of soil and land classification mapping do not require accurate placement of all cultural symbols (i.e., road names) on the base maps for accuracy of soil and land classification data. Soils and land-use boundaries are drawn by associating soils with natural land forms and other features, such as drainage patterns, relief, and natural vegetation, apparent on air photos and field checking/revising based on observations. Similarly, cropping patterns are identified on air photos and field verified by relating locations to roads and fence lines and other observable features.

**Response to Comment 72-2**

*Comment Summary: The comment questions the accuracy of land classification used to identify and characterize lands suitable for irrigation, based on an apparent discrepancy between descriptions of class 3 and 4 lands in the Draft EIR/EIS and Sonoma County Soils Survey.*

The Draft EIR/EIS does not use the land classifications described in the Sonoma County Soils Survey. The methodology used in the Draft EIR/EIS for land classification was developed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. Please refer to Appendix E-1 (Irrigation Suitability Land Classification - South County Alternative), pages 22 through 27, where land classification categories are defined. Because the classification categories are different, the descriptions in the Draft EIR/EIS would not be expected to match those in the Soil Survey.

