

**COMMENT LETTER 73 - JUDY KIRKLAND (SEPTEMBER 30, 1996), RECEIVED
OCTOBER 3, 1996**

Response to Comment 73-1

Comment Summary: The comment states that one of the partners of Kirkland Ranch on Carroll Road is against putting a dam or wetlands at or near the ranch because of the hazards which may occur from the treated sewer water.

Impacts of reservoir construction are evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS, and mitigation is proposed for significant impacts. Specific concerns were expressed in subsequent comments and these comments are addressed specifically in the Responses to Comments below. This comment also provides an opinion regarding project selection. Please refer to Master Response 2, located in section 6.2 of this document.

Response to Comment 73-2

Comment Summary: This comment states that the fecal coliform bacteria counts exceeded the maximum allowable to be considered tertiary. The comment also states that the reliability of those (fecal coliform) tests are questionable since tests were not done for viruses, cyclospora, Cryptosporidium, and a new strain of E. coli.

The comment does not state to which fecal coliform bacteria data it refers. However, since this comment is a nearly verbatim repeat of Comment 41-11, the EIR/EIS authors assume it is referring to storage pond data. Refer to Responses to Comments 41-11, 113-5 and to Master Response 8, located in Section 6.2 of this document.

Although, as stated in Response to Comment 41-11, fecal coliform analyses have not been done on storage ponds, the reliability of tests for fecal coliforms are in no way dependent on tests for viruses, cyclospora, *Cryptosporidium*, and a new strain of *E. coli*.

Response to Comment 73-3

Comment Summary: The comment asks what guarantees there are that property would not be destroyed by a dam break during an earthquake.

None of the reservoirs is located within an Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone. All dams would be designed to withstand ground shaking from earthquakes. Refer to the discussion of impacts on reservoirs from active faults on pages 4.3-70 and 4.3-71, and the discussion of the potential for dam failure in Section 4.19 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment 73-4

Comment Summary: The comment states that an ocean outfall would be more acceptable.

Ocean discharge was evaluated during the screening process and was dropped from consideration because it did not achieve the purpose of water reclamation, recycling and reuse. Refer to Appendix D-6 (Documentation in Support of Elimination of Alternatives) of the Draft EIR/EIS.