

COMMENT LETTER 90 - MELVIN STUMP TRUST, COLLEEN BRIGGS (OCTOBER 7, 1996), RECEIVED OCTOBER 7, 1996

Response to Comment 90-1

Comment Summary: The comment lists the issues concerning the Bloomfield storage reservoir site that are addressed in the rest of comment letter 90 and provides a summary of the history and natural environment of the Bloomfield site.

The EIR/EIS authors appreciate the information about the Bloomfield site provided in the comment. Specific comments on the Draft EIR/EIS are addressed below in Responses to Comments 90-3 through 90-29.

Response to Comment 90-2

Comment Summary: The comment states that Ernest Finley and Alice Mary Burbank played a significant role in the lives of Briggs family members.

The comment does not address the adequacy of the analyses or information in the Draft EIR/EIS. Specific comments on the Draft EIR/EIS are addressed below in Responses to Comments 90-3 through 90-29.

Response to Comment 90-3

Comment Summary: The comment asks how owners stand in regard to remaining property if property under Williamson Act is taken.

For any parcels with at least 40 acres of land remaining, the remainder parcel will still qualify for a Williamson Act contract, and could remain under contract. For parcels less than 40 acres, the remainder parcel will no longer qualify for the Williamson Act. As shown in Table 4.2.7 on page 4.2-14 of the Draft EIR/EIS, Parcel 27-030-03 at the Bloomfield reservoir site will have 36 acres remaining if the Bloomfield site was acquired for a reservoir; the remainder parcel will no longer qualify for a Williamson Act contract. The Draft EIR/EIS identifies this as a significant impact.

Response to Comment 90-4

Comment Summary: The comment asks who will pay Williamson Act contract cancellation fees for the property taken.

The City of Santa Rosa will pay any fees.

Response to Comment 90-5

Comment Summary: The comment asks who will give notification required to cancel the Williamson Act contract.

The City of Santa Rosa will be responsible for any required notifications.

Response to Comment 90-6

Comment Summary: The comment asks who will pay the Williamson Act contract cancellation fees.

The City of Santa Rosa will pay any fees.

Response to Comment 90-7

Comment Summary: The comment asks who will pay for new deeds of trust for affected parcels.

The City of Santa Rosa will pay for new deeds of trust.

Response to Comments 90-8 and 90-9

Comment Summary: In relation to property at the Bloomfield reservoir site, the comment asks where the houses and buildings are going to be in relation to the dam, and indicates that Figure 4.14-15 of the Draft EIR/EIS does not show these structures.

In the production of the photosimulation in Figure 4.14-15, showing the proposed Bloomfield Dam one year after construction, the buildings on the site south of the dam were inadvertently omitted. These buildings will remain in the same location shown in the existing view of the site in Figure 4.14-15. Please see Section 6.6, Replacement Pages of the Final EIR for the corrected Figure 4.14-15.

Response to Comment 90-10

Comment Summary: The comment asks who will pay for new housing and barns and/or moving existing structures.

Section 2.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS (page 2-60) states that the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-646) will govern all of the acquisition and displacement actions related to the Project, and that compensation of affected property owners and businesses shall be agreed upon prior to construction of the Project. These will be part of the total Project costs, although the specific type and amount of costs are not known at this point. The Project cost estimates contained in Appendix D-30 (Alternative Projects Construction Cost Estimate) of the Draft EIR/EIS include a 25% contingency to cover the costs of unknown Project costs, one of which is relocation and replacement costs.

Response to Comment 90-11

Comment Summary: The comment asks where surface water from land above 300 feet will go.

The EIR/EIS authors presume that the comment refers to lands above the potential Bloomfield reservoir site. Surface runoff from within the watershed, upstream of the dam will be captured within the reservoir.

Response to Comment 90-12

Comment Summary: The comment asks who will be responsible for diversion of runoff.

Diversion structures are not proposed for the Bloomfield reservoir, because analysis showed that they were not required. Analysis for the requirement for diversion is presented in Appendix D-17 (Reservoir Stormwater Runoff Diversion Structures) of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment 90-13

Comment Summary: In relation to property at the Bloomfield reservoir site, the comment asks how the remaining property will be accessed.

If new access to the remaining property is required, provision of such access will be the responsibility of the City. Also, refer to Response to Comment 90-10 for a discussion of responsibility for relocation and replacement of facilities.

Response to Comments 90-14 and 90-15

Comment Summary: The comment asks who will be financially responsible for bridges, fences, roads and water sources needed, indicating with respect to property on which the Bloomfield reservoir site is located that water troughs, roads, fencing, gates and electrical service are located below the proposed water level of the reservoir.

Refer to Response to Comment 90-10 for a discussion of responsibility for relocation and replacement of facilities.

Response to Comment 90-16

Comment Summary: With respect to property on which the Bloomfield reservoir site is located, the comment asks whether there will be access to the well below the dam.

Assuming that the well is outside of the area acquired for the reservoir, there would be no change in the existing access.

Response to Comment 90-17

Comment Summary: The comment asks who will pay for piping potable water to affected wells if well water is contaminated.

The City of Santa Rosa will pay for constructing the pipeline.

Response to Comment 90-18

Comment Summary: The comment asks if there would be monthly or yearly water charge.

Although these types of details regarding water supply have not been finalized, it likely that there will be monthly water bills.

Response to Comment 90-19

Comment Summary: The comment asks what would happen to spring water that runs off from their ranch.

Water within the watershed upstream of the dam will run into the reservoir and be collected there. Water outside the watershed or below the dam will continue to run off into Americano Creek.

Response to Comment 90-20

Comment Summary: With respect to the Bloomfield Reservoir, the comment asks where will the "silt pond" be located to contain silt released during construction of the dam, and will it be on the Brigg's Ranch.

A temporary silt pond or settlement zone in the creek is advisable to control and contain silt runoff from dam construction activities, and should be located on the streambed below the dam site, at the downstream end of the construction zone, which is shown in Figure 3.3-7 on page 3.3-15 of the Draft EIR/EIS. A separate construction easement may be required to allow placement of the silt pond out of the immediate dam construction area. Because of the limited runoff from the Bloomfield site, the silt pond will probably be confined to a few acres. The pond site will be filled, recontoured and revegetated after construction, and returned to its previous use.

Response to Comment 90-21

Comment Summary: The comment asks why farmland was excluded from Table 4.2-6 on page 4.2-12, and refers to included references that show prime farmland.

Table 4.2-6 in the Draft EIR/EIS (page 4.2-12) reports 195 acres of grazing land at the Bloomfield Reservoir site. Other categories in the table are for specific types of farmland categorized by the California Department of Conservation as "Unique Farmland" or "Farmland of Local Importance". *Important Farmland Series Maps for Sonoma County* (California Department of Land Conservation, Office of Land Conservation, Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program 1992) did not show these categories of farmland at the Bloomfield Reservoir site. The references attached to the end of the comment letter show that all of the listed soil types are considered prime farmland only if irrigated. Because the area is not currently irrigated it is not classified as prime farmland.

Response to Comment 90-22

Comment Summary: With respect to the Bloomfield Reservoir, the comment asks how long will it take to construct the dam.

If selected, construction of the Bloomfield Dam is expected to take 24 to 30 months.

Response to Comments 90-23 and 90-24

Comment Summary: The comment asks about compensation for lost income due to herd reduction and who will be responsible for temporary fences and water lines necessary to keep business productive.

Refer to Response to Comment 90-10 for a discussion of responsibility for relocation and replacement of facilities.

Response to Comment 90-25

Comment Summary: With respect to construction of the reservoir dam on the Bloomfield site, the comment asks how cows will be moved and barns accessed during construction.

For areas outside the construction zone of the reservoir, access will generally be unimpeded by construction. In the event that access is blocked during construction, it will be the City's responsibility to arrange an alternative access.

Response to Comment 90-26

Comment Summary: The comment asks where water from the spillways will flow.

Spillways are described on page 3.3-20 of the Draft EIR/EIS and the spillway for the Bloomfield Reservoir is shown in Figure 3.3-7 on page 3.3-15. Water will be discharged to the natural creek channel downstream of the dam.

Response to Comment 90-27

Comment Summary: The comment asks how flooding will be prevented during the wet season when the ground is already saturated.

The Project will not prevent chronic West County flooding problems, nor is the Project expected to worsen such problems. Project irrigation will not cause saturated soil conditions during the rainy season when floods occur, as described in Appendices D-19, I-1, and I-10 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The storage reservoir will reduce the peak flood water elevation, as described in Section 4.4 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Refer also to Response to Comment 59-3.

Response to Comment 90-28

Comment Summary: The comment asks how contamination of “fresh water” with wastewater will be prevented.

The EIR/EIS identifies impacts of the Project on water quality of West County fresh water resources (i.e., Impacts 5.5.1, 5.5.2, 6.5.1, and 6.7.1), but none of the impacts are significant after mitigation. Significant impacts are prevented by implementation of specific measures associated with each of these impacts. Refer to Measure 2.2.3: Restrict Surface and Subsurface Irrigation Water, on page 2-23 of the Draft EIR/EIS, and Measure 2.5.3: Control Program for Hydrogen Sulfide, Ammonia, and Dissolved Oxygen, on page 2-125.

Response to Comment 90-29

Comment Summary: The comment asks why a dam is proposed on a fault.

The Dunham fault is located in the footprint of the Two Rock reservoir. The Bloomfield fault traverses the northwesterly portion of the Bloomfield reservoir site. The Americano Creek fault is located more than one mile from the nearest reservoir site. None of the faults located in the vicinity of the reservoir sites has been demonstrated to have undergone recent movement and none are designated as fault-rupture hazard zones under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazards Zone Act. The history of movement and the seismic potential for each of the faults located near reservoir sites is described in the Draft EIR/EIS on page 4.3-40. Dams and reservoirs will be designed to withstand the maximum ground shaking anticipated to occur at each site, assuming a large earthquake on a regional fault. This level of design is adequate to protect public health and safety.

Response to Comment 90-30

Comment Summary: The comment consists of a U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Prime Farmland Soil Unit List for Sonoma County, attached to letter 90.

This information is presented in support of Comment 90-21. Refer to Response to Comment 90-21.

Response to Comment 90-31

Comment Summary: The comment consists of a Soil Texture Class Description List, attached to letter 90.

This information is presented in support of Comment 90-21. Refer to Response to Comment 90-21.

Response to Comment 90-32

Comment Summary: The comment provides an attachment describing land capability classification, but does not indicate how the information is to be used or how it relates to the analysis provided in the Draft EIR/EIS.

This information is presented in support of Comment 90-21. Refer to Response to Comment 90-21.

Response to Comment 90-33

Comment Summary: The comment provides a figure showing soils mapping units in the vicinity of Americano Creek.

This information is presented in support of Comment 90-21. Refer to Response to Comment 90-21.

Response to Comment 90-34

Comment Summary: The comment provides a portion of the topographic map associated with the Americano Creek area.

This information is presented in support of Comment 90-21. Refer to Response to Comment 90-21.

