

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

for the

MODESTO
SURFACE WATER TREATMENT PLANT

PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS

2. PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS

The California Environmental Quality Act requires that a Draft EIR be circulated for public comment and that any comments received by the lead agency be considered and addressed prior to EIR certification and final selection of the project alternative. This section describes the public comment process, the letters received and the public meetings held to solicit input to the EIR. It ends with a summary of additional analyses conducted to address the comments which were received.

2.1 PUBLISHING OF DRAFT EIR AND ADVERTISEMENT OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

The Draft EIR was circulated for public comment during the period October 18, 1989 to December 4, 1989. Table 2-1 is the list of agencies, organizations and individuals receiving the Draft EIR.

Public meetings to present the Project and receive oral comments were held in mid-November at four locations in the Project Study Area to assure the opportunity for input from persons throughout the area. The four locations included Salida, Empire, southwestern Modesto and downtown Modesto (at the District Headquarters). A public notice (Figure 2-1) was published in three different newspapers in the area: the Modesto Bee, the Farm News and the Waterford News. Each newspaper published the notice at least three times.

2.2 PUBLIC INPUT

A total of about 50 members of the public attended one of the four meetings. Each meeting started with an introduction by Joe Marcotte, Chief Executive Officer of the Modesto Irrigation District. A description of the Project and alternatives was presented by Peter Sturtevant, URS Project Manager for the EIR. Mr. Sturtevant also presented a summary of impacts and mitigations. Following this, the meeting was opened up to public comments and moderated by Mr. Marcotte. A total of 21 individuals presented oral comments on the 4 different evenings. A total of 83 comments requiring a response were tabulated.

With regard to written comments, a total of 23 letters were received (see page 3-16). These can be broken down into the following groups:

- Federal agencies - 1
- State agencies - 6
- Local agencies - 2
- Organizations - 7
- Individuals - 6

Table 2-1

LIST OF PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS TO WHOM
THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT WAS SENT

Federal

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Sacramento District, Environmental Division

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

State

California Air Resources Board

California Waste Management Board

Caltrans, District 10

Department of Conservation

Department of Fish and Game

Department of Food and Agriculture

Department of Health

Department of Health Services, Public Water Supply Branch

Department of Parks and Recreation

Department of Water Resources

Native American Heritage Commission

Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse

Public Utilities Commission

Reclamation Board

Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region

State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Clean Water Grants

State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Water Quality

Table 2-1, Continued

Local

City of Modesto, Department of Planning

City of Waterford
Chamber of Commerce

Empire Sanitary District

Great Valley Museum of Natural History

Salida Sanitary District

Stanislaus Area Association of Governments

Stanislaus County Agricultural Commissioner

Stanislaus County Air Pollution Control District

Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors

Stanislaus County Department of Agriculture

Stanislaus County Department of Environmental Resources

Stanislaus County Department of Fire Safety

Stanislaus County Department of Planning & Community Development

Stanislaus County Department of Public Works

Stanislaus County Library
Central Branch
Empire Branch
Salida Branch
Waterford Branch

Stanislaus County Parks Department

Turlock Irrigation District

Organizations

Ecology Action Institute

E.I.P. Associates

Table 2-1, Continued

Organizations (continued)

Growers Harvesting Committee

League of Women Voters

James M. Montgomery
Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Sierra Club Yokutus Group

Stanislaus Audubon Society

Stanislaus Conservation League

Stanislaus Farm Bureau Water Committee

Stanislaus Fly Fisherman

Tuolumne River Preservation Trust

Individuals

George Atherton

Hulda Christensen

Glenn Patton

PUBLIC INPUT INVITED

Public Meetings on the
DOMESTIC WATER TREATMENT PLANT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
will be held at 7:30 p.m. as follows:

DATE	LOCATION
November 8, 1989	Salida Union School Auditorium 4519 Finney Road, Salida
November 9, 1989	Teel Middle School 5255 First Street, Empire
November 15, 1989	Burbank-Paradise Community Center 1325 Beverly Drive, Modesto
November 16, 1989	Modesto Irrigation District 1231 11th Street, Modesto

The Modesto Irrigation District, the City of Modesto, and the Del Este Water Company have released the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Modesto Surface Water Treatment Plant. Copies of this document are available for review at the Modesto Irrigation District and the following Stanislaus County Libraries: Central, Empire, Salida, and Waterford.



This document may also be purchased for a nominal fee of \$5.00 from the Modesto Irrigation District Water Operations Division, 1231 11th Street, Modesto, CA 95354.

Your written comments regarding this document may be sent no later than December 4, 1989, to the following address:

Modesto Irrigation District
Attention: V.G. Bradford
P.O. Box 4060
Modesto, CA 95352-4060

For more information, contact the Modesto Irrigation District at 526-7571.

FIGURE 2-1

PUBLIC NOTICE



A total of 304 individual comments requiring a response were tabulated.

The comments and responses to comments can be found in Section 3.

2.3 ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

As a result of extensive comment on the possible effects of flow depletions in the Tuolumne River which might result from the proposed Project, the District closely analyzed available data regarding its historic diversions at La Grange and total irrigated acreage within the District. The results of this analysis supersede the flow depletion analysis presented in the Draft EIR. This analysis, presented in Response E8, demonstrates that Project water will be obtained from District diversions that have historically occurred at La Grange Dam. Declining irrigated acreage combined with more efficient irrigation lateral operation will provide the water necessary to supply the Project. District diversions at La Grange will not change and the downstream flow regime of the river will remain unchanged. As a result associated fishery and recreation resources will also remain unchanged.

A number of other comments requested information or presented observations which required additional analysis to address. The following is a summary of noteworthy analyses and new information gathered as a result of comments to the Draft EIR.

<u>Comment #</u>	<u>Additional Analyses</u>
C7	A statement of the District's policy on priority of water use
D2	Further description of the plant chlorine containment system
D8	Current number of water meters in operation
E4	Appropriateness of a Program EIR
E11, K2	Additional information on conjunctive use of ground and surface water supplies
E18, E38	Presentation of relevant information from the Bay/Delta Hearing
E28, E31	Reservoir drawdown effects - Don Pedro Reservoir
E32	Quantification of the Project Area overlying the zone of groundwater depression

Comment #

Additional Analyses

- E51 Project impacts on Tuolumne River recharge to the groundwater
- E52 The effects on the Project due to future river flow requirements which may result from the upcoming FERC License Review or the Bay/Delta Process
- F5, G67 Quantification of the power and associated revenues from the Project
- F15 Average river flows calculated for the period 1971-1988, the era of New Don Pedro Dam
- F18, G54, G96 Project impacts upon the taste and use of the domestic water supply
- F24 Estimate of return of Project water to the San Joaquin River (as treated effluent)
- G7 Recalculation of river flow in the vicinity of the diversion point for Alternative D
- G23 Recalculation of Project water use under Alternative D1
- G29 A summary of the Voluntary Flow Agreement
- G41 A review of turbidity data and its effects on water treatment process
- G57 Use of the transmission main in Alternative A for water storage
- K3 More detailed discussion of the No-Project Alternative
- L2 Update of the status of Modesto's General Plan update
- L3 The effect that stringent water conservation measures would have on the need for the Project
- L7 Development of a table of comparative costs among the Alternatives
- S3 The locations of the wells whose data are plotted in Figure 4-7 of the Draft EIR.

Comment #

Additional Analyses

- | | |
|----|--|
| T6 | A review of factors which may have affected salmon production in the river |
| W2 | Provisions for maintaining boating safety and river access |

Appendix A contains a discussion of the water rights of the District and how they relate to the proposed Project. Appendix B contains a recent report prepared by the City of Modesto on the options for providing an adequate, long-range water supply for the City. Appendix C contains a recent report on water conservation measures adopted by the City.