

III. RESPONSES

COMMENT LETTER 1: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

- 1.1 Comment Noted.

COMMENT LETTER 2: CITY OF FULLERTON

- 2.1 Comment Noted.

COMMENT LETTER 3: CITY OF LA HABRA

- 3.1 Impacts from the planned expansion of Orange County Sanitation District infrastructure are analyzed in OCSD's 1999 *Strategic Plan EIR*. OCSD will consider the concern about fiscal impacts to ratepayers, although this is an economic impact and is outside the scope for considering Economic Effects as stated in Section 15131 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

COMMENT LETTER 4: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

- 4.1 The alignment of the proposed pipeline would not cross SR-142 or SR-57. Therefore, no encroachment permit would be necessary. Impacts from any future infrastructure required to serve the areas included in the Expanded Service Area may require such crossings, although this would be required to undergo separate environmental review as stated in the Draft EIR.

COMMENT LETTER 5: CITY OF BREA

- 5.1 The City of Brea is on the proposed project interest list and will be notified of any future developments concerning the project.

COMMENT LETTER 6: METROPOLITAN WATER DISTRICT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

- 6.1 The proposed Carbon Canyon Dam Sewer Pipeline would not cross the MWD 96-inch Lower Feeder pipeline. The closest distance the proposed sewer pipeline will be from the Lower Feeder pipeline would be more than 25 feet at the OCSD manhole at Rose Drive and Vesuvius Drive. Construction activities would not adversely affect MWD's ability to access to the Lower Feeder pipeline at any time during the project. Therefore, MWD's requirement for unencumbered access to the Lower Feeder would be met and no further analysis is required.

COMMENT LETTER 7: DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL

- 7.1 In their October 21, 2004 comment letter on the project NOP, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) noted that the EIR should contain discussion of current or historic uses that may resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances, particularly since the pipeline alignment would traverse areas used for oil drilling and agricultural uses. In addition, the DTSC letter

contained some standard language describing how potential hazardous wastes/substances should be identified, monitored, reported, and remediated.

As noted in the Initial Study, the project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. This includes the Breitburn oil well site, which the proposed pipeline would traverse and the interim agricultural land uses. In addition, the Geotechnical Investigation (refer to Appendix E) for the alignment did not find any evidence of contaminated soils anywhere within the project site. Finally, note that the proposed project is an underground wastewater pipeline. Therefore, it would not pose a hazardous materials risk to human health or the environment.