

**WATER SUPPLY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
SECTION 1.0 – INTRODUCTION	1-1
1-1 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ORGANIZATION.....	1-1
1-2 SUMMARY OF DRAFT EIR COMMENT PERIOD.....	1-1
SECTION 2.0 – LIST OF COMMENTORS	2-1
SECTION 3.0 – COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS.....	3-1
3-1 MASTER RESPONSES TO COMMON COMMENTS.....	3-1
Master Response 1: Analysis of Potential Changes in Groundwater Levels from the Proposed Project	3-1
Master Response 2: The Groundwater Model is Inadequate	3-2
Master Response 3: The Evaluation of Impacts to Groundwater Did Not Use Specific References.....	3-5
Master Response 4: Mitigation for Changes in Groundwater Levels from the Proposed Project	3-6
Master Response 5: Cumulative Impacts to Groundwater Quantity are Significant.....	3-8
Master Response 6: Analysis of Potential Changes in Groundwater Quality from the Proposed Project	3-8
Master Response 7: The Proposed Project is Not Needed (Phase 1)	3-10
Master Response 8: The Proposed Project is Not Needed (Phase 2)	3-12
Master Response 9: An Alternative Other Than The Proposed Project Should Be Selected	3-13
Master Response 10: An Alternative Considered and Rejected Should Be Considered/Selected.....	3-17
Master Response 11: The Proposed Project is Too Costly	3-20
Master Response 12: Water Rights.....	3-20
Master Response 13: Project Changes Since EIR Scoping	3-20

**WATER SUPPLY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

3-2	RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL LETTERS	3-22
	Letter 1 – Dave Singleton Native American Heritage Commission	3-23
	Letter 2 – David Freeman	3-29
	Letter 3 – Eric Bosley	3-31
	Letter 4 – Lucinda Crosby	3-33
	Letter 5 – Kathryn Kvapil LaShure and Richard LaShure.....	3-34
	Letter 6 – Penelope LePome	3-39
	Letter 7 – Dennis and Karen Sizemore.....	3-41
	Letter 8 – Jack Tipton.....	3-44
	Letter 9 – C. Lyle Fisher.....	3-47
	Letter 10 – Sylvia Fisher	3-55
	Letter 11 – Stuart Fields	3-60
	Letter 12 – Patricia Davis.....	3-62
	Letter 13 – Mark Williams	3-65
	Letter 14 – Donna Smiley	3-71
	Letter 15 – Peter Chilbes, Jr.....	3-73
	Letter 16 – Max and Eleanor Hovaten.....	3-75
	Letter 17 – Alan and Joan Woodman.....	3-78
	Letter 18 – Inyokern Community Services District	3-80
	Letter 19 – E. Eugene and Verna Curry.....	3-82
	Letter 20 – Annette and Thomas DeMay (provided in two parts)	3-85
	Letter 21 – Kern County Planning and Community Development Department.....	3-117
	Letter 22 – H. Marie Brashear	3-127
	Letter 23 – Judith Decker	3-129
	Letter 24 – Don Decker	3-143
	Letter 25 – Mark Decker	3-171
	Letter 26 – Susan Moore.....	3-205
	Letter 27 – Patrick and Stephanie Tillman.....	3-207
	Letter 28 – Paul and Julie Von Schlemmer	3-209
	Letter 29 – Donna Sue Water Corporation	3-211
	Letter 30 – Patricia A. Sorensen	3-218
	Letter 31 – Sophia Anne Merk.....	3-223

**WATER SUPPLY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Letter 32 – State Clearinghouse 3-227
Letter 33 – Dave Decker 3-232

SECTION 4.0 – REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT PEIR 4-1

4-1 INTRODUCTION..... 4-1
4-2 DRAFT EIR ERRATA 4-1
 4.2.1 Revisions to Section 3.8-5, Residual Impacts After Mitigation,
 Hydrology and Water Quality..... 4-1
 4.2.2 Revisions to Section 5.1.1.7, Hydrology and Water Quality 4-2
 4.2.3 Revisions to Section 7.0, References..... 4-5

SECTION 5.0 – MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM 5-1

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
2-1 List of Comment Letters	2-1
3-1 Well Production Capacity, August 26, 2011.....	3-12
3-2 Comparison of Alternatives With Proposed Project	3-16

**WATER SUPPLY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK