

**Comments from the Public Participation Hearings
before the
California Public Utilities Commission**

**Lodi, California
October 19, 1999**

The Public Participation hearings conducted by the CPUC were not formally part of the CEQA process. However, participants were provided the opportunity to comment on the draft EIR. Responses to those comments are included in the following section.

**Comments from the Public Participation Hearing
before the
California Public Utilities Commission**

**Afternoon Session
Lodi, California
October 19, 1999**

Comments from Mr. Neudeck (Reclamation District No. 563):

- 1. We are concerned about the impact of the preferred alternative on future realignments of the reclamation district levees due to DWR and CalFed studies, levee system stability, and drainage ditches and drainage facilities. Peat ground conditions and the resulting subsidence frequently cause the District to work on their facilities.**

Information has been provided regarding peat soils and current subsidence rates in the Delta in section 3.3, "Geology, Soil, and Paleontology" in the draft EIR. Because a final alignment has not been selected and the project has not been approved by the CPUC, detailed soil engineering studies have not yet been completed. If the project or alternative is approved by the CPUC, the Applicant will be required to complete soil engineering studies and pipeline engineering designs and submit them to the CPUC for approval. Subsidence issues are discussed in Chapter 2, "Clarification of Major Issues", of this final EIR. The CPUC has met and discussed the proposed project with CalFed representatives. No proposed project has been identified by the CalFed program.

- 2. The EIR should include the authority of the Reclamation District as governed by the water code and include them as a permitting authority.**

As described on page 2-15 of the draft EIR, local reclamation districts are responsible agencies under CEQA and would have the opportunity to review the project's engineering designs and request additional supporting information if required to evaluate the project.

- 3. We have been working with the project proponents and think they understand the necessary design elements.**

Not a comment on the EIR. No response is required.

Comments from Ms. Leventini:

- 1. The draft EIR does not adequately address the need for the project.**

See response I21-3 in the individual response to comments.

- 2. The draft EIR does not analyze a no-project alternative. A better analysis of no-project alternative may provide inferences regarding project need.**

The CPUC has made no decision regarding this project. The basic need for projects such as the Lodi Gas Storage Project is described in Section 1.2.1 on page 1-2 of the draft EIR. As discussed in this section, although pipeline capacity into California has more than tripled over the last 15 years, demand has risen even faster. On occasion, especially during cold spells, insufficient gas is available in the state to meet demands. This situation occurred in the winter of 1998-1999 for more than 10 days, which forced some fossil-fueled plants in the state to switch to fuel oil to fire the boilers resulting in increases in air pollutants. This concern has statewide effects and ramifications and has led to the deregulation of the gas storage industry to generally encourage additional gas storage within California.

- 3. I am concerned about the tactics used to promote the project. I was notified only shortly before March scoping meeting. I am concerned about the possibility of eminent domain. Full page newspaper ad explaining the benefits of the project seems misleading and have caused divisiveness in the community.**

The question of the proposed project resulting in local land owner impacts including hardships resulting from the process of eminent domain in the context of the public benefit of the project, is outside the scope of the environmental impact report; however, this concern along with other social and economic project issues are considered by the CPUC in its decision-making process. Section 1.6, "CPUC Application Process" describes this process and opportunities for public participation. The process of eminent domain is described in Chapter 2, "Clarification of Major Issues", of this final EIR. The newspaper ad referred to above, was sponsored by the Applicant. The commenters opinions are noted.

- 4. Mitigation for the land use conflict between the compressor station and the airport is inadequate.**

See response I21-18 in the individual comments.

- 5. I am very concerned about the neighbors and property owners and the overall impact of the project. I ask the CPUC to not approve the project.**

The commenters objection to the project is noted.

Comments from Ms. Williams:

- 1. I believe the project is ill-conceived and I would like to see a plan of how deregulation will be carried out.**

The commenters opinion is noted.

- 2. I am concerned about toxic pollutant emissions from compressor, potential for health effects, and cumulative health effects. Project won't be subject to "no-burn" days. Purchasing of offset credits doesn't alleviate emissions at the compressor. Venting of compressor will contribute additional noise and air pollution.**

This comment concerns the potential for the project to result in the emission of toxic air pollutants and increased noise levels. These issues are discussed in detail in Chapter 2, "Clarification of Major Issues", of this final EIR. Air quality impacts associated with the operation of the compressor are disclosed in Section 3.5, "Air Quality", and require the incorporation of best available control technologies to reduce emissions. Offsets are required for emissions that exceed specified trigger levels.

- 3. The presence of a nearby freeway is not an adequate excuse to hide the noise and air pollution from the project. Also I am concerned with airport compressor location and potential for plane crashes. Opposes amending the Airport Land Use Plan to provide for an industrial refinery with its accompanying safety concerns.**

See response I42-3 in the individual comments.

- 4. I am concerned that land values will depreciate 10-15%. I organized a petition opposed to the project. I am opposed to a for-profit company using eminent domain.**

Comment is not specific to the environmental impact of the project. No response is required.

Comments from Mr. Bennett:

- 1. I am concerned about the possibility of eminent domain in the context of public benefit and good to be derived from the project. I believe people directly affected should be compensated other than through eminent domain.**

See response I4-5 in the individual comments.

- 2. I am concerned that the draft EIR provides an average decibel rating, but does not indicate the peaks. Would like to see as mitigation, an upper limit on the noise level (probably 60 or 70 dBA). What is an “A” rating? Are the noise levels within the acceptable levels of the San Joaquin County Noise Ordinance? Please provide examples of different sounds at different decibel levels.**

See responses I42 and I42-3 in the individual comments. Noise levels associated with infrequent venting of the compressor are discussed in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

- 3. The use of electric compressors should be specifically required to alleviate air pollution and noise from this facility.**

Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, issue 2 of this final EIR.

Comments from Ms. Remmick:

- 1. I was approached in 1998 with a lease prepared by Northern California Gas Storage Company of Fair Oaks; I felt the terms (price) of the lease were ridiculously low. Amerada Hess indicates a vast oil field underlies the gas field. Feels property owners ought to be compensated as to what is rightly theirs.**

Not a comment on the EIR. No response is required.

- 2. Most people in the gas field area don’t use natural gas; why should they subsidize a project that brings no local benefit?**

The opinion of the commenter regarding lack of public benefit is noted. The CPUC will be considering public benefit of the proposed project as part of its proceedings.

- 3. How does injection/withdrawal work? Where does LGS intend to place the contaminated water? I am opposed to a well site that is located within 300 feet of my property; I am concerned that drilling will bring people, noise, lights, and dust.**

One water re-injection well would have the capacity necessary to handle all produced water; however, there are two formations that gas and water will be withdrawn from. Permitting requires that produced water be re-injected into the formation where it was withdrawn.

Noise from the construction of the wells is discussed in Impact 3.10-2, “Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses from Well Drilling Activities”. This analysis found that noise from well-drilling activities could exceed 50 dBA within 2,000 feet of a well site and that approximately 50 residences are located within this distance. As discussed in Chapter 3, “Revisions to the Draft EIR”, Mitigation Measure 3.10-2 has been revised to restrict the noisiest activities associated with well-drilling operations and to require the installation of a hay wall around the perimeter of each well site and a sound wall around the drill floor.

4. What will the travel route be for equipment? Will they go down Collier or Jahant?

Travel routes for construction vehicles are discussed in Chapter 3.6, “Transportation and Circulation”. During project construction the combined traffic volume of construction employees and delivery and haul truck trips would require 170-200 vehicle trips per day. This traffic would have a negligible effect on traffic volumes on Highway 99 and other state and federal roadways in the area; however, construction-related traffic would represent a large increase on local roadways in the project area during peak commute hours. For this reason, Mitigation Measure 3.6-1, which requires the Applicant to develop and implement a traffic control plan, requires that the plan be developed in coordination with Sacramento and San Joaquin County Department of Public Works.

Comments from Mr. Ruhl (Land Utilization Alliance):

- 1. I am unhappy with the project and feels that the project makes a profit off the local residents, with the residents receiving no local benefit.**

Not a comment on the EIR. No response is required.

- 2. Draft EIR does not address the psychological effects of the pipeline and a possible explosion.**

The draft EIR adequately identifies potential risks to the community and the environment. The federal, state, and local regulations are in place to allow development of projects with an acceptable level of risk; however the psychological or physiological health of persons in the community are not typically considered environmental impacts.

- 3. I disagree with the cumulative growth impact in the executive summary; I feel the project will induce growth due to LGS’s efforts to establish a market for their product.**

The Applicant’s customers are large-scale natural gas users. There is no information available that suggests that growth-inducing impacts would result.

- 4. I think the No-Project Alternative should be adopted because the project doesn’t serve the local community and is strictly a for-profit undertaking.**

The purpose of the EIR is to identify and disclose potential environmental impacts to the public and public officials as part of the decision-making process. In addition to looking at three action alternatives, the EIR does examine the alternative of no project. This alternative is not extensively discussed in this EIR because the result of this alternative would simply be that the project would not be constructed and none of the impacts identified in the EIR would occur. The opinion of the commenter regarding lack of public benefit is noted. The CPUC will be considering public benefit of the proposed project as part of its proceedings.

Comments from Mr. Hawes:

1. I agree with everything Mr. Ruhl said.

Comment noted. See responses to Mr. Ruhl's comments.

Comments from Ms. Reichert (Land Utilization Alliance):

1. I am concerned about why people were not notified about the project during a scoping process. Also I am concerned that the pipeline is located between two rivers that flood periodically. How will access to the pipeline be achieved during flooding?

The CPUC undertook an extensive scoping process, including holding two meetings that were attended by about 300 people. Several newspaper ads regarding the scoping process and extensive mailings were also undertaken. Section 3.4, "Hydrology", evaluates flooding issues as they relate to the project.

2. I am concerned about the removal of trees along the Public Right-of-Way Alternative.

As identified in Table ES-2 in the draft EIR, implementation of the Public Right-of-Way Alternative has the potential to affect 198 trees, although not necessarily destroy this number of trees. Some trees may only require pruning in order to allow for construction equipment to access certain areas. The loss of native trees, native oaks, landmark trees, heritage trees, and historical trees is evaluated in Section 3.7, "Biological Resources". Because these trees would qualify for protection under tree ordinances in the Sacramento and San Joaquin County General Plans, damage or mortality of these trees is identified as a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 3.7-4 requires preconstruction surveys to be conducted to identify the locations of these trees and the development of a plan for the treatment of heritage and landmark trees. Additionally, the mitigation measure requires compensatory actions for trees that cannot be avoided. Compensation will be determined in coordination with the Sacramento and San Joaquin County Planning Departments and the guidelines in the county ordinances. Implementation of this mitigation will reduce adverse impacts on landmark trees or groves to a less-than-significant level.

3. I am concerned about the impact of eminent domain and the farmer's right to farm.

The question of the proposed project resulting in local land owner impacts including hardships resulting from the process of eminent domain in the context of the public benefit of the project, is outside the scope of the environmental impact report; however, this concern along with other social and economic project issues are considered by the CPUC in its decision-making process. Section 1.6, "CPUC Application Process" describes this process and opportunities for public participation. The process of eminent domain is described in Chapter 2, "Clarification of Major Issues", of this final EIR.

Comments from Ms. Rogers:

- 1. I don't like the project and don't think it's needed. It's not compatible with the area and not listed in the County General Plan.**

Comment noted. The project is considered generally compatible with the surrounding land uses. The zoning ordinance allows utility services such as natural gas extraction and transmission facilities in agricultural areas. The ordinance does not expressly prohibit storage projects. The County has the primary role for determining consistency with the General Plan.

- 2. I am concerned about the possibility of gas leaks from the storage cavity or catastrophic explosions that the fire department is not prepared for.**

Gas could leak if the pipeline was damaged. Automated systems would sense the pressure drop in the line and shut down the system (see Chapter 2 of the draft EIR). A fire could not occur in the pressurized line. Natural gas requires oxygen to burn. A fire could occur outside of the pipe if there was an appropriate ignition source. LGS has committed to familiarize fire department personnel with project facilities, assist in training local fire department personnel to respond to emergencies involving natural gas facilities, and providing equipment as necessary, to respond to potential emergencies at project facilities.

LGS will meet with local fire district personnel, emergency medical services providers, and law enforcement agencies during project construction to familiarize them with the various control and safety systems designed into project facilities, substances that will be stored at project facilities, and the emergency procedures which LGS will implement. Additionally, communications links and protocols will be established for notification and response in the event of emergencies. These protocols will include notification lists of residents in the immediate vicinity of project facilities.

Meetings between LGS and the emergency response service providers and local law enforcement personnel will be conducted at least on an annual basis as needed, to train new personnel. LGS will also coordinate with these agencies to conduct annual drills simulating various emergency conditions.

Comments from Mr. Anderson:

- 1. I agree with Ms. Leventini.**

Comment noted.

Comments from Mr. Mercado (Department of Water Resources):

- 1. The Department of Water Resources supports the Composite Route Alternative, rather than the original proposed project alignment. Please also consider the March 18th letter from DWR.**

Comment noted.

Comments from Ms. Ost:

- 1. I am concerned about which regulatory agency is responsible if the compressor facility is located at the airport. FAA? Caltrans?**

Since publication of the draft EIR the Applicant has received a determination from the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) that the alternative compressor site would not interfere with general aviation activities. Both the FAA and the local Airport Land Use Commission have authority with respect to airport activities.

Comments from Ms. Holley:

- 1. I am concerned about the potential of gas leaking into the groundwater, compressor emissions, and potential health impacts on residents.**

The comment concerns potential groundwater contamination, air quality degradation, and health impacts. Air quality impacts of the project are analyzed in Section 3.5, “Air Quality”, of the draft EIR. This analysis includes the evaluation of construction- and operation-related impacts and identifies mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts. Noise impacts of the project are analyzed in Section 3.10, “Noise”, of the draft EIR. Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling, groundwater contamination, and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

Comments from Ms. Shimad:

- 1. I am concerned that a big company is coming to town to make a profit. I am concerned about eminent domain.**

The question of the proposed project resulting in local land owner impacts including hardships resulting from the process of eminent domain in the context of the public benefit of the project, is outside the scope of the environmental impact report; however, this concern along with other social and economic project issues are considered by the CPUC in its decision-making process.

Section 1.6, “CPUC Application Process” describes this process and opportunities for public participation. The process of eminent domain is described in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

2. I am concerned about the safety of the pipeline during earthquakes.

Section 3.3, “Geology, Soil, and Paleontology”, examines the potential for earthquakes in the project area. Health and safety issues related to the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities are evaluated in Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

3. I am concerned about the odors and noise associated with the project.

The comment concerns the potential for odors and noise resulting from operation of the project. The potential for objectionable odors is analyzed in Section 3.5, “Air Quality”, and also in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR. Noise levels associated with infrequent venting of the compressor are discussed in Section 3.10, “Noise”, of the draft EIR and Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”.

4. I am concerned about the soil and water quality impacts, and potential for adversely affecting these resources in the future.

The comment concerns potential impacts on soil and water quality. Section 3.4, “Hydrology”, examines possible effects that the project and project alternatives could have on the quality and quantity of surface waters, including the major rivers and sloughs that the proposed pipeline or alternatives would pass under, and on the quality, availability, and flow of groundwater in the area. Section 3.3, “Geology, Soil, and Paleontology”, examines the potential for the project and project alternatives to cause substantial soil erosion.

Comments from Ms. Gaudet:

1. I am concerned that water level is very low along Acampo Road. Would like to see the pipeline in the established in right-of-way as much as possible.

As discussed in Section 3.1, “Land Use, Planning and Agricultural Resources”, policies established by San Joaquin County, Sacramento County and the Delta Protection Commission recommend that utility facilities should, to the extent feasible, be routed adjacent to existing facilities or other existing rights-of-way to minimize the number of utility disruptions. Analysis in this section includes an evaluation of the consistency of the proposed project and project alternatives with these policies. Although the consideration of the effect of several adjacent utility easements traversing the private property of a single land owner is outside the scope of the environmental impact report, project impacts to individual landowners in the context of the project’s public benefit is considered by the CPUC as part of its decision-making process. This

process and opportunities for public participation in this process are described in Section 1.6, “CPUC Application Process”.

Comments from Mr. Hansen:

- 1. I am concerned about the proximity of my house to the pipeline and compression facility, and I am concerned about the safety of these facilities.**

Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

Comments from Mr. Filbin:

- 1. I am concerned about the public health and safety impacts of the project, specifically a possible airplane crash into the compressor building. I am afraid that LGS will not be accountable to the residents or the State.**

Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts. Since publication of the draft EIR, the Applicant has received a letter from the Federal Aviation Administration indicating that the proposed project did not conflict with the those elements of airport safety under the jurisdiction of the FAA.

Comments from Ms. Seifert:

- 1. I am concerned that nine of the eleven proposed wells would be on my property. I am disappointed that there has been limited recent communication with Lodi Gas Storage on where exactly the wells would be located.**

The applicant will negotiate the specific location of the individual well pads and well construction sites with each affected landowner. Recently, the Applicant has negotiated with this landowner to combine well construction sites 1 and 2 at construction site 2, as shown on Figure 2-2 of the draft EIR. Four of the 10, or up to 11 proposed injection/withdrawal wells will be located within construction site 2. This project change, also reflected in Chapter 3, "Revisions to the Draft EIR", reduces potential adverse effects on the landowner's dairy operations. The change may also reduce potential noise impacts, described in the draft EIR, to residents located on Collier Road.

- 2. I am concerned that the wells will require access and result in the disruption of my cattle operation.**

Impacts to agriculture, including the potential for disruption of agricultural production, is evaluated in Section 3.1, “Land Use, Planning, and Agricultural Resources”, of the draft EIR. This section also identifies mitigation measures to reduce significant agricultural impacts. The Applicant will be required to not unreasonably affect farming operations. In addition, the Applicant has recently negotiated the relocation of wells on this property.

- 3. I would like to see LGS let people know what is really happening, and let people know what the health risks of the project really are.**

Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

Comments from Ms. Young:

- 1. I am concerned about the impact of the pipeline on Gill Creek (goes down Kennifick).**

Gill Creek transports runoff in the project area during storm events. As discussed in Section 3.4.2, “Regulatory Setting”, the project would require a streambed alteration agreement for any work proposed within a creek or stream and its floodplain.

- 2. I am concerned about air pollution from the compression building to my west, along Kennifick Road.**

This issue is discussed in detail in Section 3.5, “Air Quality”, of the draft EIR.

Comments from Mr. Thompson:

- 1. I am concerned that the positive aspects of the project do not outweigh the negative aspects of the project. I see no direct benefit to the community.**

The opinion of the commenter is noted. The CPUC will be considering public benefit of the proposed project as part of its proceedings.

Comments from Mr. Hawes:

- 1. I am a former pipeline worker who thinks the safety of pipelines is generally very good. Three examples of things I have seen happen along pipelines include: a train derailment that lead to a fire, a leaking defective pipe that lead to repairs, and encroachment by housing that lead to a pipeline realignment.**

Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

Comments from Mr. Kuwamoto:

- 1. I am concerned about the local impact of toxic air emissions on children in light of the purchasing of regional offsets.**

This issue is discussed in detail in Section 3.5, “Air Quality”, of the draft EIR.

Comments from Mr. Niemman:

- 1. I object to another gas line on my property.**

The commenter’s objection to the project is noted.

Comments from Ms. Ost:

- 1. I am concerned about potential flooding from disruption of Gill Creek.**

Gill Creek transports runoff in the project area during storm events. As discussed in Section 3.4.2, “Regulatory Setting”, the project would require a streambed alteration agreement for any work proposed within a creek or stream and its floodplain.

Comments from Ms. Lucchesi:

- 1. Hazardous waste is not addressed in the EIR.**

Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as

applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

Comments from Mr. Witt:

1. I am concerned about the smell of the pipeline and facilities and the potential health impacts to his children.

The comment concerns the potential for odors resulting from operation of the project and potential health impacts. The potential for objectionable odors is analyzed in Section 3.5, “Air Quality”, and discussed in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR. Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

2. I am concerned about potential of residents accidentally hitting the pipeline.

If the project or alternative is approved by the CPUC, the Applicant will be required to complete soil engineering studies and pipeline engineering designs and submit them to the CPUC for approval. The minimum burial depth of the pipeline would be 4 feet. The Applicant recognizes that reburial of the pipeline may be necessary during the life of the project. Mitigation measure 3.3-1 describes reasonable measures to ensure that the pipeline will be maintained at a safe depth.

3. I am concerned about drainage after construction.

Information has been provided regarding drainage in section 3.3, “Geology, Soil, and Paleontology”, in the draft EIR.

4. I am concerned about the project’s impact on property value.

Comment noted. Effects on property values are not typically considered in an EIR.

5. I am concerned about noise impacts.

Noise impacts of the project are analyzed in Section 3.10, “Noise”, of the draft EIR and discussed in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

6. I am concerned about impacts on water quality.

Section 3.4, “Hydrology”, examines possible effects that the project and project alternatives could have on the quality and quantity of surface waters, including the major rivers and sloughs

that the proposed pipeline or alternatives would pass under, and on the quality, availability, and flow of groundwater in the area.

Comments from Mr. Espie:

1. Pipeline will impact my property and the operation of my farm and pumps.

The potential for impacts on agricultural operations is discussed in Section 3.1 of the draft EIR and several mitigation measures are proposed to minimize these impacts.

Comments from Mr. Sieglock:

1. I am concerned about possible eminent domain.

The question of the proposed project resulting in local land owner impacts including hardships resulting from the process of eminent domain in the context of the public benefit of the project, is outside the scope of the environmental impact report; however, this concern along with other social and economic project issues are considered by the CPUC in its decision-making process. Section 1.6, “CPUC Application Process” describes this process and opportunities for public participation. The process of eminent domain is described in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR. This process will also be governed by the procedures put in place by the CPUC as a result of SB177.

2. I am concerned about the project impacts on grape growing industry. I feel that the EIR didn’t evaluate impacts on the industry. I think the project will detract from production.

Mitigation measure 3.1-1, as written, provides a reasonable balance between necessary project construction activities, should the project be approved, and potential interference with grape harvesting. Should the project be approved, the Applicant will be required to take actions to minimize the production of dust. Although some impacts will occur, these impacts have been minimized, and are not considered significant in the context of the EIR. Vineyards would be allowed to be replanted over the pipeline.

3. I am concerned about potential safety, odor, and noise issues from the compression station. Need to evaluate venting.

The comment concerns the potential safety, noise, and odors resulting from operation of the project. Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts. The potential for objectionable odors is analyzed in Section 3.5, “Air Quality”. Noise impacts of the project are analyzed in Section 3.10, “Noise”, of the draft EIR and discussed in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”.

Venting of the compressor was briefly discussed in Section 2.4 of the draft EIR. Additional information is included in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

4. I am concerned about the impact on property values.

Comment noted. Effects on property values are not typically considered in an EIR.

**Comments from the Public Participation Hearing
before the
California Public Utilities Commission**

**Evening Session
Lodi, California
October 19, 1999**

Comments from Ms. Giusto:

- 1. The draft EIR fails to recognize concerns regarding land adjacent to the pipeline area (in all directions from the pipeline). My concerns include safety, fair market value of land, potential for incidents, and responsibility for indemnification of landowners against losses.**

See responses I14-2 and I14-3 in the individual comments.

Comments from Mr. Williams:

- 1. There are conflicts in the draft EIR concerning whether compressor site locations meet the initial evaluation criteria for sensitive resources and conform to the Airport Land Use Plan.**

See response I42-8 in the individual comments.

Comments from Mrs. Williams:

- 1. Significant impacts (e.g., on air quality) will be mitigated through less-than-acceptable means.**

See response I39-6 in the individual comments.

- 2. Air quality is already a problem in the area on many days. Air quality data are invalid. Monitoring stations are not near LGS project area, and there is no nearby monitoring station for sulfur dioxide.**

See response I42-3 in the individual comments.

- 3. The draft EIR does not address reactions of pollutants in the atmosphere to form new toxic substances.**

All anticipated reactions of this kind, are discussed in Section 3.5 of the draft EIR. The draft EIR relied on state and federal standard approaches for addressing air quality impacts.

4. The emission offsets will not reduce the amount of pollutants emitted from the facility.

See response I42-3 in the individual comments.

5. The draft EIR downplays the significance of carcinogenic pollutants such as formaldehyde.

See response I42-3 in the individual comments.

6. I am concerned about the accuracy of the emissions data supplied by Western Hub Properties.

See response I42-3 in the individual comments.

7. If LGS engineers would not live next to the facility, why should anyone else be forced to live there?

Not a comment on the EIR. No response is required.

8. I would like to see the CPUC choose the No-Project Alternative.

The commenters preference for the No-Project Alternative is noted.

Comments from Mr. Vergano:

1. I am concerned about the noise of three turbines running 24 hours a day.

Noise impacts of the project are analyzed in Section 3.10, “Noise” of the draft EIR and discussed in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

Comments from Mr. Erbele:

1. The Draft EIR does not adequately address the need for the project. The project has the capacity for 5,000 people for 800 days, but the need identifies 10 days of supply shortage in 1998-1999. The newly discovered Lost Hills gas field is a better location.

The basic need for projects such as the Lodi Gas Storage Project is described in Section 1.2.1 on page 1-2 of the draft EIR. As discussed in this section, although pipeline capacity into California has more than tripled over the last 15 years, demand has risen even faster. On occasion, especially during cold spells, insufficient gas is available in the state to meet demands. This situation occurred in the winter of 1998-1999 for more than 10 days, which forced some fossil-fueled plants in the state to switch to fuel oil to fire the boilers resulting in increases in air pollutants. This concern has statewide effects and ramifications and has led to the deregulation of the gas storage industry to generally encourage additional gas storage within California.

2. I ask the CPUC not to be swayed by money and to turn down the project.

Comment is not germane to the EIR. No response is required.

Comments from Mr. Wirtz:

1. I am concerned about the chemicals at the facility putting his family at risk and the extremely high sound levels during venting.

Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts. Noise impacts of the project are analyzed in Section 3.10, “Noise” of the draft EIR and discussed in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

Comments from Mr. Wells:

1. I would like to see the CPUC deny the project. The project endangers lives; endangers those living in the country and people in town because of noise, chemicals, reduced property values, and the project in general.

Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

2. People are not being adequately compensated for their land.

The issue of compensation for property and property value is not directly regulated by the CPUC. California state law contains extensive requirements regarding compensation for property. Typically, the value of property or an easement is negotiated between a buyer and a seller. Assuming that CPUC approves the project, if LGS and a landowner cannot come to mutually agreeable terms, and if CPUC also determines that it is appropriate to grant LGS authority to exercise eminent domain, appraisals will be required and the value of and effect to property will be decided through an impartial court process. During such proceedings, issues such as severance, loss of income, and reduced property values are typically addressed.

Comments from Mr. Wells:

- 1. I am opposed to the project. Land values will drop. People working on the project will not be affected by it, and people in the area don't want it. Only the companies benefit. People will lose large amounts of land and will not be adequately compensated.**

The issue of compensation for property and property value is not directly regulated by the CPUC. California state law contains extensive requirements regarding compensation for property. Typically, the value of property or an easement is negotiated between a buyer and a seller. Assuming that CPUC approves the project, if LGS and a landowner cannot come to mutually agreeable terms, and if CPUC also determines that it is appropriate to grant LGS authority to exercise eminent domain, appraisals will be required and the value of and effect to property will be decided through an impartial court process. During such proceedings, issues such as severance, loss of income, and reduced property values are typically addressed.

Comments from Ms. Allan:

- 1. Are you aware of the gas pipeline explosion in Bellingham, Washington, that happened in June? I am concerned about the potential for similar accidents in this project. I believe that the safest course is not to approve the project.**

Comment concerns potential safety impacts as regards the project. Section 3.9, "Public Health and Safety", evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

Comments from Ms. Erbele:

- 1. The public health and safety discussion in the draft EIR reports on the pipeline itself but not on accidents and fatalities. I have researched accidents involving PG&E facilities and I am concerned that industrial accidents will happen regardless of safety precautions. All facility accidents should be addressed in the final EIR. I am particularly concerned about explosions near Highway 99 during commute hours.**

See response I9-3 in the individual comments.

- 2. The land use discussion in the draft EIR has inconsistencies. Locating the compressor facility near the airport would conflict with the Airport Land Use Plan. The proposed mitigation is to change the airport plan, but the plan was proposed to protect public safety.**

See response I9-2 in the individual comments.

- 3. I am confused about how information has been propagated that the project is certain to be approved.**

Not a comment on the EIR. No response is required.

- 4. I request that the CPUC deny the project.**

Comment noted.

Comments from Ms. Graham:

- 1. I would like to confirm the rumors that have been circulated about pipeline and motors already being purchased for the project.**

Not a comment on the EIR. No response is required.

- 2. I have prepared a resource guide for CPUC board members to the Lodi wine grape appellation and the wineries in the area. The community has set up a scenic wine tour of the area, and the project does not fit in with the goals of the community.**

The CPUC recognizes the growth of the premium wine industry in the general Lodi area. The CPUC has proposed substantial mitigation measures to reduce, minimize, and eliminate as many impacts as is feasible and is particularly concerned about potential visual impacts. Therefore the CPUC has proposed Mitigation Measure 3.12-1 to reduce potential visual impacts to a less-than-significant level. The Applicant has also attempted to site above-ground facilities near relatively compatible uses. For example, the alternate compressor facility sites are either adjacent to Highway 99 near other uses that include a former propane storage yard and trucking facilities, or away from Highway 99 on property owned by the airport, which supports other similar uses, and the proposed separation facility is located off Jahant Road adjacent to an operating dairy.

- 3. I suggest that the Lost Hills area is a more appropriate location for the project.**

Alternatives to the proposed project, including alternative locations were evaluated as part of the alternative screening process. This process and the location alternatives evaluated is described in Section 2.2, "Alternatives Screening Process" of the draft EIR. In addition to the Lodi gas field, 20 Northern California gas fields were evaluated. Only four were determined to have sufficient potential for development as gas storage fields. Although technically feasible, each of these fields were eliminated from further consideration because they either didn't meet the project objectives or because they had the potential to result in greater noise and air quality impacts

- 4. I am also concerned about odor, lack of noise attenuation, and potential noise issues if the compressor explodes.**

The comment concerns odor and noise impacts of the project. The potential for objectionable odors is analyzed in Section 3.5, “Air Quality”, and discussed in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR. Noise impacts of the project are analyzed in Section 3.10, “Noise” of the draft EIR.

Comments from Mr. Wolford:

- 1. The project benefits only the people in Texas; it does nothing for the community, the county, job investment, or taxes. The project is not acceptable.**

The commenter’s opinions regarding the project are noted.

Comments from Ms. Hansen:

- 1. I have never been notified of the project, although I live within a mile of the compressor facility and within half a mile of the pipeline. My parents, third-generation residents on the family’s farm, are considering leaving because of the project. Our peaceful country lifestyle is being threatened by a desire for profit.**

The CPUC has undertaken extensive public involvement efforts during the course of environmental review including advertisements in the local media and CPUC public meetings on the EIR. The Commenter’s concerns regarding the project are noted.

Comments from Mr. Lentz:

- 1. Because of differences in prevailing winds, gas odors will affect people in all directions during various parts of the year.**

The comment concerns the potential for odors resulting from operation of the project. The potential for objectionable odors is analyzed in Section 3.5, “Air Quality”, and discussed in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

- 2. I am concerned about effects of power outages, which happen each winter, on the operation of the facility.**

Because natural gas would be used to drive the compressors, power outages would not affect the facility.

3. I am concerned that project is being justified by gas prices but will harm the environment.

If approved, the operation of the project would be carefully monitored by a variety of state and federal agencies with responsibility and jurisdiction over these facilities. In addition, the CPUC would have an ongoing monitoring role to ensure that the mitigation measures adopted by the CPUC are fully implemented on an ongoing basis.

Comments from Mr. Espinoza:

1. I am concerned about questionable conduct of LGS in project dealings.

Comment is not germane to the EIR. No response is required.

2. I am concerned about continuing pollution in the area, especially deteriorating air quality.

Air quality impacts of the project are described in Section 3.5, “Air Quality” of the draft EIR.

3. Safety cannot be guaranteed. Mechanical problems can happen that cannot be predicted.

Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

4. The draft EIR fails to address sandhill cranes at Shelter Island.

Mitigation Measure 3.7-6 has been revised. See Chapter 3, “Revisions to the Draft EIR”, in this final EIR.

5. Geologic stability reports were requested on the cabin at the storage site but have not yet been provided.

Section 3.3, “Geology, Soil, and Paleontology” in the draft EIR addresses geologic stability. Because a final alignment has not been selected and the project has not been approved by the CPUC, detailed soil engineering studies have not yet been completed. If the project or alternative is approved by the CPUC, the Applicant will be required to complete soil engineering studies and pipeline engineering designs and submit them to the CPUC for approval. Subsidence issues are discussed in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

6. I draw a distinction between morality and legality. The project would take away what morally belongs to area residents.

Comment is not germane to the EIR. No response is required.

Comments from Mr. and Ms. Ward

- 1. Noise levels in areas away from Highway 99 are very representative of rural areas and it is quiet. To have them impacted would greatly decrease our quality of life.**

Section 3.10 of the draft EIR confirms that noise levels in the project area away from major roadways are typical of rural environments. Impacts are described in this section of the draft EIR as are proposed mitigation measures.

- 2. The scale of measurement for the 5 dB significance threshold is not stated.**

The scale of measurement for this significance threshold is the A-weighted scale.

- 3. The draft EIR does not discuss potential transient impacts (such as the clanging of pipe) that could produce noise levels higher than the 85 dBA stated in the draft EIR as the construction noise impact.**

Mitigation Measure 3.10-2 has been revised, in part to address this issue. Please see Chapter 3, “Revisions to the Draft EIR”, of this final EIR.

- 4. Mitigation Measure 3.10-2 only requires notification to residents within 2,000 feet of well sites. This distance is insufficient given the potential for transient noise impacts.**

The CPUC believes that a 2,000-foot-radius for a notification requirement is appropriate given the relatively short-term nature of potential impacts (6-12 weeks). Mitigation Measure 3.10-2 has been revised. Please see Chapter 3, “Revisions to the Draft EIR”, of this final EIR.

- 5. The impact discussion for the operation of the compressor facility and the separation facility also ignores transient noise events.**

See Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, in this final EIR.

- 6. Exhaust noise radiators must be included in the analysis.**

All potential major noise sources were addressed in the analyses. Additional information regarding compressor depressurization events is included in Chapter 2, “Clarifications of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

- 7. I am concerned about air quality and concept of credits as mitigation.**

The comment concerns the emission of ozone. Ozone is a regional rather than a microscale pollutant. Emissions of ROG and NO_x by the proposed project will result in increases in regional ozone concentrations downwind of the project rather than in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Emissions of ozone precursors (ROG and NO_x) undergo a chemical reaction in the presence of sunlight, forming ozone several miles downwind of the emission points. Consequently, emission offsets are an effective way to reduce regional ozone concentrations.

Additionally, in response to this comment “hot spot” modeling of NO₂ was conducted to estimate local concentrations of NO₂ during project operation. Using the results of the health risk assessment, a worse case estimate of NO₂ concentrations was developed assuming that all NO_x is NO₂, which is not the case. These estimates were then compared to the state and federal NO₂ standards. The results of the NO₂ modeling for the project and related standards are presented below.

1-hour worst case concentration:	7.1 micrograms/cubic meter
1-hour California standard:	470 micrograms/cubic meter

Annual worst case concentration:	0.71 micrograms/cubic meter
Annual federal standard	100 micrograms/cubic meter

As indicated by these screening-level modeling results, the project would not result in exceedances of either the 1-hour California standard or the annual federal standard.

The same procedures cannot be used to estimate local concentrations of ROG. Because they are “reactive” organic gases, ROG concentrations cannot be accurately estimated with nonreactive models such as SCREEN3 (the model used to conduct the health risk assessment). Additionally, there are no ambient standards for ROG, so even if accurate modeling methodology was available, the resulting information would be meaningless without comparison to adopted standards. It is also important to note that local concentrations of ROG were indirectly addressed in the screening level health risk analysis in that all of the constituents of ROG were considered a potential health risk and analyzed as part of the health risk analysis. Constituents of ROG were found not to present a health risk to nearby residents.

Comments from Mr. Shoemaker:

- 1. I am concerned about condition of the site, which has been empty since 1972, and who is responsible for safety issues regarding existing well holes and shell cap rock.**

Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, of the draft EIR, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. The California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources is the agency with primary responsibility for operation and abandonment of gas wells.

- 2. I want information about tangible collateral to be provided by the proponent as a limited liability company to protect the community once operations begin.**

Comment is not specific to the environmental impact of the project. No response is required.

3. I am concerned about possible problems affecting agricultural and vineyard operations.

Impacts to agriculture, including the potential for disruption of agricultural production, is evaluated in Section 3.1, “Land Use, Planning, and Agricultural Resources”, of the draft EIR. This section also identifies mitigation measures to reduce significant agricultural impacts.

4. I believe a private company should not be permitted to exercise eminent domain over private property.

The question of the proposed project resulting in local land owner impacts including hardships resulting from the process of eminent domain in the context of the public benefit of the project, is outside the scope of the environmental impact report; however, this concern along with other social and economic project issues are considered by the CPUC in its decision-making process. Section 1.6, “CPUC Application Process”, describes this process and opportunities for public participation. The process of eminent domain is described in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

5. I believe there is no need for the project at this time.

The basic need for projects such as the Lodi Gas Storage Project is described in Section 1.2.1 on page 1-2 of the draft EIR. As discussed in this section, although pipeline capacity into California has more than tripled over the last 15 years, demand has risen even faster. On occasion, especially during cold spells, insufficient gas is available in the state to meet demands. This situation occurred in the winter of 1998-1999 for more than 10 days, which forced some fossil-fueled plants in the state to switch to fuel oil to fire the boilers resulting in increases in air pollutants. This concern has statewide effects and ramifications and has led to the deregulation of the gas storage industry to generally encourage additional gas storage within California.

Comments from Mr. Farmer:

1. Draft EIR states that residents’ concerns are insignificant.

Numerous significant impacts are identified in the draft EIR.

2. Residents don’t want the project; they should be allowed to vote on it.

Comment is not specific to the environmental impact of the project. No response is required.

3. Geological survey reports have been requested but the request has not been responded to. These questions should be addressed.

Geologic information is provided in Section 3.3, “Geology, Soil, and Paleontology” in the draft EIR. Because a final alignment has not been selected and the project has not been approved by the CPUC, detailed soil engineering studies have not yet been completed. If the project or alternative is approved by the CPUC, the Applicant will be required to complete soil engineering

studies and pipeline engineering designs and submit them to the CPUC for approval.

- 4. The draft EIR says that the pipeline would be at 1,200 psi, but PG&E pipeline is at 1,600 psi. This would reverse the flow in the pipeline.**

The maximum operating pressure of the proposed pipeline is approximately 1,400 psi. The pressure in the pipeline at any particular location, however, varies depending on the operation of the system. When the applicant is withdrawing gas from the PG&E system the pressure in the pipeline between the PG&E interconnect and the compressor station will be less than the operating pressure of the PG&E pipeline, which is approximately 750 psi. The pressure in the pipeline between the compressor facility and the injection wells will vary up to the maximum operating pressure depending on the rate of gas injection and the available storage capacity. The opposite situation occurs when gas is withdrawn from the Lodi Gas Field. The pressure in the pipeline between the wells and the compressor facility will lower than the pressure in the gas field. The compressor station will increase the pressure in the pipeline to force gas back into the PG&E system. Because of frictional losses, the pressure in the pipeline will vary continuously from the outlet of the compressor to either the PG&E interconnect or the injection wells.

- 5. Fire departments in the area use water trucks, not water mains; I am concerned about how the department will deal with fires at the facility.**

This comment concerns the emergency response implications of the project. As discussed in Section 3.11, “Public Services and Socioeconomics” of the draft EIR, the project would result in the temporary increase in demand for emergency services during project construction as construction activities could result in injuries to construction workers. Emergency service providers in the area would be able to respond to these construction-related injuries because they are located within an appropriate distance. Increased demand for emergency response related to the risk of fire at the compressor or separation facility would be offset by LGS’s commitment familiarize fire department personnel with project facilities, assist in training local fire department personnel to respond to fires involving natural gas facilities, and providing equipment, as necessary, to respond to potential emergencies at project facilities.

- 6. I object to claim of additional tax dollars; LGS revenue will increase, PG&E revenue will increase, property value will decline and tax revenues will be reduced.**

Comment is not germane to the EIR. No response is required.

Comments from Ms. Angel:

- 1. The benefits of living in a rural area cannot be appreciated by people who haven’t lived there.**

Comment is not germane to the EIR. No response is required.

- 2. I am concerned about project’s impact on air quality. What is the equity of agricultural burning restrictions to air quality offsets?**

Agricultural burning restrictions are largely a function of daily meteorology, not regional air quality.

- 3. Safety cannot be guaranteed. Materials may be found to be hazardous that were not originally believed to be so; human error cannot be ruled out.**

Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

- 4. The quality of life in the area cannot be purchased. Not everyone wants to live in a rural area, but area residents like things the way they are.**

Not a comment on the EIR. No response is required.

Comments from Mr. Shanks:

- 1. I am concerned that if the pipeline is intrastate only, federal safety standards will not apply.**

The CPUC believes that federal pipeline safety standards do apply.

- 2. CALFED should be consulted regarding plans to install weirs on Staten Island. Soil covering pipeline could erode during flooding. Responsibility for maintenance should be determined.**

CALFED was contacted. There are currently no firm plans regarding potential projects on Staten Island. CALFED is in the very preliminary planning stages of such a project, but a decision on a preferred alternative is at least 18 months away.

- 3. Why is an 8-foot pipeline depth the standard only in vineyard areas rather than all agricultural areas.**

Mitigation Measure 3.1-2 addresses this issue. A depth of 8 feet is adequate in most cases to provide for deep ripping of soils. In addition, Mitigation Measure 3.1-2 has been revised to further ensure consistency with agricultural practices. See Chapter 3, “Revisions to the Draft EIR”, in this final EIR.

- 4. The draft EIR does not clarify what happens to the pipeline after the 30-year lifetime of the project.**

Abandonment of the project is described in Chapter 2, “Project and Alternatives Description” of the draft EIR.

- 5. I dispute the idea that PG&E pipeline has no problem as justification for installing LGS pipeline parallel to PG&E pipeline.**

The idea of examining an alternative that parallels existing pipeline is to eliminate the creation of an entirely new utility corridor through the Delta area.

- 6. What agency will enforce agreements between LGS and landowners?**

The CPUC is not addressing private agreements between LGS and landowners in this application. Land agreements between LGS and landowners would be subject to all applicable state laws, as are all such agreements and contracts.

- 7. I would like to know how taxes will be assessed on LGS for the pipeline route, at the stated value of \$1 million per mile of pipeline or based on the reclamation to be performed afterward.**

Comment is not specific to the environmental impact of the project. No response is required.

Comments from Ms. Farmer:

- 1. The draft EIR insults people by downplaying their legitimate concerns.**

The draft EIR examines the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project based on standard practices, professional judgement, and state regulations. No attempt has been made to downplay any issue.

- 2. I ask CPUC to consider that the effects of the project on residents cannot be undone. The CPUC should allow residents to control their own lifestyle.**

Comment noted. No response is required.

Comments from Ms. McGhie:

- 1. Eminent domain is a process for public benefit, but LGS is a private company that will profit from the project. The public would not gain anything from the project. If the project is approved, other companies will request similar privileges.**

Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

- 2. I am concerned about the size of the pipeline in relation to safety issues. LGS stated that the pipeline would carry 500 million cubic feet per day, but the application identifies 400 million cubic feet per day as the maximum. The CPUC's report (p. 22) states that PG&E's withdrawals may not exceed 200 million cubic feet per day, but LGS says that its predicted volume is 500 million cubic feet per day.**

The pipeline would be constructed in accordance with 39 CFR 192, which are the federal safety standards for natural gas pipelines. The pipeline will be designed to safely accommodate the maximum operating pressure. To clarify project operations, information provided by LGS states that up to 500 million cubic feet per day could be withdrawn from the gas field, while 400 million cubic feet per day could be injected. PG&E has stated that on a "typical" day, its system could only accommodate approximately 200 million cubic feet. However, during periods of low or high demand, the maximum LGS project operations could be accommodated.

- 3. I have safety concerns about a pipeline this large. I submitted 30 pages of articles about pipeline accidents.**

Section 3.9, "Public Health and Safety", evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

- 4. I am concerned about ability of fire department to respond to accidents and logistics of training them.**

This comment concerns the emergency response implications of the project. As discussed in Section 3.11, "Public Services and Socioeconomics" of the draft EIR, the project would result in the temporary increase in demand for emergency services during project construction as construction activities could result in injuries to construction workers. Emergency service providers in the area would be able to respond to these construction-related injuries because they are located within an appropriate distance. Increased demand for emergency response related to the risk of fire at the compressor or separation facility would be offset by LGS's commitment to familiarize fire department personnel with project facilities, assist in training local fire department personnel to respond to fires involving natural gas facilities, and providing equipment, as necessary, to respond to potential emergencies at project facilities.

- 5. I believe declining property values would affect property owners within 2 miles of the pipeline.**

The potential commenters opinion is noted. The effect of the proposed project on property values is beyond the scope of the EIR.

6. Landowners will be liable for pipeline accidents as well as LGS.

It is highly unlikely that landowners would be found liable for any pipeline accidents caused by others.

Comments from Ms. Shanks:

1. Draft EIR states that no special-status species would be directly affected by the project, but the Delta has many.

Impacts and mitigation measures concerning special-status species are outlined in Section 3.7, “Biological Resources”, in the draft EIR.

2. The largest population of sandhill cranes in California is on Staten Island; the draft EIR does not address them.

Mitigation Measure 3.7-6 has been revised. See Chapter 3 “Revisions to the Draft EIR”, of this final EIR.

3. The draft EIR (mitigation measure 3.7-6) addresses preconstruction surveys for cranes along the alignment in roosting areas, but roosting areas are under 2 feet 6 inches of water; how will pipeline be installed?

Mitigation Measure 3.7-6 has been revised. See Chapter 3 “Revisions to the Draft EIR”, of this final EIR.

4. Pipeline installation will affect either sandhill cranes (during winter feeding and roosting) or agricultural operations (during summer).

Mitigation Measure 3.7-6 has been revised. See Chapter 3 “Revisions to the Draft EIR”, of this final EIR.

5. The draft EIR identifies mitigation when pipeline in the Delta is 3.5 feet deep; this will be within 3 years at current subsidence rates. Will mitigation be done immediately, affecting winter roosting or summer agriculture?

Information has been provided regarding peat soils and current subsidence rates in the Delta in section 3.3, “Geology, Soil, and Paleontology” in the draft EIR. Because a final alignment has not been selected and the project has not been approved by the CPUC, detailed soil engineering studies have not yet been completed. If the project or alternative is approved by the CPUC, the Applicant will be required to complete soil engineering studies and pipeline engineering designs and submit them to the CPUC for approval. Subsidence issues are discussed in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

6. Any analogy between LGS project and Wild Goose gas storage project in Butte County is false, and impacts of constructing pipeline across Staten Island cannot be mitigated.

The comment concerns the comparison of LGS's proposed project with the Wild Goose storage project in Butte County. The draft EIR does not compare LGS's proposed project or project alternatives with other competitive gas storage projects. The draft EIR evaluates the potential for environmental impacts to result from the proposed project or project alternatives and identifies mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts.

Comments from Mr. Verdegad (UC Farm Advisor):

1. Growers in the area would have a substantial burden in reaching state and federal air quality standards.

The project would be required to comply with all state and federal air quality regulations. Because the project will be required to obtain emission offsets greater than its emissions, the project should not increase the burden to comply with standards on others.

2. Most mitigation for water quality and environmental impacts has been proposed between I-5 and 99, and these areas haven't achieved substantial mitigation.

The CPUC believes that appropriate mitigation measures and alternatives were identified in the draft EIR.

3. The land use implications of the project are important. Much of an area's reputation for grape growing is based on perception as much as production quality.

The CPUC recognizes the growth of the premium wine industry in the general Lodi area. The CPUC has proposed substantial mitigation measures to reduce, minimize, and eliminate as many impacts as is feasible and is particularly concerned about potential visual impacts. Therefore the CPUC has proposed Mitigation Measure 3.12-1 to reduce potential visual impacts to a less-than-significant level. The Applicant has also attempted to site above-ground facilities near relatively compatible uses. For example, the alternate compressor facility sites are either adjacent to Highway 99 near other uses that include a former propane storage yard and trucking facilities, or away from Highway 99 on property owned by the airport, which supports other similar uses, and the proposed separation facility is located off Jahant Road adjacent to an operating dairy.

4. Impacts in the Delta involve many concerns and problems.

Comment is not specific to the environmental impact of the project. No response if required.

5. I have concerns about eminent domain and the concept of “convenience” in requesting a certificate of public need and convenience.

The question of the proposed project resulting in local land owner impacts including hardships resulting from the process of eminent domain in the context of the public benefit of the project, is outside the scope of the environmental impact report; however, this concern along with other social and economic project issues are considered by the CPUC in its decision-making process. Section 1.6, “CPUC Application Process”, describes this process and opportunities for public participation. The process of eminent domain is described in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

Comments from Ms. Blakely:

1. I prefer that the project not be approved.

Comment noted. No response if required.

2. My preferred alternative among those presented is the Public Right-of-Way Alternative.

Comment noted. No response is required.

3. I have no trust in dealing with LGS. LGS or its agents entered my property without my permission.

Comment noted. Alleged unauthorized access by the Applicant is also noted.

Comments from Mr. Schambauer:

1. I am concerned that draft EIR identifies significant impacts that become less than significant because of government regulation and proper maintenance. Accidents happen, whether expected or not.

Construction and operation of the project will primarily be monitored by local, state, and federal agencies which have jurisdictional authority over such facilities including, the U.S. Department of Transportation, Office of Pipeline Safety, and the California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources. These agencies are specifically designated as the primary agencies responsible for the appropriate and safe design of natural gas facilities, including providing for appropriate closure. Section 3.9, “Public Health and Safety”, evaluates health and safety issues related to hazardous materials handling and the potential for rupture or explosion of the natural gas pipelines and facilities. This section includes an overview of the safety features of the project as well as applicable state and federal safety requirements. Mitigation measures are presented to reduce significant public health and safety impacts.

Comments from Mr. Vallow (City of Lodi Electric Utility Director, California Power Exchange board member):

- 1. If environmental safety concerns cannot be mitigated, the project should not be built.**

Comment noted. No response is required.

- 2. The project would have tangible benefits for Lodi. California needs in-state energy resources to avoid importing power from other states on power lines, using the same type of right-of-way discussed for the pipeline.**

Comment noted. No response is required.

Comments from Ms. Lind:

- 1. I am concerned that chemicals emitted into the air will later be found to be harmful.**

This comment concerns the potential for the project to result in the emission of toxic air pollutants, specifically formaldehyde. As part of the air quality analysis for this project, a screening level health risk assessment was conducted based on methodology recommended by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. This analysis is presented on pages 3.5-14 through 3.5-15 of the draft EIR. The analysis found that the highest estimated cancer risk would result from the exposure to formaldehyde emissions and equals a cancer risk of 3.4 per million people which is less than the San Joaquin Air District threshold of 10 per million people.

Using extremely conservative air quality dispersion modeling, formaldehyde concentrations from the proposed project were estimated to equal a maximum of 14.28 micrograms per cubic meter (ug/m^3) averaged over 1 hour and $0.57 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$ averaged over one year. The annual concentration of $14.28 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$ is associated with an increased cancer risk of 3.4 per million people.

Formaldehyde is normally present at low levels in both outdoor and indoor air. Residences or offices that contain products that release formaldehyde to the air can have formaldehyde levels of more than $375 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$. Products that add formaldehyde to the air include particle board, fiberboard, and urea-formaldehyde as insulation (EPA web site: <http://www.epa.gov/iedweb00/formalde.html>).

No federal standard has been set for indoor air concentrations of formaldehyde; however, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) now regulates formaldehyde as a carcinogen. Some states have established a standard of $499 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$ in their residential building codes while California has established a much lower recommendation of $62 \text{ ug}/\text{m}^3$. Consequently, the standards set for indoor air concentrations of formaldehyde at the federal and California levels are well above the incremental increase in outdoor concentrations that would result from the proposed project.

2. Seven accidents involving the airport have occurred in the compressor area.

Comment noted. Since publication of the draft EIR, the Applicant has received a letter from the Federal Aviation Administration indicating that the proposed project did not conflict with the those elements of airport safety under the jurisdiction of the FAA. The types of accidents recently reported would be unlikely to compromise the safety of the project. It is important to note that reported accidents have occurred within a radius of the airport not at the actual compressor sites.

3. The PG&E Las Vinas substation has had many problems: broken valves, noise, and fumes. This project would involve a larger pipeline.

The PG&E Las Vinas substation is an older facility and is likely subject to problems that a newer, modern facility would not have. In particular, fumes and noise are substantially reduced with the current technology proposed by the Applicant.

4. LGS has been in business for only 1.5 years; citizens of Lodi don't want to be experimented with.

Comment noted. No response is required.

Comments from Ms. Sorour:

1. I am concerned about how gas storage facilities will affect competition of the Lodi appellation with Napa and Sonoma. The draft EIR downplays the size of the vineyard industry in the area.

See response I36-1 in the individual comments.

2. The draft EIR is incorrect in stating that laborers are in the fields only during harvest. I am concerned about exposure to laborers during other times. I am concerned about grower liability for laborers' exposure or accidents.

See response I36-3 in the individual comments.

3. Approval of this project will set off a flood of investment in gas storage facilities in the area. I am concerned about eventual effects of cartels and limiting of competition among gas providers.

As described in Chapter 4, "Cumulative and Growth-Inducing Impacts" in the draft EIR, the proposed project would facilitate the maintenance of a more consistent supply of natural gas for statewide customers, likely increasing the competition among energy providers in a deregulated marketplace. This increased availability of natural gas is not likely to remove obstacles to growth and therefore the project is not expected to induce any related industrial development.

Currently, the only other company other than PG&E and Southern California Gas Company that owns a natural gas storage facility in California is the Wild Goose Storage Company, Inc. This company recently began operations in Butte County and no information is available regarding additional industrial development resulting from the project.

Comments from Mr. Pescetti (California State Assemblyman):

- 1. Senate Bill 177 will take effect on January 1, 2000. Section 625 addresses eminent domain as being acceptable only for the provider of last resort to an unserved area. Public utilities must be able to show four circumstances to be eligible for eminent domain. Eminent domain won't be a concern for citizens until after the CPUC has decided on the project, and LGS will probably be subject to SB 177 by then.**

The process of eminent domain is described in Chapter 2, "Clarification of Major Issues", of this final EIR.

- 2. The CPUC must consider the question of need for the project.**

The basic need for projects such as the Lodi Gas Storage Project is described in Section 1.2.1 on page 1-2 of the draft EIR. As discussed in this section, although pipeline capacity into California has more than tripled over the last 15 years, demand has risen even faster. On occasion, especially during cold spells, insufficient gas is available in the state to meet demands. This situation occurred in the winter of 1998-1999 for more than 10 days, which forced some fossil-fueled plants in the state to switch to fuel oil to fire the boilers resulting in increases in air pollutants. This concern has statewide effects and ramifications and has led to the deregulation of the gas storage industry to generally encourage additional gas storage within California.

- 3. I am opposed to the project.**

Comment noted. No response is required.

Comments from Mr. Peterson:

- 1. A lot of gas storage space is available and not used to capacity.**

Comment is not specific to the environmental impact of the project. No response is required.

- 2. The Chief of Liberty Fire District has not been told about the project.**

The Applicant will be required to consult with all relevant fire protection agencies should the project be approved. The Applicant has now contacted this agency.

- 3. I signed the MOU with LGS and am concerned that many issues were not addressed in it. I hope that my signature does not outweigh the voices of other citizens.**

Comment is not germane to the EIR. No response is required.

- 4. I would like clarification about who to consult if MOU is not followed.**

Land agreements between LGS and property owners are subject to all applicable state laws as are all such agreements and contracts.

- 5. I am concerned that the process favors those with money, time, and attorneys. If private corporations do not have eminent domain, they must negotiate with everyone equally.**

The question of the proposed project resulting in local land owner impacts including hardships resulting from the process of eminent domain in the context of the public benefit of the project, is outside the scope of the environmental impact report; however, this concern along with other social and economic project issues are considered by the CPUC in its decision-making process. Section 1.6, “CPUC Application Process”, describes this process and opportunities for public participation. The process of eminent domain is described in Chapter 2, “Clarification of Major Issues”, of this final EIR.

