

June 20, 1997

Maria C. Solis  
Project Manager - Environmental and Regulatory  
Folsom South Canal Connection Project  
Mail 305  
P.O. Box 24055  
Oakland, CA 94623-1055

Dear Ms. Solis:

I met with you at your office on June 3, 1997, and again at the property owner meeting in Herald on June 14, 1997. Although you recorded some of our concerns at our second meeting, please address the following in your environmental documents.

Any alternative that does not utilize the existing Folsom South Canal is unacceptable. Alternatives 1 and 4 would build 17 miles of new pipeline roughly parallel to the Folsom South Canal, which would result in unnecessary environmental impacts and a waste of approximately \$130 million of public funds. For example, the existing Folsom South Canal already crosses the Cosumnes River. Alternative 4 proposes a new pipeline across the Cosumnes River about 1700 feet downstream from the existing Folsom South Canal crossing, even though there is no other planned use for the existing Folsom South Canal.

It happens that our farm is located on the Cosumnes River at the point where the river crossing is proposed in Alternative 4. Riparian forest would have to be clear cut to complete the installation. This is precisely where the January 1997 flood eroded the river bank. I believe that much more damage would have occurred this winter if the banks had been clear cut and trenched. Tunneling would raise concerns regarding whether adequate compaction of surrounding material could be achieved to prevent future collapse and erosion.

Construction of the existing Folsom South Canal across the Cosumnes river required a temporary diversion channel for the entire river, the same river that demonstrated its destructive power this past winter. After having suffered the environmental impacts of the construction of the unused Folsom South Canal, it makes no sense to create new environmental impacts to cross the river again.

No irrigation will be allowed within the 80 foot right-of-way of the proposed pipeline. Over the 17 miles of unnecessary pipeline, where Alternatives 1 and 4 do not utilize the existing Folsom South Canal, more than 160 acres would have irrigation prohibited. However, much more than these 160 acres would be affected by the irrigation prohibition. For example, where the pipeline would not follow the existing property lines, but would

cut through the center of a property, the remaining property on either side of the pipeline right-of-way would be forever more problematic to irrigate and therefore more likely to lie fallow. That means no trees, no vineyards, no irrigated pasture, not even lawns in the yards of houses near the pipeline. It is my understanding that the property owner adjacent to the river crossing in Alternative 4 is planning to install a vineyard. Vineyard is also a possible future use of our property in the area where the pipeline is proposed.

The following pipeline appurtenances would all permanently impact the character of this area: maintenance roads and the attendant loss of privacy that maintenance access entails, above-ground cabinets for flow monitoring and corrosion control equipment, electrical line extensions and service cabinets to provide power for such equipment, and manholes for access to the interior of the pipeline.

I believe you would have had much more public opposition to this project if the potentially affected property owners were aware of the impacts to their property. Recipients of your May 23, 1997, letter could not possibly have determined if the pipeline would impact their property based on the poor map of the proposals which was attached.

In the unconscionable event that construction does follow Alternative 4, the contract must include explicit requirements that limit the time in days that construction is allowed in any one area, particularly at the river crossing. Failure to comply should result in large monetary penalties for the contractor. Under no circumstances should there be any construction presence for more than one season. This is particularly important where the proposal bisects a property, as it would do to ours.

Sincerely,



John Gledhill  
Trustee  
Edvisa Barbero Trust  
12319 Plum Lane  
Wilton, CA 95693

cc: Don Nottoli  
Fifth District Supervisor  
Sacramento Board of Supervisors