

At the end of the circulation period, a total of 115 written comment letters were received. In addition, verbal comments were received at the public hearings. All the written comments have been assigned codes starting with the letters “FA” for all federal agencies, “SA” for all state agencies, “LA” for all local agencies, “O” for organizations and groups, and “T” for individuals. Each written comment letter is assigned a number, and specific comments within each comment letter are individually marked. Therefore, individual comments are coded FA1-1, FA1-2, and so forth. With respect to verbal comments at the public hearing, all comments are marked with the letter “PH” followed by a number identifying the commenter, and a number identifying the specific comment in the transcript. Verbal comments therefore are coded PH1-1, PH1-2, and so forth.

Multiple comments were received with respect to most key issues. To provide comprehensive responses regarding the issues raised, UC Merced decided to prepare responses addressing all comments relating to a each substantive issue within each resource area. Each of these responses provides some background regarding the specific issue, how the issue was dealt with in the Draft EIR, and additional explanation as appropriate in response to the concerns raised in the comments. At the beginning of each response section, the comments it addresses are identified. An index is also included at the end of this section to assist the commenter in determining where the response to her or his specific comment is located in Section 4.

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Schwinn, Karen	Deputy Director, Water Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region IX	FA1-01	4.22. B	Growth Inducing Impacts	Induced Growth
		FA1-01	4.2.A	Purpose and Need	Relationship Between Project Objectives and Project Design and Air Quality Impacts
		FA1-01	4.22.C	Growth Inducing Impacts	Explanation of Land Requirements and Proposed Location of University Community
		FA1-02	4.8.C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA1-03	4.8.D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		FA1-03	4.8.D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		FA1-04	4.8.C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA1-05	4.21.D	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Higher Density
		FA1-06	4	Response to Comments	Introduction
		FA1-06	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternatives
		FA1-07	4.3 B	Permitting	Section 404 LEDPA Analysis and Evidence Needed for LEDPA Analysis
		FA1-08	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		FA1-09	4.3 B	Permitting	Section 404 LEDPA Analysis and Evidence Needed for LEDPA Analysis
		FA1-09	4.18 E	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Parking
		FA1-10	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternatives
FA1-11	4.21 D	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Higher Density		
FA1-12	4.21 E	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Fewer Programs		
FA1-13	4.21 H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative		
FA1-14	4.4 B	Project Description	Data Regarding Campus Size		
FA1-14	4.4 D	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of the University Community		
FA1-14	4.4 E	Project Description	Campus Population		
FA1-15	4.19 A	Utilities	Wastewater Treatment by City		

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Schwinn, Karen	Deputy Director, Water Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region IX	FA1-16	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
		FA1-17	4.4 E	Project Description	Campus Population
		FA1-17	4.4 F	Project Description	Corrections to the Project Description
		FA1-18	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA1-18b	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		FA1-19	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		FA1-20	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		FA1-21	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		FA1-22	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA1-22	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		FA1-23	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA1-24	4.11 A	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hazardous Materials Transportation and Storage
		FA1-24a	4.11 B	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Pollution from Wastewater Treatment
		FA1-25	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA1-25	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA1-25	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		FA1-25	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		FA1-26	4.12 G	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Concerns
		FA1-27	4.19 A	Utilities	Wastewater Treatment by City
		FA1-28	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
FA1-28	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis		
FA1-28	4.14 B	Noise	Other Concerns		

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Schwinn, Karen	Deputy Director, Water Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – Region IX	FA1-29	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		FA1-29	4.18 E	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Parking
		FA1-30	4.12 B	Hydrology and Water Quality	Localized Groundwater Effects
		FA1-30	4.19 C	Utilities	Water Service Infrastructure
		FA1-31	4.19 C	Utilities	Water Service Infrastructure
		FA1-32	4.21 E	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Fewer Programs
		FA1-33	4.21 H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative
		FA1-34	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA1-35	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA1-35	4.23 B	Phase 1 Campus	Construction Impacts
		FA1-36	4.23 D	Phase 1 Campus	Housing
		FA1-37	4.22 C	Growth Inducing Impacts	Explanation of Land Requirements and Proposed Location of University Community
		FA1-38	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA1-39	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		FA1-40	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
		FA1-41	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
		FA1-42	4.22 C	Growth Inducing Impacts	Explanation of Land Requirements and Proposed Location of University Community
		FA1-43	4.22 C	Growth Inducing Impacts	Explanation of Land Requirements and Proposed Location of University Community
		FA1-45	4.4 D	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of the University Community
		FA1-45	4.22 C	Growth Inducing Impacts	Explanation of Land Requirements and Proposed Location of University Community
Lent, Rebecca, Ph.D.	Regional Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Dept. of Commerce	FA2-1	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		FA2-1	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Lent, Rebecca, Ph.D.	Regional Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Dept. of Commerce	FA2-2	4.12 D	Hydrology and Water Quality	Downstream Pollution from Site Runoff
		FA3	4.12 D	Hydrology and Water Quality	Downstream Pollution from Site Runoff
Harlow, Loren J.	Cal. Regional Water Quality Control Bd. Cal. Environmental Protection Agency	SA1-01	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA1-02	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA1-03	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA1-04	4.11 B	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Pollution from Wastewater Treatment
		SA1-05	4.11 B	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Pollution from Wastewater Treatment
		SA1-06	4.11 A	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hazardous Materials Transportation and Storage
		SA1-07	4.12 B	Hydrology and Water Quality	Localized Groundwater Effects
		SA1-08	4.12 D	Hydrology and Water Quality	Downstream Pollution from Site Runoff
		SA1-09	4.12 D	Hydrology and Water Quality	Downstream Pollution from Site Runoff
		SA1-10	4.12 D	Hydrology and Water Quality	Downstream Pollution from Site Runoff
		SA1-11	4.19 A	Utilities	Wastewater Treatment by City
		SA1-11a	4.12 F	Hydrology and Water Quality	Water Conservation and Recycling
		SA1-12	4.12	Hydrology and Water Quality	Introduction
		SA1-12	4.12 B	Hydrology and Water Quality	Localized Groundwater Effects
Falkenstein, Michael	State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights	SA2-1	4.12 E	Hydrology and Water Quality	Site Drainage
Loane, John	Cal. Integrated Waste Management Board	SA3-1	4.19 D	Utilities	Solid Waste Disposal
		SA3-2	4.19 D	Utilities	Solid Waste Disposal
Kenny, Michael P.	Executive Officer, Air Resources Board	SA4-1	4.7 D	Air Quality	Relationship Between Project Objectives and Project Design and Air Quality Impacts
		SA4-1	4.18 D	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mass Transit and Other Traffic Alternatives
		SA4-2	4.7 C	Air Quality	Air Quality Mitigation

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
		SA4-3	4.7 C	Air Quality	Air Quality Mitigation
Gosselin, Paul H.	Dept. of Pesticide Regulation	SA5	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous
Siebal, Val F.	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment	SA6	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
Carlucci, Carl L. P.E.	Senior Sanitary Engineer, Merced District, Drinking Water Field Operations, Dept. of Health Services	SA7	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
Landis, Paula J.	Chief, San Joaquin District, Dept. of Water Resources	SA8	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		SA8-1	4.12	Hydrology and Water Quality	Introduction
Cadrett, John	Air Quality Planner, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District	SA9-1	4.7 A	Air Quality	Adequacy of Impact Analysis
		SA9-2	4.7 C	Air Quality	Air Quality Mitigation
		SA9-3	4.7 C	Air Quality	Air Quality Mitigation
		SA9-4	4.7 B	Air Quality	Consistency with Attainment Plans and Conformity
		SA9-5	4.7 A	Air Quality	Adequacy of Impact Analysis
Loudermilk, W.E. & White, Wayne S.	California Department of Fish and Game/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	SA10-01	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		SA10-01	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-02	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		SA10-02	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		SA10-02	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA10-03	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		SA10-03	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		SA10-03	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA10-04	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		SA10-04	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		SA10-04	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Loudermilk, W.E. & White, Wayne S.	California Department of Fish and Game/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	SA10-05	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		SA10-06	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		SA10-07	4.1 D	CEQA Process	Relationship Between LRDP Analysis and Analysis of Phase 1 /Future Develop.
		SA10-08	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		SA10-08	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-09	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-09	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA10-09	4.20 B	Cumulative Impacts	Scope of EIR's Cumulative Impact Analysis
		SA10-10	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-10	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-10	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-10	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA10-11	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-11	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA10-11	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA10-12	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		SA10-12	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA10-13	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		SA10-13	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA10-13	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA10-14	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-14	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Loudermilk, W.E. & White, Wayne S.	California Department of Fish and Game/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	SA10-15	4.1 D	CEQA Process	Relationship Between LRDP Analysis and Analysis of Phase 1 /Future Develop.
		SA10-15	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		SA10-16	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-17	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		SA10-18	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		SA10-19	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-20	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		SA10-21	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		SA10-22	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		SA10-22	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
Roberts, Terry	Senior Planner, State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research	SA11	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous
Trott, Kenneth E.	Environemtnal Coordinator, California Department of Conservation	SA12-01	4.6 A	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation
		SA12-01	4.6 D	Agricultural Resources	Issues Related to Indirect Effects of the University Community
		SA12-02	4.6 A	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation
		SA12-03	4.6 A	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation
		SA12-03	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		SA12-04	4.22 B	Growth Inducing Impacts	Induced Growth
		SA12-05	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		SA12-06	4.22 B	Growth Inducing Impacts	Induced Growth
		SA12-07	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		SA12-08	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		SA12-09	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title		
Trott, Kenneth E.	Environmental Coordinator, California Department of Conservation	SA12-10	4.6 A	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation		
		SA12-10	4.6 E	Agricultural Resources	Miscellaneous		
		SA12-11	4.6 D	Agricultural Resources	Issues Related to Indirect Effects of the University Community		
		SA12-11	4.6 D	Agricultural Resources	Issues Related to Indirect Effects of the University Community		
		SA12-12	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation		
		SA12-12	4.6 E	Agricultural Resources	Miscellaneous		
		SA12-13	4.6 D	Agricultural Resources	Issues Related to Indirect Effects of the University Community		
		SA12-13	4.6 D	Agricultural Resources	Issues Related to Indirect Effects of the University Community		
		SA12-14	4.6 A	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation		
		Shaffer, Steven	Office of Agriculture and Environmental Policy, Department of Food and Agriculture	SA13-01	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
				SA13-02	4.6 A	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation
				SA13-02	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
				SA13-02	4.6 C	Agricultural Resources	Compatibility With County General Plan Policies
				SA13-03	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation
SA13-04	4.6 A			Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation		
SA13-05	4.6 A			Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation		
SA13-06	4.6 A			Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation		
SA13-07	4.6 B			Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation		
SA13-08	4.6 B			Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation		
		SA13-08	4.20 B	Cumulative Impacts	Scope of EIR's Cumulative Impact Analysis		
		SA13-09	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation		
		SA13-10	4.22 B	Growth Inducing Impacts	Induced Growth		

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Shaffer, Steven	Office of Agriculture and Environmental Policy, Department of Food and Agriculture	SA13-11	4.22 B	Growth Inducing Impacts	Induced Growth
		SA13-12	4.6 A	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation
		SA13-12	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		SA13-12	4.22 B	Growth Inducing Impacts	Induced Growth
		SA13-13	4.6 A	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation
		SA13-14	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
Cowell, Dana	Planning, Modal, and Local Assistance Programs, Department of Transportation	SA14-01	4.18	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Introduction
		SA14-02	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		SA14-03	4.18 E	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Parking
		SA14-04	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		SA14-05	4.18	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Introduction
		SA14-06	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		SA14-07	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		SA14-08	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		SA14-09	4.18 D	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mass Transit and Other Traffic Alternatives
		SA14-10	4.18 D	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mass Transit and Other Traffic Alternatives
		SA14-11	4.18 D	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mass Transit and Other Traffic Alternatives
		SA14-12	4.18 D	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mass Transit and Other Traffic Alternatives
Balmain, Doug	Mariposa County, Board of Supervisors Chair	LA1-1	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
Radanovich, Leroy	Chairman, Mariposa County Planning Commission, Radanovich Photography	LA2	4	Response to Comments	Introduction
Craig, Stanley F.	Chief Merced County, Fire Dept.	LA3-1	4.16 A	Public Services	Police and Fire
		LA3-2	4.16 A	Public Services	Police and Fire

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
		LA3-3	4.16 A	Public Services	Police and Fire
Nicholson, William	Acting Executive Officer, Local Agency Formation Commission	LA4-1	4.13 A	Land Use and Planning	Application of LAFCO Policies and Procedures
		LA4-2	4.13 A	Land Use and Planning	Application of LAFCO Policies and Procedures
Acker, Robert	Director of Facilities & Planning, Merced Irrigation District	LA5-1	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
		LA5-2	4.11 C	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Other Safety Concerns
		LA5-2	4.17 A	Recreation	Impacts on Lake Yosemite Regional Park
		LA5-3	4.12 E	Hydrology and Water Quality	Site Drainage
		LA5-4	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
		LA5-5	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
		LA5-6	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
		LA5-7	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
		LA5-8	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
		LA5-9	7	Changes to the Draft EIR	Biological Resources
		LA5-10	7	Changes to the Draft EIR	Biological Resources
		LA5-11	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
		LA5-12	4.10 A	Geology	Earthquake Hazards
		LA5-13	4.11 C	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Other Safety Concerns
		LA5-14	4.12 E	Hydrology and Water Quality	Site Drainage
		LA5-15	4.12 E	Hydrology and Water Quality	Site Drainage
		LA5-16	4.12 E	Hydrology and Water Quality	Site Drainage
		LA5-17	4.12 E	Hydrology and Water Quality	Site Drainage
		LA5-18	4.12 E	Hydrology and Water Quality	Site Drainage

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Acker, Robert	Director of Facilities & Planning, Merced Irrigation District	LA5-19	4.17 A	Recreation	Impacts on Lake Yosemite Regional Park
		LA5-20	4.19 B	Utilities	Electricity and Natural Gas
		LA5-21	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
		LA5-22	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
Knudsen, Mary Jo	Mayor, City of Merced	LA6-1	4.11 A	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hazardous Materials Transportation and Storage
		LA6-2	4.11 A	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hazardous Materials Transportation and Storage
		LA6-2	4.11 C	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Other Safety Concerns
		LA6-2	4.16 A	Public Services	Police and Fire
		LA6-3	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities
		LA6-3	4.12 E	Hydrology and Water Quality	Site Drainage
		LA6-4	4.16 A	Public Services	Police and Fire
		LA6-5	4.16 A	Public Services	Police and Fire
		LA6-6	4.17 B	Recreation	Other Park Facilities Demands
		LA6-7	4.18	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Introduction
		LA6-8	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA6-9	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA6-10	4.18 C	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Suggestions for Additional/Modified Circulation System Improvements
		LA6-11	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA6-11	4.18 C	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Suggestions for Additional/Modified Circulation System Improvements
		LA6-12	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		LA6-13	4.21.J	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Locate Campus South of the proposed site
		LA6-14	4.4 E	Project Description	Treatment of MID Irrigation Facilities

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Knudsen, Mary Jo	Mayor, City of Merced	LA6-15	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		LA6-16	4.15 B	Population, Employment and Housing	Housing Effects
		LA6-17	4.19 C	Utilities	Water Service Infrastructure
		LA6-18	4.19 A	Utilities	Wastewater Treatment by City
Balmain, Doug	Mariposa County, Board of Supervisors Chair	LA7-1	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		LA7-2	4.22 A	Growth Inducing Impacts	Growth Effects Beyond Eastern Merced County
		LA7-3	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		LA7-4	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		LA7-5	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
Mollart, Stan W.	Superintendent, McSwain Union Elementary School District	LA8	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Fillebrown, Paul A.	Director of Merced County Dept. of Public Works	LA9-1	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		LA9-1	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA9-1a	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA9-2	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA9-3	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA9-4	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA9-5	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA9-6	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA9-7	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		LA9-7	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		LA9-8	4.5 A	Aesthetics	Views From Yosemite Park
		LA9-9	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Fillebrown, Paul A.	Director of Merced County Dept. of Public Works	LA9-10	4.5 A	Aesthetics	Views From Yosemite Park
		LA9-11	4.12 B	Hydrology and Water Quality	Localized Groundwater Effects
		LA9-12	4.17 C	Recreation	Conversion of County Park Land By UC
		LA9-13	4.17 A	Recreation	Impacts on Lake Yosemite Regional Park
		LA9-14	4.14 A	Noise	Effects on Lake Yosemite County Park
		LA9-15	4.14 A	Noise	Effects on Lake Yosemite County Park
		LA9-16	4.17 A	Recreation	Impacts on Lake Yosemite Regional Park
		LA9-16a	4.17 C	Recreation	Conversion of County Park Land By UC
		LA9-17	4.18 E	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Parking
		LA9-18	4.18 D	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Bus Transit
		LA9-19	4.19 D	Utilities	Solid Waste Disposal
		LA9-20	4.19 D	Utilities	Solid Waste Disposal
		LA9-21	4.19 D	Utilities	Solid Waste Disposal
		LA9-22	4.19 D	Utilities	Solid Waste Disposal
LA9-23	4.19 D	Utilities	Solid Waste Disposal		
Holland, Patrick J.	Superintendent of School, Mariposa County School District	LA10-1	4.16 B	Public Services	Schools
		LA10-2	4.22 A	Growth Inducing Impacts	Growth Effects Beyond Eastern Merced County
		LA10-3	4.16 B	Public Services	Schools
		LA10-4	4.16 B	Public Services	Schools
		LA10-5	4.22 A	Growth Inducing Impacts	Growth Effects Beyond Eastern Merced County
		LA10-6	4.16 B	Public Services	Schools
		LA10-7	4.16 B	Public Services	Schools

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Rasmussen, Alan Ed.D	Superintendent, Merced City School District	LA11-1	4.16 B	Public Services	Schools
		LA11-2	4.16 B	Public Services	Schools
Kelsey, Jon G.	President, East Merced Resource Conservation District	LA12-1	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		LA12-1	4.6 C	Agricultural Resources	Issues Related to Indirect Effects of the University Community
		LA12-1	4.6 E	Agricultural Resources	Miscellaneous
		LA12-2	4.22 D	Growth Inducing Impacts	Other Growth Issues
		LA12-3	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		LA12-4	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		LA12-5	4.7 C	Air Quality	Air Quality Mitigation
		LA12-6	4.6 E	Agricultural Resources	Miscellaneous
Rasmussen, Alan Ed.D	Superintendent, Merced City School District	LA13	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
Pitman, Marsh	Sierra Club, Merced Group-Tehipite Chapter	O1-1	4.22 D	Growth Inducing Impacts	Miscellaneous Growth Issues
Witham, Carol	Vernal Pools.Org	O2-1	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O2-1	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
Gosting, Kenneth A.	Transportation Involves Everyone	O3	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
Vance, Julie	Conservation Committee Chair, The Wildlife Society, San Joaquin Valley Chapter	O4	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
Hatano, Daryl G.	Vice President, Public Policy, Semiconductor Industry Association	O5	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
	Eastern Merced Agricultural Coalition	O6-1	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O6-2	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O6-3	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O6-4	4.12 B	Hydrology and Water Quality	Localized Groundwater Effects
		O6-5	4.12 E	Hydrology and Water Quality	Site Drainage

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
		O6-6	4.12 B	Hydrology and Water Quality	Localized Groundwater Effects
Felch, Russell	President Merced County Farm Bureau	O7	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
Ferrari, Jeani	President The Farmland Working Group	O8	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
Boese, Lee R. Jr., D.D.S.	Friends of UC Merced	O9	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Miller, Lydia / Burke, Steve	President San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Center / Protect Our Water	O10-1	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
Mooney, Donald B.	Law Offices of Donald B. Mooney	O11-1	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
	Friends for the Preservation of Property Rights in Merced County	O12	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
Brown, Jesse	Executive Director, Merced County Association Of Governments	O13-1	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-2	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
		O13-3	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-4	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-4	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-5	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-6	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-6	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-7	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-8	4.15 A	Population, Employment and Housing	Data and Forecasts
		O13-9	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-10	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-11	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-11	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-12	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Brown, Jesse	Executive Director, Merced County Association Of Governments	O13-12	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-13	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-13	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-14	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-15	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-16	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-17	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-18	4.18 D	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Bus Transit
		O13-19	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-20	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-21	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-22	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-23a	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-23b	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-24	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-25	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-26	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-27	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-27	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-28	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-29	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-30	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Brown, Jesse	Executive Director, Merced County Association Of Governments	O13-30	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-31	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation
		O13-32	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O13-33	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
Delfino, Kim	California Program Director, Defenders of Wildlife	O14-1	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O14-2	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O14-2	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		O14-3	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O14-4	4.3.A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		O14-13a	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
Selb, E.C. "Ted" III	Merced Area Groundwater Pool Interests, Merced Irrigation District	O15-1	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O15-2	4.12 B	Hydrology and Water Quality	Localized Groundwater Effects
Ryan, Sadie	UC Berkeley Chapter. Society for Conservation Biology	O16-1	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		O16-2	4	Response to Comments	Introduction
		O16-3	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O16-4	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O16-5	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O16-5	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O16-5	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		O16-6	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O16-6	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O16-6	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
		O16-7	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O16-7	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
Members	Friends for Preservation of Property Rights in Merced County	O17-1	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		O17-2	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O17-3	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
	Friends for Preservation of Property Rights	O18	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
McCabe, Les	Co-Chair, Eastern Merced Agriculture Coalition	O19-1	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O19-2	4.17 C	Recreation	Conversion of County Park Land By UC
		O19-3	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O19-3	4.12 .B	Hydrology and Water Quality	Localized Groundwater Effects
		O19-4	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O19-5	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O19-5	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		O19-6	4.8.D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O19-7	4.6 C	Agricultural Resources	Compatibility with County General Plan Policies
		O19-8	4.16 C	Public Services	Cost
Macedo, Linda	President, Merced County Farmlands & Open Space Trust	O20	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
Taylor, Daniel	Vice President and Executive Director, Audubon	O21-1	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O21-1	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		O21-2	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O21-3	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O21-3b	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Taylor, Daniel	Vice President and Executive Director, Audubon	O21-4	4.5 B	Aesthetics	Cumulative Effect of Urbanization
		O21-5	4.5 B	Aesthetics	Cumulative Effect of Urbanization
		O21-6	4.5 B	Aesthetics	Cumulative Effect of Urbanization
		O21-7	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		O21-8	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O21-9	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O21-10	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O21-11	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O21-12	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O21-13	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-14	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-15	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-16	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-17	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-17	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-17	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-18	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O21-18	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		O21-18	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-19	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-20	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-21	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Taylor, Daniel	Vice President and Executive Director, Audubon	O21-21	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-22	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-23	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-24	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O21-25	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O21-26	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-26	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-27	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O21-27	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
Barnes, Allen	Executive Director, Cal. Native Plant Society	O22-1	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-2	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-3	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Collocation of Specific Programs
		O22-3	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-3	4.21 F	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-site alternatives
		O22-3	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		O22-3a	4.4 B	Project Description	Data Regarding Campus Size
		O22-3a	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Collocation of Specific Programs
		O22-3a	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		O22-3b	4.21 D	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Higher Density
		O22-4	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O22-5	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O22-6	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Barnes, Allen	Executive Director, Cal. Native Plant Society	O22-7	4.21 D	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Higher Density
		O22-8	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O22-8	4.21 D	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Higher Density
		O22-9	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O22-9	4.21 D	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Higher Density
		O22-10	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-10	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-11	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-11	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-12	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-13	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-14	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-15	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O22-16	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O22-16	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O22-17	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-17	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-18	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-19	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-20	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-21	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-22	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Barnes, Allen	Exectuive Director, Cal. Native Plant Society	O22-22	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-22	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-23	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-24	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-25	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-26	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O22-26	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-27	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O22-28	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O22-29	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O22-29	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O22-30	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-31	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O22-32	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O22-33	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O22-34	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-35	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-35	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-36	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-37	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-38	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-39	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Barnes, Allen	Exectuive Director, Cal. Native Plant Society	O22-40	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-41	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-42	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-43	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O22-43	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-44	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O22-45	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-46	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-47	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-47	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O22-48	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-49	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-50	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-50	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-51	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-52	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-52	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O22-53	4.20 A	Cumulative Impacts	Potential Other Future Projects
		O22-54	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O22-54	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O22-55	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O22-56	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
		O22-57	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O22-57	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
LaRiviere, Florence M.	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge	O23-1	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O23-1	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O23-1a	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O23-2	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O23-3	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O23-4	4.4 B	Project Description	Data Regarding Campus Size
		O23-4	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		O23-5	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		O23-6	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		O23-7	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		O23-8	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O23-9	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness Of The Size Of The Campus
		O23-9	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O23-10	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O23-10	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O23-11	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O23-11	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O23-12	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O23-12	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O23-12	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
LaRiviere, Florence M.	Citizens Committee to Complete the Refuge	O23-12	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O23-12	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O23-12	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O23b	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
Allayaud, Bill	State Legislative Director, Sierra Club	O24-1	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O24-1	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O24-2	4.21.B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternatives
		O24-3	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O24-4	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness Of The Size Of The Campus
		O24-4	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		O24-4	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternatives
		O24-4	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O24-4	4.21 G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-Site Alternatives
		O24-4	4.21 G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		O24-5	4.21 H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative
		O24-5	4.21 H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative
		O24-6	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		O24-7	4.21 G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-Site Alternatives
		O24-8	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O24-8	4.21.G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-Site Alternatives
		O24-9	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		O24-9	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternatives

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Allayaud, Bill	State Legislative Director, Sierra Club	O24-9	4.21 G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-Site Alternatives
		O24-10	4.21 G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-Site Alternatives
		O24-11	4.21 G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-Site Alternatives
		O24-12	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O24-13	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O24-14	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O24-15	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O24-16	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O24-17	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O24-18	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O24-19	4.3 B	Permitting	Section 404 LEDPA Analysis and Evidence Needed for LEDPA Analysis
		O24-20	4.7 B	Air Quality	Consistency with Attainment Plans and Conformity
		O24-21	4.7 B	Air Quality	Consistency with Attainment Plans and Conformity
		O24-22	4.7 B	Air Quality	Consistency with Attainment Plans and Conformity
		O24-23	4.7 A	Air Quality	Adequacy of Impact Analysis
		O24-24	4.7 B	Air Quality	Consistency with Attainment Plans and Conformity
		O24-25	4.7 A	Air Quality	Adequacy of Impact Analysis
		O24-26	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O24-27	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
		O24-28	4.7 C	Air Quality	Air Quality Mitigation
		O24-28	4.7 C	Air Quality	Air Quality Mitigation
		O24-28	4.18 D	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mitigation

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Allayaud, Bill	State Legislative Director, Sierra Club	O24-29	4.7 C	Air Quality	Air Quality Mitigation
		O24-30	4.7 A	Air Quality	Adequacy of Impact Analysis
		O24-30	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O24-31	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		O24-32	4.19 A	Utilities	Wastewater Treatment by City
		O24-33	4.19 A	Utilities	Wastewater Treatment by City
		O24-34	4.19 A	Utilities	Wastewater Treatment by City
		O24-35	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		O24-36	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O24-36	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		O24-37	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O24-37	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		O24-38	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		O24-39	4.18 E	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Parking
O24-40	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis		
O24-40	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis		
O24-40	4.18 B	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis		
		O24-41	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
Hubbart, Lori	California Native Plant Society	O25-1	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		O25-2	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O25-3	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O25-3	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Hubbart, Lori	California Native Plant Society	O25-4	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O25-5	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O25-6	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O25-7	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O25-8	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O25-9	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		O25-10	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		O25-11	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		O25-11	4.20 A	Cumulative Impacts	Potential Other Future Projects
		O25-12	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O25-13	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O25-14	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O25-15	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O25-16	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O25-17	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O25-18	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O25-19	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O25-20	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
Siegel, Kassie R.	Center for Biological Diversity	O26-1a	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
		O26-1b	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O26-2	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O26-3	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Siegel, Kassie R.	Center for Biological Diversity	O26-3	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O26-3	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O26-3	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O26-4	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-4	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-5	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-6	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O26-7	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O26-8	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O26-9	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O26-9	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-10	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O26-10	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-11	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O26-11	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O26-11	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O26-12	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O26-12	4.21J	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Suggestion to Locate the Campus Elsewhere Near the Proposed Site
		O26-13	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-14	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-15	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-15b	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Siegel, Kassie R.	Center for Biological Diversity	O26-16	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-17	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-18	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-19	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-20	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-21	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-22	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-23	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-24	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-25	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-25	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-26	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-26	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O26-27	4.20 A	Cumulative Impacts	Potential Other Future Projects
		O26-28	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O26-29	4.1 G	CEQA Process	Recirculation Requests
		O26-30	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		O26-30	4.3 B	Permitting	Section 404 LEDPA Analysis and Evidence Needed for LEDPA Analysis
Carpenter, Bob	Chair, University Committee of Merced	O27	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Witham, Carol	Vernal Pools.Org	O28-1	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
		O28-2	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
		O28-2	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Witham, Carol	Vernal Pools.Org	O28-3	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O28-4	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		O28-4	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		O28-5	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		O28-6	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O28-7	4.3 B	Permitting	Section 404 LEDPA Analysis and Evidence Needed for LEDPA Analysis
		O28-8	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-8	4.21 J	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Suggestion to Locate the Campus Elsewhere Near the Proposed Site
		O28-9	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
		O28-9	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O28-10	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O28-10	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O28-11	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-12	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O28-13	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O28-14	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O28-15	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-16	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O28-16	7	Changes to the Draft EIR	Biological Resources
		O28-17	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O28-18	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O28-19	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Witham, Carol	Vernal Pools.Org	O28-20	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O28-21	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O28-21	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-22	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O28-23	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O28-24	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		O28-25	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-26	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-27	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-28	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-29	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-30	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-31	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-32	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-32	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-32	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-33	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-34	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-35	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-36	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-37	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-37	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Witham, Carol	Vernal Pools.Org	O28-38	4.10 B	Geology	Other Concerns
		O28-39	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-40	4.20 A	Cumulative Impacts	Potential Other Future Projects
		O28-41	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-42	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O28-42	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		O28-43	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O28-44	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		O28-44	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-45	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-46	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-46	4.21 D	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Higher Density
		O28-47	4.21 G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-site Alternatives
		O28-48	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-48	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-49	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-50	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-51	4.21 C	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Decreased Population
		O28-52	4.21 D	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Higher Density
		O28-53	4.21 E	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Fewer Programs
		O28-54	4.21 J	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Suggestion to Locate the Campus Elsewhere Near the Proposed Site
		O28-55	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Collocation of Specific Programs

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Witham, Carol	Vernal Pools.Org	O28-56	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of Specific Programs
		O28-57	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of Specific Programs
		O28-58	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of Specific Programs
		O28-59	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of Specific Programs
		O28-60	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of Specific Programs
		O28-61	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of Specific Programs
		O28-62	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of Specific Programs
		O28-62	4.18 E	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Parking
		O28-63	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of Specific Programs
		O28-64	4.4 C	Project Description	Explanation of Land Requirements and Colocation of Specific Programs
		O28-65	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		O28-65	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		O28-66	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		O28-66	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		O28-67	4.22 C	Growth Inducing Impacts	Explanation of Land Requirements and Proposed Location of University Community
		O28-68	4.22 C	Growth Inducing Impacts	Explanation of Land Requirements and Proposed Location of University Community
		O28-69	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-70	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		O28-71	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-72	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-73	4.4 B	Project Description	Data Regarding Campus Size
		O28-73	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Witham, Carol	Vernal Pools.Org	O28-73	4.22 C	Growth Inducing Impacts	Explanation of Land Requirements and Proposed Location of University Community
		O28-74	4.21 G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-site Alternatives
		O28-75	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-76	4.3 B	Permitting	Section 404 LEDPA Analysis and Evidence Needed for LEDPA Analysis
		O28-77	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-77	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O28-78	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O28-79	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
		O28-80	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-81	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O28-82	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O28-82	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O28-83	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O28-84	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O28-85	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O28-86	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O28-87	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O28-87	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-88	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O28-89	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O28-89	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-90	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Witham, Carol	Vernal Pools.Org	O28-91	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O28-92	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		O28-93	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-93	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-94	4.7 A	Air Quality	Adequacy of Impact Analysis
		O28-94	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-94	4.20 B	Cumulative Impacts	Scope of EIR's Cumulative Impact Analysis
		O28-95	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-96	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-96	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-96	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-96	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-96	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-96	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-96	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-96	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-96	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O28-97	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Resource Mitigation Program
		O28-98	4.11 A	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hazardous Materials Transportation and Storage
		O28-99	4.19 B	Utilities	Electricity and Natural Gas
		O28-100	4.5 B	Aesthetics	Views From Yosemite Park
		O28-100	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Witham, Carol	Vernal Pools.Org	O28-100	4.7 B	Air Quality	Consistency with Attainment Plans and Conformity
		O28-100	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O28-100	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
Vlomis, Barbara	Executive Director, Butte Environmental Council	O29-1	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O29-1a	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		O29-2	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O29-2	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O29-3	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		O29-4	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O29-5	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
		O29-6	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
Gosting, Kenneth A.	Executive Director, Transportation Involves Everyone	O29-7	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O30-1	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O30-1	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O30-2	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O30-3	4.7 D	Air Quality	Relationship Between Project Objectives and Project Design and Air Quality Impacts
		O30-4	4.7 A	Air Quality	Adequacy of Impact Analysis
		O30-4	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O30-5	4.18 D	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mass Transit and Other Traffic Alternatives
Cresap, Anthony W. Esq.	San Joaquin Raptor/Protect Our Water	O31-1	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O31-2	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		O31-2	4.20 B	Cumulative Impacts	Scope of EIR's Cumulative Impact Analysis

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Cresap, Anthony W. Esq.	San Joaquin Raptor/Protect Our Water	O31-2	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O31-3	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O31-3	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		O31-4	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
		O31-5	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
		O31-6	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
		O31-7	4.1 D	CEQA Process	Relationship Between LRDP Analysis and Analysis of Phase I /Future Develop.
		O31-8	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		O31-9	4.1 A	CEQA Process	Relationship to Site Selection Process
		O31-10	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O31-11	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O31-12	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O31-13	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O31-13	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O31-13	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		O31-14	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O31-15	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O31-15	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		O31-15	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		O31-16	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O31-16a	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O31-17	4.22 B	Growth Inducing Impacts	Other Growth Issues

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Cresap, Anthony W. Esq.	San Joaquin Raptor/Protect Our Water	O31-18	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O31-19	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		O31-20	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		O31-20	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O31-20	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		O31-21	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O31-22	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		O31-23	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O31-24	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		O31-25	4.21 E	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Fewer Programs
		O31-26	4.21 E	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Fewer Programs
		O31-27	4.21 H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative
		O31-27	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		O31-28	4.11 A	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hazardous Materials Transportation and Storage
		O31-28	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O31-29	4.12 E	Hydrology and Water Quality	Site Drainage
		O31-30	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O31-31	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O31-32	4.6 E	Agricultural Resources	Miscellaneous
		O31-33	4.12 B	Hydrology and Water Quality	Localized Groundwater Effects
		O31-34	4.6 E	Agricultural Resources	Miscellaneous
		O31-34	4.12 D	Hydrology and Water Quality	Downstream Pollution from Site Runoff

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Cresap, Anthony W. Esq.	San Joaquin Raptor/Protect Our Water	O31-34	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		O31-35	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O31-36	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		O31-37	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O31-38	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		O31-39	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O31-40	4.6 C	Agricultural Resources	Compatibility with County General Plan Policies
		O31-41	4.6 C	Agricultural Resources	Compatibility with County General Plan Policies
		O31-42	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O31-42	4.8.C	Biological Resources	Lake Yosemite and Irrigation Canals
		O31-43	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O31-44	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O31-45	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
		O31-46	4.11 B	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Pollution From Wastewater Treatment
		O31-47	4.12 F	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		O31-48	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O31-49	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O31-50	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O31-50	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O31-51	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		O31-52	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O31-52	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Cresap, Anthony W. Esq.	San Joaquin Raptor/Protect Our Water	O31-53	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O31-54	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O31-55	4.5 B	Aesthetics	Cumulative Effect of Urbanization
		O31-56	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O31-56	4.22 D	Growth Inducing Impacts	Miscellaneous Growth Issues
		O31-57	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
		O31-58	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O31-59	4.17 A	Recreation	Impacts on Lake Yosemite Regional Park
		O31-60	4.19 A	Utilities	Wastewater Treatment by City
		O31-61	4.11 A	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Hazardous Materials Transportation and Storage
		O31-61	4.11 B	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Pollution from Wastewater Treatment
		O31-62	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		O31-63	4.8 B	Biological Resources	Methodology
		O31-64	4.22 D	Growth Inducing Impacts	Miscellaneous Growth Issues
		O31-65	4.22 D	Growth Inducing Impacts	Miscellaneous Growth Issues
McCaul, John	America Farmland Trust	O32-1	4.6 A	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation
		O32-2	4.6 D	Agricultural Resources	Issues Related to Indirect Effects of the University Community
		O32-3	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		O32-3	4.6 D	Agricultural Resources	Issues Related to Indirect Effects of the University Community
		O32-4	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		O32-5	4.3 A	Permitting	Relationship Between EIR/LRDP and CWA/ESA Permitting
		O32-5	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
McCaul, John	America Farmland Trust	O32-6	4	Response to Comments	Introduction
		O32-7	4	Response to Comments	Introduction
		O32-8	4	Response to Comments	Introduction
Bergman, Don	CEO, The Greater Merced, Chamber of Commerce	O33-1	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
Evans, Robert T.		11	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Edminster, Robert J. "Bob"	Independent Botanist Consulting Ecologist	12	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Baker, Brett	President, Building Industry Association of Central California, Merced Chapter	13	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Abbate, Jim	McDonalds, Alia Corporation	14	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Kolligian, Leo S.		15	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Giampaoli, Maria	Eastside Merced Agricultural Coalition	16-1	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		16-2	4.12 A	Hydrology and Water Quality	Basinwide Groundwater Effects and MID Water Supply Plan
Wood, Roger		17	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Smith, T. W.	President Calcot, Ltd.	18	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Sansoni, Aldo		19-1	4.6 B	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		19-1	4.6	Agricultural Resources	Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation
		19-2	4.8 A	Biological Resources	Environmental Setting
Monteith, Dick	Senator, 12th District, California State Senate	110	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Maxwell, Guy	Maxwell Homes	111	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Voiland, Eugene J.	President & CEO of Aera Energy LLC	112	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Gallo, Michael D. & Sherrie Spendlove	Joseph Gallo Farms	113	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Clark, Willard G.	The Ruth and Sherman Lee Institute for Japanese Art at the Clark Center	114	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Gabbard, Dr. D. Christopher		115	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Mitchell, Beth	Managing Partner, Boardman Mitchell Partners	I16	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Levy, Joe	Chairman, Gottschalks Executive Offices	I17	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Cogdill, Dave	Assemblyman, 25th District, California Legislature	I18	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Evans, John	Evans Companies	I19	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Evans, John	Evans Companies	I19	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Connors, Michael		I20	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Dowlan, Thomas C.	President and CEO Yosemite Bank	I21	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Ellison, Claude D.	UC Merced Foundation Trustee	I22	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Luster, Robert A.	President and CEO of Luster National Inc.	I23	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Boese, Lee R. Sr., D.D.S.		I24	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Stepanek, Brian		I25-1	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		I25-2	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
Boardman, Mike	President and Founder Boardman Mitchell Partners	I26	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Douglas, Noel and Linda		I27-1	4.18 A	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Traffic Analysis
Balestrery, John		I28-1	4.1 B	CEQA Process	Relationship to County CEQA Process
		I28-1	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		I28-1	4.1 D	CEQA Process	Relationship Between LRDP Analysis and Analysis of Phase I /Future Develop.
		I28-2	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
Gillen, Dennis G. Ph.D.		I29	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Maxwell, Guy	Maxwell Homes	I30	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Reyes, Sarah	Assemblymember, 31st District, California Legislature	I31	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Thorp, Robbin W.	U.C. Davis	I32-1	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Thorp, Robbin W.	U.C. Davis	I32-2	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I32-2	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I32-3	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I32-4	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		I32-4	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		I32-4	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I32-5	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I32-6	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
Wood, Robin	A.I.C.P. Professional Planner	I33-1	4.1 E	CEQA Process	Notices, Document Availability, Requests for Time Extensions
		I33-2	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		I33-2a	4.1	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		I33-3	4.21 F	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	On-Site Alternatives
		I33-4	4.21 F	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	On-Site Alternatives
		I33-4	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		I33-5	4.21 F	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	On-Site Alternatives
		I33-6	4.21 F	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	On-Site Alternatives
		I33-7	4.21 F	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	On-Site Alternatives
		I33-8	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impacts to Special Status Species
		I33-8	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		I33-9	4.21 H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative
		I33-10	4.21 F	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	On-Site Alternatives
		I33-11	4.21 F	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	On-Site Alternatives

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Wood, Robin	A.I.C.P. Professional Planner	I33-12	4.17 B	Recreation	Other Park Facilities Demands
		I33-13	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		I33-14	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		I33-15	4.21 G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-Site Alternatives
		I33-16	4.1 C	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		I33-16	4.1	CEQA Process	Relationship to Federal NEPA Process
		I33-16	4.21 F	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	On-Site Alternatives
		I33-17	4.21 F	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	On-Site Alternatives
		I33-18	4.21	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		I33-18	4.21 K	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Fresno Alternatives
		I33-19	4.4 B	Project Description	Data Regarding Campus Size
		I33-19	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		I33-20	4.21.H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative
		I33-20a	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I33-20b	4.21 H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative
		I33-21	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I33-22	4.21 H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative
		I33-23	4.21 H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative
		I33-24	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I33-25	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
Wood, Robert P.E.		I34-1	4.4 B	Project Description	Data Regarding Campus Size
		I34-1	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Wood, Robert P.E.		I34-1	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		I34-1a	4.15 B	Population, Employment and Housing	Housing Effects
		I34-1b	4.16 C	Public Services	Cost
		I34-1c	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		I34-2	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		I34-2	4.21 E	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Fewer Programs
		I34-3	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I34-4	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I34-5	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I34-6	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I34-7	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I34-8	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I34-9	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I34-10	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I34-11	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
		I34-12	4.21 I	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Castle Airport Alternative
McNeely, Camille	University of California, Berkeley	I35-1	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		I35-2	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I35-3	4.4 B	Project Description	Data Regarding Campus Size
		I35-3	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		I35-3	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		I35-3a	4.21.A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
McNeely, Camille	University of California, Berkeley	I35-3b	4.2.1.A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		I35-4	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		I35-4	4.21 D	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Smaller Campus/Higher Density
		I35-4	4.21 H	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	North Merced/Bellevue Ranch Alternative
		I35-4	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		I35-5	4.21.G	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Off-Site Alternatives
		I35-6	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		I35-7	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I35-8	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I35-8	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I35-9	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I35-9	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I35-10	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		I35-10	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I35-10	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I35-11	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I35-11	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		I35-11	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
Bandoni, Louie		I36	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous
Pitman, Marsh	Sierra Club / Merced Group-Tehipite Chapter	I37-1	4.18 D	Traffic, Circulation and Parking	Mass Transit and Other Traffic Alternatives
Ripley, Dana K.	Principal, Ripley Pacific Company	I38-1	4.12 F	Hydrology and Water Quality	Water Conservation and Recycling
		I38-1a	4.12 B	Hydrology and Water Quality	Localized Groundwater Effects

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
Ripley, Dana K.	Principal, Ripley Pacific Company	I38-1a	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		I38-2	4.19 A	Utilities	Wastewater Treatment by City
		I38-3	4.12 F	Hydrology and Water Quality	Water Conservation and Recycling
		I38-4	4.12 F	Hydrology and Water Quality	Water Conservation and Recycling
		I38-5	4.19 A	Utilities	Wastewater Treatment by City
		I38-6	4.17 B	Recreation	Other Park Facilities Demands
		I38-7	4.12 F	Hydrology and Water Quality	Water Conservation and Recycling
Owens, Bryant		I39	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous Comments
Bastow, Justin	Center for Population Biology	I40-1	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I40-2	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I40-2	4.8 D	Biological Resources	Adequacy of Mitigation Program
		I40-3	4.4 B	Project Description	Data Regarding Campus Size
		I40-3	4.4 C	Project Description	Justification for Land Requirements and Colocation of Specific Programs
		I40-3	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
		I40-4	4.4 A	Project Description	Treatment of Campus Land Reserve and Campus Natural Preserve
		I40-5	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		I40-6	4.21 B	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Criteria Used in Evaluating Alternative
		I40-7	4.21 A	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	Appropriateness of the Size of the Campus
Cardoza, Dennis	Assemblymember, 26th District, California Assembly	I41	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Hardy, Edward		I42	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Barkett, Joseph A. M.D.	Emerald Properties	I43	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Kelley, Carla		I44	4.1 H	CEQA Process	Miscellaneous

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
		I44	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
Kelley, George		I45	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
King, Carrie		I46-1	4.6 A	Agricultural Resources	Project Impacts on Agricultural Resources and Mitigation
		I46-1	4.8 C	Biological Resources	Impact Analysis
		I46-1	4.21 L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		I46-2	4.22 D	Growth Inducing Impacts	Miscellaneous Growth Issues
Loring, Lawrence Thomas		I47-1	4.21.L	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	General
		I48	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		I49	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		I51	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH1	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH2-1	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH2-2	4.12 C	Hydrology and Water Quality	Other Water Supply Issues
		PH3	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH4	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH9	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH10	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH11	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH13	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH14	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH15	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH16	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project

INDEX TO RESPONSES

Name	Agency / Affiliation	Commentor Code	Section #	Section Title	Subsection Title
		PH17	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH18	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH19	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH20	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH21	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH22	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH23	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH24	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH26	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH28	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH29	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project
		PH29	4.2 C	Purpose and Need	Expressions of Support for UC Merced Project