

**COMMENT LETTER 34 - KEVIN JEP, REBECCA KERSNAR, SIMON BARBER, AND
KATHLEEN M. GOLDEN (NO DATE), RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996**

Response to Comment 34-1

Comment Summary: The comment asserts that any discharge to the Russian River is a health hazard, and opposes selection of the 20% discharge alternative.

Public health impacts of the discharge are evaluated on pages 4.7-60 through 4.7-63 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Additional details about public health are presented in Appendix J-3 (Human Health Risks of Chemical and Biological Constituents of Reclaimed Water). The studies conclude that discharge does not present a significant health risk.

The comment's opposition to a 20% discharge alternative is a statement regarding selection of an alternative. Refer to Master Response 2, located in Section 6.2 of this document.

Response to Comment 34-2

Comment Summary: The comment states that the discharge of treated wastewater to the Russian River will destroy property values in Monte Rio and Guerneville and has led to the belief that swimming in the river is dangerous.

As discussed above in Response to Comment 34-1, the Draft EIR/EIS evaluated public health impacts in detail including impacts from exposure to reclaimed water while swimming, and found no significant impacts. A discussion of potential impacts on tourism is included on page 4.18-44 of the Draft EIR/EIS, and these potential impacts are discussed further in Master Response 7, located in Section 6.2 of this document. Since no health impacts or tourism impacts have been identified, there would be no reason for property values along the Russian River to be impacted by the Project.

Response to Comment 34-3

Comment Summary: The comment states that all treated effluent should be given or sold to farmers for irrigation, and no effluent should be discharged to the Russian River.

The comment provides a statement of opinion regarding selection of an alternative. Refer to Master Response 2 regarding opinion about Project selection and to Master Response 15 regarding zero discharge. Both Master Responses are located in Section 6.2 of this document. The City of Santa Rosa has not decided whether to charge for water, or what type of pricing structure there may be for reclaimed water, but it is likely that if irrigators are charged for water, the cost would be substantially less than for alternative water sources.

