

**COMMENT LETTER 35 - CHRISTMAS LEUBRIE AND ALICE HEIMSOOTH (NO DATE),  
RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996**

**Response to Comment 35-1**

*Comment Summary: The comment asserts the opinion that any discharge to the Russian River is a health hazard.*

Refer to Response to Comment 34-1.

**Response to Comment 35-2**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that increasing the discharge into the Russian River is a health hazard that will destroy property values.*

Refer to Response to Comment 17-2.

**Response to Comment 35-3**

*Comment Summary: The comment expresses the belief that swimming in the Russian River is dangerous.*

Swimming was evaluated as an exposure pathway in Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR/EIS (see Table 4.7-9 on page 4.7-33). Studies concluded that exposure to reclaimed water through swimming would not expose the public to harmful effects.

**Response to Comment 35-4**

*Comment Summary: The comment advocates zero discharge and indicates that preventing any discharges to the Russian River is so important that the commentor took time off from work to attend the hearing.*

Refer to Master Response 15, located in section 6.2 of this document, regarding zero discharge. The Draft EIR/EIS has evaluated two alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3) that provide reclaimed water for agricultural irrigation, and the Project includes an urban irrigation component.

