

**COMMENT LETTER 48 - SCOR AND CONCERNED CITIZENS FOR SANTA ROSA,
ANNE SEELEY (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996), RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24,
1996**

Response to Comment 48-1

Comment Summary: The comment recommends a phased project.

Refer to Master Response 14, located in Section 6.2 of this document, concerning a phased project.

Response to Comment 48-2

Comment Summary: The comment states that with a "front-loaded" project current rate-payers will suffer rate increases if growth does not happen at the project rate.

Refer to Master Response 14, located in Section 6.2 of this document, concerning a phased project.

Response to Comment 48-3

Comment Summary: The comment recommends phasing as a way to build trust in the farming community, enhancing the agricultural economy.

Refer to Master Response 14, located in Section 6.2 of this document, concerning a phased project. The Draft EIR/EIS projects substantial enhancement of the agricultural economy associated with agricultural irrigation projects (refer to Section 4.18), and Appendix D-19 (Irrigation Management Guidelines for West and South County Alternatives), recommends charging for reclaimed water. Also refer to Master Response 13, located in Section 6.2 of this document.

Response to Comment 48-4

Comment Summary: The comment again urges phasing and maximum reuse of reclaimed water, and suggests that a phased project would be less likely to be a subject of a lawsuit.

Refer to Master Response 14, located in Section 6.2 of this document, concerning a phased project. Speculation about the possibility of lawsuits is not required by either NEPA and CEQA, and is not appropriate in the context of the Draft EIR/EIS.

