

**COMMENT LETTER 55 - PAUL D. STUTRUD (SEPTEMBER 21, 1996), RECEIVED
SEPTEMBER 24, 1996**

Response to Comment 55-1

Comment Summary: The comment identifies that there was a lack of availability and insufficient time to review the Draft EIR/EIS.

Refer to Master Response 3, which deals with the availability and cost of the document and Master Response 4, which deals with time for review of the document. Master Responses are located in Section 6.2 of this document.

Response to Comment 55-2

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that insufficient time was provided for review of the Draft EIR/EIS and suggests that decision-makers who will be using the document will not have had enough time to review all portions of the document before making the necessary informed decisions concerning the project.

Refer to Master Response 4, located in Section 6.2 of this document, which deals with time for review of the document.

Response to Comment 55-3

Comment Summary: The comment indicates opposition to having the taxpayers of Sonoma County pay for expansion related to this matter while taxpayers are precluded from choosing whether or not to underwrite growth.

Page 4.18-23 of the Draft EIR/EIS indicates that the costs for construction of disposal improvements required to accommodate future growth will be paid by the future users. Existing users will only be required to pay for improvements required to dispose of existing flows.

Response to Comment 55-4

Comment Summary: The comment voices several concerns about capacity of the Subregional System and wastewater flow including a question of whether or not the Llano Plant is operating at or over its rated capacity. The comment also states that figures reported to the Water Quality Control Board are erroneous and are under-reported, and that "dry weather flow data are based on supposition and biased calculations rather than actual meter readings" The comment asserts that Rohnert Park (flow) meters have been broken for years and that Rohnert Park records state there has been no sewage capacity since at least 1987. The comment also asks about potable water capacity, including the Russian River and the various wells in this area.

The water balance prepared for the alternative projects in the Draft EIR/EIS (Appendices D-8 through D-11) coupled with the recent history of the Subregional System operation, demonstrate the need for substantially more than current storage capacity and irrigated acreage. This is necessary to accommodate the annual accumulation and disposal of treated reclaimed water, and thereby make the system weather independent. The Regional System has, for the last several years, been expanding the storage capacity and disposal acreage on an interim basis to accommodate the increasing reclaimed water volume. Based on the flow records of the Laguna Plant, the EIR/EIS authors have no reason to believe that the Subregional System is operating above its current capacity.

The question of potable water capacity and its adequacy to support of future growth is beyond the scope of this EIR/EIS.