

**COMMENT LETTER 64 - MR. AND MRS. JOHN D. CARTER (SEPTEMBER 27, 1996), RECEIVED OCTOBER 1, 1996**

**Response to Comment 64-1**

*Comment Summary: The comment presents the opinion that three of the four alternatives proposed in the Draft EIR/EIS are too expensive and that the Russian River discharge alternative is a waste of a valuable asset and a desecration of a precious resource.*

One of the objectives of the project is to “promote wise use of water resources”. It will be the job of the decision makers to determine which alternative best meets this and other project objectives.

**Response to Comment 64-2**

*Comment Summary: The comment presents the opinion that a wastewater program should proceed in cooperation with the affected communities and with private enterprise. It also states that the South County and West County alternatives have support from some large landowners and farmers anxious to receive wastewater, while others are not interested in the wastewater. The comment states, finally, that the cooperative effort should proceed with those who want to participate, sharing expenses and expertise.*

The City of Santa Rosa welcomes collaboration with farmers and investors. Irrigation contracts would only involve willing landowners; there is no proposal to condemn land for irrigation.

**Response to Comment 64-3**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that the Geyser’s representative at the September 24th public hearing displayed a willingness to cooperate and exhibited knowledge of the expense involved and potential routes to be followed for Alternative 4.*

The City of Santa Rosa is continuing to work with the Geysers operators. Refer to Response to Comment 26-5. All of the alternatives evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS will be considered fully in the selection process.

**Response to Comment 64-4**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS lacks imagination, scope, and foresight and is superficial. It states that the Draft EIR/EIS appears to have been written by personnel charged with the task of getting rid of the wastewater as soon as possible and does not examine solutions that benefit all communities.*

The Draft EIR/EIS is intended to present an objective evaluation of the environmental impacts of each alternative. It is outside the scope of an EIR/EIS to advocate a particular solution. The comment has not identified any particular areas where a more detailed

analysis is necessary, so a more specific response is not possible. Specific comments are addressed below.

### Response to Comment 64-5

*Comment Summary: The comment states that “No resort owner in the lower Russian River area could be found who had been interviewed---”*

Refer to Master Response 7, located in Section 6.2 of this document, regarding impacts to the tourist economy.

### Response to Comment 64-6

*Comment Summary: The comment states that west county farmers who only indicated an interest receiving information were counted as wanting to receive reclaimed water from the City of Santa Rosa.*

A letter from the City was sent to property owners who are located in the potential irrigation areas of the Project in early December 1994. The letter explained the purpose of the letter and environmental studies that needed to be conducted for the Project. In addition, the letter states “The City of Santa Rosa would also like to know your interest in agricultural irrigation on your property. Please complete the enclosed postcard (postage paid) and return it to us within the next 10 days.” The postcard provided three options to demonstrate a property owner’s interest in the agricultural irrigation program. These options included: (1) I/We are interested in agricultural irrigation on our parcel, without making any commitment at this time; (2) I/We would like more information on agricultural irrigation so as to make an initial decision on this program; and (3) I/We are not interested in the agricultural irrigation program. The results of this survey are as follows:

West County Total Respondents		Interested Respondents		Respondents Not Interested		Respondents Wanting More Information		No Response	
Acreage	Land- owners	Acreage	Land- owners	Acreage	Land- owners	Acreage	Land- owners	Acreage	Land- owners
10,097	122	3,148	31	2,607	40	1,628	15	2,714	36

Although the results of this survey were never published, the City of Santa Rosa has the returned postcards to support the decision that was made by each landowner at the time the survey was conducted.

## **Response to Comment 64-7**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that there was an incorrect assumption regarding the amount of reclaimed water that could be applied to West County during the winter when soils are saturated.*

The Draft EIR/EIS does not assume that reclaimed water would be used in West County in the winter months. The irrigation program generally does not include irrigation during the winter months. During normal operation reclaimed water is provided for irrigation during the summer, dry months. The Contingency Program does include occasional winter irrigation during dry winters when discharge to the Russian River is extremely limited. During dry winters soils would not be saturated. Additional detail regarding winter irrigation is provided on pages 19 and 20 of Appendix D-19 (Irrigation Management Guidelines) for the West County and South County Alternatives. As explained there, winter irrigation is planned to occur primarily in City-owned lands around the Laguna de Santa Rosa. It may be possible to include some West County lands in the winter irrigation program, but these would need to be carefully managed. An application rate of 1.5 inches per month is assumed, and the Draft EIR/EIS authors believe this to be a reasonable, conservative assumption.

## **Response to Comment 64-8**

*Comment Summary: The comment is a plea to proceed with caution with the Subregional system project.*

The City of Santa Rosa is aware of the importance of selecting a project and will conduct a careful project selection process after certification of the EIR.

