

**COMMENT LETTER 80 - LAWRENCE LEO SHURLIFF (SEPTEMBER 30, 1996),
RECEIVED OCTOBER 4, 1996**

Response to Comment 80-1

Comment Summary: The comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS proposes discharge to the Russian River of up to 20 percent and that it presents the possibility of condemnation and flooding of lands, including dairies, under one of five storage reservoir sites. The comment also states that the pending outcome of the proposed Subregional system project would determine the health and integrity of the Russian River and the placement of storage reservoir sites across open space.

The City of Santa Rosa is aware that the selection of a Project is of major concern for the local area, and proposes a careful selection process after certification of the EIR. However, the EIR/EIS authors do not agree with the comment's implication that discharge would damage the health and integrity of the Russian River. The Draft EIR/EIS has evaluated discharge to the river and Section 4.7 concluded that "Direct discharge of reclaimed water into the Laguna de Santa Rosa or the Russian River will not adversely affect water quality at drinking water sources and would not adversely affect human health via other potential exposure pathways" (refer to page 4.7-61). Section 4.6 found significant unavoidable impacts to conductivity, dissolved oxygen, and biostimulatory substances in the Russian River (refer to page 4.6-150). However, with implementation of cumulative projects to reduce nutrient inputs to the Laguna, and with mitigation proposed for project impacts, analysis concluded that 20% design discharge to the Laguna could be implemented without significant water quality impacts. The EIR/EIS has recognized that a West County project has a number of significant unavoidable impacts, as enumerated in Table 1-13 on page 1-44 of the Draft EIR/EIS .

Response to Comment 80-2

Comment Summary: The comment states that the CD ROM costs \$120.00 and is incomplete by two books.

Refer to Master Response 3, located in Section 6.2 of this document, concerning availability and cost of the document.

Response to Comment 80-3

Comment Summary: The comment expresses the opinion that the City's program for managing irrigation would interfere with private property rights.

Refer to Response to Comment 75-6. These provisions are necessary to ensure proper management.

Response to Comment 80-4

Comment Summary: The comment asserts that environmental costs were not accurately addressed, and asks how long it will take before a 32-foot well would be contaminated.

The EIR/EIS authors cannot determine the precise location of the referenced well, so estimates of time are not possible. However, properties on Chileno Valley Road are not close enough to any of the reservoir sites to be affected by reclaimed water from reservoirs. Table 4.5.6 on page 4.5-30 of the Draft EIR/EIS provides travel times for reclaimed water moving from each potential reservoir site to the nearest domestic well. Irrigation is not expected to contaminate wells.