

**PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT 259 - OLIVIA WALTER, (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996),
RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996**

Response to Comment 259-342

Comment Summary: The comment offers the opinion that discharge of sewage should not occur to the Russian River.

Existing and proposed discharges to the Russian River consist of tertiary treated reclaimed water, which is not correctly termed "sewage". No discharge of raw sewage is proposed. The Draft EIR/EIS has evaluated discharge of reclaimed water to the Russian River. 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 will not adversely affect human health via other potential exposure pathways" (see page 4.7-61). Section 4.6 found significant unavoidable impacts to conductivity, dissolved oxygen, and biostimulatory substances in the Russian River (see 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.

**PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT 260 - BEN MARCHAND, (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996),
RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996**

Response to Comment 260-343

Comment Summary: The comment refers to the Draft EIR/EIS summary and states that conclusions regarding significance are inconsistent, and that the summary has "poor scientific content".

Based on a review of subsequent comments, the EIR/EIS authors believe that the comment is based on a misunderstanding of the method of analysis of impacts under CEQA. Impacts of particular Project components and alternatives are evaluated for a wide variety of impacts, and it is possible for impacts to be significant in one area, but less than significant in another. For example, pump stations have significant operational noise impacts, but do not have significant operational air quality impacts. These different conclusions are not evidence of inconsistency in the document.

No specific reasons are given why the summary document has "poor scientific content", so a specific response is not possible. However, the EIR/EIS authors recommend that the reader refer to the actual text of the Draft EIR/EIS sections, and the Appendices which provide supporting technical analysis. Because of its nature, the summary does not include information about methodologies and detailed analytical results, but simply reports conclusions. The reader must look elsewhere for the scientific content which is the basis of the summary.

Response to Comment 260-344

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that the description of pipelines as being buried and generally following public rights-of-way is incorrect, and that a pipeline will come above ground at a pump station on property at 3680 Pine Flat Road. The comment also characterizes as incorrect a reference in draft EIR/EIS that a pump station for the Geysers alternative impacts property for which the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District holds a conservation easement and that this impact can be mitigated to a level below significance.

The commentor also submitted this comment in writing, and it is responded to in Responses to Comments 112-8, 112-16, 112-17 and 112-18.

Response to Comment 260-345

Comment Summary: The comment appears to disagree with the conclusion that public health impacts for compounds other than nitrate are less than significant and suggests that even a little pollution is not acceptable.

The comment refers to conclusions of the Human Health Risk Assessment, which are summarized on page 1-35 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Results indicated that the only

significant impact associated with exposure to reclaimed water was associated with nitrate levels in water that will enter groundwater in the vicinity of reservoirs. Mitigation is proposed to reduce the impact to less than significant. None of the potential pathways for exposure to reclaimed water associated with pipelines, pump stations, river discharge or geysers recharge was determined to pose a significant risk to public health. With the exception of nitrate levels, the quality of reclaimed water was found to be as good or better than local surface water bodies.

Response to Comment 260-346

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that a large oak tree located on Mr. Marchand's property would be affected by the project.

Pump stations will be situated so as to avoid oak trees. Measure 2.2.5: Avoid Sensitive Biological Resources, specifies that pump stations be designed "to provide an exclusionary buffer from sensitive plant resources". Refer to pages 2-28 through 2-33 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment 260-347

Comment Summary: The comment states that noise impacts from pump stations cannot be mitigated to a level less than significant.

The conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS are in agreement with the comment. Pump station noise impacts will be significant, and while mitigation can reduce noise levels, because the existing environment is relatively quiet, the mitigation could not reduce noise impacts to a less than significant level.

Response to Comment 260-348

Comment Summary: The comment states that "this thing's very contrary within itself. It says one thing and it says another and that they both don't lead to the same spot."

This comment apparently refers to the Draft EIR/EIS, but does not provide any specific instances of inconsistency. Refer to Response to Comment 260-343. A similar comment was also submitted in writing. Refer to Response to Comment 112-20.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT 261 - ROBERTA WALTER, (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996), RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996

Response to Comment 261-349

Comment Summary: The comment requests consideration of storage facilities under on billion gallons capacity.

Refer to Master Response 14 regarding phasing and small reservoirs. Master Responses are located in Section 6.2 of this document.

Response to Comment 261-350

Comment Summary: The comment states the cost benefits to agriculture are eliminated and consequently to consumers as a whole.

The analysis of economic impacts in Section 4.18 of the Draft EIR/EIS, beginning on page 4.18-38, concluded that the economic benefit to agriculture for the irrigation alternatives was between \$2.5 million and \$102 million annually, depending upon the specific cropping scenario and alternative.

Response to Comment 261-351

Comment Summary: The comment advocates a phased multi-reservoir system, and states that if such a program had begun 10 years ago the problem would be solved by now.

Unfortunately the City of Santa Rosa was unable to begin such a program 10 years ago, and must solve the problem that exists now. Refer to Master Response 14 regarding a phased project and multiple small storage reservoirs. Both Master Responses are located in Section 6.2 of this document.

Response to Comment 261-352

Comment Summary: The comment states that agricultural reuse is better suited to future expansion, and expansion would be less expensive if pipelines to South County are in place.

The comment is correct in stating that agricultural reuse can be expanded, while there will ultimately be limits on river discharge. Expansion of agricultural irrigation will, however, require additional storage in addition to extension of pipelines. It is also not certain whether expansion will be possible in South County, or whether pipelines to other areas will be needed for expansion.

Response to Comment 261-353

Comment Summary: The comment states that a plant upgrade and expansion that will need to precede implementation of the Laguna Discharge alternative have already been funded and developed and therefore “loads the deck in favor of this alternative being selected.”

The plant upgrade is necessary for all Project alternatives. The fact that upgrades are already funded therefore reduces the cost of all alternatives, not just the 20 % discharge option. Expansion of the headworks to increase treatment plant capacity is part of this Project, and the cost for this is therefore included in the cost for all alternatives. Thus, the cost basis for all alternatives is the same, and has not been adjusted in favor of any particular option.

Response to Comment 261-354

Comment Summary: The comment states that studies have been avoided on any current practices utilized with the Laguna Discharge alternative.

Although environmental evaluation of the existing system is not part of the Draft EIR/EIS, all analyses have considered the existing condition as the baseline against which all impacts are evaluated. In addition, the Water Quality Impact Analysis Report (Appendix I-16 of the Draft EIR/EIS) compares effects of discharge both to an existing conditions baseline and to a zero discharge baseline.

Response to Comment 261-355

Comment Summary: The comment states that there is a big difference between 5, 10 and 20 percent.

Presumably the comment refers to the difference between 5, 10 and 20 percent discharge rates. Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS states the impacts identified for the 1 percent discharge rate, and in evaluating Alternative 5 (Discharge), also identifies the impacts for 20 percent option. Appendix A (Range of Discharge Evaluation) of the Draft EIR/EIS identifies the differences in impacts expected for the 5, 10, and 15 percent discharge options from the 1 percent and 20 percent discharges evaluated in Chapter 4. Appendix A also identifies the differences in estimated Project cost for the 5, 10, and 15 percent discharge options in comparison to the 1 percent and 20 percent discharges. More detailed evaluation of the water quality impacts of the various design discharge rates is presented in Appendix I-16 (Water Quality Impact Analysis Report Volume I - Text) of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment 261-356

Comment Summary: The comment suggests that increased discharge to the Russian River would require filtration of the City of Santa Rosa's water supply.

The Draft EIR/EIS concluded that discharge did not pose a threat to water supply (refer to the discussion starting on page 4.7-61), and there is no reason to expect that discharge will alter treatment requirements for the Sonoma County Water Agency. Also refer to Response to Comment 18-2 and to Master Response 8, located in Section 6.2 of this document, for additional discussion of this issue.

Response to Comment 261-357

Comment Summary: The comment asks that the “true release percentage at the confluence of Mark West Spring Creek [sic] and the Russian River” be shown.

Refer to Response to Comment 85-488.

Response to Comment 261-358

Comment Summary: The comment asks that actual reclaimed water concentrations for Santa Rosa Creek and the Laguna be shown.

Refer to Response to Comment 85-489.

Response to Comment 261-359

Comment Summary: The comment asks why actual flow data for the Laguna above and below the Santa Rosa Creek confluence are not available.

Refer to Response to Comment 85-490.

Response to Comment 261-360

Comment Summary: The comment states that “the document does not detail current discharge calculations as allowed by the Regional Board.” The comment also asserts that operation of the existing system according to Regional Board compliance method would result in concentrations of 10 to 15 percent, which is greater than the currently-allowed 5 percent. The comment goes on to request a description of how “such an average (10 to 15 percent) would affect actual discharge and associated impacts.”

Refer to Response to Comment 85-491.

Response to Comment 261-361

Comment Summary: The comment objects to the fact that Alternative 2M was not carried forward for analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS.

Most of the components of Alternative 2M were carried forward. Refer to Response to Comment 85-49.

Response to Comment 261-362

Comment Summary: The comment states that the fisheries studies conducted in support of this document determined only that fish were present in areas where wastewater is being discharged. The comment also states that these studies did not examine whether the fish were suffering from sublethal effects as a result of exposure to the wastewater.

The fisheries studies described in Appendices L-1 (Anadromous Fish Migration Study Program, 1991-1994) and L-2 (Anadromous Fish Migration Study Program, 1991-1995) of the Draft EIR/EIS did not evaluate for all possible sublethal effects. For additional information regarding this subject, refer to Response to Comment 85-326.

Response to Comment 261-363

Comment Summary: The comment states that the sample size was inadequate to determine if fish are avoiding the wastewater.

The fisheries studies described in Appendices L-1 (Anadromous Fish Migration Study Program, 1991-1994) and L-2 (Anadromous Fish Migration Study Program, 1991-1995) of the Draft EIR/EIS did not attempt to quantify the number of fish that avoided reclaimed water. However, the study does support the conclusion that any such avoidance did not affect the number of juveniles produced. For additional information, refer to Response to Comment 85-326.

Response to Comment 261-364

Comment Summary: The comment states that the sublethal effects to juvenile fish as a result of exposure to wastewater is unknown.

Refer to the Responses to Comments 261-362 and 85-401.

Response to Comment 261-365

Comment Summary: This comment states that nutrients in increased wastewater discharges are likely to raise water temperatures which will foster increase of warm water predator species which will adversely affect steelhead and salmon.

Nutrients in increased wastewater discharge will not raise water temperatures.

Response to Comment 261-366

Comment Summary: This comment states that dissolved silver and zinc are very high, indicating possible contamination from electroplating, electronics and photo finishing industries.

Refer to Responses to Comments 85-119 and 85-504.

Response to Comment 261-367

Comment Summary: The comment states “I just want to reiterate that I’d like to see that promise fulfilled that was made. Remember that one about promising to be out of the river?”

This comment appears to be supporting zero discharge. Refer to Master Response 15, located in Section 6.2 of this document, regarding zero discharge.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT 262 - RICH SHERWOOD, (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996), RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996

Response to Comment 262-368

Comment Summary: The comment asks if it will still be possible to swim in the river if 20% discharge is implemented.

It will still be safe to swim in the river under the 20% discharge alternative. Public health impacts to swimmers are discussed starting on page 4.7-61 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment 262-369

Comment Summary: The comment asks if, under a 20 percent discharge alternative, will the commentor "be able to go to the River and feel good."

Although, the impact of Project alternatives on the emotional state of River visitors was not evaluated in the EIR/EIS, human health impacts were evaluated. The comment relates to the importance of being able to swim in the River. Direct ingestion of River water was one of the exposure pathways evaluated in Appendix J-3 (Human Health Risks from Chemical and Biological Components of Reclaimed Water) and Section 4.7 of the Draft EIR/EIS, and no significant human health impacts were identified from this or any other exposure pathway.

**PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT 263 - JUDY BOYCE (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996),
RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996**

Response to Comment 263-370

Comment Summary: The comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS inadequately addresses the impacts of pollution and the perception of pollution on tourism and the well-being of everyone along the Russian River.

The Draft EIR/EIS has evaluated discharge to the Russian River. 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 will not adversely affect human health via other potential exposure pathways" (see page 4.7-61). Section 4.6 found significant unavoidable impacts to conductivity, dissolved oxygen, and biostimulatory substances in the Russian River (see 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. Refer to Master Response 7, located in Section 6.2 of this document, regarding impacts to the tourist economy.

**PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT 264 - TOM YARISH, (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996),
RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996**

Response to Comment 264-371

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that a consultant has been retained to evaluate Volumes VI and VII of the Draft EIR/EIS that relate to geology.

The EIR/EIS authors assume that the comment refers to the evaluation by Dr. Kojan, as indicated later in the testimony. Refer to Responses to Comment Letter 110 for specific responses to each of Dr. Kojan's comments.

Response to Comment 264-372

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that a consultant has been retained to evaluate groundwater quality aspects of the Draft EIR/EIS, with specific reference to erosion and siltation problems.

The comment refers to the evaluation by Dr. Kojan, which was submitted as a written comment. Refer to Responses to Comments 110-3 and 110-6.

Response to Comment 264-373

Comment Summary: The comment cautions that irrigation and storage projects in the West County cannot be done without significant environmental consequences. The comment also criticizes use of the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE).

The Draft EIR/EIS identifies the significant unmitigable impacts associated with the West County Irrigation Alternative. Refer to Table 1-13, which starts on page 1-44. Refer to Response to Comment 109-4 for a discussion of the USLE, and why its use in the Draft EIR/EIS is appropriate.

Response to Comment 264-374

Comment Summary: The comment requests consideration of a joint wastewater disposal project (preferably the South County alternative) with the City of Petaluma, and requests that the City take a broader view of costs to include public interest issues.

Refer to Response to Comment 38-8 for a discussion of a joint project with Petaluma. The Draft EIR/EIS has provided an evaluation of net regional economic impacts. Refer to the discussion of net economic impact in Section 4.18, starting on page 4.18-46. Also refer to Master Response 2, located in Section 6.2 of this document, regarding Project selection.

Response to Comment 264-375

Comment Summary: The comment indicates support of the City of Santa Rosa's efforts in advancing the wastewater treatment process.

The City appreciates the comment's recognition of improvements in the disinfection process and measures to reduce copper levels in drinking water.

Response to Comment 264-376

Comment Summary: With respect to the West County Alternative, the comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS is inadequate in analyzing and addressing cost factors such as agricultural practices, management, environmental protection and mitigation. The comment also asserts that these costs would make any kind of West County irrigation prohibitive.

The commentor also submitted this comment in writing, and it is responded to in Response to Comment 132-29.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT 265 - STEPHANIE PAPPAS, (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996), RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996

Response to Comment 265-377

Comment Summary: The comment states that there is not a clear understanding of the terms “threshold of significance” and “mitigation strategies” and that these terms are euphemisms. In addition, the comment states that these terms will not negate the fact that the West County alternative will have substantial negative impacts on the people and towns of Bloomfield, Valley Ford, and Two Rock. Lastly, the comment provides the statement that the West County alternative will result in substantial negative impact.

The Draft EIR/EIS does not use the term “threshold of significance”, but has established significance criteria and determined points of significance. The terms “point of significance” and “mitigation strategies” are terms that are consistent with the standard terminology associated with CEQA and NEPA documents. In addition, the term “point of significance” is defined on page G-39 of the Draft EIR/EIS as a “measurable point at which a potential environmental impact becomes significant.” The use of the “point of significance” is further described on page 4.0-1. The use of this term is an important tool in the analysis of impacts that will be expected to occur as a result of the Project because it allows for a differentiation between changes in the environment that are generally regarded as not acceptable as opposed to acceptable. These criteria (i.e., points of significance) are subject to change if substantial justification for their change is provided during comment on the Draft EIR/EIS.

“Mitigation” is defined on page G-33 of the Draft EIR/EIS as “a change in the Project designed to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, or compensate for a significant impact.” Mitigation is a necessary part of the environmental process since any new project will result in a change in the environment (the definition of an impact). If a project is implemented, the choice therefore becomes accepting whatever level of change occurs with the Project or mitigating the Project's impacts such that the magnitude of the impacts is reduced as much as possible. CEQA and NEPA seek to ensure that the latter scenario occurs.

The Draft EIR/EIS has identified significant impacts associated with the West County alternative, and these are summarized in Table 1-13, which starts on page 1-44 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment 265-378

Comment Summary: The comment states that the West County alternative will have significant impacts on the esteros.

The comment is correct, and agrees with the conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impacts 6.5.3, 9.5.6 and 9.7.6 are significant after mitigation. Criteria for the Gulf of the

Farallones Marine Sanctuary were established to reflect the Sanctuary's position that any water quality change is significant.

Response to Comment 265-379

Comment Summary: The comment expresses concern about air quality impacts in West County.

Air quality impacts are described in Section 4.12 of the Draft EIR/EIS, with a summary of significant impacts in Table 4.12-12 on page 4.12-36. Construction of reservoirs in West County will cause significant short-term dust impacts, but there will be no significant long-term operational air quality impacts.

Response to Comment 265-380

Comment Summary: The comment expresses concern about noise impacts in West County.

Noise impacts are described in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR/EIS, with a summary of significant impacts in Table 4.13-23, starting on page 4.13-55. Both construction and operational noise impacts in West County are considered significant. Operation of pump stations will increase noise levels in West County, even with mitigation.

Response to Comment 265-381

Comment Summary: The comment expresses concern about quality of water in West County wells.

Impacts on wells are assessed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS, with a summary of significant impacts in Table 4.5-9 on page 4.5-57. There is a potential for significant impacts on West County wells associated with seepage from reclaimed water reservoirs. Mitigation for this impact is described in Measure 2.3.12: Provide Replacement Water Supply for Affected Wells on page 2-85. With mitigation this impact is considered less than significant.

Response to Comment 265-382

Comment Summary: The comment provides the statement that the residents of the west county do not want the City of Santa Rosa's reclaimed water and will fight the selection and implementation of the West County alternative.

Refer to Master Response 2, located in Section 6.2 of this document, regarding Project selection.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT 266 - LLOYD PATTERSON, (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996), RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996

Response to Comment 266-383

Comment Summary: This comment states that a glass of water from a wastewater plant would have in it di-ethylhexyl-phthalate, chlorobenzene, 1,4 dichlorobenzene, ethylbenzene, hexachlorobenzene, Lindane, methylchloride, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, PHA, tetrachloroethylene, PCE, toluene, 1,1,1-tetrachloroethane, trihalomethane, and nitrate and that it doesn't sound like good drinking water.

Reclaimed water has been analyzed for the presence of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons) and hexachlorobenzene, and these compounds have not been detected. The EIR/EIS authors assume "PHA" is supposed to be PAH which is the same as polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons. The other compounds cited in the comment have been detected in reclaimed water (assuming PHA was meant to be PAH and 1,1,1 tetrachloroethane was meant to be 1,1,1-trichloroethane). Data on organic constituents of reclaimed water are presented in Appendix 2 of Appendix H-2 (Reclaimed Water Quality) of the Draft EIR/EIS. The human health risks of organic chemicals in reclaimed water are evaluated in Appendix J-3 (Human Health Risks from Chemical and Biological Components of Reclaimed Water).

Response to Comment 266-384

Comment Summary: This comment states that a glass of water from a wastewater plant would have 44.4 milligrams of nitrate per liter (mg/L).

The average concentration of nitrate in Santa Rosa's reclaimed water is 16 mg/L or 18 mg/L when nitrifying. The health risks of nitrate in reclaimed water are evaluated in Appendix J-3 (Human Health Risks from Chemical and Biological Components of Reclaimed Water).

Response to Comment 266-385

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that the current quality of the treated wastewater being produced by the wastewater treatment plant is better than it has ever been. However, residents do not want it injected into the aquifer or discharged into the Russian River.

Aquifer injection is not part of the Project. The Draft EIR/EIS has evaluated discharge to the Russian River. 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 will not adversely affect human health via other potential exposure pathways" (see page 4.7-61). Section 4.6 found significant unavoidable impacts to conductivity, dissolved oxygen, and biostimulatory substances in the Russian River (see 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. Section 4.4 found that the Project will not increase flooding in the Russian River (see page 4.4-32), and contains mitigation that will avoid any contribution to cumulative flooding impacts (Mitigation Measure 2.5.10: Discharge Prohibition During Flood Stage, on page 2-137). Refer to Master Response 2, located in Section 6.2 of this document, regarding comments about Project selection.

Response to Comment 266-386

Comment Summary: The comment provides the statement that the City of Santa Rosa is growing beyond its means.

It is not within the scope of the Draft EIR/EIS to evaluate growth management for the members of the Subregional System. This is appropriately done in the General Plans for each member, and in the environmental documents assessing the impacts of those General Plans.

Response to Comment 266-387

Comment Summary: The comment advocates a phased project using small ponds.

Refer to Master Response 14 regarding phasing and small storage reservoirs. The Master Responses are located in Section 6.2 of this document.

Response to Comment 266-388

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that there are many different factions with different agendas when it comes to providing a solution to City of Santa Rosa's need to dispose of treated wastewater. The comment also states that these differences will only be resolved if good information is produced and made available to everyone, and everyone can come together to find a workable solution.

This is the process that the City of Santa Rosa has embarked upon in producing the Draft EIR/EIS. Since this comment does not address the adequacy or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS, no further response can be provided.

Response to Comment 266-389

Comment Summary: The comment expresses opposition to aquifer storage and recovery (ASR), asks about permits required for drilling wells and states that ASR is indirect discharge to the Russian River.

ASR was at one time considered as a possible component for the Long-Term Project, but is no longer under consideration. The ASR project being considered separately for the Third Street area is not proceeding at this time (December 1996). Appendix D-5 (Permitting Report), was prepared when ASR was still under consideration, and indicates

permits necessary for injection of reclaimed water include a UIC Group V Well Injection Permit from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Waste Discharge Requirements from the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board. These two permits will take six months to a year to obtain. The Sonoma County Well Drilling Permit takes one to two weeks to obtain.

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT 267 - VANESSA PATTERSON, (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996), RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996

Response to Comment 267-390

Comment Summary: The comment states that “40 ... buildings would be dumped into the River each day.”

The Project addresses the impacts of discharging reclaimed water. The volume of water that will be discharged may be equivalent to the volume of forty buildings, depending on the volume of the buildings. With a 20% design discharge to the river, the average daily discharge will be under 21 million gallons, which is equal to about 2.75 million cubic feet. This is equal to the size of one building that is 140 feet on each side.

Response to Comment 267-391

Comment Summary: With respect to river discharge, the comment asks when the population grows does the discharge increase from 20 percent now to 40 percent in five years. The comment also states that we need to think about the future and asks whether the Draft EIR/EIS has looked ahead in the next 10 years.

As stated in Section 1 of the Draft EIR/EIS (page 1-3), the Project is intended to provide for disposal of wastewater from the member communities of the Subregional System at buildout, which is expected to occur in approximately 2010. The 20 percent discharge rate will serve the population at buildout.

Response to Comment 267-392

Comment Summary: The comment asks what happens to sewage during a flood and asks if it enters people’s back yards.

Sewage will be fully treated prior to discharge, and discharge of reclaimed water during floods will not occur, as described in Mitigation Measure 2.5.10: Discharge Prohibition During Flood Stage, in Section 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS (page 2-137).

PUBLIC HEARING COMMENT 268 - MICHAEL BRIDGE, (SEPTEMBER 24, 1996), RECEIVED SEPTEMBER 24, 1996

Response to Comment 268-393

Comment Summary: This comment states that nature tells us what is right for the Russian River.

This comment does not provide any new information that suggests that the analysis provided in the Draft EIR/EIS is incomplete or inadequate. Therefore, no specific response can be provided.

