

COMMENT LETTER 88 - BARBARA BARRETT, ATTORNEY AT LAW (OCTOBER 4, 1996), RECEIVED OCTOBER 7, 1996

Response to Comment 88-1

Comment Summary: The comment states that West County citizens requested a review of their legal option in relation to Sonoma County's proposed use of the Draft EIR/EIS findings to implement its 20 percent wastewater plan.

The Subregional Long-Term Wastewater Project Draft EIR/EIS is a document of the City of Santa Rosa and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, not Sonoma County as is specified in the comment. Additionally, the Project examines a range of alternatives and components which are described on pages 3.1-21 through 3.1-27 and 3.3-1 through 3.3-43 of the Draft EIR/EIS. One of the alternatives is discharge to the Russian River (Alternative 5A), which is defined as up to 20 percent design discharge into the River. It is assumed that the term "20 percent wastewater plan" used in the comment refers to Alternative 5B

Response to Comment 88-2

Comment Summary: The comment states that the EIR fails to address the impact on West County tourism.

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

Response to Comment 88-3

Comment Summary: The comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS fails to evaluate increased flooding potential associated with 20 percent discharge.

Evaluation of potential flooding impacts is presented on pages 4.4-31 through 4.4-33 of the Draft EIR/EIS. The Project will not have significant flooding impacts. However, the Project plus other cumulative projects has the potential to create significant flooding impacts (refer to pages 4.4-34 and 4.4-35 of the Draft EIR/EIS), so Mitigation Measure 2.5.10: Discharge Prohibition During Flood Stage, is proposed. This measure, as described on page 2-137 of the Draft EIR/EIS, will avoid significant impacts.

Response to Comment 88-4

Comment Summary: The comment asserts that the Draft EIR/EIS fails to address the impact which the project will have on business and real estate values in Sonoma County.

Section 4.18 of the Draft EIR/EIS (pages 4.18-46 through 4.18-51) addresses the impact on income and employment for Sonoma County for each of the alternatives. Section 4.18

also addresses the effect of the Project on real estate values (pages 4.18-36 and 4.18-37 of the Draft EIR/EIS).

Response to Comment 88-5

Comment Summary: The comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS does not consider the hidden costs of long-term litigation and relocation benefits to West County citizens under California or federal relocation laws.

The Project cost estimates contained in Appendix D-30 (Alternative Projects Construction Cost Estimate) of the Draft EIR/EIS include a 25 percent contingency to cover the costs of unknown Project costs, one of which is relocation and replacement costs. For the West County alternatives, this contingency ranges between \$37.5 million and \$43.6 million. Any consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS of future litigation would be premature and speculative.

Response to Comment 88-6

Comment Summary: The comment states that at a meeting of the Monte Rio, Forestville, and Russian River Chambers of Commerce, the residents from Forestville to Jenner voiced outrage at the inadequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS.

The comment states an opinion concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR/EIS. No additional data or analysis, however, is provided to suggest why or where the document is inadequate. Therefore, a specific response cannot be provided.

Response to Comment 88-7

Comment Summary: The comment states that resort owners deny the polling of them purported in the EIR.

Refer to Master Response 7, located in Section 6.2 of this document, regarding impacts to the tourist economy concerning those interviewed for the survey.

Response to Comment 88-8

Comment Summary: The comment urges Sonoma County to rethink its proposed plan and to find a less destructive solution to Santa Rosa's wastewater dilemma. It states that the concerned citizens of West County will attempt to restrain the County from pushing forward with the project in West County and/or be justly compensated.

The Subregional Long-Term Wastewater Project Draft EIR/EIS is a document of the City of Santa Rosa and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, not Sonoma County as is specified in the comment. The Draft EIR/EIS has evaluated discharge to the Russian River, and has not found that discharge will destroy the 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 would 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.

Response to Comment 88-9

Comment Summary: This comment consists of a duplicate copy of Comment Letter 88.

All comments in this duplicate letter have been addressed in Responses to Comments 88-1 through 88-8. No further response is necessary.

