

## **COMMENT LETTER 91 - BURKE'S CANOE TRIPS, INC., LINDA BURKE (OCTOBER 7, 1996), RECEIVED OCTOBER 7, 1996**

### **Response to Comment 91-1**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that the owners and operators of Burke's Canoe Trips feel that the Draft EIR/EIS is inadequate in many areas.*

Specific concerns were expressed in subsequent comments and these comments are addressed specifically in the Responses to Comments below.

### **Response to Comment 91-2**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that the EIR does not adequately address health issues.*

An extensive evaluation of public health and is provided in Section 4.7, Public Health and Safety, with supporting information in Appendices J-2 and J-3 of the Draft EIR/EIS. 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). Because the comment does not point out any specific concerns, a more detailed response is not possible.

### **Response to Comment 91-3**

*Comment Summary: The comment states the opinion that the Draft EIR/EIS does not adequately address issues of public perception in relation to discharge to the Russian River.*

Public perception is discussed on page 4.18-45. Refer also to Master Response 7, located in Section 6.2 of this document.

### **Response to Comment 91-4**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that there would be a loss of business if discharge to the Russian River was to be increased.*

The analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS does not support this conclusion. Refer to Master Response 7, located in Section 6.2 of this document, regarding impacts on tourism.

### **Response to Comment 91-5**

*Comment Summary: The comment asks if the City of Santa Rosa is prepared to compensate businesses for lost revenue in the event of an increase of discharge to 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 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. The Surface Water Hydrology Section found that 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 (Measure 2.5.10, Discharge Prohibition During Flood Stage on page 2-137). There is thus no causal relationship between Project impacts and potential decreases in revenue to justify compensation.

### **Response to Comment 91-6**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that the commentor is prepared to use any means to fight added increase in discharge to the Russian River.*

This comment is an opinion regarding Project selection; refer to Master Response 2, located in Section 6.2 in this document.