

**COMMENT LETTER 94 - MADRONE AUDUBON SOCIETY, INC., LINDA CURRY
(OCTOBER 6, 1996), RECEIVED OCTOBER 7, 1996**

Response to Comment 94-1

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that the Draft EIR/EIS is flawed and probably invalid because it has not been presented in a user friendly way. The comment further implies that the document was "compiled in a deliberately long winded, involved and obfuscatory style" to discourage public participation in the review process.

Refer to Master Response 1, located in Section 6.2 of this document, for a discussion of the Draft EIR/EIS organization.

Response to Comment 94-2

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that the Draft EIR/EIS does not adequately address what the long term uses for the reclaimed water will be and how such uses will be achieved.

The Draft EIR/EIS has evaluated alternatives for the long-term use of reclaimed water and how those uses will be achieved. As indicated on Page 1-5 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the intent is to serve as a joint review document meeting the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Accordingly, the purpose of the document is to assess all reasonable alternatives, provide a full discussion of significant impacts of the alternatives, and inform decision makers and the public of Project alternatives that could avoid or minimize adverse impacts or actually enhance environmental quality. Specific comments are addressed below.

Response to Comment 94-3

Comment Summary: This comment states that no clear sampling plan is evident in the presentation of the data and sampling data do not always state date and method of analysis.

This comment does not state which data are being referred to so it is assumed that the comment refers to reclaimed water quality data and/or receiving water quality data. No "clear sampling plan" is evident because data were collected for a variety of purposes pursuant to many plans. An attempt was made to present all available data and, in the case of the receiving waters, these data were collected by different groups (for example, the Regional Water Quality Control Board and Sonoma County Water Authority). The dates for all data are given in the appendices of each report (see Appendices H-2, H-3, I-4, I-5, and I-8 of the Draft EIR/EIS). The method of analysis is not included because all analyses were conducted by certified laboratories using EPA approved methodology.

Response to Comment 94-4

Comment Summary: The comment states that the evaluation of the impacts of other wastewater discharges to the River is “not adequate,” and that the potential for “synergistic degradation of the total river system water quality” should be analyzed.

The impact of other wastewater discharges to the River is evaluated on two levels in the Draft EIR/EIS. First, existing discharges combine with other factors to create the existing condition upon which the evaluation of Santa Rosa’s discharge impacts is based. Second, impacts from the future growth of each River discharger and Santa Rosa’s Project alternatives are evaluated relative to existing conditions in the cumulative impacts analysis. The comment does not specify in what way either of these evaluations is inadequate.

Response to Comment 94-5

Comment Summary: The comment states that impacts to area tourism are minimized or overlooked. The comment states that there seems to be no analysis of the tourist customer profile that quantifies the impacts when tourists prefer not to use the river for recreation due to health concerns or aesthetic preference.

Impacts on tourism are discussed in Section 4.18, Socio-economics, starting on page 4.18-44 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Refer also to Master Response 7, located in Section 6.2 of this document, regarding impacts to the tourist economy.

Response to Comment 94-6

Comment Summary: The comment indicates that the scope of the Project considered in the Draft EIR/EIS should extend beyond 2010.

On page 1-3 of the Draft EIR/EIS it is noted that the Project considered is intended to provide for reliable disposal of the existing and the projected reclaimed water flows expected through buildout of the General Plans (effective as of April 1994) for each of the subregional members. Although the 2010 is noted as the approximate year in which the buildout is expected, the capacity of the Project considered in the Draft EIR/EIS is based on estimated buildout flows, irrespective of when buildout occurs.

Response to Comment 94-7

Comment Summary: The comment requests consideration of a phased project with small reservoirs.

Refer to Master Response 14, located in Section 6.2 of this document.

Response to Comment 94-8

Comment Summary: The comment states that it is not sufficient to present a brief summary of the studies in a coherent format, that a well organized presentation of the data on which the Summary is based is required. "That we do not have!"

Refer to Master Response 1, Document Organization, located in Section 6.2 of this document.

