

**CITY OF SANTA ROSA**  
P.O. Box 1678  
Santa Rosa, CA 95402

OCT 07 1996

**DEPARTMENT OF  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

City of Santa Rosa  
Environmental Impact Report  
Wastewater Treatment Options

With regard to my property at 3680 Pine Flat Road, Healdsburg CA.

First let me thank you for the 5 minutes I was allowed to speak on September 24, 1996. While I did in no way cover many of my concerns, I am glad that I was afforded the opportunity to vent some of my apprehension about this project. My speech was about how the project effected my property and how the use of "can be mitigated", the use of "can not be mitigated" and the use of "little or no impact" can be confused with something harmful, noisy and having enormous impact on an otherwise serene setting. | 001

I must also bring to your attention the fact that I did not receive a CD-ROM of the EIR. My property will be devastated by something which you control, and yet I am told that I can buy the CD for a nominal fee. Let me give the perspective I have on this... suppose I were to say to you "I am going to kick you in the teeth" to which you might reply, "Why?" My next comment would be "Pay me \$39.95 and I will tell you why and how I am going to kick you in the teeth". Do you see the absurdity of the situation? If you are going to impose something on me, is there no moral or ethical laws which bind you to at least not make me pay for it too? For this reason alone, I want to make a claim for the cost of the EIR CD-ROM from you right now. Send me the CD-ROM as soon as you can, free of charge. | 002

I did notice that the draft copy of the EIR, EIS stated that the time frame for the practical usefulness of what you are proposing is 14 years. I find this to be a wholly half-baked scheme, to devote so much time and energy to something with a "lifetime" of less than 15 years is preposterous. Has the saying "putting a Band-Aid on a broken aorta" come to mind? What kind of solution are you proposing, a quick fix or something which will have a long term visionary impact? | 003

It sounds like you have chosen the former, which in this case brings doubt on the veracity of the EIR. It might say, "We are putting forth a half baked scheme in order to get the federal government off our backs. It may have terrible effects on your property, your peace of mind and also your ability to farm and earn money with the property we are forcibly going to take from you". I did not see this anywhere in the report, but maybe the 8000 pages did not have room for such details. | 004

I found the EIR/EIS to be so disjointed that if one were to read the report without plugging in the words "some place" (or my place, for instance) you could easily say this project is not so bad after all. | But if you were to place some of the statements one after the other, the report might read like a Stephen King novel. I will give you some examples... On page 1-32 of the draft report, under GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY it states, | 005

"Although all of the alternatives are potentially subject to strong ground shaking in an earthquake, these impacts can be avoided by constructing facilities according to the requirements of the Division of Safety of dam and building codes, and impacts are, therefore, less than significant....The Geysers and urban irrigation pipelines cross an active fault." | 006

Then on page 1-33 under GROUNDWATER (chapter 4.5 of the EIR/EIS) it states,

"Geysers Recharge and Russian River Discharge alternatives will not affect quantity or quality of groundwater in drinking water wells"

Let us suppose that an actual earthquake occurred. Do you think the 36-42" pipe might rupture? Do you think it might rupture along the line? Do you think it might rupture at a pumping station, a place where it makes a 90 degree turn? Do you think the effluent might make it into MY drinking water well? 006 (cont.)

As you can see, the report does not take into account the possibilities of one thing leading to another, and these statements were page to page in the draft statement. I am not a professional report writer, but as a serious observer of what may be taking place, I must say, did these people actually think about the "What if" factor? I do not think they thought this through.

With all this in mind, let me begin to start comment on the report on a statement by statement basis as it affects me...Please think of my property as if it were your own, and think if you would want this abomination forced on you... 007

On Page 1-24 of the EIR/EIS summary, (chapter 3.5 In the draft: Description of components) 008  
 PIPELINES: Pipelines are required in Alternative 4 (Geysers Recharge) to transport reclaimed water from Delta Pond to the Geysers area, a lift of 3,300 feet. Pipelines would range from 42 to 48 inches in diameter.  
 Pipelines will be buried and will generally follow public rights of way.

Comment: Wrong. They will come above ground at a pumping station ON MY PROPERTY. In the event of an earthquake where does something usually break, at a joint or someplace else? Please refer to damage on S.F. BAY Bridge on 17 Oct. 1989. If such a break should occur what would happen to my drinking water well? Is it not apparent that the preparers of this EIR/EIS overlooked My Property when they conveniently overlooked the fact that the pipeline will be above ground at My House? 009

PUMP STATIONS: For alternative 4, the Geysers Recharge Alternative, a series of 4 HIGH PRESSURE PUMPING STATIONS WILL BE REQUIRED TO TRANSPORT THE WATER ABOUT 35 MILES FROM DELTA POND TO THE GEYSERS AREA NORTHEAST OF HEALDSBURG. 010

Comment: No MENTION about loss of PRIME AGRICULTURAL FARMLAND, no mention of NOISE, no mention of VISUAL POLLUTION, no mention of the loss of a 200 year old OAK, no mention of loss of SERENITY. Naturally, some of those concerns will be brought up later, somewhere where they have the effect of having "NO EFFECT" 011 012 013 014 015

Page 1-31 of the Summary EIR/EIS (Environmental Impacts and Mitigation, (Chapter 4 of Draft EIR/EIS) 016  
 LAND USE: "Alternative 4, Geysers Recharge, will require conversion of public open space for a pump station located along Pine Flat Road on property for which the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District hold conservation easements. This impact can be mitigated to a level below significance"

COMMENT: ALL INCORRECT... The pump station is to be located on MY PRIVATE PROPERTY, for which there are no easements, A PUMP STATION THERE CAN NOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL BELOW SIGNIFICANCE 017

THE PROPERTY WHICH IS BEING DISCUSSED IS PRIME AGRICULTURAL FARMLAND, I OWN IT AND I DO NOT WANT A PUMP STATION ON THIS PROPERTY, NOR DO I WANT A PIPELINE GOING ACROSS IT Who 018  
 made the statement that the impact can be mitigated to a level below significance? Let us imagine that someone decided to TAKE a tenth of your property, tell you they would put an ugly, noisy and potentially polluting building just outside

your window. DO YOU THINK IT COULD BE "MITIGATED TO A LEVEL BELOW SIGNIFICANCE"? Be honest, you would probably decide to get an attorney immediately. 018 (cont.)

AGRICULTURE, PAGES 1-31 AND 1-32 OF THE SUMMARY. (Chapter 4.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS) 019

"Construction of pump stations will result in LOSS OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL FARMLAND (emphasis mine) under alternatives 2, 3, and 4 (Geysers Recharge, My home in Alexander Valley). There is NO MITIGATION TO REDUCE IMPACTS FROM LOSS OF PRIME FARMLAND or cancellation of Williamson Act contracts to LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT"

COMMENT: The report is schizoid, on one page it says that the impact of a pump station can be reduced to a level below significance, yet on the very next page it says that there is no mitigation to a level less than significant. Let me put it another way, if a doctor were to tell you that elective surgery was not going to be of any pain you would probably opt for the surgery. But, if the next day he were to tell you that you will probably die from the surgery would you say "Let's do it"? Unless you are hard of hearing or a complete imbecile you would probably say, "Whoa, Doc!! Let's think about this awhile and not do something hasty". My point is that in one part of the report it says NO PROBLEM, yet within a page or two it says MAJOR PROBLEM. Again, it is my property, my house, which is being so recklessly mentioned. I do not want to belabor the point, but wouldn't this be akin to someone saying they would like to practice brain surgery on you and their first instrument is going to be a baseball bat? You would have serious reservations. 020

GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY, Page 1-32 of the Summary, (Chapter 4.3 of the Draft EIR/EIS) 021

"Although all of the alternatives are potentially subject to strong ground shaking in an earthquake, these impacts can be avoided by constructing facilities according to requirements of the Division of Safety of Dams and Building Codes, and impacts are, therefore, less than significant... Liquefaction is a concern for the Russian River outfall and four pump stations common to both the South County and West County Reclamation Alternatives, and the hazard can be mitigated to a level below significance. The Geysers and urban irrigation cross an active fault. As a result, the Discharge Alternative is the only option not subject to the SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH GROUND RUPTURE"

COMMENT: What the report is not saying may kill me. What about the pump station on my property? What might happen in the event of an earthquake? Is it not prudent to think that the possibility exists of the pipeline rupturing at the point of a pump station (ON MY PROPERTY, AT MY HOUSE) especially the last pump station before the water is sent UP 3,000 feet? Any engineer would tell you that that point is more than likely to be the weakest link in the whole project. Was there sampling of the soil (where the pump station is to be built) on the wettest days of the year? How recently was the soil analysis done for Alexander Valley? 1938? Did the analysis conclude that liquefaction could Not take place? Actually, the summary is telling me that the possibility is great that some sort of earthquake will befall the pipeline which goes across my property and beside my house. Conveniently, it forgot to mention that the pump station on my property could be extremely hazardous. 022

023

GROUNDWATER, page 1-33 of the summary EIR/EIS, (Chapter 4.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS) 024

"...Geysers Recharge and Russian River Discharge alternatives will not affect quantity or quality of groundwater in drinking water wells".

COMMENT: Imagine a large earthquake. Imagine one affecting a pipeline 48 inches in diameter, which makes a 90 degree turn, and then heads 12 miles uphill (approximately 3000 feet vertically). Where do you think the pipeline is most likely to break? In the middle or at a joint? Do you think the effluent would stay above ground, or would it seep into the water table? And if the water is so perfectly treated, why isn't it being discharged upstream of the intake for Santa Rosa's Drinking water? Again, let's use the surgery analogy. Suppose I were to convince you that the elective surgery on your brain was almost assuredly going to work. And I said that complications could arise (earthquake anyone?) but they could be mitigated to a level of less than significant. But just before we were going to anesthetize you I came into the room with very dirty hands (looking like a house plumber) and told you "Don't worry about my hands, I always do surgery without gloves and with dirty hands. They won't have any affect on the surgery". Would you let someone perform the surgery? Would you let someone tell you that a 48 inch pipeline which makes a 90 degree turn on your property, which carries millions of pounds of treated water across your property and pumps it (at your property) up 3,000 feet -- would you let them tell you that there is no possibility of it affecting your drinking water? If it was your house you would start looking for attorneys.

024 (cont.)

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY, page 1-35 of the summary EIR/EIS, (chapter 4.7 of the Draft EIR/EIS)

025

"Potential exposure to pathogenic organisms and to all chemicals except nitrate is less than significant for all alternatives."

COMMENT: If the treated water is of such innocuous quality why not discharge it just above the Santa Rosa drinking water intake? Surely the nitrate levels can be mitigated to a level of less than significant.

AIR QUALITY, page 1-38 and 1-39 of the summary, (chapter 4.12 of the draft EIR/EIS)

026

"Construction of the Geysers steamfield component will also cause short term emissions of nitrogen oxides exceeding threshold levels. Although mitigation will reduce emissions, the impact would still be significant."

COMMENT: Again, how does this affect my house? Will this "significant" pollution reach my house?

NOISE, page 1-39 of the summary, (chapter 4.13 of the draft EIR/EIS)

027

"... Pump stations associated with... the Geysers alternative will all have SIGNIFICANT LONG TERM OPERATIONAL IMPACTS. Although mitigation will reduce noise levels, the increase in noise levels in rural areas will still be perceptible, and will be an UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACT."

COMMENT: The report forgot to mention that my home in the country, where the serenity is only occasionally interrupted by a loud passing automobile, the noise level CAN NOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT. Instead they say the noise will be an unavoidable adverse impact. Again, your surgeon says that the elective surgery you are having will bring on a loud ringing noise in your ear. The noise will always be present and it will also affect anyone who comes to visit you and the wildlife on your property. How would you respond? Would you say "let's go for it doc!"?

VISUAL RESOURCES, page 1-39 of the summary, (chapter 4.14 of the draft EIR/EIS)

028

"Project impacts on visual resources were evaluated based upon the changes in views... from private residences up to 2,000 feet away. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WILL OCCUR ALONG PIPELINE ROUTES BECAUSE OF THE STRONG VISUAL CONTRAST RESULTING FROM THE DISTURBANCE OF THE LANDSCAPE EDGE FROM

028 (cont.)

GRADING AND REMOVAL OF VEGETATION.... THE PUMP STATIONS WILL ALSO HAVE POTENTIAL VISUAL IMPACTS DUE TO THEIR CONTRAST WITH SURROUNDING AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL ENVIRONMENTS. THESE IMPACTS WILL AFFECT BOTH PUBLIC VIEWPOINTS AND PRIVATE RESIDENCES.

MITIGATION REDUCES THE IMPACTS RELATED TO VISUAL CONTRAST. HOWEVER, THERE IS NO MITIGATION AVAILABLE FOR PERMANENT VIEW OBSTRUCTION OR DISPLACEMENT OF MATURE STANDS OF TREES."

COMMENT: Were you to be told that some ugly noisy and potentially sickening building were to be built in a spot near your home, destroying a 200 year old oak, costing you serenity, loss of prime agricultural farm land and devastating the resale value of your property would you support such a plan? You would probably start seeking help from the government - surely this can not be legal.

ENERGY, page 1-40 of the summary, (Chapter 4.17 of the draft EIR/EIS)

029

"The Geysers project will generate more energy than will be used for pumping."

COMMENT: Without the ability of calculating the actual energy cost of moving the water from it's original source, treating it and then pumping it 35 miles and up 3,000 feet I can not be sure of my feeling that the overall energy cost is overwhelmingly greater than the cited energy cost merely pumping it away. This is akin to saying the tax on a new car is not significant, unless of course you include the price of the new car, my point being that if you are going to start mentioning costs one must either include all costs or no costs. Otherwise the findings are skewed.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE, page 1-59 of the summary, (chapter 5.5 of the draft EIR/EIS)

030

"The reclamation alternatives and the Geysers Alternative have fewer water quality impacts on the Russian River. However, these alternatives require physical changes to the existing environment which cause SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS ON OTHER RESOURCES WITHIN SONOMA AND MARIN COUNTIES"

COMMENT: Let's think what if. What if there were a seismic event? What if it cause a rupture of the 48 inch pipeline near thy drinking water well? What about the agricultural farmland, the 200 year old Oak tree which will destroyed?

031 032

033 034

What if someone were to force a loud, ugly and potentially ruinous building to be located next to your home? Would you agree to it's construction?

035

In summary, the forcible inclusion of my property in this poor scheme to ameliorate problems which are the result of poor planning by the City of Santa Rosa constitutes reckless disregard for the rights of individuals living outside the area where the

036

problem is being promulgated. I have shown instance after instance where the so-called Environmental Impact Statement fails to accurately identify "significant problems" and tries to ameliorate them by glossing over them with 90's style buzzwords. By failing to include the problems (for each alternative) one after the other, it gives the false sense that they can individually be overcome. If one were to list the problems one after another, citing the specific place affected - as I have here - the long term, deeply destructive, wholly unsuitable option would be apparent. The City of Santa Rosa

037

038

should not be allowed to chose Alternative 4, the Geysers Recharge Alternative, because it is wasteful, destructive and unsafe.

038 (cont.)

I hereby make Claim against the City of Santa Rosa for the following sums of money, in the event that the Geysers Alternative is chosen and that a pumping station and/or pipeline is put on my property:

039

- A) The higher cost of either prime commercial property in Santa Rosa or prime agricultural vineyard property of Sonoma County for an area twice that of which will be encroached upon. The property would either be located in Old Courthouse Square (downtown Santa Rosa), or that vineyard which commands the highest prices for it's grapes (as tabulated by the Sonoma County Grape Growers Association).
- B) The sum of what that same property mentioned in A) above would bring in rents, leases of the commercial property or profits from premium grapes (average 20 tons per acre) for the next 50 (fifty) years, including inflation and cost of living increases.
- C) A fee of \$.02 per 5 gallons of effluent which flows through any pipeline, pump or building erected on my property.
- D) A 5% fee on any moneys the City of Santa Rosa realizes from the sale of the treated water to the energy companies which will use the water to recharge their wells.
- E) The cost of constructing a 500 foot well, with 50 gallon per minute recharge capability, to be located on my property, and a guarantee to supply enough clean drinking water to irrigate a vineyard of 22 acres.
- F) The planting of 100 trees, 100 shrubs/bushes, 2000 flowers of my choice in order to reduce noise and visual impact of any construction of either pipeline, building or pumpstation.

While all of these requirements must be met for me to allow you the possibility of constructing the pump station/pipeline on my property, and while my "legalese" may not be sufficient to carry proper weight in a court of law, I will assume that you agree to all terms set out above unless I receive a written statement, by certified mail, saying otherwise within 10 days of receipt of this letter. This is binding and not negotiable. Do not allow for weekends or holidays.

I remain fully opposed to the Geysers Recharge alternative. It is with wanton disregard of personal property that The City of Santa Rosa has proposed putting the pumping station and pipeline on my property. If you would like to have your own backyard destroyed, your property devalued, your peace and quiet forever gone then you might opt for something like this. If you would not like to have this done to you, then PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE, DO NOT IMPOSE A PUMPING STATION ON ME !!!!! I love the property I own, it has been in my family for over 75 years. I am certain that my grandparents would be as vehemently opposed to this land grab as I am. Do the right thing, eliminate the Geysers Recharge Alternative as an option.

040

Thank you for your patience and good luck to everyone on this sensitive subject.

Sincerely,

*Benjamin R. Marchand*  
Benjamin R. Marchand

*new for address*

3680 Pine Flat Road  
Healdsburg CA 95448

