

**PUBLIC COMMENTOR 224 - LEN SWENSON, SEPTEMBER 24, 1996**

155

Yeah, Len Swenson, 655 Doyle Park Drive. Most of the points that I was going to make have already been referred to, so I'm going to skip over them very quickly. My concerns are with the -- the South County alternative, some of the deficiencies in the EIR in relation to it. First of all, there's -- all the options, there's no designation of the reduced environmental impacts from a gradual implementation of storage requirements. Sort of an all or nothing approach in the EIR, which is unfortunate. Why aren't all of the potential legal reuses of reclaimed water explored? There are many options that have not been considered in the EIR. Have all the potential surface storage sites been explored? This has been referred to by many of the other speakers, and there are a lot of smaller sites that could be used.

156

157

Why was there no study of the beneficial effects from the -- both environmentally and financially from the growing of high yield cash crops with the use of reclaimed water? Many types of options are available, especially in the South County, for other types of agricultural uses. The only real focus in the EIR was the loss of some of the agricultural lands that might be used -- better used currently for dairy farming, but there are many more productive uses that could be made of that -- of that land. Also, why was there no study of the potential for use of certain reservoirs for recreational purposes? This is completely overlooked in the EIR. And why hasn't there been a list of potential ranchers that are interested in the use of reclaimed water that should have been prepared for the South County, the same was done for the West County ?

158

159

160

There was a long list of farmers that said they wanted to use the water in the West County and others that didn't want to use it, but nothing was done similar to that in the South County. And why was there no study of the growth inducing effects and related environmental consequences from the implementation of all of these different options? The -- whatever's going to happen in terms of growth in the county was completely overlooked. Cost projections need to be made for this mode with many different alternatives in the South County. It shouldn't be just an all or one -- or nothing approach. And that's -- that's unfortunate, because there are many smaller scale options such as more ground water injection, or a series of smaller ponds or slower population growth. Many other variables that could be studied. Why hasn't the option of a joint project with Petaluma been studied? This has already been referred to by Mr. Kortum. I think that's a major other site. So that the South County should be listed as the environmentally superior option, not the use of the river, as is pointed out in the document, and there are more negatives than positives from the use of the river as the main option.

161

162

163

164

**Mayor Wright :**

Leon Beck, followed by Martin Coopender, followed by Natasha Pehrson.