

PUBLIC COMMENTOR 246 - BRENDA ADELMAN, SEPTEMBER 24, 1996

259

Brenda Adelman. I'm here for 2,000 supporters of Russian River Watershed Protection Committee and also the Russian River Alliance. I'd like to tell everyone here that seven people put up cards saying that I could use their time, and this was denied by this board. They're only going to allow me five minutes to speak about 8,000 pages of complicated and technical data, and I think that this is a gross problem that is going to keep us from -- that will keep me from adequately giving you my comments at this time.

I want to say the analysis of this document is analogous to a blind man's description of the elephant. None of them could see the whole animal. Many different minds are providing many different pieces, and none of it fuses into an homogeneous whole. The organizational focus on impacts rather than on project descriptions provides a disjointed and difficult format. We question whether decision makers will be able to provide an adequate basis for their decision because of this document's convoluted presentation.

260

One of our greatest concerns is that most of the information in this document was developed by computer. We wonder whether the authors of this study have ever even seen the Russian River. There's a remoteness from reality that leads to questions of validity.

261

There are no impact studies on the tourist industry or health of people of the lower Russian River. We are concerned there are no connections made between high rates of breast cancer, a birth rate that is lower than state and national levels -- and this is for Sonoma County -- increasing rates of salmonellosis, and higher rates of giardiasis over the period 1988 to 1990. And next month newer statistics will be available. Prostate cancer led for men and breast cancer for women. Colorectal cancer showed the higher rate for Sonoma County than California as a whole, and the most astounding statistic is that in Sonoma County there were 212.6 deaths per 100,000 people from 1988 to 1990 from all malignant tumors as opposed to 166 per 100,000 California wide for the same period. Why is this happening?

262

263

There's a lack of differentiation of the various risks and impacts between the 5 percent, 10 percent, 15 percent and 20 percent plans for two different discharge points in most analysis.

264

The reliance on regulatory standards eliminates discussion of issues outside the regulatory framework. For instance, City officials refuse to study possible estrogenic effects in pond fish for \$33,000. In many places in the document, reference is made to the maximum one percent or five percent discharge allowed by the regional board.

265

266

Well, let me tell you, folks, 10 percent means 20 percent, 5 percent means 10 percent. The way the discharge is calculated, it ends up being way more than is being told to you in these documents. Nutrients and increased wastewater discharges are likely to raise water temperatures. This will foster increase of warm water predator species which adversely affect steelhead and salmon.

267

In light of the proposed endangered listings of the steelhead, how will this situation be remedied if you have higher discharges into the river? Risk assessment is based on the probability of dose exposure effects.

268

Assessment does not address current concerns about synergistic effects about minute amounts of toxic chemicals. It also does not address cumulative effects of the synergy.

New studies are showing, for instance, that a mixture of two weakly estrogenic chemicals can be far more potent than the individual compounds. And this means numbers so minute that they are called nondetect in your reports. According to Dr. Marion Moses, vulnerable populations are not studied in reference to prudent exposures.

Exposures to the embryo, developing fetus, infants and children at critical periods of growth and development can have profound complications at doses which are toxicologically insignificant in an adult.

The analysis of toxics in the wastewater downplays several problems, and it provides inadequate sampling in others.

Cryptosporidium parasites are an express concern of City consultants, as well as federal regulators, yet only four samples are provided of that pathogen. The most recent issue of the American Waterworks Association Journal, a very conservative organization, devotes their whole issue to cryptosporidium, and I've copied out a few articles .

269

There have been outbreaks of this. It gets through the filtration process. Chlorine doesn't kill it. And it -- filtered water has still been subject to exposures. According to toxicologist and health professional Mark Lepe, (phonetic) Santa Rosa's lead levels are bordering on the very high side Silver, cyanide, dissolved silver, and zinc are very high , indicating possible contamination from electroplating, electronics, and photo finishing industries

270

271

I'm almost done. The regional plant does receive influent from many such industries. He expresses concern about asbestos which is too high for which only four samples was taken. In light of the asbestos-contaminated sewer pipes that were recently illegally disposed of by City contractors, this is a very serious issue.

272

The phthalates are seen in estrogens and carcinogens that show up in the wastewater in about 20 percent of the samples taken, needs to be monitored much more closely.

273

Mayor Wright:

You'll have to conclude your remarks.

BRENDA ADELMAN:

I have two more sentences, please.

Mayor Wright:

Okay.

BRENDA ADELMAN:

While heptachlor showed up only once, this is a very serious event, since this chemical's a known carcinogen and banned years ago. Rindane showed up almost half the time, should be much more closely monitored. Nitrates are too high for human health concerns, and blue baby syndrome possibilities provide serious risk. This is the tip of the iceberg. I've only begun this process.

274

275

276

Mayor Wright:

Thank you, Brenda.

BRENDA ADELMAN:

And there will be a lot more turned in to you by October 7th. I sure hope you'll take the time to read it. Thank you.

Mayor Wright:

Thank you. Lou Ann Johnson. Is Lou Ann Johnson Here? Okay, Linda Curry.