

**PUBLIC COMMENTOR 256 - HOLLY GUSTAFSON, SEPTEMBER 24, 1996**

330

My name is Holly Gustafson. I live at 5960 Van Keppel Road in Forestville. And I too would like to repeat how very very large the project is the way it's written. Some of that can't be avoided, I know, but there is no index, to my knowledge. I had difficulty finding the subjects that I wanted to find. There are listings of references in many of the sections, but there are no footnotes to those references when statements are made, such as that a certain chemical doesn't hurt cows when they eat grass that has been fed sludge. So you can't ever track anything and know that you've really found something. So the scientific validity here is in question, as far as I'm concerned.

331

I want to talk about a few things I tried to think of that I didn't think others would talk so much about, but that stuck out at me in thinking about this whole project. All of them are mentioned in it except one, and they all need to be further researched and implemented, or at least suggested for implementation in the project before it goes any further, in the EIR.

332

First one is growth, the ramifications for growth. I don't want to argue what causes what. Sewer capacity goes along with growth, period. Growth -- hey, guys -- I got to use this time here -- growth is the biggest issue for Sonoma County residents, and all of you up there should be real concerned with that. The project does admit to being associated with growth, and in fact over the life of the project, which is some 13 years plus, until 2010, they expect to have 25,900 houses come along in association with this project.

What they don't say, though, is the nature of the infrastructure of this project, and that you are actually approving a project that can extend way beyond 2010. It's the nature of the components in this project, were they to approve them. Discharge to the river -- which is winter disposal, the cheap problem in wastewater disposal. Irrigation can be expanded. And lord help us if they push some of it under ground. All those things are expandable. So 25,000 may be only the beginning. There's no cap in this -- there's no capacity limit in this project.

333

Number 2, sludge. I could find very little, but it is mentioned in there, and it is a major problem. As far as I know today, we just put it on fields and either plow it in or just let it sit there, I'm not sure what. It looks deceptively like manure, so you may be seeing it -- I think I've seen it along occidental road. But I'm not sure, and I'm not going to go find out. It is a toxic waste. The last -- the last part of the process of trying to get solids out of wastewater, and you have to do something with it if you create it. There are systems that do not create sludge, or not very much sludge. The St. Helena plant has one very good digester, a model for us to follow, and we have not looked into that carefully enough in this EIR. They have not had to clean out their sludge for something over 20 years. Okay, so there is an alternative, guys. We don't have to move everything through so fast.

334

Let's see here -- conservation, I couldn't find much about, but I talked to Andy Hauge when I walked in here and he said there is something in there about encouraging people to use low flush toilets and so on. But there are basically two quandaries that I want to

335

mention that may or may not be discussed in the EIR -- and one of them is -- that if you -- whoever you might be -- are selling water for money, and charging for wastewater treatment, you might be disinclined to encourage people to use less, or produce less.

Wastewater treatment needs to remain a public service, not a money-making machine. We need to be careful that the people who are wanting this water for agriculture aren't driving us to not conserve. The whole process may be driving us to use more and more of the precious water under our ground and turn them into wastewater. The real resource in wastewater is the water before you put the waste in it.

I also think that we need to look at further purification of our water. I'm not sure this is in the EIR. I couldn't find it at all. We're at tertiary, which means third level. We don't want anything to do with first or second. We're all in agreement on something here. But why not go to fourth level? I tried to think of some sort of a name, a cute name with quad in it, but I couldn't. So you can figure that one out. But there are things left in this wastewater, period. There are things left in it. We need to discuss what those things are, and what -- what we want to do about those, and we could be a leader -- a model in that. Let's lead in something here.

336

Let's see -- irrigation and -- this may seem small to you but it's not to me. Irrigation, and under the drip lines of valley oak trees. It's happening all the time now. It should a part of this EIR. It's an environmental impact. No water that is dispensed from the wastewater plant should ever be given to anyone who waters under the drip line of valley oak trees.

337

Thank you for listening.

**Mayor Wright:**

Thanks, Holly. Lynette Mclean is next. Then we're going to take a five-minute break.

We have a court reporter that is needing a break. He's been going for an hour and 15 minutes. He has to rest his hands for a minute. So, after Lynette, we'll take a five-minute break. Go ahead, Lynette.