

TO: Santa Rosa City Council and BPU
 FROM: Len Swenson, 655 Doyle Park Drive, SR

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR---LONG TERM WASTEWATER PROJECT;
 DEFICIENCIES IN THE EIR REGARDING THE SOUTH COUNTY OPTION

1. For all the options there is no designation of the reduced environmental impacts from a gradual implementation of storage requirements. 001
2. Why weren't all the potential legal reuses of reclaimed water explored, such as use of grey water in homes, and injection underground at various locations (in addition to the West 3rd Street site)? 002
3. Have all the potential surface storage sites been explored---especially the use of smaller ponds? 003
4. Why was there no study of the beneficial effects (financial/environmental) from the growing of high-yield cash crops with the use of reclaimed water? The study only focussed on loss of low-productivity ag land as a result of construction of new reservoirs. 004
5. Why was there no study of the potential for use of certain reservoirs for recreational purposes? 005
6. Why hasn't a list of potential rancher-recipients of reclaimed water been prepared for the South County, as was done for the West County? 006
7. Why was there no study of the growth-inducing effects, and related environmental consequences, from implementation of various options? 007
8. Cost projections need to be made of various South County alternatives, including use of numerous smaller-scale options (such as more ground water injection, series of smaller ponds, slower population growth, and other variables), which are phased-in only as needed. 008
009
010
9. Why wasn't the option of a joint project with Petaluma studied? 011
10. The South Co. should be listed as the environmentally-superior option---not the use of the River (more environmental negatives than positives from that option). 012

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

SEP 24 1996

DEPARTMENT OF
 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

