



Subregional Long-Term Wastewater Project

FINAL SCOPING REPORT VOLUME III

August 7, 1995

HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW & ASSOCIATES, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME III

12 SCOPING MEETING TRANSCRIPTS

13 WRITTEN COMMENT LETTERS

12 SCOPING MEETING TRANSCRIPTS

PAGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

1 SANTA ROSA SUBREGIONAL LONG-TERM WASTEWATER PROJECT

2
3 —oOo—4 Subject: Santa Rosa/Subregional
5 Long-Term Wastewater
6 Project, Scoping Session. }7
8 —oOo—9
10
11 HELD AT:
12 Steele Lane Community Center
13 416 Steele Lane
14 Santa Rosa, California

15 Thursday, November 17, 1994

16 3:00 p.m. - First Session

17 7:00 p.m. - Second Session

18 Reported by:

19 CINDY L. CARMICHAEL,
20 CSR #267

21 OUTLINE OF SCOPING SESSION

22 —oOo—

23 First Scoping Session - page 3

24 Welcome and Introductions by Ed Brauner - page 3

25 Presentation by Marie Meredith - page 6

26 Presentation by Anders Hauge - page 7

27 Instructions by Jim Marks - page 10

28 Input from public - page 17

29 End of First Scoping Session - page 73

30 Second Scoping Session - page 74

31 Welcome and Introduction by Ed Brauner - (not reported)

32 Presentation by Marie Meredith - (not reported)

33 Presentation by Anders Hauge - (not reported)

34 Input from public - page 74

35 End of Second Scoping Session - page 177

36
37 —oOo—

38 THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1994, 3:00 P.M.

39 SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA

40 —oOo—

41 MR. BRAUNER: Good afternoon. I would like to

42 welcome everyone here. My name is Ed Brauner. I'm the
43 Assistant City Manager for the City of Santa Rosa, and I
44 would like to welcome you all here this afternoon.45 I would also like to introduce a few people
46 for those of you who don't know them who are a part of
47 this process. First of all, in the back of the room
48 Ting Gugliana is the chairman of the Board of Public
49 Utilities. He'll be here to also hear your comments for
50 solutions. He'll be able to stay this afternoon. The
51 people at the front table that you'll be speaking to this
52 afternoon and who are important to hear your comments are,
53 from our consultant team, Andy Hauge of Barland
54 Bartholomew & Associates, who is the project manager for
55 the EIR, and his co-project manager, Dr. Robin Cort from
56 Engineering Science. They're tasked with the
57 responsibility for preparing the EIR and conducting the
58 study program. Wade Eakel from the Army Corps of
59 Engineers is here to hear input on behalf of the Corps of23 Engineers who will be the lead agency on the Environmental
24 Impact Statement for the purpose of the federal
25 government. In the center of the table is Marie Meredith,1 Project Manager for the City of Santa Rosa from the
2 Community Development Department who is responsible for
3 seeing that the EIR is prepared. Also, we have Urban
4 Alternatives, Jim Marks, who will be helping to facilitate
5 the discussion this afternoon. Also, Cary Robbins from
6 Urban Alternatives, and Mark Millan from Ponsetti &
7 Partners who will be assisting us as well. Pat Fruht
8 from the City Manager's Office is here to give any
9 assistance that she can, if you need any logistical
10 assistance.

11 And I believe that just about covers it.

12 Anything I missed? Anyone I've missed.

13 Okay. First of all, I would like to go over
14 the agenda for this afternoon. We're going to make a
15 presentation to you that's going to take as short a period
16 of time as possible because we do want to devote this time
17 today to your talking, not to us talking. We want to go
18 through the CEQA and NEPA process for the purpose of the
19 scoping that Marie Meredith will be doing. Andy Hauge
20 will be going through the scope of work and the schedule
21 for the program that's being proposed that you're here to
22 comment on today. Also, we have Jim Marks who will then
23 take over to assist with the input from all of you.24 One thing that I would like to mention, we
25 have copies of the Preliminary Scoping Report, if you1 haven't received them on the table, the blue book. There
2 also should be a Summary Screening Report that summarizes
3 that. Although the Summary Report is fairly long, too,
4 it's a little less reading than the full report. We have
5 mailed these reports to many people, and some of you on
6 our mailing list did not receive the report prior to this
7 meeting, so you may not have had a chance to read through
8 it. If you haven't, be assured that today is not your
9 last opportunity to have input. We'll be taking written
10 comments on this scope of work up until the 5th of
11 December. So any comments that you have that you would
12 like to put in writing to us, feel free to do that. We
13 encourage that. So for those of you who didn't receive
14 that Summary Report earlier, our apologies for that. But
15 hopefully that won't impede your ability to participate.16 Anything else that we need to cover before we
17 get started? Oh, yes. We have speaker cards. We would
18 like to have you -- if you would like to speak, we have
19 speaker cards, the little blue cards, up on the table.
20 Please fill those out so we can have a record of who is
21 speaking this afternoon. There also are sheets that can
22 be used for you to give comment, if you would like to use
23 those. You don't have to. You can use whatever format
24 you would like, but those you can take back with you and
25 fold them over and mail them back to us. The postage is

1 paid by the City, so you don't have to incur that.

2 I think that just about covers it. With that,
3 I'll turn it over to Marie.4 MS. MEREDITH: Good afternoon. The
5 Environmental Impact Report/Impact Statement, also called
6 EIR/EIS, will be a joint federal and state document. The
7 purpose is to provide a reasonable range of alternatives
8 for projects called "alternatives". It will describe
9 their potential effects, called "impacts". It will
10 describe what will be done to lessen or eliminate adverse
11 impacts, called mitigations. It will describe what
12 adverse impacts cannot be mitigated.13 The EIR/EIS will be used by decision makers to
14 make an informed decision and choice for their selection
15 of the project. It will also be used by the public in
16 reaching their own conclusions and providing input to the
17 decision makers.18 The City of Santa Rosa is responsible for
19 production of the EIR under the California Environmental
20 Quality Act. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is
21 responsible for production of the EIS under the National

PAGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

2 Environmental Policy Act. This is going to be a joint
3 document which will be prepared by Harland Bartholomew &
4 Associates.

5 The purpose of the Scoping Process will be to

6

1 define the scope of the EIR/EIS, what is to be studied
2 and how it will be studied. It will provide an
3 opportunity for agency and public input. This meeting
4 will satisfy legal requirements for public consultation.
5 At this time, I would like to introduce Anders
6 Hauge with Harland Bartholomew who will be going over the
7 scope of work and schedule.

8 MR. HAUGE: Good afternoon. I think, as we've
9 mentioned, you should have the Preliminary Scoping Report
0 which has in that the scope of work that is being proposed
1 to prepare the EIR/EIS. This tentative schedule is going
2 to take us into 1998. The construction will take us into
3 the year 2001 of whatever project is selected. The
4 process involves scoping, which we've been involved with
5 since July of 1993 and which will conclude on December the
6 7th.

7 The Federal Register did not publish the
8 Notice of Intent until November 7th. There's a 30-day
9 period over that, so we're extending both the CEQA and
0 NEPA date of comment from December 5th. It now has been
1 moved to Wednesday December 7th. So all comments will
2 be received through that date.

3 We're also presently involved in a number of
4 special studies for your information. Preliminary results
5 on some of those studies were released to the Board of

7

1 Public Utilities today. Those are available from Marie
2 Meredith at the Community Development Department in Santa
3 Rosa. Those studies dealt with amphibian wetlands, data
4 base regarding habitat types, and also on botanical
5 surveys that have been conducted on the reservoir sites
6 through this date.

7 Upon completion of the special studies and
8 upon authorization of the Board of Public Utilities and
9 City Council, we'll move forward with the preparation of
0 the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact
1 Statement, which will be unusual in this process.
2 Normally you will not see any documentation until the
3 draft is published. In this process, you'll be seeing an
4 administrative draft section of the EIR/EIS, and we'll be
5 holding workshops on those. From the comments that we
6 receive from you on the administrative draft, we will then
7 take that document back and we will prepare a draft EIR
8 and that will circulate for 60 days pursuant to California
9 and Federal regulation.

0 At the completion of the circulation, we'll
1 respond to all comments and we will prepare the final
2 EIR/EIS. That is a document that the City Council will
3 utilize in determining if all the impacts had been
4 identified to a fair level. And at that point in time,
5 the document will be certified.

8

1 What we want to make clear is that the
2 EIR/EIS is a document to disclose impacts only. After
3 the certification has occurred of the EIR, the City will
4 then go into the process of actually selecting the project
5 that will be finally selected and implemented to resolve
6 the wastewater issues that we're evaluating.

7 At this time there are six alternatives that
8 are being evaluated and being proposed to be evaluated.
9 One is "no project", which is the existing conditions of
0 the system. This basically is a one percent discharge
1 with five percent discharges during unusual seasons.

2 There's a South County Reclamation Project
3 that includes the reservoirs in the South County, along
4 with agricultural irrigation in the South County
5 alternative.

6 There's a community separator plan involving
7 wetlands creation around Santa Rosa. It also involves
8 storage of water in the aquifer through injection of water
9 into the aquifer and then removing it during the
0 summertime by pumping. It also includes a South County

21 component of a reservoir and also ags project.

22 The West County Reclamation Project is
23 similar to the South County in that it includes a
24 reservoir and the agricultural irrigation in the West
25 County.

9

1 We also have an alternative that takes the
2 water up to the Geysers and injects the water into the
3 subsurface through 16 injection wells in the Geysers to
4 maintain the life of the Geysers outside of Healdsburg.

5 And the final alternative is a 20 percent
6 maximum Russian River discharge. This would be taking the
7 water and putting it directly into the Russian River. No
8 additional storage would be required and no additional
9 agricultural irrigation. That alternative will be looking
10 at a variety of discharge rates into the Russian River
11 from one percent up to the 20 percent.

12 Next slide.

13 I'll think I talked briefly about some of the
14 categories of studies. And there's a number of studies
15 being conducted. But there are biological studies of
16 physical environment, land use, socio-economic and finance
17 assessments presently going on and additional studies that
18 are recommended in the scope of work. This list of
19 studies and the scope of work will be adjusted or modified
20 based on the comments that you provide to us during the
21 scoping period.

22 So at this time I think, Jim, you're on.

23 MR. MARKS: Thanks, Andy.

24 The next one, please. I just want to speak
25 briefly about the public's role in scoping and then move

10

1 to the meeting, if you will, the mechanics of how we will
2 proceed today.

3 First of all, the public's role in scoping is
4 to comment on and help, first of all, finalize the
5 alternatives to be studied. So certainly they can be
6 commented upon; and secondly, to help shape the
7 consultants' scope of work for preparing the EIR/EIS, and
8 this includes the issues that are going to be studied and
9 method of analysis and the level of detail of that
10 analysis and final option in scoping to comment on the
11 criteria that will be used to judge the significance of
12 potential impacts.

13 Now, with this role, then, how do you actually
14 carry this out? What are your opportunities for
15 commenting? And really there are two basic ways. First
16 of all, there are oral comments that you can make at the
17 scoping meeting, the session this afternoon, and there
18 will be another session tonight at seven o'clock. And
19 secondly, written comments can be submitted. Again, you
20 can submit those written comments today at the Scoping
21 Meeting or you can send them to Santa Rosa's Community
22 Development Department, and the deadline is December 7th
23 for those written comments.

24 Next one, please.

25 Now, what will happen to the oral and written

11

1 comments? They will be reviewed, summarized, and analyzed
2 by Urban Alternatives, HBA, the environmental consultants,
3 the City, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Then the
4 results of that work will come out and the alternatives to
5 be studied in the EIR/EIS will then be finalized. The
6 scope of work will be revised as appropriate to address
7 all those alternatives. The final set of significance
8 criteria will be determined. And finally, Harland
9 Bartholomew will prepare their final scoping report,
10 laying out what they're going to do.

11 Now, all this commenting is good, but you
12 would, I'm sure, want to see how your input will have been
13 used in this scoping period. We will prepare a feedback
14 report on this scoping period, and we will send it to you.
15 And in that report, we will describe the issues, the
16 comments and the questions raised during scoping, and show
17 any changes in the alternatives that will be studied, and
18 also identify any changes in the environmental
19 consultants' scope of work and the set of significance

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

criteria so you can see what has changed. We will also explain why the suggested revisions to the alternatives or the scope of work or criteria. If there are any that have not been made, then we will explain why that was not done.

Thank you.

Now, there will be additional opportunities

12

for public input in this beyond the scoping period. As Andy Hauge alluded to, first of all, before the draft EIR/EIS is completed, there will be a set of meetings called "round tables" to work on specific parts of that document before it becomes a draft. So you'll be, if you will, looking over the consultant's shoulder and making some comments as that's coming together.

Secondly, there's also the review and comment period on the draft EIR/EIS, and within that period, there will be a public hearing at which people can provide oral comment on the draft EIR/EIS.

Now, it's important to note that once we have final EIR certification, that there will be a final certification EIR hearing or meeting by the City Council and Board of Public Utilities at which they certify that document. And it's important to remember that EIR certification is not project approval.

Now, what happens next then? What's going to happen? After reviewing the agency and public comments, as we've mentioned before, Harland Bartholomew prepares the final scoping report for the EIR/EIS. What happens with that is the Army Corps of Engineers, EPU, and City Council approve that final scope. They say, Yeah, that's what you need to do. That's what the EIR/EIS should cover. And finally, that revised scope of work is then

13

used to prepare the draft EIR/EIS.

Now, let's get to the practicalities for today. One of the things that you may have seen is a blue card when you came in today, and this is a speaker card. If you wish to speak today, then we ask you to fill out this card and place it -- there's a speaker card box over here. Or I don't know. Is Pat still here? I was just going to say you can maybe hand it to Pat or maybe even hand it to Cary Robbins over here just so that we get those cards in and get them gathered up here.

Now, one other thing I want to point out to you before I go on to the rest of the list, we also have the Scoping Comment forms. I just want to make sure you've seen these. You can also provide written comments today at this session or at the following session using these forms, or you can take them home with you and use them. You don't have to, but just to make a way perhaps to make it more convenient for you.

Now, what we will do is we will put the names of those lined up to speak on the overhead here, so you can see the next three or four names, so you know when you're coming up. When you are called on to speak, you can use either microphone there, and you don't have to step up to be right on top of it. Please state your name and residence before giving your input. Please speak into

14

the microphone, but you don't have to get too close.

Now, when you finish your comments, or what you have to say, the consultants here may ask you some questions to clarify it. So if they do, just please stay at the microphone and help them understand what you've been trying to say.

And finally, I would like to point out, we have a shorthand reporter who is sitting right over here, and she's going to work hard taking down everything. I think with the sound system that will help you quite a bit. But also, I would ask you to please, you know, take your time and speak clearly. It makes her job a lot easier.

Mark, can we get the other one?

Now, I also just want to go over a few of the rules that I know we printed in the newsletter. First of all, during this session, I don't know if there are any here, but we will have -- if there are any agency

representatives, we will ask them to speak first. Then we will just move on with the speaker cards. Now, if we have a whole bunch and it's looking like it's going to be difficult to get through, and I'll check it out with you, okay, it may be that we can squeeze everybody in this session. So far we have about 15 cards. If I run into any problems or it looks like it's going to run significantly

15

over, what I will do is stop and ask all of those remaining, you know who you are, the ones who maybe could come back at 7:00 and who are the ones who need to speak now, and we'll just try to make sure that the people who cannot come back tonight get a chance to have their say.

Also, some of you may want to have comment for longer than five minutes. Well, we can't do that right now, and in fact, they provided me with this handy-dandy little machine here so I can set it. When it goes off, I'll have to say "your time is up". So if you have more comments, there are two ways you can deal with that. One of them is that tonight at the seven o'clock session after we've gone through all the commenting, for those who have longer oral comments, you can stay around and we can hear your comments until no one has anymore to give.

The second way, though, is you can also provide your comments in writing; either hand it in today or up until December 7th. So if you have more comments to give, the other way is in writing.

Now, I would like to get this session going.

And, Andy, you have a comment. Go ahead.

MR. HAUGE: One of the things I forgot to mention in the alternatives, we have six alternatives selected, but in the last very short period, the Corps of Engineers has come back to us and they feel that we may

16

need to consider an ocean alternative along with the other alternatives. And if you have opinion on that, please let us know. What they're looking for as a Corps of Engineers under their guidelines of NEPA is a range of alternatives; a full range of alternatives, a reasonable range of alternatives, and they want to make sure that we are in fact looking at a reasonable range of alternatives.

Just so you know the consequences to the City, it's a very expensive study, over one and a half million dollars, and it is at least 18 months, which will shove our entire program back at least one year. So those are the consequences of making that decision now, but it's one that the Corps has come to us and wants us to evaluate.

MR. MARKS: Thank you. So with that, we are ready to begin.

Mark, maybe you could put that up there. And the first two names we have are Stan Denner and then Jim Groom. And you can see who else follows on. If you have any problems or questions seeing that, I'll just read off names as we go through.

Stan, where are you? Could we get you to the microphone? And your name and residence, please.

STAN DENNER: I'm Stan Denner. My address is 24 4390 Woolsey Road.

I hate to be the one to start this off, but I

17

I have all these -- I propose we use the South County plan for a number of reasons. First, that it would make a valuable greenbelt separator. It would -- By the way, I also represent Fane Bureau as well as Denner Ranch. And I should say that Denner Ranch is the largest private user of Santa Rosa wastewater at this time, and it has been for quite some years. I've learned quite a lot about how and what we can do with wastewater over the years. And it's a shame to waste this valuable resource such as dumping it in the ocean.

The South County Plan seems to offer the best alternative as far as value. We use this commodity. There's a lot of acres that's been proposed, over five thousand acres down in that area that would be able to be irrigated from the Petaluma Hill area and Adobe Road and more towards Sonoma and over the hill. The Tulelake area would be a nice place for a storage pond.

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

I don't really have too much other than that to say other than the fact that I have looked at this plan for quite some time and I also wrote quite a detailed letter stating my facts to the board of times past, and I really do feel that this South County is the most advisable. There's less danger of bothering streams and people's wells and so forth with any wastewater, and it's a very arid area, a lot of that right now. A nice

18

greenbelt down there would be a great thing to pull in visitors and tours from the Bay Area and so fourth to drive up and see our beautiful green Sonoma County.

Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you very much, Stan.

Jim Groom.

By the way, as we move along in the list, if whoever is going to speak next could either position yourself near the mikes or get ready to go, it will help us save some time. Thank you.

Go ahead, Jim.

JIM GROOM: Yes. My name is Jim Groom and I'm here representing the Sonoma Taxpayers Association. I haven't been extremely active in this area nor with the Association, but they've asked me to come here today to say a few words. There will be others who will be speaking here tonight, I'm sure.

I'm here today to bring a message. I think the average ratepayers have a clue what's going on, from judging from the questions and inquiries and comments we're receiving in the office. There's beginning to be some disturbing feelings out there in the ratepayers' hands, particularly the people that are paying the bill. I don't know how many studies have been made so far. I know there's been a number of them, and I don't exactly

19

know how much has been spent, but I think I saw a figure of around 120 million dollars and which doesn't include all studies.

I realize that there's been a revamping of the plan included in those figures, but there's been into the millions of dollars done in studies on this project for the last several years. This all results in expenses to the ratepayers who are paying this bill. And up to this date, I have pretty much acquiesced and gone along. I think you're going to see an uprising to some degree, and if you keep raising these rates and increasing these costs, this stuff is all history to this point with the money that's been spent.

But our message here today is to say to you: It's time to stop. Re-evaluate where you're going. This study here could cost up to, I understand, six million dollars, and it could probably lead to recommendations that could run into hundreds of millions before we maybe find a solution. So far, with all the money spent, there hasn't seemed to be any solution to this thing.

I'm wondering how far and how much longer we're going to go before we find a solution. I don't think if we keep acquiescing to the opponents who are generally not ratepayers — as near as I can figure out, they're opponents to finding other solutions that are a

20

lot less costly and permanent — we're never going to have a solution to this problem. It has to be brought to a close. I don't think we need to spend the kind of money you're planning to spend here on this study, because I think we have solutions that have been offered time and time again.

The one thing that I think we really insist upon is that a cost analysis be made almost up front before this study gets underway. Let's find out what this is going to cost. What's it going to cost the average ratepayer? Is this really effective? Is it cost-effective or is it a scheme by some people to get the costs so high to find these conclusions: That we no longer can develop in this town, that nobody can afford to build any housing.

I think it's a "no growth" matter by some

17 people. I'm sure that some people are very seriously 18 concerned about the health and they are discharging into 19 the River, but those are areas that can be defined and 20 this can be taken care of from a scientific standpoint. 21 They should and have been done, but the cost analysis to 22 my view and our view has never been done. Nobody talks 23 about what this is going to cost and where it's going to 24 stop.

25

Our conclusionary statement is: Let's do a

21

1 cost analysis. Let's do a risk factor. We know that 2 there's not a risk factor in this, though it's been raised 3 constantly, and let's get some common sense into this 4 project.

Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you very much.

The next speaker, Martin Coopender.

MARTIN COOPENDER: My name is Martin

5 Coopender. I'm a farm federal inspector for every 6 stinking sewer system and water system from Ventura to the 7 Oregon line. This message going through here is this is a 8 boondoggler. Every biochemistry person in the world 9 knows there's only one system that's going to work; that's 10 wetlands reservoir and marshlands and dump the whole mess 11 into the Russian River. When it comes out, there will be 12 better water the Russian River has seen in about 16 years 13 in the county.

14 I'm also sick and tired of politician 15 developers and engineers that are in no way connected with 16 what Santa Rosa is doing with this system. They're here 17 for their own enchantment, nothing else.

18 I'm also disgusted with all these people from 19 everywhere else. Where are all the Santa Rosan people at 20 this damn meeting? Very few have showed up here to say 21 one word. Only outsiders are going to tell Santa Rosa

22

1 what to do with the wastewater? They can all go straight 2 to hell.

3 This wastewater system is operating in Denver 4 and they're coming out with potable water. Phoenix and 5 Tucson is putting 250 million gallons a day into the San 6 River and the Salt River, and it's never looked better. 7 They're running a series of wetlands down through there. 8 It is beautiful. All the habitat is back. Trees and 9 bushes and everything is growing like crazy.

10 The laguna used to be a beautiful. The 11 flyway, I used to shoot honkers over the laguna. You 12 don't see a honker over a hundred miles over the laguna 13 anymore.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes you do.

14 MARTIN COOPENDER: But you can't shoot them. 15 Wetlands out there and running through the 16 marsh would create the flyway again.

17 Davis is going after 4,000 acres of wetlands. 18 Arcadia marsh has a salt pond and a freshwater pond, and 19 they've been doing it for years. It's worldwide known for 20 people coming there to count the number of birds and fish 21 and everything else. This system works.

22 With 4,000 acres at Davis, and this is all in 23 cooperation with the Corps of Engineers. Every one of 24 these projects I've mentioned, they first started on the

23

1 Michilpence (phonetic) law years ago. They couldn't 2 figure out why they would come out of that marsh such 3 perfect water. Trout and everything is growing like 4 crazy.

5 So if you're going to do anything, especially 6 for people my age that's on a pension and on retirement 7 and drawing social security, we get less than three 8 percent this year and already all the agencies that's 9 involved in this town and this county have jacked it up 10 to ten percent. How in the hell are we going to meet 11 that? You better be thinking about the senior citizens. 12 If you don't, you're in trouble.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

AL MARRUCCI.

14 AL MARRUCCI: My name is Al Marrucci. I live

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

3 at 8535 Lakeville Highway.
 7 My property is targeted for one of the
 3 unwanted reservoir sites. I'm not here to say whether I
 9 think the water should go east, west, south, but I do have
 4 a few comments on this Summary, specifically Task Number
 1 31 -- Task Number 31, points two, three, four, five, and
 2 six. I won't bother reading them to you because I'm sure
 5 that most everybody has them in front of them right now.
 4 An economic concern I have if I were forced,
 5 and I repeat the word "forced", to put a reservoir site on

24

1 my property, it would cause me to lose my business. I
 2 have a small cow/calf operation, and I would like to see
 3 the EIR address this. What are they going to do to help
 4 the people who get forced off their -- I won't be forced
 5 off the property, but if there's a reservoir by it, it
 6 would ruin my livelihood as I know it today. It would
 7 probably be as extinct as the geese that this man is
 8 talking about. Sonoma County was built with small
 9 agricultural endeavors and I don't want to be forced out
 0 of the business.

1 And another concern is what crops are to be
 2 irrigated? I think that should be studied. What are they
 3 planning on irrigating with this water, whether it's in
 4 West County or South County? Are they going to be
 5 irrigating crops that are going to be usable for food
 6 production? Grazing crops? Vegetable crops? Something
 7 that would benefit the county and the community at large?
 8 Are we just going to spray this water on land to make
 9 pasture for horses to graze? Horses are not viable
 0 agriculture in Sonoma, as far as I'm concerned.

1 And then I agreed with the gentleman back here
 2 from the Tax Association. What are the ratepayers -- I
 3 mean, I think something should be done to address the
 4 concern for the ratepayers.

5 I see Santa Rosa got a proposed rate increase

25

1 in the paper. Which one of the alternatives is going to
 2 be the most economically viable for the ratepayers to
 3 survive? We all pay taxes. Even though I don't live in
 4 Santa Rosa, I fear for the people in the City of Santa
 5 Rosa who pay the city and county tax and so forth.

6 And then I'm concerned about water. Will
 7 these reservoir sites damage my water supply? If it does
 8 damage my water supply, is the City of Santa Rosa going to
 9 provide me and my family with fine, safe drinking water?

0 My final comment is, with this entire
 1 decision, I mean, we've been going on with this thing for
 2 about 20 years now, is this going to come down to an
 3 intelligent decision or is it going to become a political
 4 decision?

5 Thank you.

6 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

7 The next speaker, Roz Scholze.

8 ROZ SCHOLZE: Roz Scholze, 11535

9 Street, Bloomfield.

0 Yes, it is a political decision, and,
 1 Mr. Groom, I do thank you for pointing out that the County
 2 of Sonoma is paying a high fee for these people who are
 3 sitting here and for these studies that have gone back.
 4 And I have written out my note here and I say that I
 5 do not believe you have chosen a reasonable range of

26

1 alternatives. And I disagree on how you are going about
 2 evaluating the alternatives for wastewater disposal sites
 3 in the County of Sonoma:

4 Given the fact that the previous study of
 5 disposal plan was ruled inadequate by a superior court
 6 judge at a cost to the county of millions and millions of
 7 dollars resulting in a 166 percent jump.

8 Given the fact that the faults in the EIR
 9 report were brought to the attention of our county's
 0 judicial system by organizations such as: Friends of the
 1 Esteros, Bloomfield Rural Alliance, and the Shrimp Club
 2 plus many others who are fighting the wastewater
 3 alternative of Button Ranch due to its direct impact on
 4 two of only a few esteros left on the west coast of North

15 America.

16 And given the fact that today our elected
 17 legislative bodies that represent our county, Carrie
 18 Mazzoni and Lynne Woolsey, plus a verbal commitment from
 19 the Sierra Club, plus the above-mentioned organizations,
 20 i.e., Friends of the Esteros, plan to step in and fight
 21 the EIR report again in court if the Button Ranch were
 22 considered a wastewater alternative site.

23 Given the fact that this organization, you
 24 guys, you are trying to put it in the esteros and up at
 25 the Button Ranch, and this costs millions and millions of

27

1 dollars. Mr. Groom wanted to know what the cost was
 2 coming from. It's costing millions and millions of
 3 dollars and you are obviously setting them up again for
 4 more expense. About 20 people in this room are saying
 5 "no", and we're taking you to court. We're going to do
 6 that again.

7 I want to know why it's still on that map.
 8 Why the Site Number 3 is still there, given the fact that
 9 Santa Rosa and the County of Sonoma are going to be paying
 10 millions and millions of dollars again, because we're
 11 going to fight again, I promise you and I thank you.

12 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

13 The next speaker, Jim Jacobs.

14 JIM JACOBS: I'm Jim Jacobs. 6289 Caroli
 15 Road, Petaluma.

16 I run a cattle ranch in the West County and
 17 that's the plan that I want to address.

18 By the way, these maps -- the aerial maps that
 19 you sent out to landowners are not exactly the latest
 20 aerial technology. I can barely find my house on the
 21 thing. I wondered 32 years ago how they ever found the
 22 missiles in Cuba with the maps they had.

23 Anyway, we don't need a map to see what's
 24 happening in the West County. There were three valleys
 25 between Bloomfield and Valley Ford being surveyed right

28

1 now for possible reservoirs. If the Button Ranch we're
 2 not really sure, all three dams will be located less than
 3 three miles from the Tresch's property and the Tunzi's
 4 or one or more of those sites to store wastewater during
 5 the winter. And then the summer months -- I guess around
 6 the summer, ranchlands, the (inadmissible) ranchland, this is
 7 not farmland out there. Around the turn of the century
 8 there were potato farms out there. They were responsible
 9 for most of the siltation that took place in the esteros.
 10 These are hilly slopes. The soil is very thin. If you
 11 till it, you lose it.

12 In the wintertime, soil should not be
 13 disturbed through any sort of plowing or tilling. So
 14 that's why the enterprises that are out there are dairies,
 15 sheep ranch, and cattle ranches, not farms.

16 So the whole idea of irrigating this area just
 17 would not work. Most of it is hilly, as I said. The
 18 low land areas which are maybe a fracture of the whole
 19 area, they have deep soil and they are flat, but they're
 20 subject to flooding in the wintertime because of the
 21 runoff from the hills back up at high speed at the estero.
 22 So again, that's not practical for growing much.

23 Also, the weather out there is cool and foggy,
 24 limiting most crops you even try to grow out there. Also,
 25 there's an abundance of springs in the area which can

29

1 cause soil slippage if the lands are overirrigated, or it
 2 often happens in the wintertime when you have saturated
 3 ground and heavy rains. Also, the area stays green
 4 because of that cool weather until sometimes as late as
 5 the end of June and greens up again in October. You would
 6 have the short season for irrigating. I don't know even
 7 how if you can use up the water that would be in those
 8 reservoirs.

9 If the plan is to turn existing pastures into
 10 irrigating pasture, the problem there is the grasses out
 11 there are annual grasses. The cycle goes: dry up in the
 12 summertime, seed, and come up again in the winter. If you
 13 want to have irrigated pasture, you have to change over to

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

another type of grass, but to do that, you have to till, and you're back to the soil problems, erosion problem.

The idea of irrigating the county is not practical. It just wouldn't work. And besides that, the practicality of that, there are other things, too. All three of the valleys have a lot of springs, as I mentioned, and some of the springs would be under the footprint of the ponds, which would tell me that wastewater would enter the aquifer and we don't know what it would do. Then the water is used by the ranchers and water for eating and drinking themselves and watering livestock, so that should be taken into account.

30

Every geologist mentions the cracks out there in the land. This water is coming up, it can go back down. Every one of those valleys I've mentioned, three have working ranches. One of them have the largest dairies in Sonoma County. That dairy would be located about 50 to 100 yards below the damsite. So I'm sure that couldn't exist there.

I don't think the City of Santa Rosa would want to buy out this dairy, the size that it is. And it would be taking away the livelihood and homes of the people that live in those valleys. There are other houses in that area that are 100 years old or more that are probably historical.

As far as the esteros, that's been argued back and forth, but my feeling is that if it isn't good for the Russian River, it can't be good on the esteros. So I believe the water comes up in the wintertime and goes down in the summertime.

Anybody that is in charge of this project that wants to see what I'm talking about is welcome to come out and I'll give them a tour, because I don't think this was looked at closely by anyone before this project came into being, otherwise they wouldn't have left the drawing board because irrigating the West County is just not practical. It wouldn't work.

31

But I do have an alternative. And that is the idea that water is precious to California. We all know that, why then do we have all this wastewater we're trying to get rid of.

And the citizens of Santa Rosa are dumping freshwater on their lawns and gardens. Why not have a second main refitted to Santa Rosa and all new construction that would carry wastewater to outdoor spigots and let the people use that to water their gardens. That would be expensive and inconvenient, but these plans being thrown about now are also expensive and very inconvenient to the people on impact.

MR. MARKS: Your time has gone over.

JIM JACOBS: Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Next speaker, Steve Klausner.

STEVE KLAUSNER: I'm Steve Klausner. I'm here representing the Sonoma County Taxpayer Association.

What I would like to speak to right now are the endless lists of special studies that are being proposed. You know, it would appear that we are prepared now to study the flora and fauna of this entire county from San Pablo Bay up to the Geysers north of Healdsburg. It's far too extensive, that's why we're talking about five, six million dollars worth studies. It's really excessive. I think what we need to do is a simple

32

economic analysis of these plans and narrow down the options and then do studies. There's no reason to send some poor fool out tramping around in poison oak trying to survey every road, creek, and ridge for a pipeline from the Laguna all the way up to the Geysers. Let's just study the things that are actually feasible.

I've got a couple of comments I would like to make for modifications of at least two studies. I'm familiar with the steelhead run on Santa Rosa Creek. It's a small remnant of what once was. The study being proposed will do nothing but harass these few remaining fish to death. We strongly protest. They are going to be

13 electro-fished during the summer, that is, jolted with a
14 paralyzing jolt of electricity. They are going to be
15 netted on the way downstream and then on the way back
16 upstream.

17 Leave them alone. You're harassing them to
18 death.

19 The craziest part of all is the intent of the
20 study to evaluate the impact of wastewater during a
21 drought on migratory fish during the drought. The
22 spawning streams are dry. These fish aren't going
23 anywhere. You cannot draw any conclusions from any of
24 this kind of study.

25 Another study I'm kind of interested in is the

33

1 Estero's Hypo-saline condition. Again, it looks like
2 entire study — the entire measure I would suggest you
3 narrow your focus here. The critical issue you need to
4 clarify is the impact the freshwater would have on the
5 Estero's Hypo-saline. Congress specifically included the
6 protection of this hypo-saline environment in their
7 legislation when they created the National Marine
8 Sanctuary. I think it's going to be real challenge to
9 find anything that can live in water that is 40 parts
10 salt per thousand. But what the heck, study it. I'm sure
11 we're all interested in finding out a little more about
12 this unique environment. You'll pay for that study, won't
13 you.

14 MR. MARKS: Please speak into the microphone.

15 STEVE KLAUSNER: Okay. Now, what I see
16 missing here are a couple of studies. It seems like the
17 general thrust of all these studies seems to minimize the
18 impact of wastewater discharges on streams and wetlands.
19 Might there been any benefits to augmenting streams and
20 wetlands during a drought? How would this affect
21 biological productivity? How would this impact the
22 migratory waterfowl of the Pacific Coast Flyway? Could
23 constructed wetlands in the Laguna be managed in a way to
24 that enhances flood control as well as wildlife values?
25 Could freshwater augmentation actually enhance biological

34

1 productivity of the Americano and/or San Antonio
2 estuaries during normal rainfall, during a drought? And
3 is wetlands restoration a legitimate form of reuse? These
4 are simple ideas. They probably won't cost as much to
5 study. They certainly won't be as expensive to implement
6 as some of the ideas talked about.

7 I want to see a system that meets public
8 health standards, is safe for the environment. We want a
9 system that is cost-effective and we want it now.

10 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

11 Next speaker in Nan McGuire.

12 NAN MCGUIRE: My name is Nan McGuire, and I
13 recently bought a home at 14576 Cherry Street in
14 Guerneville. Although that is not my permanent residence
15 at this time, I plan to spend a lot of time there and
16 eventually retire in Guerneville.

17 I am not familiar with the technicalities of
18 the various reports that I picked up today because this is
19 my first immediate exposure to it, but I have been
20 following this controversy in the San Francisco papers
21 for a number of years. And frankly, as someone who has
22 admired the Russian River from afar and come up here
23 occasionally as a visitor, I just couldn't believe that
24 this whole situation existed.

25 Now as someone who is a homeowner here, I am

35

1 much more immediately affected and will become much more
2 acquainted with all of your reports and plan to submit
3 something in writing before December 7th.

4 I must say that several of the speakers prior
5 to myself have made some reasonable sounding suggestions.
6 I particularly was taken by the one Mr. Jacobs made. I
7 have no idea how inconvenient and how expensive that would
8 be, but it seems to me we are going to continue to have
9 droughts and we are going to continue to have to conserve
10 water, and I imagine lots of laws in Santa Rosa and
11 neighborhoods here. I hope you would seriously explore

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

2 that.
3 I would just close with the plea that whatever
4 is decided on finally, whether it's at the end of this
5 year or three years from now, however long it takes, that
6 it is environmentally safe and sound.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

9 Before we get to the next speaker, just a
10 reminder for those of you who may have come in later,
11 if any of you has not signed in, would you do so before
12 you leave? That helps us especially getting information
13 back to you.

14 Now, the next speaker, Erin Hill.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: She's not here yet.

38

16 MR. MARKS: She's not here. Okay. Then Frank
17 Hilder.

18 FRANK HILDER: My name is Frank Hilder and
19 I've been to three meetings so far. Okay. We've got a
20 real problem here. The lower Russian River has had a
21 problem for a long time. Now Santa Rosa has a problem. I
22 don't think you people understand any of this. Nobody
23 here has talked about this. We have people up above —
24 Can I ask one question to anybody that knows about this
25 about Healdsburg, Cloverdale, Windsor and all the other
26 towns up there, which there are a lot of people moving in,
27 their water, does it go into the Russian River? Their
28 wastewater? I want to know this right now. Somebody give
29 me an answer, because I want to talk a lot more. Please.

30 MR. MARKS: Is there someone who can answer

31 that? The answer is yes.

32 FRANK HILDER: Okay. All those towns?

33 MR. MARKS: All of those? Yes.

34 FRANK HILDER: Okay. We've got a problem.

35 The lower Russian River has got a problem. Now Santa Rosa
36 has a problem. This is wastewater going into our
37 freshwater that we are drinking. And I like water. I
38 drink a lot of water. And I'm real upset here. I've been
39 at home thinking this thing over for weeks and weeks now.
40 I don't think you people know what the hell you're doing.

37

41 You don't know what you're up against. I've got ways of
42 paying for the pipeline that has to go in. I have ways.
43 I have thought of those ways. I'm not going to talk about
44 it now because I don't have time. People don't give me
45 any time.

46 Now, I'm a little nervous about this. The
47 problem of it is you're going to have to have pipelines
48 that go along long the Highway 101 or along Russian River
49 from all these towns — all these little towns up the
50 River. And you cannot put anymore wastewater in the lower
51 Russian River; not 10 percent, one percent, or no percent.

52 I understand this water has got polio in it
53 and a lot of other germs. And I mean, it's there. You
54 can't see those things. And nobody is really talking
55 about them, but I'm telling you about them. They are
56 there. And somebody is going to have to get their head
57 together, because I'm telling you right now, this is a big
58 thing.

59 There's going to be so many suits against this
60 town and then we're going to sue up above, too, because
61 they're putting their waste in our water. And this is
62 going to be a bad situation. It cannot continue. In no
63 way can this continue any further than what it's already
64 gone.

65 I used to go to — I was brought up in San

38

66 Francisco. I used to be up the River every year with my
67 parents. We could rent a place up there back there in
68 the '50s for about \$200 a week. That was a furnished
69 place. Very nice, beautiful place. I would love to live
70 down at the lower part of the Russian River around Rio
71 Nido and all those places. It's the most beautiful
72 country in the world. The redwoods, the river that flows
73 through there, I mean, it's so beautiful. I mean, there's
74 so much I could say about it, but I don't have time to say
75 about it.

76 We've already ruined that for people. I've
77 been down there lately. I have seen houses where the
78 paint is peeling off. Those houses should be renting now
79 in the summertime for \$400 a week, no less. Those people
80 have gotten ripped off. They have got burnt. They have
81 really been messed over. And we're going to have the same
82 thing happen to us here. And there's going to be so many
83 suits here you cannot imagine.

84 I mean, I have a daughter going on with the
85 problems she has, salt water problems. We have problems.
86 The first shot my wife gave my daughter was in the muscles
87 in the legs. We have her now back in the house again.
88 She's 27 years old. We've gone through hell.

89 Now, there's people my wife knows at work
90 where their children, one has polio. Where in the hell

39

91 I did she get this polio from? And she has another child
92 with another hip problem, too, bone problem. These people
93 have to carry these children around. They can't walk.
94 One has just gone through seven operations, he's not even
95 four years olds.

96 I'm telling you, this stuff has got to stop.
97 The pipeline has got to go in along the River, along
98 roads, down 101, whatever the hell it is. No water can
99 go — No wastewater can go into the Russian River. Sooner
100 or later, the people down river — and we have our
101 courthouse — sooner or later people down the river are
102 going to get their own courthouse. They're going to put,
103 I heard, a hundred something thousand dollars suit against
104 this town. That's going to be nothing. There's multi-
105 million dollar suits in this town's own courthouses and
106 judges down there. They are going to get down there and
107 win out and go to higher courts, not in this town but
108 maybe Sacramento or someplace else. They're going to
109 kick our ass.

110 I don't think you people know what the hell
111 you're up against here. You better wake up. And I'll
112 tell you about it tonight when I come to the meeting how
113 we are going to pay for the God damn pipe.

114 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

115 The next speaker is — Yes, Erin.

40

116 ERIN HILL: Excuse me. I'm sorry we're late,
117 but I have a permission slip if you want it.

118 MR. MARKS: Okay. Fine. Are you ready to
119 speak now?

120 ERIN HILL: Yes.

121 MR. MARKS: Why don't you.

122 ERIN HILL: Hello, my name is Erin Hill.

123 TRACY DURNELL: My name is Tracy Durnell. We
124 are from Brookside School in San Anselmo. We are trying
125 to save the California Freshwater Shrimp. We are
126 rehabilitating Stemple Creek. We are fencing, planting,
127 and putting in cattle bridge.

128 We would like to ask you a few questions about
129 the proposed dam on Button Ranch.

130 1) What endangered species live on the
131 proposed dam site?

132 2) How clean would the water be?

133 3) What chemicals will be in the water?

134 4) Will the chemicals harm the California
135 Freshwater Shrimp? If so, how?

136 5) Will there be copper in the wastewater?

137 6) If there is copper in the wastewater,

138 will it harm the California Freshwater Shrimp?

139 7) Will the wastewater kill the vegetation on
140 the banks of the creek?

41

141 8) Will the wastewater seep through the
142 ground and go into the rancher's wells?

143 9) Would the wastewater harm the Stemple
144 Creek watershed.

145 10) Will the wastewater make the detritus
146 poisonous?

147 Please answer our questions as soon as
148 possible. Thank you for your time.

149 MR. MARKS: Thank you. That's it? Okay.

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

The next speaker, please. Loretta Borges.

LORETTA BORGES: Hello, I'm Loretta Borges from Leisure Park. That's 176 Leisure Park, and that's a mobile home park.

We have a lot of tenants in our park. We own our mobiles. Most of us who have new ones are now paying county taxes, so we are taxpayers. I would like to know what compromising — are you compromising the wells in the areas where these lakes and holding ponds are? I believe that there is one being compromised already, if not more. Also, I believe the people here are tired of all this running around and doing a lot of extra work when all they really want is if you're going to do something, do it.

As far as the Russian River goes, most of the septic tanks in the homes on the River are under the river, so it's not just our water going in there, but

42

is our water clean? We don't know if the water is pure enough to go in there. If it is, it's better than the water in the River.

Another point I would like to make is there are a lot of people, like he said, who are on social security or on pensions that have no idea what this rate's going to do to them. In our park we don't even know what rates we're paying. It's a blanket rate. We have no way of knowing. We have a water meeting, but nothing is happening and those papers are supposed to be up at the clubhouse and they are not, so we're in the same position as everybody else in this room so far as sewage.

I would like to thank you for listening.

Thank you.

MS. CORT: Could you tell us about what wells you're already concerned about that are already contaminated? You said you were concerned —

LORETTA BORGES: I believe there's a pond off Todd Road. Isn't there a pond or holding area there off Todd Road there? There's one of roads in that area that has a well. My husband told me there's a well there and there are ponds there and that the water in that area is now shut off and it had been shut off. He died a couple of years ago, so this has been a while.

Oh, another thing I forgot to mention, there

43

is a lake, I don't know whether it's going to Reno or going to Tahoe, but it is purified water that they have taken from the sewage areas and it is there. I've seen it on television years ago, that it's clean water, as far as I know. They were going to put fish in it and people were swimming in it. So you might check that out too.

Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

The next speaker is Richard Nissin.

RICHARD NISSIN: Yes. I live at 202 Arboleda Drive here in town.

I'm wondering why when you people ask of these consultants, like the guy asked for \$4,000, he rubber stamped it. City Council don't even know who, when, what they are getting. How about seeing a budget, you know?

The other thing is they say something like five percent of poisonous material may or may not be in the water. You don't even know that because it seems to me that you could have somebody with one of those microspectroscopes could analyze it for toxic metals and stuff like that. And there are other tests that could be used for pesticides and germs.

I follow Mr. Hilder's idea, that we're going to have to recycle this water through pipes. And how you're going to finance that should be studied. Revenue

44

bonds is one way to do it without whacking us with a big, huge tax increase.

Growth. Healdsburg is being stopped by the state from putting 500 homes in it. There's not enough water in the River to supply the toilets, and then they're putting 500 homes out there in the Bennett Valley. As far as I'm concerned, each one of those homes is a toilet. How many times a day are those toilets going to get

flushed and aggravate the problem that we've got? You've got to put a stop to this growth until we get a handle on this wastewater problem.

Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

Richard Charter.

RICHARD CHARTER: Hi. My name is Richard

Charter. I reside at 6947 Cliff Avenue, Bodega Bay.

I would like to second all the comments made by the Shrimp Club a minute ago. I think this is the up and coming generation. We should be paying to the — They're paying attention to our past mistakes that we are making. If we're not careful, we are going to make more. There wouldn't be anyone to take care of for their children.

My comments are focused primarily on the West County disposal option and also the scoping documents that

45

1 you just put out continues to attempt to perpetuate the
2 myth that a West County effluent disposal plan is somehow
3 to include either a damsite at either Button Ranch or
4 other alternative sites and discharge indirect or direct
5 into the Estero Americano or Estero de San Antonio.
6 Since the Army Corps of Engineers have come into the
7 process, they should be looking fundamentally at the
8 underlying assumption that anything in the West County
9 plan is going to quote "improve the environment", that's
10 what killed this process last time in the course or one of
11 the fundamental assumptions that was flawed.

12 Since you're looking at the marine
13 environment, when you're looking at the Estero Americano
14 and Estero de San Antonio, you must know, and particularly
15 since you've now added the ocean outfall option back in,
16 that when you get around the marine environment, you're
17 looking at near-shore current studies on the order of five
18 years. That's pretty much baseline science for anything
19 to do with either an ocean outfall or effluent flow that
20 might be surface microlayer on the Estero Americano or the
21 Estero de San Antonio. So I think you really ought to
22 build in a five-year study to figure out where the outflow
23 for the estero is going to end up, is it going into
24 Tomales Bay or wrap around the Bodega head as we saw in
25 the 1970 Puerto Rico oil spill do. We don't know where

46

1 the stuff is going.

2 Also, I think the University of California
3 started a pretty good detailed biological survey of the
4 Button Ranch that found an amazing degree of biodiversity
5 there; in fact, some of the most diverse biological
6 systems they had found anywhere on any of the university
7 properties. So I suggest that a detailed biological
8 survey of the Button Ranch, the Shump Ranch (phonetic),
9 any of the other reservoir sites that you're looking at in
10 West County should be one of your first priorities,
11 because I think you're going to find either in plant or
12 animal kingdom some endangered species out there, either
13 listing, pending, or threatened.

14 And furthermore, since the Corps has 404
15 wetland permit jurisdiction over what appears to be most
16 of Sonoma County and half of Marin County in this process,
17 I think you better get going with a GIS-based detailed
18 mapping of seasonal wetlands and year-round wetlands in
19 vicinities of the reservoir sites and the entire
20 watersheds of the Estero Americano and Estero de San
21 Antonio to decide whether you're going to be able to
22 "mitigate" those impacts.

23 As you know, the surveys of wetlands out there
24 are very spotty and the results with wetlands creations or
25 wetlands restoration that we're seeing out of scientific

47

1 establishments around the country lead us to believe that
2 creating wetlands is a very ephemeral science. You will
3 never get the biological productivity of the wetlands you
4 destroy.

5 Finally, your documents as released
6 conveniently does not address the fact that the courts
7 still retain is secret jurisdiction over this process.

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

And I don't know whether you just sort of neglected to mention that or you prefer that readers of the document not know that, but I think it should be right up front in the documents, the past court history of this.

And finally, I would like to incorporate here by reference all previous comments made by Friends of the Esteros in writing, in oral testimony presented at previous hearings, and I would also like to incorporate here by reference the videotaped record of the University of California Board of Regents meeting on March 18th, 1994 and March 17th, 1994, at which City of Santa Rosa officials testified to the effect that they had to have the Button Ranch, that this was their only possible alternative. And I submit that as evidence that a project alternative had been pre-selected prior to the beginning of this scoping process. It's on the record. There's a videotape of that. And I submit that as part of this record by reference.

48

Thank you very much for the opportunity to present testimony here today, and we'll be participating in each step of your process.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

MR. RAUGE: Richard? Richard? I'm not positive that we have in our library the videotape that you referenced nor the correspondence, so we could work together so we have that on record?

RICHARD CHARTER: I'm sure the staff of Board of Regents has the videotaped offer and probably transcribed oral testimony. I would say all the City officials who testified there, I believe there were five or six, that should all be part of this record.

MR. RAUGE: Okay. If you could work with us on that?

RICHARD CHARTER: Sure, I'll be happy to.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

Next speaker, David Bannister.

Hold on. Andy Camozzi, please call home. There's an emergency at the dairy.

Okay. Go ahead.

DAVID BANNISTER: David Bannister. 7915 St. Helena Road, Santa Rosa.

I would like to speak to the issue of the creation of wetlands from Santa Rosa's wastewater and say

49

that I support the concept of the creation of wetlands with Santa Rosa wastewater because it's a beneficial reuse of the resource. However, if that's to be accomplished, I think several conditions have to be met, and I would like to — and I will submit in writing — but I would to mention a couple of them.

One is that I believe that if wetlands are to be created, there should not be any destruction or disruption of existing wildlife habitat values. BEA's own report from earlier this year indicates that the wetlands or restoration sites which have not been specifically identified at this point on the Santa Rosa plain may have significant threatened or endangered wildlife species, habitat values, and they question whether there's even a thousand acres necessary of suitable habitat out there.

So I think a study would have to be done indicating where the wetlands would be created and what wildlife habitat values would be disrupted.

Another study I think that would need to be done is a bioaccumulation of heavy metals in the food chain in the wetlands that would be created. Santa Rosa has Kelly Pond as a potential study site. As I understand it, that's been there for four or five years. And I think there would need to be studies done right there to determine whether there have been any metals accumulating

50

in the biology there, as well as reviewing any other literature that's been published on that issue nationwide.

So those are the two primary concerns and studies that I think would need to be conducted on the wetlands issue.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

The next speaker, please. Dale Wright.

DALE WRIGHT: My name is Dale Wright at 4240 Concord Road in Santa Rosa.

I use the water for irrigating ornamental corn and squash which I sell, but to the cost of one of my large oaks which split by being overwatered. Now, looking around, I see that where the other water is taking place around the rest of me, large oaks are being killed off and most of these oaks are the 200-year-old variety. A young oak will take that water and use it, but the old oaks won't. So if you want to use water out there on any kind of growing anything, how about growing the redwoods? And just forget your old oaks because they won't grow out there. Old oaks take the winter rain and the summer dry to flourish. That's it.

My other idea four years ago was to water the hills above Santa Rosa's inlet of the water and let the water seep down into the Santa Rosa's water supply or go over here in the Russian River and go above their — I

51

mean, above in pumps and empty their water into the River there, so they would make sure that they're going to get pure water.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Mr. Wright.

The next speaker, Philip Bertoli.

PHILIP BERTOLI: Hello, my name is Phil Bertoli, 2458 Westvale Court, Santa Rosa.

I'm here as a representative of Sebastopol area. I have properties there. We've made our living there for many years in agriculture. And I believe sustained agriculture in that area along with the lower Santa Rosa area is a very viable and necessary thing to consider.

There's a lot of talk of, you know, open space, deduction of urbanization. These things all are incorporated in what's going on as far as what we do with the water. The water will provide those people who have properties and economic living because they can take that water and generate a living off it, generate economic value for the county, for the population; therefore, they don't have to reduce that sustained land out there to housing because they can no longer farm it or they don't want to see. They cannot find an economic reason to use that land, other than creating a profit by cutting it out and making an urbanization.

52

So as far as we can see, we know there's a lot of avenues to coordinate, and I do believe that reservoirs, whichever area they're in, of course they can be viable. They can be from wetlands. They can use that water if it's in a wetland back in the water. It can be filtered. It can be used, if we see that we don't have to see the water go into the Russian River, as some people are looking for. The thing I would like to see in this area is reservoirs closer by, rather than the western county, say closer maybe to the Laguna, if that's an economic possibility.

Of course there's many problems, and I don't have the answers, and I think that's what you're there for. Again, I would really like to know, understand that. Especially in the Sebastopol area, there's a lot of viable farmland. We could lose it because of urbanization, if those people who have fairly large properties cannot make a stable living off of it.

Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

The next speaker, Stan Griffin.

STAN GRIFFIN: My name is Stan Griffin. I'm here today representing Trout Unlimited, America's leading coldwater nonprofit conservation organization which is staffed in Washington, D.C., also Giant Anslers (phonetic)

53

of California has asked me to represent them on this project. I would also say I'm a member of the Salmon and Steelhead Advisory Committee to the legislature here in California. And my main activity is to restore the Russian River fishery, the salmon and steelhead in

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

particular.

And I appreciate the fact that the City of Santa Rosa is conducting a special fish study in the Laguna de Santa Rosa and its tributaries. And I have attended these scheduled meetings and hope to be acting in the future.

In spite of these meetings, I still had some serious concerns as to the impact on the migrating salmon and steelhead, and briefly, a special concern with the Laguna de Santa Rosa listed as an impaired water body by the EPA because of the dissolved oxygen problem. And I have not seen to date any serious studies to relieve this problem. As you probably know that any — at certain levels that causes fish death by suffocation. And I'm also not convinced that the wastewater does not confuse the fish's so-called "honing" behavior. And what impacts on the imprint of the downstream migration from — that is, the downstream smelt going out to the ocean migrating from Mark West and Santa Rosa creeks through the Laguna and will be returned to the Mark West and Santa Rosa

54

creeks to spawn again.

And there's still quite a few other unanswered questions regarding the fish behavior and health, however, hopefully we can resolve these the problems in the near future in future fish study meetings.

And thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you very much.

Tom Foster.

TOM FOSTER: The one I would be talking about would be something Klausner and Carter have already mentioned about an environmental standpoint.

MR. MARKS: Can I have your residence, too?

TOM FOSTER: 1657 Mt. View Avenue, Petaluma.

And why Petaluma city isn't involved in this, I don't know. They'll ultimately have to dispose of their wastewaters, too.

I'm not going to make a judgment on which of these five alternatives in part or in total are used, if they're used at all. There's — I don't know if anybody is taking any pages from Europe's book. I understand there's a lot of open ponds where bacterial action take place automatically clarifying the water. I don't know what's going to happen, but I'm concerned with from an environmental standpoint.

I was born and raised in Two Rock Valley. My

55

mother was born and raised in Two Rock Valley. I've hunted and fished in all these streams out here. I don't hunt or fish anymore, I observe them. I love them. But a point that I don't like is this survey or summary or whatever you call it refers only in passing to the West Petaluma esteros. Unless you were looking for it, all you would hear about is Santa Rosa and the River. But those esteros is where ultimately the bulk of Healdsburg, Cloverdale, Ukiah, you name it, their water is going to go. If they get the permission, if this thing gets going and the government doesn't stop them, a certain amount of water is going to be used for irrigation. And the point's well taken that that grass doesn't need irrigation other than what nature gives it. But there's no mention of discharge in those two esteros, and you know damn well they're going to discharge everything they can get by accident or design. It will be by design. Okay.

What happens if that water goes out into the bay, they call that Bodega Bay between Bodega Head and Tomales Head, you've got this beautiful bay. The Japanese current comes down and it washes past Bodega Head and the bay remains tranquil, up and down with the tide. Like the bay down in Puerto Vallarta. I went down there one day to go swimming. I didn't. Anything that goes out of those two esteros is going to stay there and it will just

56

wash back and forth, back and forth. In between times, it will go up into Bodega Bay and then down into the Tomales Bay.

And that's about all I got to say. But

5 don't — But be assured that that's where Santa Rosa is going to dump their water, in those two esteros. I've seen steelhead 66 years ago right at the base of Button Ranch is going to be Bob Tresch, Joe Tresch's father, and we never took them. We didn't — We wouldn't. I fished every damn stream around here, tributaries, the Estero Americano and Estero de San Antonio, and it irks me that there's no other way to get rid of the waste. There's got to be some other way.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

TOM FOSTER: I want my kids to appreciate it.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

The next speaker, Laura Graham.

LAURA GRAHAM: Laura Graham, 5306 San Luis Avenue, Santa Rosa.

Last spring, I think it was in May, I can't remember, the Friends of the River had a symposium in the Senior Center and nobody from the City Hall came. They made a very good presentation. They had two professors from UC and one from Cal Poly that were displaying slides and all, very viable alternative methods for recycling the

57

1 wastewater right in neighborhoods or areas where they could create neighborhood parks using this tertiary-treated water for the streams and all.

There's a town down in San Diego County that has all of this going on. These methods were far less costly than some of the things that are being piped around. And I think that those methods, you can go down to UC's field station in Richmond and see some of these methods that they have been experimenting on and all down there.

If land was suitable for wetlands, there would already be a wetlands there. You can't go out and manufacture a wetlands unless the situation is favorable for it. And Mr. Blackman stated, I think it was at the Regents meeting back in March, that the only problem they had was in the winter; they had all the areas to irrigate in the summer.

Well, the sensible solution then rather than building a huge dam on the Bloomfield fault is to team up with Union Oil and get that winter water going up to the Geysers. Because now Union Oil was down at the City Hall here some time ago, a representative of theirs saying they would be very interested in that water because situations are changing up there where they don't have the water to generate the steam that they once did.

58

1 So it seems to me it wouldn't cost anymore to build a pipeline up there than put the darn dam down on the Tresch's ranch. And small reservoirs have much less impact on the area — disruptive impact — than that huge dam on the Bloomfield fault would have.

The gentleman that said he spent his summer at the River in the '50s, my first recollection of the River was the last year the train ran, and that was in 1936. And in those days, the River was one green pool and the water going over the rapids to the next green pool, and they were lots of nutrients in it. And the lady from the Sweet Water Water District that almost got fired because she says if the creeks are running in August, it's coming from septic tanks. She was right. We used to go up the road by Dorman's Spring (phonetic), and their septic tank was just a few feet down from where the spring was.

But this tertiary water is a heck of a lot cleaner than what originally came down that river. And the fish need nutrients in the river in order to feed. So I get upset with some of these people who don't understand what the water used to be like down there. And I think it gets — The bacteria count goes up more on the weekend when everybody is in there swimming in the river.

There's also a possibility of discharge into

59

1 the bay. They keep draining the water out up the River and shipping it to LA, and so we could freshen up the bay water with some of that tertiary. But you've got to have

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

several different ways of disposing of that. You can't put all your eggs in one basket, because if something goes wrong or we get a five point whatever, and then everybody's up a creek without a paddle.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would like to throw a quick curve. Did you know that before 1978 the Laguna did not run into the Russian River? Now you figure out where it went to.

MR. MARKS: Thanks.

Okay. We have two more speakers here, and how many more, Mark, do we have? So we have all total six.

Okay, Russell Ridge.

RUSSELL RIDGE: Thank you for the opportunity to speak at this meeting. I live closer to Point Reyes Station, but also close to Inverness Park. I'm one of those people out of the area and relegated to hell. I'll say I've been through there already today coming through the traffic to get here to this meeting.

The issues that are raised here about the problems of disposing of such tremendous amount of waste would encourage us to try to reduce that amount of waste,

60

I try to reduce it. And the growth that speaks of increasing amounts of waste, perhaps we should be encouraged to reduce the growth also. The only thing that grows upon itself is a cancer.

I would like to second comments that were made by Richard Charter as we look back on those who came before and we had a chance to agree with certain of their statements. A mention was made of 18 months in studies. I went through the Scoping Report there and there's issues there that would take years and years, specifically one area, the West County alternative and water going into the esteros. The effect of massive amounts of freshwater into estero, organisms, plants, and animals that have been adapted to their way of life for long periods, what would be the effect of heavy metals on these organisms? Water going into Bodega Bay, this was alluded to by another speaker, down into Tomales Bay, and the Foster Farms that are so critical. The organism is being critical to heavy metals.

With all the obstacles people from Santa Rosa, the officials face in looking at a West County alternative from lawsuits, threatened additional lawsuits, I would hardly think that Santa Rosa would still pursue that alternative.

The marin sanctuary that encloses the esteros,

61

there's just too many obstacles. I realize a lot of people here have spoken about various alternatives and this was my understanding this was the scoping about various issues, so I just point out those issues there in the West County. The need for studies which by of necessity would be long term, not cursory or incomplete studies on which you make these decisions. I can understand the frustration of people here in Santa Rosa, the ratepayers. What's a tangible cost to ratepayers? What's the intangible cost on the effect of the environment and the organisms, and as someone alluded to, our children, our children's children, your project, the children, the future children? It's difficult.

Common sense. What's common sense? Get on with it. I understand common sense in the sense that prevents horses from betting on people. So I leave it at that.

MR. MARKS: Thank you very much.

Jim Dickinson.

JIM DICKINSON: Good afternoon. My name is Jim Dickinson. I live at 1195 Crest Drive, Santa Rosa. My original suggested alternative was and still is 2-M with increased South County irrigation and up to two percent River discharge, if absolutely necessary. 2-M with increase South County irrigation should be able

62

to have an environmentally sound wastewater plan with no Russian River discharge. To get to that point, if we have

3 to, at the beginning to use some Russian River discharge, 4 a maximum of two percent, we'll have to do that, and it's 5 acceptable. This is one of the lower cost plans. I think 6 we must all make a greater effort to work out an 7 environmentally safe system at the lowest cost possible.

The last voting records in Santa Rosa and the 9 county clearly indicates the public is going to strongly 10 resist continually increased large sewer rates. I must 11 admit that early in the Scoping process I became very 12 interested in the absolutely most perfect environmentally 13 safe system. But gradually, it's become obvious to me 14 that we must keep sewer rates as low as possible.

I'm very active in the Santa Rosa Senior 16 Center. We have many members who are living on a bare 17 survival income. Adding \$10 to \$20 each month to their 18 sewer rates is a serious hardship. Usually it means 19 cutting back on clothing, food, or medicine. I'm 20 convinced the Public Utilities Board and the City of Santa 21 Rosa, and particularly Ed Brauner, I think he's done a 22 super job, and Ken Blackman and the all the consultants 23 are making a very sincere and effective effort to solve 24 our problems. And I thank you for your efforts. However, 25 I do feel that it's necessary and it's possible to have an

63

1 environmentally safe system at a reasonable cost, and I 2 ask you to keep that in mind.

Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

Rob Levinsky.

ROB LEVINSKY: Hi. My name is Rob Levinsky.

I live at 11500 Mays Canyon Road in Forestville.

I appreciate the chance to speak with you.

And I will say that having met and written to Mr. Brauner 10 and gotten a courteous response to a question, it was very 11 impressive, I think. I appreciate the fact you tried to 12 give the public the input. I feel very positive about 13 that.

The compliment said, I think we should really 15 focus on the real reason we're here and the reason we 16 haven't adopted one preferable alternative, which to me 17 is the community separator on South County alternative 18 long ago, and that's the issue of development. It's 19 clear from any reasonable person's reading of the facts 20 that a West County storage option, let alone any of the 21 others, are a disaster in every respect, both economic as 22 well as environmental. Doing something like destroying 23 the Button Ranch accomplishes nothing. Dumping it into 24 the ocean accomplishes nothing except lawsuits and waste 25 of time and not getting on with the project.

64

1 The real issue, and the reason we're standing 2 here is an issue of growth. If we are ready to limit 3 growth to a reasonable degree and utilize innovative 4 conservation, we can build a wastewater treatment system 5 less costly to taxpayers and protect the environment. 6 If that's really what we want to do is the South County 7 and urban separator work, fine, if we're building a system 8 to accommodate present residence and slow, proper plan 9 growth.

The only reason we haven't adopted that now in 11 my mind is that we're looking at or there are a lot of 12 powerful interests looking at the needs of rapid growth 13 and development and accommodating very powerful, very 14 well-interested, high-paid lawyers who are trying to see 15 that the county becomes another San Jose.

If you support any other alternative than the 17 community separator South County alternative, there's only 18 one group that's going to benefit, and it's not the one 19 sitting here except those who are developers. Make no 20 mistake about it. Because that is the key issue we're 21 really discussing.

And how much are present residents and 23 present taxpayers to pay to install a system that 24 accommodates new development and new infrastructure that 25 goes along with it?

65

1 If you compare the quality of life in a place

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

like Sonoma County, which many of us come here — I have come here because we love and value and cherish the quality of life. In urban centers like Los Angeles and San Jose, which were wonderful places not long ago, you see what happens when you allow unrestricted growth. That's what some of the alternatives when you read this document really talks about is the capacity for allowing a lot more building very quickly.

One final thing, any plan that includes dumping wastewater in the Russian River to any extent, even if it really is clean, if even if it really is truly so clean you can drink the stuff, doesn't work for simple reasons that it creates a terrible negative impression in the general public, both in Sonoma County and the tourist and tourism business we depend on. The fact that we're creating a sewer, it creates a negative image that destroys tourism that's a large part of this county's income. And I have a lot of friends in San Francisco. I go there often, and when I talk about the Russian River, you would be surprised, you would be scared if you knew how much they laugh, "Oh, you're swimming in the toilets. They dump toilet water there." That may be grossly exaggerated. It may be treated and clean. I don't have the knowledge to speak to that. I think it's the image

66

you create when you dump water in the Russian River. The last thing you want to do is create an image that destroys jobs for the people in this county. This county really need this industry. Tourism is a clean industry in this county. They know you people work hard on the project to come up with an extensive report.

Go past the interest and money of the developers and look at the interest of the people who are the residents of this county who want an affordable alternative that's politically clean and adopted. It should have been adopted many, many years ago. And stop spending time on more studies and spend it on getting the project going or community separators.

Thank you very much.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

The next speaker, Frank Glazier.

FRANK GLAZIER: I'm Frank Glazier. I live at 58 Fallon Road, Two Rock Valley. I have for the past 40 years. It kind of seem like we're getting a big — I feel like we're all in a family here, we keep seeing the same faces over the last years.

I'm here representing myself and the well owners in the Two Rock Valley. And I'm especially speaking for on Alternative Number 4. Any dam or irrigation in the Two Rock Valley will definitely destroy

67

all of our wells. And I'm sure that the Public Utilities, the consultants and the engineers in this room have read all of my documents over the past years of the fact. I say "years" because it does seem like years.

So really I just have three questions for you. I would like to know where the freshwater for the Two Rock Valley is coming from. I want a specific location of where it's coming from. I want to know when it's coming, meaning before the project, during the project, or after the project. And number three, I would like to know who is going to pay for the costs of this water. Also, if these questions aren't answered and answered correctly, I'm sure there's going to be plenty of litigation on this subject.

I would like to close by saying that if you do choose the Alternative Number 4, that I would be willing to work with your consultants and your engineers to try and work out this problem, because it has to be done in a right manner.

I thank you for your time.

MR. MARKS: Thank you, Frank.

Andrew Camozzi.

ANDREW CAMOZZI: I'm here today to ask the City of Santa Rosa —

MR. MARKS: Mr. Camozzi, could we have your address, too, please?

68

2 ANDREW CAMOZZI: I am the owner of property at
3 1795 Pepper Road, which I'm here to discuss. I live at
4 840 West Railroad Avenue in Cotati.

5 The favor I'm asking of the City of Santa Rosa
6 is my wife and I own a 200-acre ranch on Pepper Road in
7 the Two Rock area, and I've been receiving material in the
8 mail for the last four months asking to come on the site
9 and run tests, and things like this. And I am asking you
10 to consider dropping this 200 acres in Pepper Road that's
11 referred to as the Meacham Reservoir. I'm asking you to
12 consider dropping it because I lease the ranch and my son,
13 we run a 400-cow dairy. My family and I have put a lot of
14 hard work in this place. And there's six big barns, other
15 out buildings, two-story house that will be all under
16 water if you decide to take this pond site.

17 And I also say, it's right below the county
18 dump. It's the beginning of Steeples Creek. There's
19 enough water returning out of that dump like the other day
20 when it rained there's a four foot pipe two and a half
21 foot water running out of it. If you take a dam, there's
22 enough water coming out of the dump and several
23 neighboring properties that fill the damsite without your
24 wastewater.

25 And secondly, the buildings on the ranch, it

69

1 cost us between 750 and a million dollars — 750,000 and
2 a million dollars and this will be all under water. And
3 sure, use that money to pay for it, but money doesn't
4 mean nothing at my age anymore. Please consider dropping
5 it.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

8 Clifford Ostrem.

9 CLIFFORD OSTREM: Clifford Ostrem, 7720 Bodega
10 Avenue, Number 25, Sebastopol.

11 I was just — I'm a retired sanitary worker
12 and also I spent a number of years in the pipelines with
13 the two oil companies in Richmond. But I was going to
14 suggest that the wastewater disposal problem could be
15 solved by using a common carrier to transport the
16 wastewater to San Pablo Bay by common carrier rather than
17 through public expense. It could eventually be tied into
18 the other sanitary districts and disposed by like San
19 Rafael disposes presently in the deep water by the
20 Richmond Bridge.

21 Thank you very much for your consideration.

22 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

23 That was the last of our speakers who had
24 submitted speaker cards. Is there anyone else who wants
25 to speak and had not submitted a card?

70

1 CHRIS PETERSON: Yeah, I'll say something.

2 MR. MARKS: Do we have your card?

3 Again, your name and residence, please.

4 CHRIS PETERSON: My name is Chris Peterson.

5 I'm a teacher at Rancho Cotati High School and my students
6 will be studying this process.

7 It's a pleasure to get a chance to have an
8 opportunity just to say a comment or two. Mr. Levinsky, I
9 love it. Mr. Camozzi, I love it. We loved you on our
10 school board, believe it.

11 Growth will go up. Rates will go up. Habitat
12 will be gone. Available space will be gone. Air quality
13 will be going down. Variety and quality of species will
14 go down. Expense will go up. Growth will go up. And
15 agricultural costs to this county will go up, I fear, but
16 I hope I'm wrong.

17 I'm here. I attended the meetings last year
18 in the public input process that I did not see in the
19 records. In all regards to public health and checking
20 the treated effluent, I hope that you will access, as you
21 do your literature search and Tasks 25 and 22, I believe,
22 that you'll look at the work of David Grimes. These are
23 all environmental microbiologists. They're all well
24 published. You'll find their work easily. David Grimes
25 is with the Department of Energy. Dr. Betty Olson is with

71

1 the University of California, Irvine, and Dr. Charles

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

2 Gerba is at the University of Arizona, and they all have a
3 wide body of information that could be very useful in
4 your literature search and also as you establish protocol
5 just to check out the treated effluents for any possible
6 pathogens which I know is a concern to a lot of people.

7 Okay. And it is a commodity. Also a real
8 commodity and I think so many of the alternatives talk
9 about where you can get rid of it, and it is a real
10 commodity. Drive to I-5 sometime and see the Lotter
11 (phonetic) and the treated effluent which is a very high
12 tech plant. We have a plant I think in many ways to be
13 proud of. I think it's something to be a real commodity
14 and I think you need to take a look at this.

15 And where did this ocean outfall come from?
16 Which way are we going? Looking west or looking south?
17 I'm serious.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

20 Any other speakers at this session?

21 I would like to remind you this evening there
22 will be a second session for the scoping comments and that
23 will begin at seven o'clock right here.

24 I would also like to remind you that there are
25 comment forms as well as the Preliminary Scoping Report

72

1 and Summary over here for anyone who needs information.
2 Is there anyone -- Ed Brauner, would you like
3 to say anything before we go?

4 MR. BRAUNER: I would just like to once again
5 thank everyone for coming and the input that we receive
6 from you is important and we're not here to the select a
7 project, we're here to scope the studies. And so that's
8 what we're trying to accomplish and thank you again for
9 being here.

10 (Whereupon the first Scoping Session was
11 adjourned at 4:45 p.m. and the second Scoping Session
12 began at 7:06 p.m.)

13 ---oo---

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

73

1 THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1994, 7:05 P.M.
2 SANTA ROSA, CALIFORNIA

3 ---oo---

4 MR. BRAUNER: Good evening everyone. We would
5 like to go ahead and get started, if we could.

6 (Whereupon introductions were made and the
7 presentation by Marie Meredith and Andy Hauge was had and
8 not reported.)

9 MR. MARKS: Then with that, why don't we get
10 started. And the first speaker is Ellery Akers.

11 ELLERY AKERS: Hi. Can you hear me?

12 MR. MARKS: Yes.

13 ELLERY AKERS: I'm a nature writer from Point
14 Reyes Station, and my address is P.O. Box 1267 Point Reyes
15 Station, California 94956.

16 I'm here to speak for the two esteros and the
17 Gulf Parallones. They are in my backyard, so to speak. I
18 feel that all shore birds and the egrets and the herons in
19 these beautiful places are frail. And I would like to ask
20 the Environmental Impact Report to address what affect the
21 effluent from Santa Rosa would have on the reproductive
22 success of these birds.

23 I would also like to speak for the Gulf of the
24 Parallones which is a National Marine Sanctuary, and
25 I feel like anything that is dumped into this area will

74

1 set a precedent for our national marine sanctuaries

2 everywhere.

3 I would like to bring up one point which I
4 don't know if it's been addressed in the report, and that
5 is the stellar sea lion is a sea lion that breeds out on
6 the Farallones and they were threatened and they are
7 having tremendous difficulty because of organochlorines,
8 which are compounds in the water. And these kinds of
9 things are just simply coming from people's washing
10 machines, detergents, and also pesticides, chlorine,
11 bleach, these kind of things that get dumped down the
12 drain. They are already in tremendous straits, and I
13 feel that more effluent from Santa Rosa would be their
14 death now. And I would like to have that addressed by the
15 Environmental Impact Report.

16 Obviously I'm opposed to the West Marin
17 alternative and I would like to have other alternatives
18 considered.

19 Thanks.

20 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

21 Next we have Bill Jahn.

22 BILL JAHN: Thank you. My name is Bill Jahn
23 and I'm a homeowner. I live at 604 Buena Vista Drive in
24 Santa Rosa, 95404.

25 I come this evening and I've been a resident

75

1 here for 30 years. I've lived in several other states
2 before coming here and several cities, and I carved at
3 what we've done with our wastewater; the treatment we've
4 given to it to a point where it is capable of drinking. I
5 suggest -- I have a family, cousins, and grandchildren,
6 and I would like to see them enjoy Santa Rosa and be able
7 to stay here and enjoy the fine environment we have now,
8 but they must also balance this and have a balance between
9 the environment and the economy. Without jobs, we won't
10 have anybody here. And if we can find a way to restrain
11 the costs that we're talking about, as I recall we've
12 already spent something in excess of 140 million dollars
13 in other projects to bring our wastewater up to a point
14 that is ingestible. I hope that whatever we do, we
15 definitely cost out and find a cost performance for each
16 one of the alternatives.

17 I would like to know what it's going to cost
18 and what we would say by each one of these alternatives
19 so that we have an idea what it might cost us in the year
20 2000 to operate this treatment system and have a discharge
21 in the manner that hopefully you'll decide on.

22 I do favor Alternative 6. To my knowledge
23 in talking to a number of engineers and water people,
24 there's been no limits set on the discharge that could be
25 discharged into the Russian River. As I understand it, it

76

1 could be 100 percent discharge, and that's not one or 20
2 percent. I think that the State Water Control Board has
3 never set a figure, to my knowledge, saying 20 percent or
4 one percent. I certainly don't know that we had ever
5 discharged 100 percent. But certainly I favor using the
6 20 percent. And that water is now treated, so we're
7 actually improving -- to my understanding from what I've
8 read -- improving the quality of water downstream that's
9 entering the ocean.

10 Now, tonight, a seventh alternative was
11 proposed which is ocean outfall, and that might be our
12 answer if it's within a cost performance basis.

13 So thank you very much.

14 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

15 Next speaker is Megan Boyang. And I hope
16 I didn't murder your name too bad.

17 MEGAN BOYANG: That's as close as anybody
18 comes.

19 Megan Boyang. I live at 1670 Bloomfield Road
20 in Sebastopol. I would like to speak a little bit about
21 Button Ranch in West County. One of the questions that
22 I would have as far as Environmental Impact Statement is
23 concerned is to research what would happen to the nesting
24 pair of golden eagles that's there.

25 I've been doing ceremonies out in this valley

77

1 for a couple of years now, putting people up on the hill

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

for vision quests, doing healing ceremonies, pipe ceremonies. It's a very sacred space and I'm not sure how one would go about researching it, but there's a very strong presence of the people who were there before the white settlers came through. There's a very strong sacred presence and use of that valley, and I would really hate to see it go under wastewater.

I wonder what would happen to the eagles not only in terms of a noise factor but in terms of taking land where they can hunt and putting sewage there so that they can't really eat what's available. They would have to go elsewhere. Where can they go that isn't crowded up with other uses of the lands? So those are some concerns that I have.

You know, if people are not able to use the land in a sacred manner, then where can they go? And also I would like some research into who was there before using it. Because it's very clear if you're doing this work that this is not the first time the land has been used that way. It goes back a long, long way.

I don't have a lot of information about the various systems. I'm coming in because I have this particular connection to the land there. But it doesn't make sense to me to take what I understand to be the last

78

unpolluted esteros and turn them into sewage pathways. And it also doesn't make sense to me when we're talking about the fish disappearing from the oceans to consider the last one that was brought up tonight — the last option. It doesn't make sense to take the sewage and put it out in the ocean when we're already running the fish out of existence.

So that's all I have to say.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

The next speaker is Betty Guggloz.

BETTY GUGGLOZ: My name is Betty Guggloz. I represent the California Native Plant Society. My husband and I reside in Cloverdale at 1123 Palomino Road.

The California Native Plant Society does have an abundance of comments to make, having reviewed many of the documents. And most of those I will submit in writing this coming week, but I would like to touch tonight on a number of or on some of the more significant issues. In the interest of staying within the five minutes, I may read this. I think I can read faster than I can talk.

Alternative 2: Although Alternative 2 includes factors that make it appear preferable to some of the other alternatives, the South County alternative as proposed has the potential to impact the tidal marshes in

79

the lower reaches of Adobe Creek, Petaluma River, Petaluma Salt Marsh and several resident endangered plant species, including the endangered Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse.

Alternative 3: The Community Separator-South County Alternatives has the potential to convert existing seasonal wetlands into agricultural use in the western Santa Rosa Plains which may lead to impacts upon vernal pools and which contain several listed species. As currently proposed, the alternative also has the potential to impact Blucher Creek, which supports populations of the state and federal endangered freshwater shrimp. Blucher Creek is also the water source for the Cunningham Marsh, a significant eutrophic freshwater marsh that contains many species found elsewhere in the county only in Pitkin Marsh in the Vinehill area. Cunningham Marsh contains nine listed plant species of varying degrees of rarity, including some that are either state or federally listed and others that are currently candidates for federal listing. It is crucial that this project avoid impacts to Blucher Creek and the Cunningham Marsh.

Alternative 4 includes similar impacts to Blucher Creek and has the potential to impact the Chileno Valley wetlands, the Estero Americano, Stemple Creek, San Antonio Creek, and the Estero de San Antonio which support a variety of significant wetland habitats. This

alternative also will result in the loss of significant

80

2 plant communities and wetlands on the Button Ranch, 3 including the only remaining substantial woodland plant 4 community still in existence in the Petaluma Gap. 5 Conversion of rangelands to irrigated croplands has the 6 potential to destroy historically known location sites for 7 several endangered plant species.

8 Alternative 5: Many of the Geothermal units 9 at the Geysers are located on serpentine soils, a unique 10 soil type that supports a variety of rare plant species 11 restricted to serpentine, including several species and 12 subspecies and *Eriogonum nervulosum*. The Geysers region 13 also provides habitat for several other plant species.

14 In spite of this, the Geysers alternative has 15 the advantage of not requiring additional Russian River 16 discharge and given some flexibility in siting treatment 17 plants and pipelines away from the significant biotic 18 resources. This may be an alternative that provides a 19 less complicated solution to wastewater disposal. It also 20 may lead to the project at the Geysers continuing on a 21 little longer than it appears that they will otherwise.

22 Because of the scope of this project, the 23 potential for each of the alternatives to impact and 24 degrade the county's already diminished biological 25 resource integrity, we strongly recommend that the

81

1 project's environmental consultants be given adequate 2 field season time to conduct and complete the necessary 3 biological studies and the organizations such as local 4 chapters of Audubon and the California Native Plant 5 Society be contacted to augment biological information 6 that has not yet been included in the California Natural 7 Diversity Data Base files. Unlike some of the newspaper 8 articles that were listed in the library catalogue, and as 9 most of you know, newspaper articles are not always based 10 on accurate information, both of these organizations are 11 very good about documenting their information and their 12 information is backed up either by field study or 13 literature research.

14 I will include in our written comments contact 15 people for each of the three chapters that border on these 16 alternatives, Marin, Napa, and Sonoma County.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

19 The next speaker, Hamilton Hess.

20 HAMILTON HESS: My name is Hamilton Hess. I 21 reside both in Lake County and in Santa Rosa. The Santa 22 Rosa address is 255 Austin Road, 95403.

23 I'm speaking on behalf of Friends of Cobb 24 Mountain, a citizen's group in the neighborhood of the 25 community of Cobb, located in southern Lake County just

82

1 immediately to the east of the Geysers' geothermal field. 2 We wish to express to you our concerns regarding the 3 Geysers option for the wastewater and asking that the 4 specific issue that we're going to focus on will be 5 addressed for treatment in the EIR/EIS in substantial 6 fashion.

7 I've given written comments, and this evening 8 probably following this with more written comments. I'll 9 give you a summary now of our issue. The issue is the 10 likely seismic effects of the injection of large volumes 11 of wastewater into the Geysers geothermal field. We 12 note with some concern that this is only tentatively 13 mentioned in the Summary of the Environmental Consultants' 14 Proposed Scope of Work in the draft Preliminary Scoping 15 Report. It receives a very tentative mentioning.

16 The region of the Geysers geothermal field is 17 well known for being seismically very active. It is the 18 prevailing opinion in the scientific community that the 19 vast majority of the earthquake —

20 COURT REPORTER: Could you slow down?

21 HAMILTON HESS: The earthquakes range from 22 very small micro-earthquakes, which are too small to be 23 felt, up into the 2's and 3's and even 4 to 4.5 is the 24 largest earthquake we've experienced. The opinion of the 25 scientific community the most vast majority of the

83

1 earthquakes are caused by the industrial operations steam

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

2 extractions and fluid injection.

3 The connection between steam extraction and
4 fluid injection on the one hand and seismic activity on
5 the other is well documented in the historical records
6 maintained by the U.S.G.S., and of the Seismographic
7 Station in Berkeley. And also there are a number of
8 professional papers on the topic.

9 It's been pointed out also by seismologists
10 involved in the discussion of this issue, which was
11 treated in depth, also to our view not adequately, in the
12 parallel project reported that is like southern lake
13 County sewage treatment and effluent injection plan, which
14 I'm sure the panel knows about. It was pointed out by
15 seismologists in connection with the discussion of the
16 issues there that another factor exists and that is with
17 regard to seismic affects of the geothermal injection and
18 extraction, that there's a "stress loading" process which
19 is undoubtedly going on in neighboring faults, the
20 Calionni (phonetic) fault for one, which is very close to
21 the community of Cobb, as a result of the seismic activity
22 that is taking place by induction from injection and
23 extraction of steam.

24 This issue also is an important one that these
25 faults may be stress-related to the point that they will

84

1 produce larger events than we're getting, in the 3's and
2 up into the 4's from the Geysers activities themselves.
3 We in the Cobb area have had to live with this. We don't
4 like it. We don't like the earthquakes. They frighten
5 our guests and they have already caused minor structural
6 damage. We do not like to face more quakes in the face
7 of this project proposed, and we ask that the issue be
8 treated substantively in depth, possibly to get all of the
9 facts out and that the whole issue is not quite washed in
10 any way.

11 We are concerned about up-front mitigation and
12 that is that some plan of recompense be adopted and agreed
13 upon for damage that may occur to structures and indeed to
14 people in personal injury from earthquakes that could be
15 induced and particularly in relation to the larger stress
16 loading factor from the large volumes of water that would
17 be injected into the Geysers field by this proposed
18 project.

19 Thank you very much.

20 MR. MARKS: Thank you, Mr. Hess.

21 MS. COURT: Can I ask you for a clarification,
22 please? You mentioned the studies that were done by Lake
23 County Sanitary District and that you didn't find them
24 adequate. Do your written comments address what
25 additional study you would like to see done and where you

85

1 found the inadequacies available?

2 HAMILTON HESS: I will provide you with that
3 information. We have specific written material on that
4 and I will provide it for you.

5 MS. COURT: Thanks.

6 MR. MARKS: One other thing before we get to
7 the next speaker, if you have written comments that you
8 read here, it's very helpful also for the shorthand
9 reporter if you submit that. If you have a copy, you can
10 submit that. It makes her job a lot easier. I appreciate
11 it. Thank you.

12 Next speaker, Ed Pozzi.

13 ED POZZI: Good evening. Can you hear me?

14 MR. MARKS: Yes.

15 ED POZZI: Thank you. Ed Pozzi. I'm a
16 rancher on Estero de San Antonio. Been there all my
17 life. Seen a lot of things come and go. I actually was
18 born here in the old General Hospital in Santa Rosa, 1927.
19 My family, I'm third generation, have nine children, and
20 they're all involved in the ranching with me.

21 I say I've seen a lot of things come and go.
22 There's no more wildlife or birds to speak of. I
23 personally blame the City -- no, the county, Sonoma
24 County, for their land there along Meacham Road. And I
25 hate to see a huge dam on Walker Road to compound the side

86

1 effects of all hard chemicals or whatever it is in the

2 stuff.

3 And I personally think that water being
4 extracted from the Russian River, the Board of Santa Rosa,
5 should be returned to the Russian River. We just heard
6 it's supposed to be drinkable.

7 I had breakfast yesterday in Monte Rio. I and
8 another gentleman 80 years old, George Casini has the
9 campgrounds there. I toured the campground, looked at the
10 water coming out of Austin Creek, white seven-up water
11 coming out of Russian River. Looks like a brown color
12 Crayon color. Early rain had attracted a lot of sediment
13 and so forth.

14 But I think talking about the water to the
15 ranchers to use, I just picked up my Farm Journal
16 yesterday, they have such huge wheat grain, soy bean, all
17 the stuff for food and cattle in the middle west that
18 you're going down a blank road in Sonoma County with water
19 irrigation system. You must think, look back a little
20 bit. You can't change what happened in the past, but
21 Santa Rosa had a shop factory, retainer broom factory,
22 apple factory, processes and appliance has all gone to
23 electronics and other stuff that I just can't understand
24 why you continue building homes, taking up good land, and
25 which will never return to farmlands, one, because once

87

1 the farmer dies and moves on, they never come back.

2 I believe that if steam -- I believe if the
3 water was piped through the Geysers to kill all the
4 bacteria and pump it all up there -- I heard at the last
5 meeting they pay you people for it. Build a line like
6 Beckle Corporation proposed eight or ten years ago and
7 what water wasn't used up there could come back into the
8 Russian River like holy water.

9 So anyway, I'm no chemist and I'm no engineer,
10 but I'm a God damn good rancher. And I tell you that I
11 served a couple years in the Marine Corps. That's why I
12 can stay here and talk to you all night. I don't want to
13 drive you crazy. You do damn good work on paper, but I
14 hope I'm alive when I see where the water goes.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. MARKS: Thank you, Ed.

17 The next speaker is Don Camacho.

18 DON CAMACHO: I'm Don Camacho. I live in
19 Bloomfield, 11547 College Street. My backyard is your
20 Alternative 4, West County option, so that's what I've
21 been looking at. Although I'm sure if anyone looks
22 closely at any of them, they're going to find things you
23 are going to have to seriously look into.

24 To address the bottom line, there's big
25 numbers that are being thrown around about this, but let's

88

1 not forget the perspective here that if any of us was to
2 try to implement a residential sewage disposal system, it
3 consumes about a half acre, thousands of dollars to
4 implement the system, maintenance, so on. That's a large
5 number. What I want to see in this is a comparison of
6 these alternatives to that alternative which is each and
7 every sewage user in this plan has enough land to provide
8 for this disposal themselves and get a true comparison of
9 what the real cost to make county health requirements with
10 your sewage, very large number. That I hope will help put
11 this in a bit more perspective when you are talking about
12 a two or three dollar a month rate hike. Try owning the
13 land to maintain a septic system.

14 Let me go on here. Well, reading a little bit
15 here, I assume this is what the EIR is going to grow from.
16 I'm reading the alternative for the West County
17 reclamation, seek with a checklist. In 1.2 there's a
18 paragraph: "Discharger use of reclaimed water for
19 irrigation or augmentation of creek river flow would not
20 disrupt soils", yet, next page, 1-5 it says, "In addition,
21 water erosion could result if reclaimed water were
22 improperly applied to agricultural lands."

23 Well, which one is it?

24 Next item: Excess run-off from agricultural
25 lands could result in erosion and deposition of sediment

89

1 and nearby water course.

PAGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

2 Well, which one is it? You'll hear a little
3 bit more in writing from me on these issues.
4 And I want to see this question answered in a
5 bit of a reference to a study made on this or at least how
6 you came to these calculations. It seems to me that this
7 is saying that there will be no increase in the flood
8 potential. But my question is, Will the project increase
9 the flood potential by reducing the irrigated fields'
10 absorption of rain and thereby increase run-off? The
11 storm what, two, three weeks ago, six inches, seven
12 inches, two days. Well, the land wasn't saturated from
13 irrigation. It soaked up a certain percentage of it.
14 If the land had been saturated, that would have resulted
15 in a flood; not a big one, but to us in Bloomfield, it
16 counts.
17 I'm assuming that there will be a monitoring
18 system of the water quality here. How is the public
19 informed of the results of that? What happens if a
20 flood happens, does it not get published in the paper?
21 Is it the PD's discretion to do that? What's our
22 feedback? What's the public feedback of how this
23 monitoring is happening?
24 On the subject of quality of it, I want to
25 know the chemicals, toxins, nutrients and by-products that

90

1 will be specifically tested for in the wastewater.
2 You make a reference to disinfectant by
3 products. What exactly are the products included in this
4 term? What is the original product? Is this the chlorine
5 that gets put into this?
6 And this monitoring system that I'm hoping
7 will be designed into it actually prevents overchlorinated
8 water or otherwise harmful wastewater from getting into
9 the environment.
10 MR. MARKS: That's the five minutes. If you
11 want to say more later, you know, after everyone has gone
12 through, you're certainly welcome to. Thank you.
13 Bill Kortum.
14 BILL KORTUM: Bill Kortum. 180 Ely Road,
15 Petaluma.
16 First of all, I want to direct some of my
17 comments to the Corps representative here. To think that
18 you're coming into this county after 20 years of conflict
19 where we have essentially killed the idea of an ocean
20 outfall is very insulting to the public of this county.
21 And maybe from a technical standpoint we would like to
22 demand that we do an ocean discharge, but the City has
23 already spent 150 million dollars preparing for other uses
24 of that water they wouldn't have there to make that
25 treatment if they were going to go to an ocean discharge.

91

1 And you have to also recognize we have a international
2 recognized marine lab right off of our coast line that
3 some of the experts have said we would have to go anywhere
4 from 12 to 15 miles off the coast line to build that ocean
5 discharge. And to think we have to spend another million
6 and a half dollars to do those studies is minimal. We
7 have oceanographers who say it takes four years to do a
8 proper study. So I hope you drop that idea at a very
9 early stage.
10 In your EIR you state here under 314.4, Social
11 Economic Studies Financial Impacts. I would like to
12 suggest the idea that you look into a partnership with
13 Petaluma. We now have a new political scene in Petaluma.
14 We don't know what the attitudes will be as of January
15 when the City Council sits for the first time. It's my
16 reading that there will be a majority if not a whole vote
17 to work out a partnership for Santa Rosa.
18 If you do a South County plan and you go by
19 Petaluma, it seems a duplication of efforts and a great
20 chance for the economy of scale to work with Petaluma.
21 Right now Petaluma has five major firms bidding to build
22 a plant on a private basis and operate that plant for 30
23 or 40 years. And the moment they get the plant built,
24 they will probably be asked to -- whoever wins that
25 contract -- to go out and find a dam site, find the land,

92

1 build a pipeline, write the EIRs, the exact duplication of

2 what you're looking at right now. And I see the economy
3 of scale of working with Petaluma not only from Petaluma's
4 standpoint but from Santa Rosa's standpoint, just to
5 fulfill the financial aspects of this EIR and bring some
6 economy of scale to it.
7 And I would like to see a very thorough report
8 in this EIR, what that would amount to for Santa Rosa
9 from Santa Rosa's standpoint, so that we can look at
10 that. If we don't do that, if Santa Rosa isn't dealt its
11 hand, even though it might not be fulfilled maybe by
12 January or February, you'll be able to determine that by
13 going to Petaluma. Nothing will happen. Nobody will make
14 that offer, and you'll be going in this pattern of
15 avoiding that issue entirely and the cities never will get
16 together.
17 I can take you back 20 years when the original
18 regional plan included Petaluma. It even included Novato
19 in a super regional plan to handle this wastewater. So
20 it's not new thinking at all. And we should revisit that
21 on a more limited basis, at least with our sister city,
22 the other major city of this community, to see what we
23 could save in going that route.
24 Thank you.
25 MR. MARKS: Thank you very much.

93

1 The next speaker is Tom Yarish.
2 TOM YARISH: Hi. I'm Tom Yarish. 23 Nelson
3 Avenue, Mill Valley.
4 I'm co-chair of Friends of the Esteros. I
5 also represent Environmental Act Committee of West Marin.
6 Most recently I formed a new alliance with Friends of
7 the Sonoma County Taxpayer Association. And I would like
8 to address that first.
9 I think there's a lot of confusion about the
10 real costs of urban build-out. Today's ratepayers are hit
11 with the deferred long-term costs of the building boom of
12 the '70s and '80s, specifically you need a baseline
13 analysis of the costs of all public services structured
14 along the lines of, one, the cost of no growth, the cost
15 of limited, slow growth, and the cost of full urban
16 build-out. I think that would present the ratepayers with
17 some real baseline information on the true costs of
18 growth.
19 There's another myth at work here, the myth
20 being that population growth equals economic growth. We
21 all support economic growth. It seems to me there's a
22 balance evidence that increase in population growth is
23 antithetical to the quality of life that we all have come
24 to look for in the Bay Area.
25 I would like to see an account of what is the

94

1 legacy of the cumulative effects of population growth
2 of the '90s to the future generations. This needs serious
3 analysis of the short-term benefits versus the long-term
4 costs to future generations.
5 Let's penetrate this myth, get it off the
6 books. I think when we get through that, we'll find that
7 the interest of the ratepayers and the future generations
8 are much closer in alignment than anybody would like to
9 believe today. The Santa Rosa ratepayers have a lot to
10 gripe about, but why should the long-term costs of urban
11 growth be suffered by non-urban communities and wildlife?
12 Okay. That's as far as I'm going with the
13 taxpayers today.
14 The next issue, water quality. The hydrology
15 of the West County watersheds needs serious study.
16 There's a section in Task 22.3, Section 4, page 30 which
17 says that the consultants will rely on existing Santa
18 Rosan county agency water quality studies as the point of
19 departure.
20 I think this is problematical in that we don't
21 know the existing basis of water quality studies, and
22 hydrology is really adequate to characterize actual
23 conditions, particularly in the West County aquifers and
24 watersheds, and most particularly in the vicinity of
25 Sonoma County landfill which is adjacent to the Sutton

95

1 Ranch, which is, as far as we know, still the chosen

PAGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

2 receptor site as the storage facility.
3 I think there's some extremely serious qualms
4 that relate to the percolation of effluents from the
5 landfill and all its toxicity into the existing creeks,
6 streams, and springs that are in the Button Ranch. And of
7 course, that is the head water of the Stemple and
8 Americano creeks which treat the two esteros.

9 Another section, Task 22.1, page 24 minimizes
10 the need for hydrologic studies in West County saying that
11 the studies done for the Russian River were adequate for
12 this alternative.

13 I would rather dispute that. I think you need
14 very comprehensive study in that area with a whole new
15 array of tests and wells to really determine where the
16 fractures and faults are in that entire area around the
17 landfill.

18 Another topic, management. There's no
19 guarantee that the West County Irrigation based -- West
20 County irrigation based agriculture will be viable in the
21 long term. There isn't much to suggest that there's a
22 great benefit to be derived from irrigating in the West
23 County anyway, because those crops are not of high
24 agricultural value. There's not a highly productive area
25 for irrigated crops. Management scenarios for

96

2 the kind of steps that, for my practice, I would see as a
3 logical sequence of events or the logical kind of things
4 that would have to be studied to produce a linkage and how
5 that linkage can be spelled out analytically so we've got
6 that.

7 And the course of the two policy matters
8 appeared that I didn't see discussed, that would probably
9 be worthwhile in checking, and that is the subjects about
10 how the water conservation policy or that program will
11 evolve. There's lots of ways to do implement water
12 conservation measures. And there's more bang for the
13 buck, some more than others, and some perceived and have a
14 greater marked penetration than other methods that should
15 be addressed I believe, and also the method by which water
16 conservation measures or even the EIR and EIR measures,
17 how they're financed. And quite important, you can assume
18 that wastewater treatment and the disposal options which
19 are going to be very expensive no matter how we look at it
20 those will be financed with long-term debt. But water
21 conservation, which should be integrated with the total
22 project, should also be considered for debt finance so
23 you're not stuck in a crisis of limited capital available
24 for something that could be extremely cost-effective. And
25 help mitigate the environmental things you're looking at.

99

1 environmentally sound agriculture irrigation are highly
2 complex and uncertain, particularly in West County. We're
3 worried about the ability of the City to maintain
4 contracts with tentative agriculture which leaves us
5 wondering what the long-term use of those agricultural
6 lands will be and whether or not they will be suited for
7 irrigation indefinitely or in perpetuity.

8 MR. MARKS: The time is up.
9 TOM YARISH: This is just --
10 MR. MARKS: No. Wait a minute. The time
11 is up.

12 TOM YARISH: Okay. I will submit more in
13 writing.

14 MR. MARKS: Okay. Thank you.
15 The next speaker, please, which will be

16 Ned Orrett.
17 NED ORRETT: I was sitting here listening, so
18 I'm not -- Can we hear? I'm a short person. Okay.
19 Ned Orrett. 6 -- Well, my home address is 1161 Western
20 Avenue, Petaluma.

21 I'm here to discuss just one thing, kind of
22 a -- Robin, you described it as a mitigation. The primary
23 mitigation I see is to reduce wastewater flow so we can
24 mitigate to some extent problems in total. So in
25 reviewing the summary documents that you sent out, Marie,

97

1 So that's the essence of it. So I've got my
2 report ready.

3 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

4 NED ORRETT: Oh, and finally, I really
5 appreciate that water conservation is even addressed in
6 this study. So thank you very much.

7 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

8 The next speaker, Gabor Patay.

9 GABOR PATAY: Good evening. My name is Gabor
10 Patay. I'm in 2214 Pierre Drive in Santa Rosa.

11 I'm living in Santa Rosa in the past 28 years.
12 I'm a taxpayers, and only thing is I'm concerned, how much
13 is going to cost to the property owners on this entire
14 project? One thing is I believe is environment and the
15 growth. But one thing is I don't understand if we have
16 growth, but if we don't have adequate sewage disposal and
17 water quality in the city, why is the planning is gave
18 out hundreds and thousands of new building permits and
19 bring more people here when we don't have adequate
20 disposal? I like to know is how much is going to be cost
21 this entire project to the taxpayers to the city and
22 to the county? And I like to know how much of this entire
23 balance is going to be for studies and how much is
24 actually going to be for the work?

25 I have a little figure here is my home, which

100

1 I want to focus just on water conservation and how that
2 can integrate with the total project. And there are two
3 project supporting objectives that relate here of the
4 seven. I've got all this in writing.

5 One is optimize water resource conservation
6 where practical. Another object, what I heard from
7 Mr. Jahn, develop a disposal system that can be
8 successfully financed and is economically feasible.

9 So in reading through the studies relating to
10 the water conservation, and of course these are the
11 summaries of these studies, I couldn't see a mechanism
12 in there of how these studies would be used to integrate
13 the results of that work back into the various project
14 alternatives. In other words, there is a certain amount
15 of water or flow reduction that's postulated, but that
16 number could be variable depending on what you learn, and
17 depending on the benefits -- the cost and the benefits of
18 those, which vary. The benefits will vary with each
19 alternative study.

20 The amount of water conservation that is cost
21 effective will be different for each alternative. And as
22 those vary, that should have an effect on changing the
23 scope of the scope. The size of the disposal, the
24 treatment disposal works that are required for that
25 alternative when they're balanced with water conservation.

98

1 So I went to a lot of work today to summarize

1 is a very small, about 1,400 square feet home. I live
2 with my wife, just two of us. My water base or actually
3 is the sewer base is started -- I'm getting to January
4 19th, 1994, started with three baseline. I think it's
5 three point or whatever. And in October, this month, this
6 year, is went to four point, the baseline. Now, I use the
7 same 5,000 gallon of water in January 1994 and a figure
8 also is October 1994 is also is 5,000 gallon. And
9 increase was from January 1994 to October 1994 from \$5.04,
10 that's a sewer usage, to \$16.36. That's more than 300
11 percent increase. And we talked about in the last meeting
12 in the City Hall a six and seven percent increase. I
13 don't know where they get that six, seven percent increase
14 when he have the bill here. I have it with me, is went
15 from \$5.04 to \$16.36.

16 So I believe -- I'm retired. I'm 69 years
17 old, and I live on social security, which is ridiculous.
18 I mean, I've been 38 years in this country legally. And
19 I'm getting \$492.38 years work. My wife get \$265, so I
20 have to look my budget. I could not afford to get more
21 increase on anything.

22 Thank you very much to listening me and I hope
23 everything is going to be turn out okay. Thank you.

24 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

25 The next speaker is Brenda Adelman.

101

1 BRENDA ADELMAN: Brenda Adelman. Box 581,

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

Guerneville.

I have -- I hope I can get through this. I've had a cold. I'm here representing Russian River Watershed Protection Committee. We have approximately 8,000 plus supporters. We're very concerned about impacts of this project on the lower Russian River. We've been following this issue for ten years now quite closely, as you well know. We've been watching increased degradation on the River. Throughout that time, the River gets greener each year from nutrient contamination. The exotic plant life is proliferating. People get sick when they're swimming or they get nauseated by the slimy bottom from the algae that's growing there.

There are many problems. Salmon are disappearing, and the warmwater fish are proliferating. I think that a lot more has to be done to improve this situation.

There are several points we're going to be submitting extensive written commentary, as I've mentioned. I thought I would just hit on a few of our major concerns right now.

For the last three years, we and our technical experts have been tracking the development of the equal lay to you would be model by the Water Quality Control

2 nine million gallons in one evening with very high
3 chlorine content. So there are issues around that. There
4 are wildlife using these ponds. Are the wildlife in these
5 ponds being protected? And what about the birds who ate
6 those fish?

7 At any rate, I will stop here. I will honor
8 your time limit.

9 Thank you very much.

10 MR. MARKS: Thank you very much.

11 Martin Strain.

12 MARTIN STRAIN: I'm Martin Strain. 200 Valley
13 Street, Tomales, California.

14 I hear what Brenda is saying, and Mr. Patay
15 and all these other people. And you have to wonder how
16 the City can keep pulling the same circus. You know,
17 we're up here, it's been about five years. They've wasted
18 millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, and they
19 still don't have a clue as to what's going on with their
20 wastewater, that is, they have a pretty good idea what
21 they're up to and that is they're trying to build more
22 houses and shove their shit somewhere else, down everybody
23 else's throat. And basically the people who live outside
24 of Santa Rosa are the ones who are going to have to pay
25 the cost. I mean, the ratepayers pay for putting the

102

105

Board. We have commented extensively on the limits and
fallings of this model, and yet I'm quite certain to see
in your draft report that you're going to rely extensively
on that model and other models for determining your long
range cumulative impact.

Now, to my knowledge, there's never been a
serious and complete long-range cumulative impact on the
lower river from all of these discharges. I'm very
concerned that the kinds of information, the estimates
that are being fed into the computer are going to produce
very inadequate results in terms of conclusions. I'm
concerned when you use things like daily and weekly
averages in place of actual highs and lows of flows,
temperatures, whatever parameter you're measuring. I
think it's very important to base it on actual data, and
data that has been collected scientifically, and through a
scientific accounting that can be duplicated by someone
else going after the same information and the same
circumstances.

Another concern we have is that right now you
base your discharges on the high flow of the Russian River
from the day before. Now, when you get that certain high
number, you then are allowed to discharge at one percent
to five percent of the rate for that day, but basically it
takes a day to six days or more to get to the Russian

103

1 effluents somewhere else. But the residents in the
2 surrounding area are being asked to actually foot the bill
3 in the terms of the loss and the degradation of the
4 environment. And this is a sad thing, and I'm not sure
5 we're really going to put up with it. And I just want to
6 tell that you straight off that I don't think we are going
7 to put up with it. We're not going to let you do
8 something that's going to degrade our communities and
9 destroy our lifestyles and ruin our businesses.

10 So with that said, I specifically would like
11 the EIR/EIS to look at the impacts of nutrient loading
12 from direct or indirect discharges of wastewater on the
13 esteros and the near-shore waters of Bodega Bay and
14 Tomales Bay. We asked this in the last EIR and EIS and it
15 was dismissed as if there couldn't possibly be any impact
16 from discharging into the esteros into Bodega Bay.

17 The other major question I have is how does
18 the Subregional Wastewater System propose to identify and
19 remove any and all chemical compounds from wastewater
20 downstream from the industrial pretreatment processes?
21 I think that the people in this room ought to know that
22 there's 150,000 chemical compounds that we've made.
23 There's more than 150,000 chemical compounds and we don't
24 know how to identify a lot of them because tests haven't
25 been developed to identify these when they're in a random

106

1 River, so by the time the discharge actually reaches the
2 Russian River, no one really knows what actual percent
3 is at, and it could be way over the five percent limit.

4 It's especially important to take into
5 consideration that the flow of the river can change as
6 much as 20,000 CFS in one day, and that five percent
7 discharge can represent as much as two billion gallons in
8 one day. And none of these numbers and these scenarios
9 have been analyzed in any detail. And I'll be spelling
10 this out a lot more carefully in writing and hope that
11 they will be addressed.

12 We're concerned that in characterizing the
13 nutrient contamination in the Laguna, basically you
14 focused in on the contribution from animal waste from
15 agriculture. You have not separated out the contribution
16 from irrigation or the nitrate contribution from the
17 wastewater. There's been just this focus on agriculture
18 waste. The nutrient contamination in the Laguna is a
19 result of a combination of factors. And we've been very
20 dissatisfied with the level of analysis thus far and we've
21 provided you expert comments on that and will continue to
22 do so.

23 We're concerned about the use of chlorine. I
24 doubt if there are many people in this room who knows that
25 two weeks ago there was a major fish kill in Brown Pond

104

1 environment, such as the way stream. So if you want to
2 identify them, let's be quite frank, there's no way to
3 know how to remove them if you don't know they're there.

4 And so when they lead you to believe that the
5 water is of drinking water quality, discounting that fact
6 that there's all sorts of unknown and potential extremely
7 toxic compounds remaining in that water so anybody who is
8 going to drink it over a long period of time is in essence
9 accepting the possibility that they may come up with one
10 of these exotic cancers that seem to be blooming all over
11 in the greater United States and in all industrialized
12 countries.

13 As part of my little speech here, I would like
14 to submit an article on red tides. And this is an article
15 by Dr. Donald Anderson out of somewhere in the East Coast
16 at Woodhole Union Graphic Institute, and it deals with
17 nutrient loading and pollution in the near-shore waters
18 of the country, and I think that this article speaks a lot
19 towards -- has a lot to say about the potential of impacts
20 of discharge into the esteros. But it also would tend to
21 condemn the whole idea of direct ocean outfall and the
22 impacts that would have on the greater ocean environment.
23 I think that's a reprehensible idea and I would like to
24 discourage that.

25 So that's all I have to say tonight. I thank

107

1 because you had drawn down the pond and then discharged

1 you for listening and I want to encourage everybody to do

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

their damndest and make sure that Santa Rosa either stops building — I think Alternative Number 1 is the best. And if they don't do that, then let them put their water where they can deal with it the best, you know, right in the Coysers or right under the flood plain here and let them drink it again.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

Bob Anderson.

BOB ANDERSON: Bob Anderson of the Grape Growers Association. P.O. Box 382, Santa Rosa.

I think those were strong words from the speaker before. I'm reminded of the issue when it was ocean outfall and the kind of comments that were received in this body about eight years ago. And just to echo comments made earlier speaking against ocean outfall, I believe the document in front of you sets out as its first objective maximization of reclamation and reuse. Our organization testified earlier it is in support of 100 percent reuse and made the comment in one of these sessions earlier we take the view the ocean has enough water already. We in agriculture can use it.

In terms of the task in front of you, I think we're hearing more comments of concern from the ratepayers, and to me, what that means is that the

2 because again the ratepayers are going to have a new
3 influence as this project comes hopefully around one of
4 the last corners out there. I don't think this is our
5 last chance to comment as the paper may have said.

6 Also, as you're looking at the Russian River,
7 there had been work done previously, but the county is
8 reviewing the riparian habitat along the Russian River
9 through the ARM plan. That consult got paid for it also
10 through a coastal concern review of the Russian River. So
11 I ask you not to pay for it the third time, just use the
12 document.

13 And finally, will the treatment expansion
14 component part of this project also be part of the EIS?

15 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

16 MS. CORT: Don't sit down. I would like a
17 little bit of elaboration on horizontal storage.

18 BOB ANDERSON: Well, in reference to the
19 buffer idea, that there is a point in time you need
20 additional storage when you have extra water, what do you
21 do with it, and you can't put it in the river. The
22 concept would be that you put it onto a flat piece of
23 ground which could be banked around the edges for storage
24 for a short period of time, and when it's not needed, it
25 could be farmed or other use put to it, because ultimately

108

111

1 alternatives when they come back, you will have gone off
2 and studied all the pieces, but the decision-makers are
3 going to have to put those pieces back together. And what
4 I see is the document that's just scattering. And I don't
5 see, maybe it's too early in the process for that form to
6 be there on, how it comes back. But I would encourage you
7 to analyze the pieces as if they were building blocks so
8 that they can come back together and be put back together,
9 because that is what's going to have to happen at the end.

10 And I echo comments made during the Scoping
11 Process November 17th, 1989, that what you do is evaluate
12 them so that there can be incremental costs and you can
13 evaluate and compare the different pieces. And one piece
14 that I would request that we be provided early on, that's
15 the water balance and a set of numbers that we can
16 evaluate some of the alternatives and how they would work.

17 And one thing I do see missing in the scope of
18 work is mention made of a concept put forward earlier by
19 Richard Charter in support of having buffers, because if
20 you look at the water balance — I have — you see spikes.
21 The Russian River goes low and goes high, goes low, goes
22 high, and it just goes all over the place. And I believe
23 in the concept of some horizontal storage or some capacity
24 for getting yourself through those times when the River is
25 in one of its extreme positions would be a useful

109

1 if you look at water waste, only one in ten years or
2 twenty years you may need that.

3 MS. CORT: Thanks.

4 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

5 John Brown.

6 JOHN BROWN: I'm John Brown. 1042 Winding
7 Ridge Road, Santa Rosa. Board member of the Sonoma County
8 Board Taxpayers.

9 We're all either taxpayers or ratepayers and
10 frankly, I think we're all environmentalists. The terms
11 are not mutually exclusive. We're all living in this
12 area. We all have our concerns. I think one of the major
13 taxpayer concerns is we look not just at the environmental
14 aspects, but we look at the cost aspects and we see a
15 bottom line for each of the alternatives, and early in the
16 process rather than very late. So we can weigh the
17 prospects of each alternative.

18 The Alternative Number 7 I suggest was thrown
19 in tonight with the ocean discharge. I think that makes
20 considerable sense as well as the item Alternative Number
21 6. Santa Rosa's water treatment system, tertiary
22 treatment, is of the highest grade. The term "dump
23 sewage" I think connotes a high degree of corruptible
24 waste where that is not the condition. Santa Rosa's
25 wastewater treatment is one of the finest, highest

112

1 component to add to this project.

2 And I would also refer you to question and
3 answer printed in the Press Democrat with the City Manager
4 Ken Blackman who when he was asked if the City would have
5 done anything different if they were faced with the same
6 conditions they were faced with in 1985, he came out in
7 support of Richard Charter's concept for horizontal
8 storage as buffers. So if you get Charter and Blackman
9 together, I think it should be analyzed in the scope of
10 the work.

11 Also on page 52, there's reference of three
12 types of irrigable lands, slopes of less than 15 percent.
13 I encourage you to contact vineyard people, take a look
14 at that number and see if it is being done in excess
15 slopes of 15 percent.

16 In terms of water conservation concept, I
17 toss it out. I don't know if it's valid or not, but
18 would look at solids conservation, the kitchen disposal,
19 and how much does it contribute to the load of the
20 treatment plant? Because I do understand through the
21 solid waste people there is an effort afoot to increase.
22 Currently we're doing yard debris composting, but there's
23 also a program looking at doing it through kitchen waste.
24 And I think this project is old and long enough it's been
25 around here that new ideas are coming along, and I think

110

1 technology currently available and far exceeds that
2 throughout most of the country. The water that is
3 currently going into the Russian River has technically
4 been analyzed as better water and purer water than that up
5 above. And this is a technical analysis, not the
6 emotional analysis. And I think we should bear that in
7 mind that with technology, we have a good option for the
8 disposal of wastewater that all of us can live with, and
9 economically we can live with. So I would heartily
10 request that consideration be given and early evaluation
11 cost disclosure of each of the alternatives.

12 We will submit written comments and I won't
13 bore you with all the comments from this point, but we
14 will submit a written comment for your consideration.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. MARKS: The next speaker, Elizabeth

17 Anthony.

18 ELIZABETH ANTHONY: I'm Elizabeth Anthony. I
19 live in Bodega Bay, Post Box 601, 94923.

20 I'm speaking on behalf of the Sierra Club.
21 I'm the co-chair of the Sierra Club's Water Committee. As
22 you may know, over 90 percent of California's wetlands are
23 gone, history, and 85 percent whatever we have today are
24 in the Bay Area. So wetlands are a very high priority for
25 the Sierra Club both in California and nationally.

113

1 we need to hybridize and bring as many of them to bear

1 I appreciate this opportunity to address our

PAGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

2 concerns about the wastewater disposal as it may effect
3 the Laguna de Santa Rosa option, the creation of buffer
4 wetlands in community separator areas, and the wetlands
5 of several watershed areas; namely, the Russian River, the
6 Petaluma River, Stemple Creek, and Estero Americano.
7 Recently Sierra Club activists at more than
8 50 press conferences throughout the country called for a
9 phase-out of the industrial processes that produce dioxin,
10 a class of highly toxic chemicals. The Environmental
11 Protection Agency has reassessed dioxin and reported
12 that it is linked to cancer as well as reproductive,
13 immunological and developmental dysfunction. Dioxin is
14 present in the water of all the communities; the results
15 of its presence include low sperm counts, infertility and
16 genital deformities associated with estrogen-mimicking
17 chemicals. These reproductive, immunological and
18 developmental disruptions are currently found in wildlife
19 species in the Great Lakes, Florida and elsewhere, and are
20 likely to soon be exhibited in humans as the
21 bioaccumulation rises through the food chain. Those
22 groups at highest risk of course are young children,
23 infants and unborn babies. Dioxin passes through the
24 placenta, builds up in developing tissues and concentrates
25 in breast milk. I may foster immune-system abnormalities,

114

2 Roseland area. I grew up next to Roseland Creek. It was
3 literally in my backyard.
4 Like Mr. Pozzi, I served in the military and I
5 had the fortitude or I guess the good luck that I got sent
6 to the desert instead of the jungle. So in the desert I
7 learned water is a very valuable resource. I think we
8 should save it and sell it and prosper from it.
9 As a native of Roseland, I grew up next to the
10 creek and now I live in Santa Rosa by-choice so I can try
11 and have an effect of changing the misguidance in the
12 local government.
13 Like Mr. Pozzi, I remember the thriving
14 agricultural town as a youth. Now houses are a main crop.
15 Many things Mr. Pozzi speaks of are gone forever. I would
16 like to save some of what we have now forever. Santa
17 Rosa's growth is outstripping the City's capacity to
18 provide adequate public services, yet it insists on
19 growing without addressing many problems with
20 infrastructure and cost to taxpayers and citizens. I feel
21 ratepayers subsidize the developers. Please change this.
22 Mr. Jahn expressed the desire of having his
23 family stay here. Mr. Brown expressed the desire to be
24 able to afford staying here. All of us feel that way.
25 Let's lower the spending and spend — I plan on submitting

117

1 hormone-related disease and even diabetes. The citation
2 is Goldman: EPA 1994. There are currently no federal
3 standards for dioxin contamination, and state and federal
4 guidelines relate only to how dioxins applies to fish,
5 although the contamination pervades produce, meat and milk
6 as well.

7 Polychlorinated biphenyls, also PCBs, and
8 furans are of equal concern and equally dangerous, but are
9 not widely known. However, less widely known is the
10 potential these chemicals have to bind with each other and
11 other chemicals, forming even more deadly compounds.

12 Of additional concern is the low-level
13 radioactivity in sewage. In a recent General Accounting
14 Office investigation determined that radionuclides form
15 elevated concentrations of cobalt-60 when incinerated.
16 The citation is Science News 1994. Neither the NRC
17 nor the EPA have mandated requirements to the NRC to test
18 specifically for radionuclides and the issue has not been
19 studied closely enough to yet determine if there's a
20 significant health hazard. "The full extent of
21 radioactive contamination of sewage sludge, ash and
22 related by-products nationwide is unknown. Neither NRC
23 nor the EPA has conducted or required testing to determine
24 the extent of the radioactive contamination occurring at
25 treatment plants that receive radioactive discharges."

115

1 an article that's from the California Coast and Ocean,
2 winter and spring edition. It's about Tiawana, one of the
3 fastest growing cities on the west coast. Also, it's
4 about low tech approach to wastewater management.
5 Specifically a conventional method of dealing with
6 wastewater in treatment followed immediately by disposal.
7 That's the convenient method right now, substituted by
8 wastewater treatment direct and indirect disposals. There
9 are true costs. Rarely is wastewater considered as a
10 resource. Even more rarely as a potential economic
11 benefit or public asset.

12 This addresses that by showing that a low-cost
13 wastewater treatment and reuse facilities can be made and
14 can be had by the public. The pollution problem can be
15 significant alleviated by means of expensive alternative
16 systems. We have a system that can reclaim water, and
17 it can create opportunities for recreation and employment
18 and provide places for wildlife and open space. We just
19 need to work with what we have right now. I appreciate
20 the first alternative, preserve the wetlands, create
21 more, and sell water for profit. I appreciate the Geysers
22 alternative. Along with the Geysers we can find
23 agricultural alternative, as the gentleman just said about
24 the river, the man from the Grape Growers Association.
25 So please pursue a balance cost-effective plan

118

1 Citation is GAO, 1994.

2 The sources of this radioactivity are varied
3 and include manufacturers, medical centers, and even
4 patient excreta and nature itself. Radiation therapy and
5 diagnostic tests contribute, as well as low-level
6 radioactive laboratory wastes that are now just washed
7 down the drain. Smaller amounts of longer-lived isotopes
8 used in radioimmunoassays, cobalt-57, tritium, and
9 carbon-14) also enter the sewage system. The cost of
10 testing for these chemicals really cannot override the
11 concern and the danger to plant, animal, and human life.

12 Recent newspaper reports tell us that the
13 midwest drinking water is now polluted by several types of
14 chemical weedkillers. In other words, people are drinking
15 water laced with these chemicals, and there has been no
16 testing to determine the chemical levels accumulating in
17 the tissues of the populace. We would not want this to
18 happen in Sonoma County, and the plant and animal life
19 in the wetlands areas would likely not be appreciative.

20 MR. MARKS: Thank you. The five minutes are
21 up. Thank you.

22 Duane De Witt.

23 DUANE DE WITT: My name is Duane De Witt. I
24 live at 18517 Salem Avenue in Santa Rosa.
25 I'm not an expert on anything except what I've

116

1 for pumping the water to the Geysers and then perhaps
2 gravity will flow it to Lake Sonoma which is already a
3 storage area, Dry Creek area, and the Russian River area
4 after it's been steam-cleaned by nature. Sell water to
5 farmers rather than pay them to use it as we do now.
6 Let's start to develop an economic outlook on this that
7 makes money off of what we already have rather than having
8 us spend more money. There's been a lot of money made by
9 studies. I haven't seen anything that's changed other
10 than my quality of life. My town is no longer as nice as
11 it used to be, so let's stay at least with what we have
12 now. Don't make it any worse. Please address the
13 overgrowth issues that are going to happen in southwest
14 Santa Rosa. Those wetlands need to be preserved and we
15 need to take a pro-active approach to providing the jobs
16 that Mr. Jahn would like to see and to saving the taxes
17 Mr. Brown would like to see. All of us have interests.
18 The main thing is for us to work together and address
19 them so that we do have a really great place to live
20 still.

21 Thanks.

22 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

23 The next speaker is Ellen Hawkins.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: She had to leave.

25 MR. MARKS: Then Joan O'Brien.

119

1 lost. I've grown up here in Santa Rosa. I'm from the

1 JOAN O'BRIEN: My name is Joan O'Brien. I

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

live at 2241 Old Adobe Road, Petaluma.

As a property owner involved in a proposed reservoir site in South County, I wish to address several points. One of the plan's components as presented uses the Petaluma Hill Road-Old Adobe Road for South County as a possible route as a disposal site for wastewater. It seems Petaluma and 47,000 people don't exist or ever have any need to dispose of local wastewater. No plan should be suggested for this area without a coordinated plan with Petaluma. While Petaluma is at a totally different planning stage, their current and future needs must be recognized. Your leapfrog approach to the South County presents major potential problems for you and Petaluma. The reservoir site near me is within a mile of Petaluma city limits on a watershed that drains directly into the City of Petaluma through park and residential development to the Petaluma River and San Francisco Bay. The site is sure to present sociologic problems that will be very expensive to overcome.

If the discharge and spill potential is felt by many to be unacceptable in the Russian River area, why should it be more acceptable in a larger and more dense urban area?

The reservoir is part of a very expensive plan

2 same agencies instituting the same sewage system. It's a
3 little difficult to swallow when a lot of influences
4 on the City of Santa Rosa are in the other areas of the
5 county.

6 My second section has to do with the Geysers
7 injection and also imagine addressing this on behalf of
8 the citizens of Cloverdale. Our water is a natural
9 infiltration system that is at the influx of Big Sulfur
10 Creek that is runoff of the Geysers into the Russian
11 River. You need to address the cumulative impact from the
12 introduction of effluent from the City located at Sonoma
13 and Lake counties. There is already an EIR/EIS that has
14 addressed this issue from injection of other wastewater
15 systems in the Lake County area.

16 I would like you also to address the
17 cumulative impacts of the super fund site EPA mercury mine
18 injection that's going to be included in that project, and
19 also like at the mercury mine Taylor sites in the Geysers
20 area.

21 I've included in this packet of information a
22 topographic map that shows 30 mines alone. Even with a
23 research and historical record, I also suggest you do a
24 full address impact of a potential of pipe breaking for
25 seismicity. The reason why you have a known geothermal

123

to move water to the South County. I do not care to be involved in a reservoir site and there are very little support for any other reservoir sites in the area.

And I might also mention that at a meeting in the Lakeville area it was clearly stated by the potential users in that area that they would not accept wastewater under the circumstances and any lands -- pardon me -- any land for a reservoir was taken by condemnation. At best, the reservoirs will hold water for delivery to pasture land and vineyards that are relatively small acreages and at various locations. This would increase the capital cost for the distribution system.

Whatever components you select for in-depth study to solve current needs, two must be water conservation and growth limitation. The less water used obviously means less wastewater entering the disposal system. Under conservation, there are many successful wetlands plans which could be studied or perhaps duplicated, which could be developed in areas much closer to the source of wastewater at the treatment plant.

The program is a reactive, not a pro-active procedure. While you were trying to cobble together a program to solve current needs, other forces are working for growth which exceeds these plans. There are limits to the capacity of the area to provide services for continued

121

1 resource there is that that is the place where the surface
2 of the earth is the thinnest. It's closer to where the
3 magma comes to the surface. That's why you have the
4 Geysers.

5 One of the things that you should look at is
6 seismicity aspect of the injection, also the seismicity
7 aspects of the pipe breakage with potential runoff of
8 water waste already impacted.

9 I include in here a couple of analyses of the
10 fish that have been taken in that particular area. If you
11 look at the liver and tissue study, you'll see a high
12 level of heavy metals are already impacting those fish. I
13 would also suggest that you look at the amount of radon
14 and sulfur dioxide that will be increased by increased
15 injections.

16 There's a problem I think with the fact that
17 you're going into a financial pact with somebody who is
18 going to be changing radically. PG&E is going through a
19 change that will make them not such a viable partner, and
20 I think you need to address that in your financial
21 analysis.

22 If the City is not the sole responsible
23 physical entity, then there needs to be an analysis
24 describing the entity, wherein the funds are transferred
25 in the behalf of the second and third party. If you

124

1 population growth, but they are not being confronted.

2 MR. MARKS: Krista Rector.

3 KRISTA RECTOR: My name is Krista Rector. 147
4 Healdsburg Avenue, City of Cloverdale, California 95425,
5 on behalf of the Sierra Club representing 7,000 members in
6 the surrounding counties and this county.

7 I would like to address two of the issues and
8 I will take up further the injection of the Geysers.
9 First of all, wastewater needs to be reduced to water
10 conservation using the best management practices. One
11 example of an effective practice is use to price index,
12 encouraging conservation. Rather than having a sewer
13 charge usage fee for one month be \$60, if you really look
14 at the cost and the impacts on our resources, water, and a
15 river, and our fisheries, the real cost is \$16 per toilet
16 flush in the City of Santa Rosa. That's what I think the
17 real cost would be if you truly gave a dollar value to the
18 resources that are being depleted.

19 Second issue is corresponding land use policy
20 needs to address the issue of an assessment of the
21 population's limits and/or the maximum carrying capacity
22 of the Santa Rosa area. In order to allow for the
23 environment that can be sustained for the quality of life
24 over the long term, there needs to be a ceiling or growth
25 potential maximum calculations which must become a

122

1 do go into contract with steam developers and PG&E for the
2 influent inflection for the pipeline to be built and they
3 choose to go with a walk-away contract that they have in
4 the EIR/EIS for Lake County, where after only two years
5 they can decide not to take that water anymore, you need
6 to have some sort of fall back plan so if they walk away
7 from that, you're not stuck holding the bill to mitigate
8 the pipeline that you have built into there and also have
9 to be stuck with getting rid of your sewer again.

10 I'll stop at this point. I would like to hand
11 in -- I have 38 different suggestions from scoping
12 analyses for the Geysers, and I think that it's something
13 that you have no concept of what you're looking at when
14 you look at how you described your current plan. And I
15 would really suggest that this is only a small portion of
16 the information I could actually provide you with. I
17 would be glad to speak to you about this. And I
18 appreciate very much having this opportunity to address
19 this.

20 MR. MARKS: Thank you very much.
21 Now, since the bulb burned out, we'll have to
22 do this a little lower tech.

23 The next name on the list is Bob Ottensmeyer.
24 BOB OTTENSMEYER: I'm Bob Ottensmeyer. I live
25 at 2266 Molly Court in Santa Rosa.

125

1 component of local institution policies directed by the

1 I'm the self-appointed representative of the

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

40,000 ratepayers in the City of Santa Rosa, and I would like to reiterate that the bottom line in all of these alternatives, after you take care of all the environmental considerations that exist, all nine million of them, that you take a look at the ratepayers' problem. The ratepayers are gradually experiencing a reducing quality and standard of living as a result of increases in not only sewer and water rates but Empire Waste Management garbage rates, cable TV rates, PG&E rates, everybody's rates that we have lot of people in this town who are really finding it hard to get along, retired people and low-pay workers.

The bottom line: Watch out for the ratepayers' interests because if you don't, you're going to really have a problem on your hands.

Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

The next speaker is Joe Tresch.

JOE TRESCH: My name is Joe Tresch. I live at 1170 Walker Road. I have a dairy there. I'm the leasee of the Button Ranch, and I will be submitting many concerns in writing later, but I just would like to look around now and ask everyone, where are all the ranchers who want the water out in West County? I haven't seen

2 outfall or putting it in the River. If you can't get the 3 dam and Geysers doesn't work, this may be an answer to 4 you, you know.

5 The Bay Area is only 50 miles away and a 6 million dollars a mile, that's still a pretty cheap 7 project. You would not have a dam to take care of. I 8 think they would probably be happy to get your water 9 because it's probably treated five times better than any 10 Bay Area city. Anyway, it's an idea.

11 Thank you very much.

12 MR. MARKS: And now Kathy Tresch.

13 KATHY TRESCH: Kathy Tresch. 1170 Walker Road 14 in Petaluma.

15 My husband already spoke about the no 16 consensus in the West County and we haven't seen any 17 ranchers that want to use the wastewater. I think your 18 next step should be a round table in the West County to 19 really determine if you need to spend a million and a half 20 dollars to study the alternative.

21 Furthermore, I would like the map -- I've been 22 asking for the following information for four years now 23 and I have not yet received it. I would like a map of the 24 whole T-5 dam which is also now, I understand, for 25 purposes of clarity called S-20, which seems -- Now people

128

129

1 any, not a single one, not in the workshops. I don't see 2 them here. Maybe they're here, but I don't recognize 3 anyone here. Didn't that seem a little strange to you? 4 They need this water, they want it, they are screaming 5 for it I hear at the Regent meetings at the University of 6 California. It's the survival of Two Rock Valley and not 7 a one is here.

8 And anyway, how do you come up with -- A year 9 ago we're talking about this study of the new 10 Environmental Impact Report is going to be three million 11 dollars and now I read in the paper it's 7.7. There's 12 about 156 percent error in there. Now can you even come 13 up with any kind of an idea of what these dams are going 14 to cost or what any of these projects are going to cost as 15 alternatives when you can't even figure out what the cost 16 of studying the project is if you're off by 156 percent? 17 You know, it seems I think -- I'm a businessman. I know 18 how to handle a dollar, and this doesn't make any sense. 19 So I don't think any of these figures you've got on any of 20 these alternatives mean anything.

21 And I have another thing to throw out to you 22 here. It seems like the dammedest thing to be key to this 23 project as far as reclamation goes and everything, this 24 may be way off the beam here, but there's a congressional 25 act that just went through Washington a while back where

127

1 don't know where T-5 is anymore.

2 Anyway, I would like a whole map of that dam, 3 not just the inundation line which you people keep, as I 4 understand, maps about the whole project, which also 5 includes the reservoir outlet works, the stockpiling, 6 staging areas where you do such things as pile up the 7 trees that you would clear from Button Ranch, that you 8 clearcut the roadways, turnaround, and servicing areas 9 etcetera, etcetera. So I know you've completed the whole 10 concept of this and I really would like to see it. And I 11 would really appreciate it if you could mail to it me 12 immediately.

13 Now, under wetlands: Under scoping for the 14 project description, one of the components is wetlands. I 15 am like to know in the West County how will the wetlands 16 for the West County alternative be obtained? Will the 17 city take by eminent domain or gain control by any other 18 measures such as long-term lease or purchase, existing 19 wetlands land to restore wetlands or land to create 20 wetlands in the West County? What will be the total 21 acreage of each type of wetland in the West County 22 project?

23 I have a lot of other questions here I will 24 send in to you.

25 Streams, what will be the impacts of altering

130

1 the Central Valley Water Project people that have 2 contracts with that water down there can now take their 3 contracts and sell them. They're going to be selling 4 them, selling them to the metropolitan water districts 5 of Southern California, and they're going to be making 6 a lot of money from them on this, and it's creating 7 ranchers in this Los Banos area, West San Joaquin Valley, 8 they're not going to have as much water. They're selling 9 it. They got this water from the federal government for 10 eight dollars an acre foot. Now they're going to sell 11 it for ten, 20, 30, 40 times that. So it looks to me like 12 they're probably going to do it. They're not going to 13 sit around and say, why grow crops when I can sell water 14 and stay home and look in the mailbox and pick up a check.

15 So anyway, a long ways away. Right here 16 central water supplier as well as 18 Bay Area water 17 agencies will be holding scoping sessions to determine if 18 cycling Bay Area water is feasible. The feasibility 19 portion is to be completed within two years. Cities 20 within Bay Area currently produce 500 thousand acre feet 21 annually of recycled water which could be available for 22 those uses.

23 Well, there's a number of workshops coming up 24 if anyone would like to see these dates and everything and 25 the location. I think somebody ought to go down and see

128

1 the historical characteristics of Stemple Creek and 2 American Creek which have been seasonally dry in summer 3 months for eons? What will be the impacts to the 4 ecosystem to have these waterways flowing year round? 5 What will be the impacts regarding erosion along these 6 waterways? What will be the effects of having the soil 7 adjacent to and in the creeks permanently saturated?

8 Under land use and socio-economics I would 9 like to know what are the potential impacts on property 10 owners and property owners' rights? How much total 11 acreage is needed in the West County? And please break 12 this down into specific components, how much you need for 13 damsites, wetlands, irrigation, pipeline cut and cover 14 corridors.

15 Please explain how the irrigation contracts 16 will work. What will the wastewater users be paid to use 17 and irrigate with the wastewater? From some of the 18 wording in the scoping outline, it appears that wastewater 19 users could be asked to pay to use the wastewater. I 20 think you really need to clarify the rumor. Are we going 21 to get money to use the wastewater? If that isn't so, 22 they really need to know it right now.

23 Under groundwater: The last EIR demonstrated 24 that our shallow wells in Two Rock that are downstream 25 from the Button Ranch and rely on the aquifer that runs

131

1 if it might be feasible, you know, rather than ocean

1 out of there would be inundated with wastewater from the

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

2 storage reservoir through seepage due to the hydrostatic
3 pressure of the 15,000 acre feet stored therein and from
4 irrigation runoff and at a point that those wells were
5 shown to be contaminated and eventually condemned, a
6 source of freshwater would be supplied by the City.

7 Please answer the following questions:

8 Where will this freshwater come from?

9 What will be the cost or water rate to users?

10 We're talking about water rates in Santa Rosa.

11 The people are very concerned that we don't have water

12 rates at this point. Are we going to?

13 Will water meters be installed?

14 What will be the economic impact to landowners

15 and farmers who may have multiple dwellings on their land?

16 Water quality. I'll skip over some and mail

17 it in.

18 Previously unanswered groundwater quality

19 question:

20 On February 15, 1991, Edward J. Walker,
21 director of the Sonoma County Department of Public Works,
22 wrote the following in a comment letter to the previous
23 DEIR and it was never answered. He said:

24 "Please demonstrate that the impoundment of
25 wastewater in T-5 reservoir" (now S-20) "will not affect

132

1 groundwater at the adjacent Sonoma County Central
2 landfill. Should ground water flow be altered, it may
3 force groundwater into the refuse and create leachate."

4 I would like you to answer: What sort of

5 osmosis could occur? How would leachate be detected in

6 the wastewater? What would be downstream impacts of this?

7 And I have other questions that I'll mail in.

8 Wastewater in the Esteros. You mentioned in

9 the other studies that there were freshwater shrimp in

10 other creeks, they're also in the esteros.

11 Seismicity: Page 8 of the scoping summary

12 poses the question, "How is the system protected against

13 massive breaks during a seismic event? I would like you

14 to answer, "How will the residents be protected against

15 massive breaks during a seismic event?"

16 The Bloomfield Fault. There was opinion from

17 UC professors that visited the Button Ranch that there

18 could be a secondary trace of the Bloomfield Fault that

19 will run up into our land by our cabin by the dam. I need

20 you to look at that.

21 MR. MARKS: Five minutes are up.

22 KATHY TRESCH: Okay. Also biological

23 resources I didn't get into. One thing, when the

24 people --

25 MR. MARKS: We have to insist on the five

133

1 minutes, please.

2 KATHY TRESCH: When if people --

3 MR. MARKS: You can come back later.

4 KATHY TRESCH: I will do that. Thank you.

5 MR. MARKS: Sue Buxten, please.

6 SUE BUXTEN: Sue Buxten. 200 Vlaardingen

7 Lane, Petaluma.

8 I'm privileged to be able to spend a lot of

9 time riding on the Button Ranch. I am able to admire the

10 eagles ride through the forest, and generally love the

11 place. Think of it a lot when I'm not there. I'm also

12 privileged to know Joe and Kathy Tresch and all of those

13 who live at the mouth of where the proposed T-5 dam would

14 be. I shudder to think of the potential damage to their

15 homes, lives, and businesses this project could

16 potentiate.

17 I would like the EIR to particularly address

18 the issues of wildlife impact, erosion, and local personal

19 property impact in addition to the impact on the esteros.

20 I'm also concerned about the impact of the proposed dam so

21 close to the Meacham Road landfill and the potential

22 percolation of toxins.

23 Finally, I would like to know why the City

24 of Santa Rosa seems so determined to put the Button Ranch

25 under water as their first option when so many

134

1 environmentalists are opposed to this option and groups as

2 pristine as the Nature Research would like to keep it open
3 for future generations to enjoy.

4 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

5 The next speaker, Ethan Silva.

6 ETHAN SILVA: Hello. I'm Ethan Silva. P.O.

7 Box 121, Duncan Mills, California.

8 Most of what I wanted to say has been said

9 better than I could say it. Like many, I've watched this

10 process for the last ten years or more, and I came here to

11 find out if there was some qualitative change. I don't

12 know yet if there is. It seems to me as before, the issue

13 is that nobody wants Santa Rosa's wastewater. And to

14 those that say it is drinking quality, I suggest that they

15 drink it. And I think ultimately the only way that the

16 quality is going to be accurately monitored is if it is in

17 fact going into their drinking water. The experience has

18 shown us that whenever an effluent is disposed of in a way

19 that there are no direct immediate painful consequences to

20 its degradation, then that's what happens, it's grazed

21 periodically in spite of the best efforts.

22 The other thing that seems about the same is

23 that I think it's going to come down to a political and

24 court test of wills. Which group has the biggest

25 influence? If nobody wants your water, then who is going

135

1 to put up the biggest fight and cost ultimately the most
2 money? It's sad, but that's the way it is.

3 I come from the Russian River area. I can say

4 from firsthand experience that because I spent a certain

5 amount of time on the water, canoeing, sail boating, that

6 there has been a significant change over the years.

7 Particularly in this last year I noticed a tremendous

8 amount of algae plant growth.

9 We'll fight. Whether we can prevail is yet to

10 be seen, but we'll certainly fight. And I think all the

11 different parties that we've been hearing from feel the

12 same way. I don't know what the answer is, but I

13 certainly hope it isn't dumping it in the Russian River.

14 Thanks.

15 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

16 The next speaker is Sarah Cameron.

17 SARAH CAMERON: Hi. My name is Sarah Cameron.

18 I live at -- Well, I don't live at, but my mailing address

19 is Post Office Box 121, Inverness in California.

20 I'm here representing the Rural Landuse

21 Committee of the Land Conservation League. And I

22 unfortunately got here last, so most of my points may have

23 been said by other speakers.

24 One of the most important things to us as an

25 organization concerned about rural landuse is that the

136

1 impact of any of these decisions on growth into the rural

2 areas of the county be studied. Particularly I think the

3 financial and economic impact that would be studied I hope

4 under Task 31 would be that the cost of any growth that

5 any of these plans would encourage would be studied fully

6 and would be offset against the costs that would kind of

7 be negatively impacted in agricultural areas, particularly

8 the studies have shown that suburban growth costs more

9 in services than it produces in taxes, whereas

10 agricultural uses provide more in taxes than they cost in

11 services, so that any growth of suburban areas into

12 agricultural lands, that economic impact be studied and

13 the true costs would be figured out in terms of a greater

14 tax impact on people in Santa Rosa and Sonoma County.

15 Second, from what I've seen, the traffic

16 impacts that are going to be studied seem to be local

17 traffic impact. And again, I think to the extent that any

18 plans induce growth, that the impact be ending today to

19 the main arterials to Highway 101 and the main arterials

20 through Marin County and connect up to Highway 101 and

21 through the back roads coming down to Point Reyes, Petaluma

22 Road, and through the West County to avoid Highway 101.

23 Secondly, in the agricultural uses of the

24 wastewater, I think maybe it is in here, but I think that

25 the geology has to go beyond soils and into slopes and

137

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

through irrigation.

And secondly, kind of offsetting or going beyond that, that if irrigation creates an agricultural economy based on irrigations, that if the water then is not provided as irrigation, then what would happen to that agricultural economy?

And kind of on another point in that, then, would they -- if they then did not get the irrigation water and would depend on using irrigation, would they overpump from aquifers? And how would that affect surrounding people who draw from those aquifers on drinking water?

And finally I think, as someone who lives in Marin, there was an interesting item, I saw that everybody in the county wants to be able to vote for or against one of these projects. Well, those of us who live in Marin County don't feel we're enfranchised to vote for or against these projects, even though they have impacts on Marin County. So I think if you want to go into a political impact, you need to draw people from Marin County a little more into this process because there's a lot of water coming down to Marin in these alternatives, either through irrigation or runoff through irrigation.

And finally, I didn't see any task in here

138

that I think would address another environmental issue, which I think you could call sustainability in a larger effect, again of encouraging growth. And what that growth means is a larger environmental awareness to whether the area can sustain that growth either through water or through waste, and how the agricultural land that will be taken over by growth, the laws of that economy, and what it means to quality of life and those kinds of issues.

And just general encouragement that Santa Rosa, when it considers all these options, thinks about what it means to live within its own watershed and own waste shed and not to extend those out into its neighboring areas.

Thank you.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

Next speaker is Eric Sunswiteat.

ERIC SUNSWITEAT: My name is Eric Sunswiteat.

P.O. Box 363 in Potter Valley.

I'm kind of a compost production specialist student. I'm a bit haggard. I was instrumental this afternoon up in Mendocino County before the Building and Planning Department to -- well, they denied a composting facility permit for 200 tons per day. And what I see down here is a real consultant feeding frenzy. There seems to be lack of clear visions. I really believe

139

it's possible to have a partnership with agriculture, and I also believe that it might be a good idea to have like a dual irrigation system.

I understand in the western county apparently they don't want the water, but it seems the further east you go, the dryer it gets. And if you consider pumping up as high as the Geysers, it also seems that every foot of elevation you go, then you could start more orchards or vineyards, and there's a lot of potential agriculturists who would appreciate the opportunity, I would think, even to pay for the opportunity in terms of some of the pumping costs.

In terms of the hazards of the wastewater, well, there's buffering capacity which is possible to be developed in the soil through balancing the structure through -- or balancing the mineral content to improve the structure.

Now, the big problem with the composting programs in this county, they don't really address the farmers' needs. I submitted a report yesterday to the Sonoma County Waste Management Agency regarding the composting operation out at the central landfill, and I've been following that contract and that agency for a year and a half.

And finally last month, the contractor which

140

I had been asked to submit a report to justify their

2 composting process 60 days previous, well, it submitted a 3 report, and I debunked it yesterday. There's no 4 justification for the type of composting they were doing. 5 It's just an inside deal with Empire Waste Management.

6 And I'm going to submit a copy of this report 7 to Dan Carlson here because I have I studied with these 8 European experts, and I think we have a lots of 9 information, help for the Subregional System that because 10 if sludge is not going to be composted in the proper way 11 at all, science has more recently determined that plants, 12 plant roots do not just take up nutrients in an ion form, 13 they take up molecular structures that include these, 14 and there's other substances. And the fact that 60 15 percent of methane digested sludge is being directly 16 applied to the land, it just seems to me there's a 17 tremendous liability that Santa Rosa is undertaking. And 18 it does not help well disposal of the wastewater in terms 19 of improving the buffering capacity.

20 So anyways. Oh, yes. I think Santa Rosa -- 21 you know, I don't think they need to reuse part of their, 22 you know, reinject the water to redrink. I think people 23 in Santa Rosa have a hard enough time with the water the 24 way it is going through pipes, and I think with the 25 chlorine and the children in the schools, there should be

141

1 warning signs -- particularly young growing kids 2 pre-adolescent -- that chlorine, the estrogen mimicking 3 factors, there's a lot of terms, many long-term problems 4 with that. There's a significant risk and that should be 5 a full disclaimer. And, you know, the cancer rates are 6 rising incredibly, and there's -- and this is known. It's 7 well-known. I mean, it's possible to put chlorine filters 8 in the school system, you know. I understand from the 9 history of civilization, there traditionally have always 10 been places as they get bigger and bigger they turn into 11 people grinders. The population, they really come from 12 the agriculture areas. They go into the cities and then 13 they end up dying there. And the cities do not really 14 regenerate population, you know, if you look at, you know, 15 the extent of history as we know it.

16 And so anyways, thanks a lot.

17 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

18 The next speaker is Leonard Stewart.

19 LEONARD STEWART: I'm Leonard Stewart. 22

20 Woodwardia Square.

21 I'm with Stewart & Associates and we represent 22 the Geyser alternative, Energy Development Corporation.

23 And I want to make it clear to everyone here 24 that's still alive, awake, and what have you, that this 25 company, this corporation, has nothing to go do with PC&E,

142

1 nothing do with Unocal. And so to merely state "the 2 Geysers", you're really saying a lot of nothing, because 3 their proposals have nothing to do with ours.

4 Now, just pumping water up the hill and 5 injecting it in the ground, accomplishes things but not 6 what you want.

7 Now, we have a very extensive engineering 8 study in all of this, and it is totally different than 9 anything you have ever heard. First of all, everything 10 that you've heard of here tonight, who is paying for it? 11 Who are these projects going to be funded by? It's you 12 people. Whereas our proposal, we pay for everything. 13 It's the only proposal that is not city or government 14 funded.

15 Now, just running water up there and pumping 16 it in the ground is not the solution. This has already 17 been tried. So there have been speakers here that have 18 stated that there's seismic action and the potential. 19 There's seismic action there every day that's minuscule. 20 Some of them are reasonably good quakes.

21 And the aquifer that's been utilized -- tapped 22 and utilized is being drained, and this is causing again 23 torrential drains, whereas in our case we will be 24 rejuvenating it. We will not be quenching the magma, we 25 will be doing it in a very educated and sophisticated

143

1 manner.

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

Now, the water going up there, nobody wants it. After we cook it, we're going to be using it for quite a number of things. We're going to be reclaiming it. Primarily up there, after this use up there, and the water is going to stay ours, we're not giving it away. We're not going to be dumping it in the creek. And the discharge in the atmosphere will cease. There will be no further discharge, so contamination up there is going to be nonexistent. The seismic action will not be increased, it will be diminished, if anything else. We've got extensive seismic engineering knowledge.

Then as far as the secondary use of the water, it's going to be cooked water at this point, and we're studying right now as to what the best alternative use would be in a secondary reclamation. So that is it should not be conceived that the water going up there is going to be just disappearing, never to be seen again.

We don't advocate dumping the water in the ocean. As one speaker said, the ocean already has all it needs. And dumping it in the Russian River is again detrimental to an awful lot of people, fish, plant life, you name it. When it's done detrimentally, some of it can be injected in a sophisticated manner, but overexcessive dumping, no.

144

When you overirrigate the land, what you're doing is flushing the detriments and contaminants of one area and giving it to the neighbor. He flushes it to the next neighbor until finally it gets into the Russian River or the aquifer or the aquifers, the wells, and then the ocean. So you're just trading it from Peter to Paul to get rid of it, whereas in the case of sending it up to the Ceyzers the way we want to do it, it's not going to be detrimental to anybody, and the water is going to be used and reused.

I say again, there's absolutely no cost to anybody with regard to the construction of the pipeline, the pumping stations, etcetera. All of that is going to be private money. The pipeline is going to be private money. The operations is going to be private, not the city, not the county. So that we already have preliminary commitments in excess of 100 million dollars to build the pipeline. So this is not theory. We don't have a schoolboy type of analysis here that what is feasible and, whoopee, maybe it will work. We know it will work. Otherwise, whose going to come up with over a hundred million dollars on guesswork?

So please think about this. This is the only project that is not going to be paid for by you.

Thank you very much.

145

MR. MARKS: Thank you.
The next speaker, I'm having a little trouble reading it. William — I don't know if it's Browning or —

WILLIAM BROWNING: I'm William Browning. And I reside at 1505 Meadow Lane. That's on the corner of Llano Road and Meadow Lane right across from the Santa Rosa Sewer Plant.

And first off, I would like to say I think the Santa Rosa Sewer Plant and the City of Santa Rosa had ought to send everybody here an invitation to an open house with the sewer plant. I have attended every one, and I think it's very efficiently operated. There are problems, like there are with anything. And the thing that bothers me most is what is going on now at the sewer plant. They have taken one holding pond and put a — are going to put a building in it to recycle the waste from the city's streets, I guess, and instead of using it for a pond. They ran out of water this year.

I am also a user of the water ever since it was available, which is about five or six years. I'm not positive. But I have had no problems. If I have runoff, the city people are there and shut off the water for three days. So I watch the runoff pretty close. I've used it — I'm 76 years old. I've had no ill effects. I know

146

two or farmers that are using it and have no ill effects

2 from it.

3 I've watched Mr. Ferris drink the water with a
4 beaker from the charcoal part of the tertiary plants.
5 Also an engineer that was there. And I don't remember his
6 name.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, but is he still there?

8 WILLIAM BROWNING: No, he's still there.

9 I objected to the holding ponds on Llano

10 Road, not the sewer plant. The sewer plant had to go
11 someplace, and I felt I was a victim. But the holding
12 pond should have been put up against Taylor Mountain and
13 Sonoma Mountain and all the water could have been used
14 clear across the valley floor.

15 As I understand now, Rohnert Park is going to
16 use treated water on some of the parks and city property.
17 There is a waterline to 101, and the State of California
18 uses freshwater to sprinkle the landscape on 101. I see
19 no reason that they shouldn't be using the treated water.

20 I also think that I was told by Don Bean who
21 was an engineer for the county, and Al Petri who was the
22 engineer for the city at the time the plant was built,
23 that the cost of pumping the water to Taylor Mountain and
24 Sonoma Mountain would be too expensive. And I said,
25 "What's too expensive when you have to get rid of it?"

147

1 I feel that really if we dump it in the ocean or we dump
2 it into the Russian River and don't recycle it, we're
3 putting gold into the ocean.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

6 The next speaker, Lawrence Feltzer.

7 LAWRENCE FELTZER: My name is Lawrence
8 Feltzer. I live at 4250 Deer Meadow Lane in Occidental.
9 I'm relatively new to this process and the

10 Friends of the Esteros. I would like to say as a preface
11 that whatever option is selected — I hope personally that
12 it's number one — that whatever happens, we have to do a
13 better job than we are doing today with the treatment of
14 wastewater.

15 A couple of the speakers previously have
16 indicated how good a job we do with wastewater treatment
17 today. As a frequent user of the Russian River and the
18 esteros and Point Reyes estuaries, as a kayaker, I spend
19 lot of time close to the surface of the water. And I have
20 noticed a tremendous difference in the water quality in
21 the Russian River. Particularly as Ed Pozzi had mentioned
22 before, as you get out towards the ocean, just down below
23 where Casini Campground is, if you're in a kayak or canoe
24 along there, you just look along the banks of the river
25 and you'll see deposits of a white paper pulp like

148

1 material which is just strewn over the surface of many of
2 the plants and that kind of stuff along the side. Now,
3 I'll leave it to your own imagination to think exactly
4 what the source of that particular material is.

5 As a kayaker in that particular region, I
6 choose not to do eskimo rolls. Now in contrast, I go out
7 into the estuaries, and I began my adventures in the
8 Estero de San Antonio, and you travel along those
9 waterways, they are just absolutely pristine. I have some
10 photos that you're welcome to take a look at at the end of
11 this session, just to view those. But I really question
12 whether or not the standards that we have for water
13 quality are correct.

14 People have talked about the models that
15 are used and whether they are adequate. Did they take
16 into account whether or not toilet paper is put into this
17 equation? You have evidence of that along the Russian
18 River, you don't even have to ask the question about are
19 there heavy metals and things like this that you can't
20 see. Pollution has an accumulative effect, and this is
21 one which is very, very plain and evident.

22 So I would like to ask the questions as to
23 whether or not the water quality standards that have
24 existed up till now have been reviewed? Do we need the
25 previously adopted criteria for water quality, and are we

149

1 happy with that level? And as I say, does the model take

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

into account, you know, some of the solids which are discharged? And when they build up on the sides of the banks of the lakes, do they form sites whereby bacteria breeds? These are things which are more immediate in nature. And we've already heard people speak to the fact that some people get ill from being in the Russian River.

And I wonder if -- I don't know Mr. Ferris, but I wonder if he would be willing to drink from the Russian River in the vicinity of that contamination.

Thank you very much.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

The next speaker is Beverly Beaver Rudolph.

BEVERLY BEAVER RUDOLPH: I'm Beverly Beaver Rudolph at 8400 Bodega Avenue in Sebastopol.

I would like to, before mentioning my three points, mention that the wastewater comes from many sources and I think what we're addressing this evening or at least focusing on is the Santa Rosa wastewater treatment plant. I'm sure there's wastewater that comes from urban runoff, poorly managed septic tanks, etcetera. Those we are not addressing this evening.

Of the wastewater treatment plant here in Santa Rosa, I would like to make three points. One is that there are proven alternatives, and I will be glad to

2 afternoon. And I know, Kathy, you've expressed an
3 interest in speaking again. What I would like to do is
4 ask for any of those who have not had their first shot
5 yet, their first five-minute shot, so we can make sure
6 that you do have yours.

7 Yes.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I didn't sign a card.
9 Do I have to sign a card?

10 MR. MARKS: I would appreciate you signing a
11 card. The people who want to speak, if you would do that
12 now. You can bring them over here.

13 Thank you very much.

14 Would you like to go to the microphone?

15 So the next speaker is Ernest Noyes; is that
16 correct?

17 ERNEST NOYES: That's right. I'm Ernest
18 Noyes. I live at Tomales, P.O. Box 194.

19 I spent a lot of time on both esteros boating,
20 and I want to reiterate what Sarah Cameron was saying
21 about the incursion of suburban development onto
22 agricultural lands. I think we need to look at how we can
23 better sustain life all around us, especially right here
24 in Santa Rosa where -- I don't know what plans are lurking
25 in the back of people's minds in terms of developing all

158

153

submit them in writing to you. There was an excellent
conference dedicated to that in late October in San
Francisco, that for instance you may be aware of a
Dr. John Todd in his examples in the eastern United States
that takes not even tertiary-treated water but secondary
treated water and puts it through natural systems.

There's been microbial action on the roots of plants that
even eliminate a lot of your heavy metals so that it
literally comes out pure water. And I think he would
enjoy the challenge if in your EIR you could say, Well, if
you start with tertiary-treated water, how can you bring
that even to a higher standard? He and other scientists
have already proven that to be true and are supported by
the public health departments in that area. They're
actually reusing the water as drinking water in a given
example that I'm familiar with.

So these proven alternatives not only are the
ones I've mentioned, but they -- you can prove the costs,
long and short-term costs so that you can see the dollars.
You can also prove the environmental effect. Even they've
been studying them here in the Bay Area for over ten
years. In the Fremont area they are even now studying
the microbes. They started off with the larger animals
and plants and finally are saying what's the long-term
effect on the microbes. Then you can go to other areas

151

1 the flat area that they possibly can build condos on
2 around here, but that's the way it looks to me, you know,
3 every time I come into town it seems like another old
4 orchard is gone and condos are stretching to the horizon.
5 And I would rather see people trying to sustain other
6 organisms like food crops and things like that.

7 Another question I have is has anybody put
8 any -- are people looking at possibilities of cutting off
9 the pollutants where they start? In other words, let's
10 find some way -- Supposedly the copper and lead comes from
11 household plumbing, so do we have an alternative to copper
12 and lead in our household plumbing yet that's not toxic?
13 Because PVC has problems. Okay. Is it really from
14 household plumbing that we get these heavy metals? Are
15 there any plans in future development in this area to have
16 double plumbing, gray water, irrigation right on the spot?
17 How many of these subdivisions that we see around here
18 take their own gray water and use it to irrigate their
19 lawns, which don't grow without water obviously? How
20 about retrofitting some of this? The numerous amount of
21 development that's going on in this area that has gone
22 on in this area over the last ten years or so, what about
23 retrofitting that with double plumbing? Has anybody
24 thought about that?

25 And here we are starting a new EIR process. I

154

1 like Israel there are proven alternatives. And the one
2 thing I would like to emphasize, there was a recent
3 report, and it's not new, that California as a whole in
4 the year, well, 2020 or 2025, is going to be water short.
5 And this is nothing new to those of us who have been
6 around in California for a while. So I would really like
7 to emphasize the fact that the tertiary-treated water that
8 we're talking about is really a resource, and I think we
9 have wonderful ingenuity and wonderful ability to look at
10 this as a resource.

11 And the man that spoke earlier in regards to
12 the privately owned business in the Geysers is one example
13 of approaching this from a dollar gain as well as other
14 people have mentioned about the agricultural resource use
15 of it and then environmentally through created or enhanced
16 wetlands.

17 So I would really like to leave with the point
18 that this is a resource and if we don't see it that way,
19 it's because of our lack of imagination and lack of using
20 our own talents that we are readily available with.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

23 Now, I have three speakers here, all of whom
24 I believe have given inputs earlier. Hold on. Hold on.
25 This is why I'm asking this. The speakers I have, Dale

152

1 mean, we've been through this already. It's hard for me
2 to believe we're back here talking about this T-5 dam
3 and things. You know, it's been laid to rest so many
4 times, so here we are talking about it again. So if we
5 add up all the costs, including the unseen costs of having
6 urban development on agricultural lands, and so far is
7 this really going to be any cheaper than say building the
8 advanced treatment plant that was supposedly another
9 alternative at one time in this process that was viewed?
10 People didn't even study that because they thought it was
11 too expensive. But we've spent millions of dollars of
12 making up EIR/EIS for an unpopular project.

13 So I think that about covers everything I have
14 to say that everybody else has already.

15 Thanks.

16 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

17 Next speaker, Mark Green.

18 MARK GREEN: I'm Mark Green. I live on Clark
19 Street in Santa Rosa, so that makes me a ratepayer. And I
20 also work for Sonoma County Conservation Action which has
21 about six thousand active members in the county right now,
22 2,000 of which live in Santa Rosa.

23 And it's a little late for jokes, but it seems
24 to me that a lot of the discussion that's happened today
25 has been contrasting the needs of ratepayers with the

155

1 Wright, Steve Klausner, and Frank Hilder, spoke this

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

that part of the reason that we find the ratepayers beleaguered here is because the city has continued pursuing pipe dreams, like those to the West County, like those to the ocean, like those to the Geysers, which we continue to throw money at to the tune of millions of dollars when it's clear it's neither the scientific, the political, or the legal basis to believe that we're ever going to build any of those projects.

Given that, I really question whether it's worth continuing spending that money and continuing to beleague the ratepayers, of which I am one, when we have a real problem to solve and we have some real possible solutions, and it might be better to just spend money looking at those instead of spinning our wheels and once again making consultants wealthy.

When I look at the current situation, it looks to me as if, the way that this discussion is increasingly being framed, is exactly that, we're going to trade off supposedly the financial and ratepayer question versus the environmental protection question. And it strikes me as an uncanny symmetry that we happen to be having very heated discussions at the Santa Rosa City Council level right now about whether or not we're having a sewer rate increase at the same time supposedly the last opportunity

156

2 way that gives us some real numbers to work with and some
3 real information that allows us to make our decision. And
4 I would ask you to consider that when you're looking at
5 these problems.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

8 COURT REPORTER: Excuse-me. I need a break.
(A short break was taken.)

9 MR. MARKS: We'll continue with Rue Frich.

10 RUE FRICH: I live in Sebastopol on Anthony

11 Street.

12 I have three brief comments. One of them is
13 that the South County irrigation users are still around
14 and interested. The second is that I would encourage you
15 to in your study cost benefit analysis do it applies to
16 apples so that everybody can understand it. And the third
17 thing has less to do with what you do and more to do with
18 how you do it.

19 It's very important that you understand as
20 urban people engineers, people who are professionals, that
21 the agricultural community is really different, the
22 culture is different, and people are different. And they
23 are having a real hard time dealing with the urban
24 community. And I know that there are better ways to do

159

1 to have public input, this happens to come up now when we
2 consider there are some very real questions with regard to
3 the justifiability and even the legality of Santa Rosa's
4 rate paying process for sewer, it seems inappropriate at
5 this time for us to be banding numbers about with regards
6 to the cost of various projects and using those as
7 opportunities to get scared about how much money we're
8 going to spend to solve a problem that had planning
9 created.

10 Now, it seems to me in looking through the
11 various alternatives that we have examined which include
12 those like the West County dam which was universally
13 objected to by every participant, independent public input
14 workshops that were held about this problem. We looked at
15 these engineering proposals and it seems to me that the
16 engineering modeling is largely out of thin air. There
17 are so many different ways to implement these processes.
18 They can be done in different or some can be phases, some
19 can't. None of those matters have been incorporated into
20 the cost projections so that, as far as I can tell, the
21 numbers that we have that we're banding about for the cost
22 of say a West County project, a South County project, a
23 Geysers project, they're fixed, they're meaningless
24 numbers, and it seems to me it's far too early for us to
25 be looking at those numbers without having some real world

157

1 this.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

4 Okay. Now, there are no other first-timers,
5 I presume. Okay. Then we'll go on to those who wanted to
6 come back and complete their remarks.

7 The first is Dale Wright.

8 DALE WRIGHT: My name is Dale Wright. I live
9 at 4240 Concord Avenue in Santa Rosa. I'm actually
10 outside of Santa Rosa.

11 The water is really a valuable thing that we
12 have. And this water coming out of that plant should be
13 used for something for the future. And I believe that a
14 great big redwood park extending all the way across the
15 these planes over here that Santa Rosa owns, put a park in
16 there, have people come out and plant those trees, and a
17 redwood park in foresting, you could probably get
18 Crown Zeller (phonetic) to come back down here and help
19 you plant them. And you probably could get other people
20 from all over the United States, Relief, Tree Leaf, what
21 is the name of that company? Relief, yeah. You have
22 those people coming out and planting trees and looking
23 forward to the future of this. The future would be maybe
24 two hundred years old, and you would be gone, but there
25 would be a future out there, and you would be part of it,

160

1 comparison figures for varying ways to implement the same
2 project.

3 Right now I don't think we have any real
4 dollar numbers that we can pin our hopes or fears on.

5 A couple other things, very briefly, with
6 regards to the Geysers, I do not believe that use of the
7 treated effluent for geothermal energy generation really
8 meets the legislative intents decision on the part of the
9 City Council towards advocating reuse of the water. I
10 don't really think that falls under the category water is
11 water and it's not fuel. And my feeling is that the
12 usefulness and the desirability of its reuse lies in its
13 ability to be used for agricultural consumption or support
14 for the biotic community. I don't think the energy
15 development falls under that category.

16 I'm also very concerned about the principle
17 that because somebody comes along with a bag of money, we
18 give a chunk of the Russian River as a public resource for
19 them to use. I really caution the City of Santa Rosa to
20 be very careful about considering such a proposal.

21 In closing, it seems to me that we still are
22 dealing in a world of ghosts and mirrors a lot, and it
23 would be a good idea if we dismissed some of the ghosts
24 that aren't ever going to come along, like that T-5
25 dam, and to spend our time and our money addressing the

158

1 real possible solutions for this problem and to do it in a

1 if you would just think about different things to use this
2 water for.

3 Maybe this water is not good for vegetation
4 that people are going to eat, grapes that you're going to
5 drink. What's going to happen to this? This is -- But
6 I've never seen a person yet drink a redwood log, so they
7 wouldn't be hurt, you know. There's a lot of things that
8 you wouldn't have to worry about if you planted it into a
9 forest. And this water would be out there for years
10 that's used as fire, protection.

11 And one of the things that I heard tonight was
12 kind of interesting to me, because I proposed it about
13 five years ago, was to plant all the highways -- around
14 all of the highways with the redwoods and use the water
15 there. This is all public land, you wouldn't have but a
16 lot of people would be out there planting and a lot of
17 people would make pilgrimages back here to see what you've
18 done.

19 That's about all I can say.

20 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

21 The next follow-up speaker is Steve Klausner.
22 STEVE KLAUSNER: I'm Steve Klausner. I live
23 at 2361 Warm Springs Road. And I'm here representing the
24 Taxpayers Association -- Sonoma County Taxpayers
25 Association.

161

1 I'll try to keep it brief here. We kind of

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

feel that this process has very nearly become fatally flawed. A lot of people have been talking about costs and how it's going to cost so much, and maybe we really need to understand why that is. The reason this project is going to cost more than anybody else's project is because the federal government is no longer in the business of handing out grants for these kinds of projects. We will be the ones to pay for it. And so you're not going to be able to hide away from a lot of those kinds of things.

Now, if we had gotten the job done ten years ago when Doug Bosco wanted to fund the project, we wouldn't be here today, but we are and we're going to pay for it.

Some of the problems we really -- In looking through this whole process, we've seen some real difficult issues for the ratepayers, and this includes the projects overall and supporting objectives, the order in which tasks supporting this EIR are to be completed, the endless list of special studies that goes on and on and on and the excessive cost of the EIR. I guess the Army Corps of Engineers kicked up by another 1.5 million. I don't think we're going to let them get away with that one.

The project objectives are secured.
Developing a program that can be successfully financed and

2 steelhead run on Santa Rosa Creek. It's a small remnant
3 of what once was. The study being proposed will do
4 nothing but harass these few remaining fish to death.
5 MR. MARKS: Can I -- I think you gave this
6 in the afternoon.
7 STEVE KLAUSNER: Let me jump on. Let me jump
8 on then. You're absolutely right. You know, you get into
9 these things --
10 Okay. A great deal of thrust around
11 most of the studies -- of these of various special studies
12 to be done is to minimize the impact of tertiary-treated
13 wastewater on wetlands.
14 Some questions we would like answered are:
15 Are there any benefits to augmenting streams
16 and wetlands during a drought?
17 Could this affect biological productivity?
18 And how?
19 How would this impact the migratory waterfowl
20 of the Pacific Coast Flyway?
21 Could constructed wetlands in the Laguna be
22 managed in a way that enhances flood control as well as
23 wildlife values?
24 Is wetlands restoration a legitimate form of
25 reuse?

162

165

is economically feasible is the dead last on the list of supporting objectives. Shouldn't an issue like financing and economic feasibility be part of the overall objectives rather than part of the supporting objectives?

In review of the lists of tasks to be completed for this EIR, we find it is not until Task 31, damn near the end of the whole process before an economic study is done.

CEQA requires that an evaluation of financial burden on ratepayers be included in the final EIR. We want this to be the next study done. Not the last one.

It seems there's so many plans, so many different options that an economic analysis that includes a breakdown of all these different options should be presented just as clearly as possible and as soon as possible.

Components and costs associated with meeting the overall objectives like insuring public health and state should be separated from those supporting objectives like reuse or conservation. We want a clear understanding of what we are buying and why.

A good example of this might be to look in the Bennett Valley Golf Course -- irrigation of Bennett Valley golf course as part of the plants down the line, is this disposal or is it reuse? What does it cost per acre foot

1 Could freshwater augmentation actually
2 enhance biological productivity of the American and/or
3 San Antonio estuaries?
4 These are all simple ideas and inexpensive
5 projects. We want a disposal system that meets all public
6 health standards and is safe for the environment. We want
7 a system that offers practical and feasible opportunities
8 for disposal as well as reuse. We want a system that's
9 cost-effective.
10 I can't emphasize this enough. We want an
11 economic analysis to be the next special study done. And
12 \$8 million is an excessive amount of money for this EIR.
13 It should cost more like the original \$3 million you
14 were talking about. We cannot accept a project that costs
15 hundreds of millions of dollars. To do now what every
16 other group around here has been threatening lawsuits.
17 Let me tell you, they got lawyers, you got lawyers, we got
18 lawyers. If you try to approve an outrageous plan that
19 places onerous burden on the ratepayers, we're going to
20 file a suite too.
21 Thank you.
22 MR. MARKS: A couple of points before we get
23 on to the last few speakers. Number one, please speak
24 slowly or we'll have this white flag of surrender from
25 over here. That's one point. The second point is when

163

166

to do this; i.e., pumping? What does it currently cost to irrigate? Will the golf course be paying anything for this water? If this is to be reuse, what are the benefits?

I think you can go through and look at a lot of components that way and give us an idea of what we're buying here. I mean, I've heard estimates from five hundred to a thousand dollar acre foot to deliver water to a dairy pastureland which just seems crazy. I don't know if these numbers are real or not, but until, you know, an analysis is done, we're not going to know.

There's a really long list of special studies. Surely some of those environmental studies have already been done. Are we going to do them all again?

You know, this is a good reason to do an economic analysis. We may not need to study the flora and fauna of every potential dam or irrigation site in the entire county. We don't need to send people out there tramping through poison oak trying to survey every road, creek, and ridge for a pipeline from the Laguna all the way up to the Geysers.

Let's do the economic analysis, study those projects that are actually feasible, the ones that are practical. There are a couple of environmental studies that will likely be done, and I would like to offer some

1 you repeat -- You're not here to repeat the same thing you
2 said this afternoon. That's already in the record. We're
3 asking you to complete remarks that you didn't have a
4 chance to provide this afternoon.
5 The next speaker for this evening is Frank
6 Hilder.
7 FRANK HILDER: I was here in early this
8 afternoon. Frank Hilder, 718 Hewitt Street, Santa Rosa,
9 California.
10 I'm confused with all this talking going on,
11 dizzy and I faint and everything else here, you know.
12 What I want to say about is just briefly a
13 little bit more about the sewage that's coming down the
14 River through Santa Rosa. Now, I know I talked about this
15 a little bit, but who is modifying, who is looking at the
16 sewers, the waste coming out of there? And how does good
17 is there plans up there? Does anybody here know about
18 that, coming down the River from Healdsburg and Windsor
19 and Cloverdale and all those places up the road, all those
20 miles. Also, is there anybody here that knows about
21 their wastewater? Are their plants like we have here
22 in Santa Rosa which is high tech plants? Nobody knows
23 about it, their plants? So we really don't know what
24 we're drinking out there now is that what -- Oh, we do
25 know?

164

167

1 modifications for them. I am very familiar with the

1 MR. BRAINER: I think Dan Carlson is still

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

here somewhere, but I don't see him in the room now. We could —

FRANK HILDER: It's very important that I know this question because, you know, this is Santa Rosa. We're drinking this water now. We're like the lower river here now. We're getting something that might be worse than what we're releasing down river from a bigger town, you know, Santa Rosa, a hundred thousand people here. Up there, what is there? Maybe 20, 30,000 up the road? It's a few people, you know, we had —

MR. BRAUNER: That question can be answered, however, we can't give it to you right now.

FRANK HILDER: It's very important that we all know this. Okay.

I think I talked about what we should do with the pipe in the river, we can save some of that water. If people want to put it on their property, or if they want to drink it, you know, they can come out to the plant where I was at and go through the whole routine and then pick up a cup of water where it's refined supposedly good enough to drink, they can do that if they want, and I'll take a picture of it and I will blow it up and put it on my wall in my living room and I'll laugh at it every time I look at it.

158

2 all the god dam money you want to build that the small
3 pipe. You don't need a huge pipe you can walk down. You
4 just need a pipe to let out 20 percent of the water.
5 The rest if you want to drink it or put it in our
6 farmlands, go ahead and do it. Big deal. But I'm going
7 to tell you something, if you think about this, it makes
8 sense. And if you can't think about it, you're not very
9 intelligent. It can be done, and the people will vote it
10 in, I guarantee it because it's not going to cost the
11 taxpayers anymore money for this pipe; and this thing
12 is solved. The only problem is the people that are here
13 tonight possibly might not have a job, but maybe that's
14 not what you want is to solve a problem. Maybe that's
15 not what you want. Maybe you want to make your \$40,000,
16 \$50,000, \$60,000 a year. You know, I don't know, you
17 know. But I'm just telling you what I think could be done
18 and I know it can be done. If it goes on the ballot, I
19 guarantee all the renters will vote it in, because it's
20 not going to cost them one cent. But then you got — If
21 you can't allow these people to jack these people's rent
22 up either. You know, they are paying enough rent already.
23 But the homes and the office buildings and all the
24 businesses and this and that, which are paying money, they
25 can afford to put this pipeline in because they are all

171

Okay. Besides that little smart remark, what we're going to have to do is, taxpayers are scared about how much this is going to cost. We have a couple gentleman saying it is impossible getting money because everybody is broke and taxes are so high it's coming out our ears paying taxes. There's ways around getting money, you know, and I don't mean by selling dope. I mean, that could be done, you know, but I don't fool with that stuff.

So besides all that, I think what's going to have to be done is we have a lot of rich people in this world and it's going to have to go to them. It should have been on the ballot this time, it should have been a ballot, you use it, clean it up. That's what it should have been called. It should have been on the last voting ballot here, and that means people with big businesses in San Francisco and all over California that are in businesses, I'm talking about office working businesses, quite a few people go to work, they don't use their rest rooms at home, they use it on the job. So why not charge each one of these persons five dollars or so a month and let's get it from them, okay? They use it also, the toilets, and then let them pay for it and clean it up. Right, that's what should be done here. We're talking gas stations. We're talking all types of businesses. And we're talking all those that run around and charge people

169

1 using it too, and it's not unfair for them to pay for it.
2 And that's all I have to say.

MR. MARKS: Thank you.

FRANK HILDER: I guess I'm not going to get a 5 clap anymore. I got a clap the first time.

(Applause from the audience.)

MR. MARKS: Kathy Tresch.

KATHY TRESCH: Hi. This is quick and I won't 9 take long and I'll speak more slowly this time.

Under the heading of Water Quality, back to 11 groundwater, page 17 of the Summary of the Scope of Works 12 discusses groundwater. One of the tasks will be to 13 "Define groundwater quality using existing data." And I 14 wanted to point out where some of the previous studies on 15 the existing data were flawed in the West County and why. 16 They were flawed because of 18 test wells sampled in the 17 West County-Two Rock watershed, one was on the 18 parcel below the proposed T-5 damsite on our property. It 19 was located on a field that was significant seasonal 20 wetlands and had long since been abandoned. At ground 21 level and uncapped, this well was certainly not 22 representative of the other viable maintained wells in the 23 survey, yet its inclusion in the studies sent the nitrate 24 levels soaring.

New tests need to be done that will not

172

1 humongous rent prices. Like my daughter which had a
2 cancer operation, she paid \$745 a month rent. She's
3 buying the house, she's renting the house, a little two
4 bedroom joint.

We're going to charge these people \$100, \$200 a month, all the people own homes, not the ones living here paying like we pay the people who own two and three homes not the people they're renting homes out to.

I hope you can understand what I'm saying here. We want to get money to pay for this, people. We don't want to get money — We don't want the taxpayers to pay more money, we want to get another way which nobody has done so far. And like I say, there's always a way. And this is a way. If you think about it clearly and intelligently, you might understand what I'm saying. A person that's collecting \$1,000, \$1,200 a month that already owns that property, it's more or less — I think of it as a business that person is running when renting a house out and collecting that much money from it. I'm sure a lot of people own homes and rent them out if they aren't here tonight say, yes, we don't want that to go into effect, we'll have to pay money out for this pipeline. You know what I'm saying. That's what they're thinking. But I guarantee whoever gets this on the ballot, the voting people that do not own those homes and

170

1 do not collect those rents will vote it in and you'll have

1 feature this kind of stacked deck sampling. When you test
2 abandoned wells and incorporate them into the mix of other
3 wells, it is fairly certain to show poor groundwater
4 quality and show that your wastewater is no more offensive
5 in total nitrate content than our "average" wells in Two
6 Rock.

Please demonstrate that you will provide new 8 studies to define groundwater quality. And also I know 9 the Shrimp Club kids were here earlier today and probably 10 talked about the restoration they're doing along Stemple 11 Creek, and right now, Joe and I have fenced off our 12 property, our riparian corridor, since below Button Ranch 13 all the way to Walker Road, and my cousin Daisin 14 (phonetic) fenced off property, our neighbor Kenny Martin 15 fenced off Paul Martin's Shrimp Club kids restoration 16 project.

We're working hard in the watershed doing 18 restoration and planting. We're getting our nitrates out 19 of our groundwater or waterways. And I don't feel like 20 we're doing that in order to allow you to get yours in 21 there. I don't think that our waste belongs in our waters 22 waste. My father has been a fly fisherman for many years, 23 and I read a lot of the nitrite signs, and I just don't 24 think in any way, shape or form tertiary-treated or not, 25 our waste belongs in salmon run or shrimp habitat or

173

1 drinking water.

AGESAVER

SANTA ROSA WASTEWATER PROJECT

2 And that's basically what I wanted to say and
3 I'll just mail in my notes. And I also -- This woman that
4 was sitting here commented on Button Ranch in the golden
5 eagles and the Native American presence there, and I know
6 that the women that were doing the bio-studies for you
7 found a relic. The first time they went up in the creeks
8 they found half of an indian bowl up there. I also found
9 some picture with some of the habitat, that is, tree cover
10 that supports the habitat for the golden eagles. A lot
11 would be displaced and destroyed by the T-5 dam and we
12 don't feel that that is okay. The golden eagles, as I
13 understand, is on the rare and endangered species list.
14 This would endanger them.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. MARKS: Thank you very much.

7 We have one more speaker. Before I call the
8 speaker up, I just wanted to remind anyone here who has
9 not signed in, before you leave, please sign in. Those
10 are the white sheets on the table back there.

1 Ernest Nouse.

2 ERNEST NOUSE: I just wanted to add a couple
3 things to what I said before. One is that I don't think
4 it's a great idea to get too carried away with the idea
5 that our wastewater effluents is a resource, because we

2 will be over in California, this would include problems
3 that San Francisco has too, that our disposal of water
4 waste into the bay which is a bad problem. You cannot
5 purify that amount of waste that's going into that bay.
6 So this would be anybody with a problem in California that
7 would be paying for it, you know. And that's what I'm
8 saying, you know. I hope you understand that. It's not
9 only Santa Rosa but San Francisco, and different rivers
10 that have problems like this, like we have. I mean,
11 we have a river that San Francisco doesn't have that
12 problem. They get -- Their water goes into the tertiary
13 and wherever it is and goes into their homes, you know.
14 We've got everybody up above us here now is bringing waste
15 into the water -- into our water, you know.

16 Okay. That's all I got to say.

17 MR. MARKS: Thank you.

18 And thank everyone for coming out and
19 providing your comments to us. Thank you.

20 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at
21 10:10 p.m.)

22 ---oo---

23 ///
24 ///

25 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

174

177

1 have a way of taking resources and using them up and
2 always needing more and stuff like that. And one thing I
3 don't think that we need to produce more of is wastewater
4 effluent. And the idea of selling this, I mean, God, you
5 know, it's no good for the birds. The fish don't like it.
6 We can't throw it in the creeks. We can't -- You know,
7 it's a problem. We don't even know.

8 And here is the other question, what is going
9 to be the long-term effect of irrigating crops with this
10 water, if it does have metals in it, if it has nitrates
11 and so forth? You know, over a long, long period of time,
12 this is presumably going to go on, you know, as long as
13 Santa Rosa is here. That can be a long time. Over that
14 period of time, what's going to be the effect of dumping
15 this stuff on crops and which crops are going to be able
16 to take the toxins out the best?

17 I mean, there's some studies been done.

18 There's a system in Bureka where they have wetlands that
19 take out most of the toxins or all the toxins, or make the
20 water safe enough for them to send it into the bay.
21 There's a lot of information around about what sort of
22 plants are best irrigated with this kind of water so that
23 it can be in fact purified through its reuse. Now, this
24 may turn out that there are no agricultural crops.

25 And another thing that I want to address is

175

1 2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA }
2 }
3 COUNTY OF SONOMA }

4
5 I, CINDY L. CARMICHAEL, a Certified Shorthand
6 Reporter in and for the State of California, do hereby
7 certify that I was the official Court Reporter for the
8 proceedings named herein, and that as such reporter, I
9 reported in verbatim shorthand writing those proceedings;

10 That I thereafter caused my shorthand writing
11 to be reduced to typewriting, and the pages numbered 3
12 through 177 herein constitute a complete, true
13 and correct record of the proceedings.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed this
15 certificate at Santa Rosa, California, on this 29th day
16 of November 1994.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CINDY L. CARMICHAEL, CSR #8257

178

1 who is going to pay the cost on all this kind of stuff?
2 Well, the people who created the problem should pay the
3 cost. I don't know, but that goes way back, because we're
4 inheriting a lot of costs that were ignored previously.
5 It's called the "hidden cost". The hidden cost of
6 progress is always there. And it's like when you have
7 to pay more money for to clean up oil spills, because we
8 drive our cars, we might have to pay more money to treat
9 the sewage better so that we don't continue to poison
10 ourselves and other people, and somebody has got to start
11 picking up the hidden costs. And I'm sure that they're
12 saying that we have a hidden debt by now, I'm sure, of
13 costs that haven't been paid.

14 And I'm inclined to agree with Frank. I think
15 the rich people should pay for it somehow.

16 And other planning, I would like to see things
17 that encourage agriculture and discourage new building,
18 and retrofit old building that's better and housing people
19 in older structures and so forth.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. MARKS: Okay.

22 Okay, very brief. Go ahead, please.

23 FRANK HILDER: I know you probably don't want
24 to hear from me again, but you know this gentleman was
25 telling our problem was Russian River. San Francisco

176

1 I wouldn't want any part of this. But this ballot that

** NOTES **

13 WRITTEN COMMENT LETTERS

Scoping Written Report Comments**Santa Rosa Subregional Long-Term Wastewater Project**

Letter #	Date	Author	Agency
1	11/04/94	Abe Newman	
2	11/10/94	Donald Mc Isaac	Marin County Resource Conservation
3	11/09/94	Joseph Pence	
4	11/10/94	Martin Coorpender	Sensible Reuse of W.W. and Conservation
5	11/14/94	Gary De Weese	
6	11/16/94	Brian Hunter	CDFG
7	11/15/94	Philip Badal	Caltrans
8	11/16/94	Benjamin Kor	NCRWQCB
9	11/17/94	K.M. Lo	
10	11/17/94	R. E. Bartley	
11	11/17/94	No Name	Shrimp Club
12	11/17/94	Kenneth S. Roe	
13	11/17/94	Roz Scholze	
14	11/17/94	Frank & Bea Glazier	
15	11/17/94	David Bannister	Sierra Club
16	11/17/94	Hamilton Hess	Friends of Cobb Mountain
17	11/17/94	William & Nancy Adams	

Letter #	Date	Author	Agency
18	11/17/94	Ned Orrett	
19	11/17/94	Elizabeth Anthony	Sierra Club Water Committee
20	11/17/94	Betty Guggolz	Calif. Native Plant Society
21	11/17/94	Martin Strain	
22	11/17/94	Duane DeWitt	
23	11/17/94	Krista Rector	Sierra Club, Sonoma Group
24	11/17/94	David Asimov	
25	11/18/94	John Prunske	West Sonoma County Rural Alliance
26	11/21/94	Charles Black	
27	11/23/94	Kathy Kenny Baskin	
28	11/22/94	Ernestine I. Smith	
29	11/23/94	Edward Ueber	NOAA, Gulf of Farallones National
30	11/19/94	James Valtine	
31	11/23/94	Wayne Hubbard	SWRCB
32	11/22/94	Mark Feldman	
33	11/21/94	Hamilton Hess	Friends of Cobb Mountain
34	11/25/94	Geophery Johnson	
35	11/22/94	Martin Strain	
36	11/28/94	Leigh Jordan	NWIC

Letter #	Date	Author	Agency
37	11/29/94	Paul Ogasawara	
38	11/29/94	Monica Maguire	
39	11/28/94	Allen Marcucci	
40	11/27/94	Thomas Yarish	Friends of Esteros
41	11/28/94	Jean Starrweather	Marin Conservation League
42	11/28/94	William Walton	Estero Mutual Water Co.
43	11/27/94	Lindsay Rehm	Environmental Forum of Marin
44	11/28/94	Edward Ueber	NOAA
45	11/09/94	Jean Severinghaus	
46	11/14/94	Len Swenson	Sierra Club, Sonoma County
47	11/10/94	Joseph Pence	
48	11/28/94	Bill Kortum	
49	11/29/94	Russel Ridge	
50	11/29/94	Barbara Salzman	Marin Audubon Society
51	11/30/94	Robert Miller	Operating Engineers Local Union #3
52	12/02/94	Dean Cooley	PG&E
53	11/29/94	Steve Klausner	So. Co. Taxpayers Assn.
54	12/02/94	Susan Stompe	Sierra Club of Marin
55	11/29/94	Jerry Levy	

Letter #	Date	Author	Agency
56	12/02/94	Loretta Borges	
57	11/29/94	Davitt Mullen	
58	12/02/94	Stan Griffin	Trout Unlimited
59	12/01/94	Eric Sunsweat	
60	12/01/94	Richard Charter	Friends of the Esteros
61	12/05/94	Terry Bell	
62	12/05/94	Jack Macy	South County Alliance
63	12/05/94	Anne Magnie	Mayor of Sebastopol
64	12/03/94	Johanna Brandriff Lynn Stafford	
65	12/04/94	Robert Smithfield	
66	12/06/94	Joe and Kathy Tresch	
67	12/04/94	Carol Robillard	
68	12/03/94	Helene Steinlauf	
69	11/17/94	Denise Wright	
70	12/05/94	Edwin Orrett	
71	11/01/94	Brian Hines	
72	11/28/94	H.M. Eichstaedt	
73	12/05/94	Lawrence Folteer	
74	12/06/94	John Colomiris Kenneth Fox	Tomaes Bay Assn.

Letter #	Date	Author	Agency
75	12/05/94	Dennis Harter	
76	12/07/94	No Name	
77	12/07/94	Joel Hedgpeth	
78	12/05/94	Colleen Briggs	
79	12/07/94	Marcia Comacho	Sierra Club Water Committee
80	12/07/94	Gerry Murphy	
81	12/06/94	Leonard Stewart	
82	12/05/94	Ernest & Colleen Briggs	
83	12/07/94	Brenda Adelman	RRWPC Supporter
84	12/07/94	Marci & Don Camacho	
85	12/01/94	Maurice Ann	Ad Hoc Committee on Clean Water
86	10/12/94	Vicki Reynolds	
87	12/05/94	Clifford Ostrem	
88	12/04/94	Betty Guggolz	CA Native Plant Society
89	12/05/94	Nadine Beck	
90	12/07/94	Leon Beck	
91	12/07/94	Bob Anderson	United Wine Growers for Sonoma County
92	12/08/94	Brenda Adelman	RRWPC Supporter
93	11/09/94	Marci Camacho	RRWPC Supporter

Letter #	Date	Author	Agency
94	/ /	Susan Richter	RRWPC Supporter
95	/ /	Pauline Gilbert	RRWPC Supporter
96	/ /	Trish Wilson	RRWPC Supporter
97	/ /	Thomas Starke	RRWPC Supporter
98	/ /	John Chiappe	RRWPC Supporter
99	/ /	Gene Dyrhaug	RRWPC Supporter
100	/ /	Richard Swan	RRWPC Supporter
101	/ /	Charles Green	RRWPC Supporter
102	11/17/94	Joan O'Brien	
103	12/07/94	Kenneth Brown	
104	12/05/94	Kim Cordell	
105	09/14/92	Brenda Adelman	RRWPC Supporter
106	12/13/94	John Rosenblum	RRWPC Supporter
107	12/15/94	Alan Haramati	RRWPC Supporter
108	12/15/94	Farrel Winter	RRWPC Supporter
109	12/15/94	Gloria Potter	RRWPC Supporter
110	12/15/94	Fred Beeman	RRWPC Supporter
111	12/15/94	Charles Bishop	RRWPC Supporter
112	12/21/94	Michelle Julene	Sonoma County Water Agency

Letter #	Date	Author	Agency
113	12/22/94	Richard Fiore	RRWPC Supporter
114	12/22/94	Genevieve Malmstrom	RRWPC Supporter
115	12/22/94	Elizabeth Whitmore	RRWPC Supporter
116	12/28/94	Erika Floric	RRWPC Supporter
117	12/28/94	Rosemary Benz	RRWPC Supporter
118	12/29/94	Phyllis Honodel	RRWPC Supporter
119	01/04/95	Suzanne Curtiss	RRWPC Supporter
120	01/04/95	William P. Murray, Jr.	RRWPC Supporter
121	01/04/95	Kenneth & Vivian Bens Hower	RRWPC Supporter
122	11/23/94	Lee Erickson	Erickson Ranch
123	12/06/94	Joan O'Brien	
124	12/27/94	James T. Hollibaugh	Romberg Tiburon Centers
125	11/09/05	Anonymous	
126	02/13/95	Ken G. Wilson	RRWPC Supporter
127	12/30/94	Art Mc Nulty	RRWPC Supporter
128	01/05/95	Ed Cooper, Jr.	RRWPC Supporter
129	03/13/95	Mary L. Donatelli	RRWPC Supporter

[Click here to go to next section.](#)