

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
54	I3	Susan Stompe, Cont'd.	Would the storage facility be located on or off stream? How would construction and use of these facilities affect the creek and its resources? Would any wetlands be affected?	TASKs 18 and 31	TASKs 18 and 31		See response to comment 50 G3. Each reservoir site includes some wetland area. Minimization of lost wetland will be a criterion considered in selection of project reservoir(s). Loss of wetlands is expected to be mitigated by the creation of wetlands elsewhere in the basin.
54	I4		Would the storage facility be located on or off stream?	TASKs 18 and 31	TASKs 18 and 31		Same as 54 I3 and 50 G3.
54	I5		Identify and describe the current condition of all streams, creeks, etc., proposed for flow augmentation. Are there currently diversions from these streams? If so, estimate the amount of water diverted. Describe the probable impacts of these diversions on the creek, stream, etc. Has it likely resulted in the creek going dry in summer, loss of riparian vegetation, etc.? Show and describe the location where water would be added to the stream. Identify the potential impacts, e.g., loss of vegetation for outflow structure, possible erosion at outflow location and downstream due to increased amounts of water discharged into the streams. How would wildlife use be affected?			X	See response to 50 G1.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
54	16	Susan Stompe, Cont'd.	What is the potential for accumulation of heavy metals in the agricultural soils? Could these constituents end up in the food that is grown?	TASK 18	TASK 18		See 41 C.
54	17		What controls are possible, feasible and planned to ensure that the quality of the runoff from the irrigated crops would not degrade adjacent streams and downstream resources?	TASK 18	TASK 18		See response to comment 50 H3.
54	18		Discuss the potential for salt from the wastewater to build up in the soils to the point where the lands could no longer be usable.	TASK 18	TASK 18		In scope
54	19		Identify all constituents in wastewater after tertiary treatment.	TASK 21			The constituent being studied are those mandated by State and Federal regulations.
54	110		How would constituents (copper and other heavy metals) that remain in the water affect the water in the aquifer? Could the heavy metals accumulate to the extent that water could be degraded for other uses? What other uses are made of the aquifer water?	TASKs 18, 30, 32	TASKs 18, 30, 32		In scope

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
54	I11	Susan Stompe, Cont'd.	Describe the anticipated quality of wastewater when it enters the creek. Identify, for each alternative, the anticipated quality of the wastewater when it reaches the end of the stream, i.e., San Pablo Bay, Petaluma River, Tomales Bay, etc. What habitats and species along the stream length could be impacted by the water?	TASKs18, 19, 20, 21	TASKs18, 19, 20, 21		Wastewater quality when it enters receiving waters will be described. The wastewater effects on the receiving waters and species will be evaluated.
54	I12		What precedent would construction of a system discharging into a small stream have?			X	The existing system discharges to Santa Rosa Creek and the Laguna. Other systems in California discharge to streams.
54	J1		How would construction and use of reservoir facilities affect each creek and its biological resources? Impacts should be considered for each stream and creek as a system and should not be tied to the presence of riparian vegetation which may be absent in Mediterranean climates and on agricultural lands. Would any wetlands be affected?	TASK 18 TASK 19	TASK 18 TASK 19		In scope. Scope revisions for terrestrial biology will concentrate on mapping existing stream conditions downstream of dam site.
54	J2		How would construction and operation of the wastewater facilities adversely affect the short- and long-term functioning of each creek, stream, etc.? How would special status species, fish and other wildlife be impacted?	TASK 19, 20	TASK 19, 20		In scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
54	J3	Susan Stompe, Cont'd.	How would the project impact migratory birds of the Pacific Flyway?	TASK 19	TASK 19		Effects on migratory waterfowl are in scope.
54	J4		Do any alternatives propose storage facilities that are not connected with a creek, stream or drainageway? If so, describe the existing conditions of these areas.	NA	NA	NA	All storage alternatives are connected with creeks, streams and drainage ways.
54	J5		Which alternative would have the least impact on streams, creeks and other resources?	X	X		The EIR/EIS will disclose the impacts of each of the alternatives.
54	J6		Identify wetland acreage and type of wetland that would be filled, flooded or otherwise adversely impacted by each alternative. Describe the type of wetland (salt water, riparian, etc.) that would be impacted.	TASK 18	TASK 18		In scope.
54	J7		Describe the existing habitat characteristics of the lands proposed for wetland creation. Discuss the impacts of the loss of existing habitats, i.e., conversions of grasslands, seasonal wetlands, etc., to fresh-water, year-round wetlands on the species that depend on them. Identify any other functions and values provided by these lands. How would these wetland and other habitat losses be mitigated?			X	Wetlands creation has been eliminated as a study component.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
54	J8	Susan Stompe, Cont'd.	How would it be ensured that functional wetlands could be created in the location proposed where they do not currently exist?			X	Where required for mitigation, a detailed mitigation program will be presented in the DEIR/EIS that can be evaluated by the public, agencies and decision makers. Created wetlands have been eliminated as a study component.
54	J9		Regarding wetlands proposed as part of the treatment system, to polish wastewater, etc., fully describe how these wetlands would function. How would vegetation have to be managed?			X	Created wetlands have been eliminated as a study component.
54	J10		Would there be any wetland creation in diked historic baylands along San Pablo Bay? If so, address the conversion of the historic tidal salt marsh to diked, ponded, fresh water wetlands. What habitats currently are existing on these lands, seasonal wetlands, etc.? This conversion and loss should be considered an adverse impact and mitigation recommended.	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21	X	Wetlands creation has been eliminated as a study component. Analysis of potential impacts to the Baylands is in scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
54	K	Susan Stompe, Cont'd.	Describe all known studies addressing the bioaccumulation in species or accumulation of constituents remaining in the wastewater in soils inhabiting the wetlands. What monitoring would be required to track the accumulation of pollutants and their impact on the food chain? Even though not created for wildlife habitat, wildlife would be attracted to any wetland created. What measures would be used to ensure the wetlands do not have an adverse impact on wildlife, invertebrates, or fish?	TASKs 19, 27 and 34	TASKs 19, 27 and 34	X	Analysis of bioaccumulation is in the scope and will be based on available data on local systems. Created wetlands has been eliminated as a study component.
54	L		Identify the species, number, size and location of trees that would be removed or otherwise impacted by each alternative. Native trees should be given particular attention. Do the trees occur singly, in groups, or forest? What wildlife species use the trees? What other vegetative communities would be impacted? Address the status and ecological value of these communities and the species that use them.	TASK 19	TASK 19		Potential loss of forested woodland habitat will be evaluated including associated wildlife impacts. The scope does not include individual identification of the size and location of each tree.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
54	M	Susan Stompe, Cont'd.	What are the potential environmental and/or public health risks, if any, of locating the Russian River discharge upstream of the water supply intake? Downstream?	TASK 32			In scope
55	A	Jerry Levy, Healdsburg (L)	I support the South County/Community Separator Plan.	X		X	The South County Alternative will be studied. The Community Separator and the created wetlands portion of this alternative have not been retained because sufficient, suitable land is not available.
55	B		Our county needs to limit growth, not encourage it. It is also the least expensive plan.			X	See responses to comments 34 B, 40 A and B and 83 E.
56	A	Loretta Borges, Santa Rosa (L)	I believe the Geysers Alternative would be best. The City of Santa Rosa should not destroy any person's living or homes. The people from the Geysers need the water. We get a lot of benefits. Electricity is one. Why destroy the land and the environment when it (Geysers Recharge) is the most obvious.	X			The EIR will evaluate the net energy benefit of the Geysers alternative project; i.e., the energy to be produced from the steam derived from the water delivered to the Geysers.
56	B		Since there are so many businesses that are leaving town and the surrounding areas, why destroy more. I am for the Geyser usage.	X			Geysers Alternative is in scope.
57	A	Davitt Mullen, Novato (L)	I support the South County/Community Separator Plan. The others are a waste of taxpayer money.	X		X	See the response to comment 55 A.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
58	A	Stan Griffin, Trout Unlimited of California, Mill Valley (L)	We have not been convinced that the migratory fish study has answered our concerns for the health and behavior of the migrating fish in the watershed.	TASK 14	TASK 14		The current fish migration study continues to gather data to evaluate the effects of wastewater on fish migration. Trout Unlimited, with other interested parties, met in a work-study session to develop this scope of work and concluded that this scope adequately addresses fish migration. No scientific study can conclusively determine no impacts.
58	B		Current fish migration study results appear based on assumptions. The fact that fish have been found in the upper reaches of Mark West and Santa Rosa creeks is not conclusive that wastewater releases have no effect. Did fish migrate through the Laguna during a window of no wastewater releases or flood flows when wastewater concentration was practically zero?	TASK 14	TASK 14		See response to 58 A.
58	C		Dissolved oxygen (D.O.) problem in the Laguna is serious and needs to be addressed. This is mentioned in scope but those studies do not seem related to "fish study". What were 1994 survey results? There has been a tendency to blame agriculture for the D.O. problem, while not addressing the additional impact wastewater nutrients have. The problem of the Laguna being an impaired body of water needs to be addressed and cleaned up.	TASK 14			See response to comment 29, Table 1.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
58	D	Stan Griffin, (L) Cont'd.	Another important factor is the cumulative impacts the wastewater discharges have on the Russian River estuary.	TASK 39			Cumulative effects issues are being addressed.
59	A	Eric Sunswheat, Potter Valley (L)	No increase in methane digester sludge capacity should be contemplated.			X	Comment noted. Sludge management is not a component of this project.
59	B		If the last million dollar compost consulting contract had some legal teeth in it, I could have helped to recover the damages. Ship it to Potter Valley, if you can't do it right.	NA	NA	NA	Comment noted. Solids composting is not a component of this project.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
60	A	Richard Charter, Friends of the Esteros/Environmental Action of West Marin, Bodega Bay (L)	The NOP fails to identify the full range of project options under consideration. NOP must be republished and a new comment period initiated because of this inadequacy. NOP contains no information about ocean outfall. If this alternative is reintroduced, NOP must be renoticed and recirculated. The NOI and Preliminary Scoping Report (PSR) fail to identify the full range of alternatives, and must be republished, recirculated, and a new comment period initiated as well. The "Summary of the Environmental Consultant's Scope of Work" was not released prior to Nov. 17, 1994 public hearing. Unreasonable to expect public to read, analyze and provide comment on a 50-page technical document with no prior circulation. The summary needs to incorporate Ocean Outfall and be recirculated.	NA	NA	X	The Ocean Alternative has been eliminated as a project alternative. Therefore, recirculation is not required. The City of Santa Rosa made the preliminary scope of work available to the public on October 22, 1994. It was placed in all the libraries in Sonoma County. The comment period on the document was extended through December 14, 1994.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
60	B	Richard Charter, Cont'd.	Description of physical environment is incomplete. For example, anticipated Ocean Outfall location provides no pipeline routes and fails to indicate whether this option would be associated with wastewater storage at the Button Ranch site. Identify esteros as within the Gulf of the Farallones or Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuaries and the United Nations (UNESCO) Central Coast International Biosphere Reserve. Identify all bodies of water under consideration for discharge.	X	X	X	The physical environment for each alternative will be presented in the EIR/EIS. The Ocean Outfall Alternative has been eliminated from the study scope. Maps pertinent to each of the project alternatives will be presented in the EIR/EIS. Bodies of water under consideration for discharge will be included.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
60	C	Richard Charter, Cont'd.	The City continues to assume erroneously that unavoidable major environmental impacts associated with excavation of a borrow area, construction of a dam embankment, and inundation of sensitive woodlands at Button Ranch could be mitigated. No basis for this assumption has been provided, nor have adverse impacts on domestic water sources which rely on the aquifer recharged at Button Ranch been identified as constraints. Constraints include the high probability of adverse impacts on municipal water supply for portions of the Town of Dillon Beach. Objective mitigation feasibility criteria should be applied when considering Button Ranch or any other potential reservoir site. The loss of Button Ranch as a resource for education should be factored into any cost-benefit analysis conducted by the City or the Corps.	X	X		No such assumption is made. The EIR/EIS will disclose the potential impacts of the alternatives and to what extent these could be mitigated. The economic analysis does not factor in the value of education for any of the nine reservoir sites.
60	D		Scoping should address the impact of various project alternatives on known historic or archeological resource areas. Button Ranch includes extensive archeological sites.	TASK 36	TASK 36		The archaeological resources within the 9 reservoir sites are part of the scope (archival and field studies).

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Channel	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
60	E	Richard Charter, Cont'd.	Address the potential impacts to domestic well uses from water storage at Two Rock Reservoir. Assess the potential impacts of planned incidental, or accidental releases of wastewater from the proposed reservoir at the Button Ranch on the Dillon Beach water supply.	TASK 32			A quantitative analysis of the human health impacts from exposure to 100% reclaimed water and the Russian River as drinking water sources is within the scope of work. A qualitative analysis of other potential exposure pathways is included.
60	F		Claims of environmental enhancement associated with wastewater reclamation uses remain unsubstantiated. Mitigation of the associated environmental destruction cannot be accomplished, and the anticipated "Net Environmental Benefits" are unachievable.	NA	NA	NA	No claims of environmental enhancement or net environmental benefits associated with wastewater reuse have been made in this EIR/EIS process. The DEIR/EIS will disclose potential impacts and recommended mitigation.
60	G		Scoping must address how the planned acquisition of needed private lands could be carried out since Santa Rosa City Council has repeatedly gone on record as opposing condemnation of private lands for this project.	TASK 7	NA	NA	The Screening Report presented alternative acquisition methods which will be considered by the City at the time of project implementation. Condemnation is one of the methods available to the City at that time. Both Santa Rosa City Council and the BPU have stated they would <u>not</u> rule out condemnation, though they would prefer to implement a project that does not require it.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
60	H	Richard Charter, Cont'd.	Scoping should address the fact that the City of Santa Rosa is acting in bad faith with respect to their claims of equal and unbiased evaluation of all possible wastewater options. The cynical misrepresentations by the City of their current decision process as a "consent-building" procedure can only serve to create an atmosphere of distrust on the part of local citizens.	NA	NA	NA	It is the role and responsibility of the environmental consultant to prepare an unbiased and thorough assessment of all the alternatives and components at an equal level of detail. That is the approach being taken in preparing this EIR/EIS.
61	A	Terry Bell, (L) Sebastapol	Too many costly and unrealistic alternatives are being studied. Studies will deplete limited public funds. I urge a reduction in the number of alternatives to be studied. Any EIR will face litigation. Knowing this, limit the EIR to two or three alternatives.	NA	NA	NA	The alternatives have been reduced to five, including the No-Project Option, through the scoping process. See also response to comment 3 A in Table 2.
61	B		Economic feasibility must be part of the primary project objective, not a supporting objective.	X NA	 NA	 NA	Analysis of alternatives' costs and economic effects is in scope, but objectives are set by the BPU and Council.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
62	A	Jack Macy Sonoma County Alliance, Santa Rosa (L)	Evaluate fully any issues which could have even a remote possibility of significant impact on the environment. The Alliance strongly recommends that equal consideration be given to the costs of each of the alternatives. Identify the cost of each of the mitigation measures suggested. Decision makers need to know the total costs of all the components which will make up the selected project. Impacts on present and future rate payers need to be considered.	TASK 33	TASK 33		Economic studies are included in the scope of work.
62	B		The long-term solution will be a series of trade-offs and compromises. Analyze all impacts completely and without bias. Decision makers will then have the information necessary to choose a solution.	NA	NA	NA	Comment noted. See response to Comment 60H.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
63	A-G	Anne Magnie, City of Sebastopol (L)	<p>As to alternatives to be considered, in the past the City of Sebastopol has supported alternatives that included the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Maximum conservation, possibly mandatory; b) No more than 1% discharge into the Russian River; c) South and West County multiple storage ponds built in increments, as needed; d) Wetlands enhancement and creation with no loss of existing wetlands or vernal pools for any reason; e) Maximum water recycling/reuse for agriculture and irrigation; f) Growth control, moratorium on growth; and, g) Some discharge into the Petaluma River, amount to be determined. 	N/A	N/A	N/A	Comments noted. The BPU has adopted goals and objectives pertinent to the topics raised by the commenter. These are contained in Volume I of the Scoping Report.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
63	H	Annie Magnie, Coint'd.	Sebastopol opposes consideration of storage of treated wastewater in aquifer recharge areas, small stream flow augmentation, and injection of treated wastewater into aquifers.	TASK 22	TASK 22	X	Aquifer storage and recovery includes the storage of treated wastewater and the recovery of the wastewater to be used in other components. The purpose of the study is to determine impacts. Flow augmentation is no longer being considered as a potential component of the Long-Term Project.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
63	I	Annie Magnie, Cont'd.	<p>Only "standard" conservation is part of the alternatives being considered. The reason given is that (greater) conservation may not be manageable and could be costly. Greater conservation should be evaluated fully in the EIR/EIS because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Preliminary costs for alternatives do not include mitigation costs; greater conservation may be cheaper and have less environmental impact. 2) Member jurisdictions (of the Subregional System) may want to pursue such measures once the true costs are known. 	TASK 29	TASK 29	X	<p>Some of the components included in what was previously referred to as "Maximum conservation", have been eliminated from any further evaluation, specifically greywater and composting toilets. These are not being considered because of public health concerns, and concerns over the inability to guarantee the long-term operational reliability of these systems with changing ownership. These programs have been submitted to the Board of Public Utilities Technology Committee. The programs which will be considered are those that have quantifiable and sustainable results.</p> <p>The overall scope for the water conservation element includes a description of current conservation programs and the estimated reduction achieved with their full implementation (e.g., toilet, showerhead, faucet aerator replacement), what could be done in addition to these existing programs by employing proven technology (e.g., programs published by California Urban Water Conservation Council), and what can be done by considering new technologies (e.g., waterless urinals, replacing inefficient appliances, etc.). Cost-effectiveness evaluations will be conducted for each measure of conservation, as well as the amount of wastewater saved.</p>

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
63	J	Annie Magnie, Cont'd.	A preliminary estimate of the cost of each alternative and component should be given in the EIR/EIS; this should include the cost of mitigation measures.	TASK 33	TASK 33		In scope.
63	J1		Structure the alternatives so that, with the addition of greater than standard conservation and growth management, a superior environmental alternative can be reached by combining the best components of several alternatives. We believe this will closely approximate Sebastopol's recommended alternative.			X	Growth management is not within the authority of the Subregional System. Responsibility for the regulation of growth rests with the individual member jurisdictions through their General Plans. For conservation, see 63I.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (F) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
63	K.L	Annie Magnie, Cont'd.	<p>The EIR/EIS will use participating cities' general plans to identify growth and development requirements until 2010. Update CH2MHill's work to reflect recently adopted general plans. For example, the City of Sebastopol adopted its revised General Plan in May, 1994. By adopting growth management policies and reducing its sphere of influence by 500 acres, the City has substantially reduced its wastewater demand, so that no additional wastewater allotment beyond the present contract will be needed through the year 2013. Also, reexamine the assumptions regarding the amount of wastewater generated from each land use type.</p> <p>The NOP states that the purpose of the Subregional System is to provide wastewater treatment capacity and treated effluent disposal for the build-out of the general plans. It is assumed that this is the capacity and discharge (cont'd. on p. 133)</p>			X	<p>The buildout as described in the General Plans in effect on April 18, 1995 will be used as the basis for the General Plan consistency analysis under the land use scope. The land use scope does not address the questions of wastewater generation rates and wastewater projections that will be included in the EIR/EIS. In addition, these comments are in essence requesting that another alternative be studied or that the project objectives be changed. These are policy questions which should be determined by the Board of Public Utilities.</p> <p>See also response to comment 40 B.</p>

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
63	K,L	Annie Magnie, (Cont'd.)	that must be planned for. Sebastopol believes this assumption should be reconsidered, for if it can be shown that (1) significant environmental impacts can be avoided if development is reduced; and/or (2) the cost of mitigation for increased disposal would push user rates beyond what is acceptable, then member jurisdictions may agree to a reduced growth scenario.				See also response to comment 83 E.
63	M1		Examine potential contamination of drinking water supplies from stream augmentation, rapid infiltration and aquifer recharge. Also look at potential groundwater contamination from aquifer recharge and rapid infiltration. In relation to these, document the variable quality of treated wastewater throughout the year and its potential effects on existing and future potable water supplies.	TASK 32		X	A quantitative analysis of the human health impacts from exposure to 100% reclaimed water and the Russian River as drinking water sources is within the scope of work. A qualitative analysis of other potential exposure pathways is included. Stream augmentation and rapid infiltration have been eliminated as study components.
63	M2		Examine surface water quality impacts from small stream flow augmentation and from runoff of treated effluent into waterways adjacent to disposal/reuse areas.	TASKS 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 32	TASKS 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 32	X	Flow augmentation and rapid infiltration have been eliminated from the alternatives.
63	N		The harm to biotic resources, both aquatic and terrestrial, from the disposal of treated wastewater into waterways should be evaluated.	TASKS 19, 20	TASKS 19, 20		In scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
63	O	Annie Magnie, Cont'd.	Examine the potential contamination of groundwater and surface water sources for potable water supplies. This includes how long it would take to purify a groundwater aquifer, should it be contaminated.	TASKS 21, 22, 32, 34	TASKS 21, 22, 32, 39	X	Water quantity and supply problems are public service issues, quality is a groundwater and surface water issue. Sebastopol will be surveyed for service provision impacts due to potential contamination. Potential groundwater contamination will be evaluated; purification of the aquifer is not in the scope of work. Based on analytical data collected from 1991 to 1994, the concentration of most measured inorganic and organic compounds in the effluent are consistently lower than primary drinking water standards. Additionally, the necessity of subjecting the reclaimed water to further treatment before injection into the aquifer will be considered under the current scope of work. An evaluation of the potential movement of reclaimed water in the aquifer and possible interactions with formation water is also included under the current scope of work. Any injection of reclaimed water would be in accordance with Title 22 California Code of Regulations which includes requirements for types of treatment process, minimum retention time, minimum distance to domestic wells and maximum percentage of reclaimed water at domestic wells. All of these factors are being addressed under the current scope of the EIR. Issues related to surface water quality and potential drinking water impacts are in scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
64	A	Johanna Brandriff, San Geronimo Lynn Stafford, Bodega Bay (L)	There are no freshwater shrimp surveys scheduled for the Two Rock reservoir site. Since there are reports of this species occurring in this area, and because habitat exists on the site, we request that freshwater shrimp surveys be included for the Two Rock site.	TASK 19			Surveys will be conducted in the appropriate habitat.
64	B		The technical summary reports that no suitable yellow-legged frog habitat is found on the Two Rock site. Since there are streams on this site that fit the habitat requirements for yellow-legged frogs, we request that surveys for yellow-legged frogs be conducted.	TASK 19			In scope.
64	C		Please address the destruction of the migration/travel corridor for newts in the area of the S20 reservoir. Additionally, please address the potential loss of the entire population as it relates to the overall decline of amphibians.	TASK 19			Evaluation of impacts on amphibians, including cumulative impact assessment, is in scope.
64	D		Please address the reports of a Golden Eagle nest site on the Two Rock reservoir site.	TASK 19			In scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
64	E	Johanna Brandrif Lynn Stafford, Cont'd.	Despite the fact that the S39 site is almost entirely plowed and in crops, and virtually all the waterways are channelized, you suggest by your answers to the CEQA checklist that the S39 site might have greater loss in biodiversity than the S20 site. S20 has large areas of pristine forests, native grasslands, clear flowing streams and a very diverse native flora and fauna. Your apparent bias has no place in this document. Please address the very real and great potential loss of biodiversity when evaluating the S20 reservoir site.	TASKS 19, 39			CEQA Checklist is a preliminary assessment of potential impacts. It does not compare impacts among alternatives; it merely identifies whether impacts could exist. No bias for or against any particular alternative is implied or intended. An evaluation of impacts to biota will be presented in the DEIR/DEIS based on current studies and existing data.
64	F		The Summary of the Proposed Scope of Work suggests that those who want greater detail on study methodologies should consult Chapter Four of the PSR. However, Chapter Four has nothing that could be construed as methodologies, which are intended to allow the reader to: (1) Understand how the study is conducted, including the degree of detail involved, and (2) Allow another investigator to replicate the study. Please be sure to include this very relevant information on study methodology in the EIR/EIS.	TASK 19			Survey methodologies have been developed in coordination with responsible resource agencies. Survey methodologies will be detailed in technical reports.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
65	A	Robert Smithfield, Fairfax (L)	Is it appropriate to obtain and what are the consequences of obtaining the Two Rock Site (Site 20) by condemnation, given that: (a) The City of Santa Rosa has not published data suggesting that the ratepayers would support the use of such powers, and (b) it has not been demonstrated that condemnation is consistent with Santa Rosa's intent to construct a project which promotes the most sensible and wise use of natural and other public resources?	NA	NA	NA	The EIR/EIS will only study environmental impacts on the proposed alternatives. The selection of a project will take place only after the EIR/EIS is completed and certified. Whether condemnation would be used to obtain property would have to be addressed when the project is selected.
65	B		Condemnation of one property owner's land could have very immediate and long-term negative economic consequences on the dairy industry of the region.	TASK 33		X	The analysis of the potential economic consequences of the alternatives and components is in scope. The economic effects of condemnation for individual properties will not be evaluated.
65	C		If the dam and reservoir are constructed at the Button Ranch site, they would destroy two natural resources: (1) The Button Ranch valley, upland, and aquatic habitats, constituting a unique system; (2) An aquifer important to both local human and natural habitat/wildlife populations, to the Stemple Creek watershed, and to waters of the National Marine Sanctuary.	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21, 32	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21, 32		Comment noted. Potential impacts on natural systems and habitats will be analyzed for all alternatives.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
65	D	Robert Smithfield, Cont'd.	The City of Santa Rosa has not demonstrated that condemnation would be appropriate in view of probable future long-term need to obtain additional wastewater or reclamation water storage sites in the region in order to continue irrigation with reclaimed wastewater. (If condemnation dissuades landowners from participating, then what will happen?)	NA	NA	NA	The issue of condemnation will be addressed at the time of project selection. The EIR/EIS must be prepared prior to project selection.
65	E		Is it appropriate to propose a project which has a significant probability of having negative impacts on the habitats and wildlife of the National Marine Sanctuary? It seems imprudent to propose a project alternative which results in negative functional changes to the natural habitats/resources of the estuaries. Is there any level of acceptable risk of functional impairment of these resources? Are the socio-economic and environmental costs of unmitigable damage measurable and would they be acceptable?	X	X		See responses to comments 44.
65	F		Will any natural habitats proposed for restoration, creation or enhancement be functionally developed by the time the habitats they are intended to replace are functionally diminished or lost?	TASK 19			In scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	A	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Two Rock (L)	Please explain why there is a West County project being considered as an alternative when there is no consensus for it, or how it could be a viable alternative when there is such extensive opposition to it?	NA	NA	NA	The NEPA regulations require that all reasonable options be evaluated. The West County Alternative is a reasonable option. See also response to comments 7 and 94 in Table 1.
66	B		I would like a map which shows the whole S-20 project. Why have you not made conceptual designs available to us? These would show the inundation area and the outer project boundary area.	NA	NA	NA	As part of the EIR/EIS information, maps of all candidate storage sites, including both inundation and outer project boundary areas, will be made available to interested members of the public.
66	C		In May, 1994, I wrote to Ken Blackman and asked, "Is it correct that people are not usually allowed to inhabit a residence this close below a dam the size of T-5 or T-6A. Please answer and elaborate with maps showing the full project area. On September 12, 1994, I received a map from HBA showing only the inundation line and some property lines. It does not even show our complete parcel.	TASK 39			See response to 66 B. Limitations on residences below damsites will be discussed in the EIR/EIS.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	D	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Cont'd.	How much total acreage of Tresch land is needed for the Two Rock Reservoir project? I want to see this information now, not when you are ready to certify the next EIR.	NA	NA	NA	Planning level engineering is continuing for each candidate reservoir site. Work is in progress to size and show on drawings the embankments, spillway, outlet works, irrigation pump station (if any), pipelines, access road, wetland impact and, in general, the extent of area isolated for construction and operation of the reservoir. These drawings will be made available to the public for review as soon as they are complete.
66	E		How will wetlands for the West County Alternative be obtained? Will the City use eminent domain, long-term lease or purchase to obtain existing wetlands, or land to restore or create wetlands. What will be the total acreage of each type of wetland in the West County project? Please show (these) on a map that includes property owners and identifies that they have signed letters of intent.			X	Wetlands creation is no longer a component of the project. However, wetland mitigation will be required if there is a loss of wetlands. Property acquisition methods for all alternatives will be presented.
66	F		Please explain how the existing, restored and created wetlands will be managed.	TASK 39		X	Created wetlands have been eliminated. The management of mitigation wetlands will be addressed, if needed, in the EIR/EIS.
66	G		How many acres of wetlands will be needed to mitigate the wetlands destroyed at the T-5 damsite?	TASK 39			Evaluation of wetlands at the Two Rock site is in scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	H	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Cont'd.	What will be the impacts of altering the historic characteristics of Stemple and Americano Creeks, which have been seasonally dry in summer months for eons? What will be the ecosystem and erosion impacts? Impacts to soils adjacent to and in the creeks?			X	Flow augmentation has been eliminated from the Long-Term Project and will not be studied.
66	I		What are the potential impacts to property owners and property owners' rights? How much total acreage is needed in West County? Please break down into specific components: A. Dam sites, including total boundary area; B. Wetlands; C. Irrigation; D. Pipeline cut and cover corridors, including the tunnel through the hill from Roblar Road through the Tunzi property into the T-5 dam site. Will the Tunzi property be condemned if they are not willing sellers?	X	X		As planning level engineering of the reservoir sites is developed, the affected acreage will be identified for the reservoir itself, the watershed, and the wetlands impacted. The pipeline corridors will be shown. The pipeline route into the Two Rock reservoir site is under evaluation for possible use of a tunnel to reduce pumping costs. Acreage proposed for purchase (vs. acreage to be leased or to remain in private ownership) for construction and operation of the proposed facilities will be identified. The amount of land to be purchased could be confined to only that necessary to assure the long term reliable operation of the facilities.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	J	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Cont'd.	Please explain how the irrigation contracts will work. Will irrigators be paid to use the wastewater? How much per acre foot and for how long? Would users be asked to pay for the wastewater? If so, how much per acre foot? Previous attempts to demonstrate need or desire for wastewater to irrigate in West County were poorly conducted and generated a great deal of controversy.	TASKs 18 and 33 NA	TASK s 18 and 33 NA	NA	An Irrigation Management Plan and the economic evaluation of irrigation are included in scope. A new assessment of availability of irrigation acreage has been done and is addressed in scope. Terms of contracts would not be determined until after project selection.
66	K		When this acreage list was transferred to a topo map and compared to the Sonoma County Soil Survey, it was apparent that a large percentage of the acreage was over the allowable 15% slope. This was a significant error, considering the soil type and climate in West County.	TASK 18			See response to comment 2 S.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	L	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Cont'd.	Further controversy over the letters of intent arose over the issue of eminent domain. When it became known that the Tresch and Mattos families were not willing sellers, many farmers and ranchers revoked their letters of intent, but the City DID NOT DELETE that acreage. New letters of intent must be obtained to prove that a West County irrigation project has the necessary acreage to warrant further studies. These letters must be scrutinized by a competent, knowledgeable, non-biased person, to see if enough suitable acreage actually exists.	TASK 18	TASK 18	X	Suitable agricultural lands are being evaluated regardless of the reservoir property owner's willingness to sell. The issue of willingness to sell will be addressed only after certification of the EIR, but before project selection.
66	M		Please include climate studies that demonstrate climate comparisons between proposed irrigation areas in South County and those in West County. Monitor temperature, wind velocity and hours per day of sun and fog in each area. Have several monitoring stations in each area.	TASK 18	TASK 18	X	Existing climate data will be used to determine evapotranspiration in different irrigation areas. No monitoring stations are included in scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	N	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Cont'd.	The last EIR demonstrated that shallow wells in the Two Rock area downstream of Button Ranch rely on an aquifer that would be inundated with wastewater from the reservoir through seepage and from irrigation runoff. It also indicated that when those wells were contaminated, the City would provide a supply of fresh water.	TASK 30	TASK 30		Evaluation of impacts is in scope. Mitigation, such as providing a fresh water supply, will be described.
66	O		(Questions about water to be supplied by the City): Where will this water come from? What will it cost the users? Will water meters be installed? What will be the economic impact to landowners and farmers, who may have multiple dwellings on their land? Will conservation measures be implemented voluntarily or will they be mandatory?	TASK 40			The EIR/EIS will describe mitigation measures, and the provision of water may be one of these. A detailed mitigation program would provide adequate information to evaluate its effectiveness.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	P	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Cont'd.	With respect to defining groundwater quality, please acknowledge that previous West County studies pertaining to the T-5 site were fatally flawed. This is why these studies were flawed: Of 18 wells sampled in the West County-Two Rock watershed, one was on the parcel below the proposed T-5 dam site. It was on a long-abandoned field with a significant seasonal wetland. At ground level and uncapped, this well certainly was not representative of the other viable, maintained wells in the survey, yet its inclusion in the studies sent the nitrate levels soaring. New tests need to be done without this kind of "stacked-deck" sampling. It is fairly certain that abandoned wells will show poor water quality and that your wastewater is no more offensive in total nitrate than "average" wells in Two Rock. In new studies, what wells will be sampled? At what times of the year? How will well owners be advised of the results?	TASK 30	TASK 30		A groundwater monitoring program will be conducted. New wells will be installed and sampled in the fall of 1995. The results will be available in the Draft EIR/EIS.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	P1	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Cont'd.	Please demonstrate that the impoundment of wastewater at the T-5 reservoir will not affect groundwater at the adjacent Sonoma County Central Landfill. Should groundwater flow be altered, it may force groundwater into the refuse and create leachate. What are impacts of having only one small hill separating the reservoir and the landfill? Could wastewater permeate the landfill or leachate from the landfill enter the reservoir? How would leachate be detected in the wastewater? What impacts could occur downstream in waterways, drinking water wells, and the Esteros? To humans, aquatic and terrestrial species?	X	X		Landfill impacts on the Two Rock Reservoir site will be evaluated.
66	Q		What will be the cfs wastewater flow in the esteros? By what means will wastewater enter the waterways? How do you address the fact that the National Marine Sanctuary will accept no changes in the salinity of the esteros? What effect will wastewater have on freshwater shrimp in Stemple Creek?	TASK 20	TASK 20	X	Flow augmentation is no longer a study component. Indirect impacts to the Esteros and Stemple Creek will be studied.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	R	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Cont'd.	How will residents downstream of the dam be protected against massive breaks during a seismic event? My children attend a preschool right on the Estero de San Antonio. What warning and evacuation procedure will you set up? Please create a model that will show the path, height and rate of travel of wastewater following a dam failure.	TASKs 31, 38, 39	TASKs 31, 38, 39		In scope. Potential impacts that could result from a major earthquake within the project vicinity are included in the scope. Analysis of mitigation will be provided.
66	R1		Your consultants have said that constructing the T-5 dam on top of the Bloomfield fault would not be a fatal flaw, because the fault shows no recent evidence of movement and the dam would be sited parallel to the fault. A group of UC professors visiting the Button Ranch said there appeared to be a secondary trace of the fault going northwest from the T-5 notch toward the Tresch cabin. If so, this fault would bisect the T-5 dam. How do you respond to this. A geologist hired by the Tresches to examine the Bloomfield fault found evidence of an ancient marine bench buried below the T-5 site. Conferences with USGS revealed that T-5 notch was likely the mouth of the Estero millions of years ago. What potential geological evidence will we be burying forever under the T-5 dam? What is the potential loss to education?	TASKs 35 and 36	TASK 35 and 36		The geotechnical studies will address these concerns regarding the Two Rock site. See also response to comment 60 C.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	S	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Cont'd.	The NOP/NOI states that the project may have impacts on the human environment. Please define this statement. What will be the potential impacts on the Tresches and their children? The human impact on the Tresches already has been significant. We request that the City cease and desist in its attempts to build a reservoir on our land or on the adjacent Button Ranch.		TASK 33	X	One component of the economic analysis will examine the impact on the Sonoma County economy, with a particular focus on the project's impact on the agricultural sector. The analysis will address the impacts of the project on an aggregate basis, not address individual circumstances. Comments have been noted.
66	T		UC studies of the biological significance of Button Ranch demonstrate an ecosystem of tremendous educational value. More than 500 plant species were catalogued, with an unexpected array of native grasses. Why are these grasses thriving here and diminishing elsewhere? What will be the loss to give up the chance to study these grasses? Are they successful because of the unique hydro-geological setting?	TASK 19	TASK 19		In scope. See also response to comment 60 C.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Response/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
66	U	Joe and Kathy Tresch, Cont'd.	The Button Ranch provides habitat to a wide array of creatures, including a breeding pair of golden eagles. An environmental evaluation criterion for your project states: The project should not result in a significant loss of habitat diversity or habitat value. Clearly your project will impact the Button Ranch. You cannot mitigate what you will destroy here.	TASK 19	TASK 19		In scope.
67	A	Caroll Robillard, California Native Plant Society, Bodega Bay(L)	We feel that the evaluation criteria should consider and weigh native plant diversity equally with animal diversity.	TASK 19	TASK 19		In scope.
67	B		Button Ranch contains 25 species of native perennial grasses, at least four kinds of native oaks, and many wetland plant species. We understand that some of the plants found on the reservoir footprint are rare in Sonoma County, namely Meconella californica, Potamogeton foliosus, Ceratophyllum demersum, Festuca elmeri, and Triodanus biflora. Evaluate carefully the potential loss of plant habitat and species diversity at Button Ranch.	TASK 19	TASK 19		In scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
68	A	Helene Steinlauf, Two Rock (L)	Have the EIR address what <u>all</u> the impacts would be on living adjacent to Button Ranch in regard to smell, effect on groundwater and well, traffic, pollution, etc. I am extremely concerned about all these impacts on our quality of life.	TASKs 37 and 39	TASKs 30 and 39		See responses to comment 11. Evaluation of traffic impacts are included in scope. If there are to be significant traffic impacts (in terms of volume of traffic or congestion), the air quality scope has been expanded to include the air quality impacts of project traffic.
68	B		Since we are zoned ag and open space, how will the (reservoir) change our zoning? Will lot sizes change?	TASKs 37 and 39			Impacts on zoning will be included in the scope.
68	C		We should not be penalized here for Santa Rosa's lack of planning for sewage disposal as that city has been developing.	NA	NA	NA	Santa Rosa is seeking to solve a serious wastewater disposal problem. The role of the EIR/EIS is to give decision makers information about the potential effects of all the alternatives and components so that they can make an informed choice to support responsible planning.
68	D		What compensation would the City of Santa Rosa consider giving us? We believe it should be considerable, if there is any impact on our quality of life.	NA	NA		Compensation is not an issue to be addressed in the EIR/EIS.
69	A1	Denise Wright, Santa Rosa (L)	Inform the public of what they can do to lessen the toxicity of what goes down our drains.			X	Wastewater treatment is not part of the Long-Term Project or this EIR/EIS. However, the City has a pretreatment program to address this issue.
69	A2		Implement radical changes in the consumer availability of non-polluting cleaners. No polluting brands should be sold in Sonoma County.			X	This option would be addressed through an evaluation of comment 69A1, and a determination by Santa Rosa and/or Sonoma County of a strategy to control toxic pollution at its source.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
69	A3	Denise Wright, (L) Cont'd.	Require any new construction to use waterless, wasteless toilets. I can't believe we still build houses the same way they have been built since indoor plumbing was introduced.	TASK 29	TASK 29		The overall scope for the water conservation element includes a description of current conservation programs and the estimated reduction achieved at the full implementation level (e.g., toilet, showerhead, faucet aerator replacement), what could be done in addition to these existing programs by employing technology (e.g., programs consistent with Best Management Practices - published by California Urban Water Conservation Council), and what can be done by considering new technologies (e.g., waterless urinals, replacing inefficient appliances, etc.). Cost-effectiveness evaluations will be conducted for each measure of conservation, as well as the amount of wastewater saved.
69	B		Use (the Community Separator Alternative) to develop microbe effective marshland to create reusable pure water.			X	Created wetlands have been eliminated from the Long-Term Project because suitable lands were not available to develop the community separator wetlands.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
70	A	Edwin Orrett, Pacific Technology Associates, Petaluma (L.)	I want to encourage the integration of water conservation programs with the various disposal alternatives. To the extent the volume of treated wastewater is reduced with cost-effective improvements in end-use efficiency, environmental, economic and social impacts also will be reduced. For the more expensive disposal alternatives, the reduction of wastewater volume through efficiency improvements appears to be large. Cost-effective environmental mitigation offered by this approach therefore justifies a level of study on a par with the evaluation of impacts that will occur if the wastewater volume is not reduced.	TASK 29	TASK 29		The overall scope for the water conservation element includes a description of current conservation programs and the estimated reduction achieved at the full implementation level (e.g., toilet, showerhead, faucet aerator replacement), what could be done in addition to these existing programs by employing proven technology (e.g., programs consistent with Best Management Practices - published by California Urban Water Conservation Council), and what can be done by considering new technologies (e.g., waterless urinals, replacing inefficient appliances, etc.). Cost-effectiveness evaluations will be conducted for each measure of conservation, as well as the amount of wastewater saved.
70	B		The Draft EIR/EIS should explain how annual wastewater flow projections are derived. Describe the assumptions on which flow projections are based.	TASK 29	TASK 29		The wastewater flow projections, and the water conservation measures which could be adopted to reduce the flows, are currently being refined. Assumptions and conclusions regarding flow projections will be identified in the proposed alternative project summaries and in the EIR/EIS.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
71	A	Brian Hines, Santa Rosa (L)	I support the Russian River Watershed Protection Committee's (RRWPC) view that <i>all</i> wastewater discharges should be limited to 1% in the winter only. There are many unknowns about chemicals and other toxic constituents; further, viruses and parasites are sometimes a problem even with highly treated wastewater.	TASKs 21, 32	TASKs 21, 32 and 39		Virus presence and effects will be evaluated.
71	B		I understand that a 1% discharge could represent as much as 400 million gallons in a single day and more commonly allows as much as 100 million gallons daily during wet weather months. Can you tell me what impacts these large amounts have at percentages even higher than 1% (up to 20%) in combination with all other river wastewater discharges?	TASKs 21, 32	TASKs 21, 32		In scope. The volume of wastewater that is discharged is proposed to be dependent on River flow. The existing system, under optimal conditions (full ponds, high River flows not at flood stage) cannot physically discharge more than approximately 250 million gallons per day. The EIR/EIS will evaluate other flow scenarios for the Russian River discharge alternatives.
71	C		I support high levels of conservation and urban and agricultural reuse. I am concerned that the City is developing a very expensive river option so that it can be said that a 1% option is unaffordable. Carefully scrutinize all project cost estimates to ensure that projected expenses are not padded to ensure a specific outcome.	TASK31.4			The alternatives are being developed and cost estimated to the same level of care. The costs, environmental impacts, and other factors will be available for impartial comparison for final selection of the approved project.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
71	D		I am concerned that Santa Rosa's consultants are relying too heavily on estimated and/or inadequate data fed into computerized models as a basis for making recommendations about the safety of these discharges. Conclusions about wastewater quality should be based on actual monitoring data that can be scientifically validated.	TASK 28	TASK 28		In scope. The model will be calibrated with actual data.
72	A	H.M. Eichstaedt, Sonoma (L)	Many ratepayers fail to see the justification for pumping pure domestic quality water from one end of the county to the other--then PAY farmers -- who do not need it -- additional money to apply it to their lands.	TASK 33			Santa Rosa must find a reliable solution to dispose of the Subregional System's treated wastewater through discharge and/or reuse. The potential cost of the alternatives and their impacts on rates will be addressed in this scope, so that the BPU and City Council will have this information when they select an alternative.
72	B		I suggest you establish very firm guidelines for the remaining studies: A. First task of the planners and engineers will be to give you preliminary cost estimates of the various alternatives. B. The main criterion you will use in comparing the various schemes will be "Total Cost to the Ratepayers." There will be no detailed studies of higher cost alternatives. C. Least cost to your ratepayers will be objective No. 1.	NA	NA	NA	Santa Rosa is required to analyze the environmental and economic effects of all reasonable alternatives at an equal level of detail. The concern about cost is noted. See also response to 72A.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Response/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
73	A	Lawrence Foltzer, Occidental (L)	Study the impact of previous wastewater releases on the Russian River before considering using other pristine waterways for discharge. Over the last three years I have observed a substantial increase in algae-like plant growth in the River and an accumulation of a paper-pulp-like deposit along the shoreline and in shrubs that line the river bank.	TASKs 28, 34			This is being done with bioaccumulation and toxicity studies. The paper pulp-like material you observed in the River may be dried attached algae, and is a concern that is being evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
74	A	John Calomiris Kenneth Fox, Tomales Bay Association, Pt. Reyes Station (L)	The preliminary scope does not address the potential for wastewater discharged into the esteros to impact water quality in Tomales Bay. The scope does not propose to identify any existing marine currents which could result in the transport of potentially toxic substances into Tomales Bay. We recommend a minimum two-year study of marine currents be conducted.		TASK 21	X	An evaluation of the quantity of wastewater and effects in the Estero will be conducted first. The results of this study will provide the basis for determining if any significant potential exists for effects in Tomales Bay. No two-year study of marine currents is included in scope.
74	B		If ocean discharge becomes an alternative, it will be necessary to study marine currents with respect to possible impact on Tomales Bay water quality, as well as water quality of Bodega Bay and the Bodega-Tomales Bay bight.			X	The Ocean Outfall Alternative has been dropped from consideration.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
75	A1	Dennis Harter, Santa Rosa (L)	Evaluate the financial impact on the rate payer for all of the alternatives.	TASK 33	TASK 33		In scope.
75	A2		Evaluate all the alternatives based on socio-economic impact; the tertiary water is a resource and should be used as such.	TASK 33	TASK 33	X	In scope, except social impacts will not be studied.
75	A3		Evaluate the land use impacts of each alternative. If additional storage sites are required, there would be additional land use planning involved to insure that the site is compatible with future use.	TASKs 37 and 39		X	Additional land use planning is not included in the land use scope, and would be the responsibility of the relevant jurisdiction. The land use analysis will identify areas of potential incompatibility with planned land use as well as potential mitigation measures for any identified areas of incompatibility.
75	B		Evaluate the potential effects of all the alternatives on the physical environment, so that the long-term wastewater plan is safe to the environment and the rate payers.	X	X		Potential impacts on the physical environment will be evaluated extensively in the EIR/EIS.
75	C		I hope the "Ocean Outfall" alternative will not be added to the study.		X		Consistent with this suggestion, the ocean outfall alternative has been dropped from the study.
76	A	Unidentified Commenter (L)	We understand that the Geysers Discharge option could help sustain tax and other funds that Sonoma County receives from the energy companies at the Geysers. Will this be studied in Task 31, and can some of those taxes offset the rate impact on sewage bills?		TASK 33	X	The economic impacts of the Geysers alternative will be evaluated. The use of taxes to offset sewer bills would be a policy decision by the Council.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
77	A	Joel Hedgpeth, Santa Rosa (L)	I enclose a copy of the title page of an aerial reconnaissance study of ocean currents, which includes detailed observations of the region between Point Reyes Station and the Russian River. This study could be useful if Ocean Outfall is considered.			X	The Ocean Outfall Alternative has been dropped from consideration.
77	B		To qualify Ocean Outfall as a viable option, it will be necessary to study ocean upwelling in a manner comparable with other studies, such as the Coastal Ocean Dynamics Experiment, or CODE project, administered by Oregon State University.			X	See 77A.
77	C		Because of potential horizontal displacement along the San Andreas Fault, the location of the ocean outfall diffuser is a serious problem.			X	See 77A.
77	D		Critical studies required for the ocean outfall alternative cannot be left to a later time.			X	See 77A.
77	E		If the riparian rights reside with fee owners of the Stemple Creek drainage, the City could find itself obliged to condemn sixty square miles of farmland. This could elevate the cost to ratepayers well beyond distilling all the wastewater and conveying it to the farmers free in five gallon bottles.	TASK 7		X	Methods of aquisition were described in the Screening Report and will be further evaluated at time of project selection.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
78	A	Colleen Briggs, Two Rock (L)	The Stump Ranch is a working beef operation. In order to compete with larger companies, we need to increase the number of cattle in our herd. We cannot complete this objective with a decrease in land. If you condemn our property, you condemn our business. This ranch has been passed down through six generations, each one struggling and sacrificing to achieve dreams and goals. I am suggesting that you pursue alternatives that do not destroy the businesses of taxpaying residents of Sonoma County.		TASK 33		Potential economic impacts have been added to the scope. See response to comment 82 A.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
79	A	Marcia Camacho, Sierra Club Water Committee (L)	Will there be studies to analyze the benefits of water conservation, including the cost comparison of replacing all old toilets versus the cost of subsidizing irrigation?	TASK 29	TASK 29		The overall scope for the water conservation element includes a description of current conservation programs and the estimated reduction achieved at the full implementation level (e.g., toilet, showerhead, faucet aerator replacement), what could be done in addition to these existing programs by employing proven technology (e.g., programs consistent with Best Management Practices - published by California Urban Water Conservation Council), and what can be done by considering new technologies (e.g., waterless urinals, replacing inefficient appliances, etc.). Cost-effectiveness evaluations will be conducted for each measure of conservation, as well as the amount of wastewater saved. An avoided cost analysis will also be completed to compare water conservation options to other project alternatives.
79	B1		How will the public be informed of the water quality monitoring results?	TASK 21	TASK 21		Technical reports will be prepared and available to the public, and key data included directly in the draft EIR/EIS.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
79	B2	Marcia Camacho, Cont'd.	Can you list all the chemicals, toxins, nutrients and byproducts that you will specifically test for in the treated and untreated wastewater?	TASK 21	TASK 21		The chemicals will be identified in technical reports which will be available to the public.
79	B3		Will the water quality monitoring system prevent overchlorinated or otherwise harmful wastewater from getting into the environment?	TASK 31	TASK 31		Particular components of the City's ongoing monitoring are intended to provide quick feedback to treatment plant operators. The design of the Long-Term Project is expected to include the same type of monitoring strategies.
79	C		What will be the projected routes for the pipelines and/or facilities needed for storage, reuse or discharge? A map of these routes would be helpful.	TASK 31	TASK 31		Proposed pipelines from the treatment plant to the storage reservoirs, and from the reservoirs to the reuse areas will be identified on drawings currently in preparation. Most pipelines will follow public rights-of-way. Some will require cross-country alignment through private properties to reduce construction and operation costs. Final alignment for any pipeline can be adjusted to minimize impact on existing facilities or planned improvements to private property.
79	D		Will the project increase the flood potential by reducing the irrigated field's absorption of rain and thereby increase runoff? What studies will be done to cover seasonal and historical flooding, the impact of high tides, combined with the current drought conditions, and how will the discharge and irrigation affect these conditions?	TASK 39	TASK 38		In scope. See response to comment 31 F.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
79	E	Marcia Camacho, Cont'd.	What impact will this project have on the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary?	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21		See response to comment letters 29 and 44.
79	F1		What impact will discharge or irrigation have on the fresh water marshes and, in addition, the salt water marshes of the Bay?	TASK 18	TASK 18		In scope.
79	F2		What long-term studies will be done to determine the effect of the ocean as a turbulent body of water and its spreading pollutants over a wide area?		TASK 21	X	The Ocean Alternative has been dropped from consideration. See response to Comment 74 A.
79	F3		What long-term studies will be done to determine the effect and amount of bioaccumulation of noxious materials over time? What exactly will be studied? Does this include dissolved nutrients, dissolved toxins and suspended particles?	TASK 34			In scope.
79	G		What long-term studies will be done to determine the effect and amount of biomagnification of toxins that are passed along the food chain and accumulate in progressively higher concentrations?			X	Long-term studies on biomagnification are not currently considered in the scope. If state or federal agencies have a concern regarding biomagnification after the EIR/EIS is completed, they can include study requirements in any permits which are issued.
79	H		How will reuse or discharge affect the short-term and long-term functioning of any stream, river, estuary, or ocean?	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21		In scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
80	A	Gerry Murphy, (T)	Stay aware of Bay Area Dischargers' (BADA) study of transporting Bay Area wastewater to the Central Valley for reuse. The results could be the basis for a solution to Santa Rosa's wastewater disposal problem.	NA	NA	X	The BADA study covers the possible reuse of treated wastewater from central Bay Area dischargers only. As the study is presently conceived, North Bay dischargers like the City of Santa Rosa are not included. Disposal to the Central Valley was considered and dropped during screening. The City of Santa Rosa will track the progress of this study.
80	B		Evaluate the potential impacts on nearby candidate reservoir sites of West County landfill sites being studied by the county. Utilize the data about West County wells and aquifers collected by the county during its recent study of potential landfill sites.	TASKs 30 and 39			The groundwater analysis will consider proximity of reservoirs and irrigation areas to identified landfills.
80	C		Study the potential long-term effects of the proposed Stump Ranch Reservoir on the nearby recharging aquifer recently discovered by the county during its solid waste study and the long-term effects of replacement wells, which the City might have to develop, on the existing shallow wells found throughout West County.	TASK 30			In scope.
81	A	Leonard Stewart, Geyser Alt. Energy Dev. Corp. (L)	Commenter affirmed the merits of the Geysers Recharge Alternative as a solution to the Subregional System's wastewater disposal problem.	X			No change in scope as a result of this comment letter, which supports Alt. 4: Geysers Recharge.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
82	A	Colleen Briggs, (L)	Remove the Bloomfield Reservoir site (S40) from the Long-Term Wastewater Project environmental study. We own this site and it is not for sale.			X	To satisfy State law under the California Environmental Quality Act, a reasonable range of options must be studied. Under federal law, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), all reasonable options are to be studied. Your property is a reasonable option. Therefore, any decision about the ultimate viability of your property for a reservoir cannot be made until after the environmental impact data have been collected and analyzed in the EIR/EIS. Therefore, while we understand your concern, we cannot remove your property from the list of candidates to be studied at this time.
83	A	Brenda Adelman, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee (L)	Base conclusions about the contribution of Subregional System treated wastewater discharges to the degradation of the Russian River and Laguna de Santa Rosa (e.g. low dissolved oxygen and excessive algae growth) on empirical data obtained in the field.	TASKs 25 and 28	TASKs 25 and 28		Extensive data about Russian River water quality will be obtained in the field. Once obtained, this information will be used as input to the Russian River water quality model. Dissolved oxygen, for example, will be measured at two locations on the River, twice in 1994 and monthly through September, 1995.
83	B		To what extent will the EIR/EIS rely on past studies and analyses and will these be clearly referenced? If information and analyses from the two previous EIRs are used in the current EIR/EIS, address any major public concerns specifically related to those results which were inadequately answered at that time.	TASK 3			Past studies and analyses have been reviewed as background information in the Baseline Data Report. Any information used will be evaluated and verified prior to being referenced.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	C	Brenda Adelman, (L) Cont'd.	What is the City of Santa Rosa's responsibility to study impacts for which a precise cause and effect relationship may not be possible to establish (e.g., estrogenic effects on wildlife and humans)? Is the City relieved of responsibility for studying potential impacts which would be difficult and expensive to analyze?	NA	NA	NA	CEQA and NEPA do not require original research to be done in order to determine an impact. CEQA and NEPA require that impacts be evaluated using available information. The City's responsibility is to meet these requirements within reasonable time frames and cost parameters.
83	D		Does completing a valid EIR/EIS at a project level of detail, as the City has planned, mean that engineering plans (at a high level of detail) must first be prepared? Does this apply to all components, especially wetlands?	TASK 18		X	The level of detail of plans required to assess impacts of alternatives and components in the EIR/EIS at a "project level" (not program level), does not have to be as refined as the plans required to permit and monitor a selected component. Since created wetlands are no longer a study component, detailed plans for them will not be necessary. Wetlands for mitigation will be described.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (F) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	E	Brenda Adelman, (L) (Cont'd.)	Would public officials from the various Subregional System cities, who are concerned about the cost of long-range infrastructure development, consider reducing their respective general plan growth projections as a way of reducing Long-Term Project costs?	TASK 39	TASK 33		Key staff and decision makers in each of the Subregional System communities were contacted by HBA about their respective jurisdiction's long-term growth projections during spring and summer of 1994 and 1995. They were made aware that reduced rates of increase in wastewater flows would translate into reduced future infrastructure costs. Given the choice, all of the member cities submitted growth projections consistent with their general plan estimates. The Subregional System does not have authority over its members' general plans. Growth and general plan population projections are a policy decision of the members. As a result, the general plan projections of the member communities as of the summer of 1995 serve as the basis for determining long-term wastewater flows to the System for the study period.
83	F1		How does the City make sure that existing Subregional System customers, especially low income ratepayers, will not be subsidizing the cost of growth?		TASK 33		Existing customers are <u>not</u> responsible for financing the cost of system expansion to accommodate growth. They pay for upgrades, rehabilitation and operation/maintenance of the existing system only. New customers are solely responsible for the cost of facilities expansion, which they pay for through a one-time connection fee. Once new customers have paid the connection fee and become System customers, they pay a regular sewer service charge like all existing ratepayers. This cost allocation ratio is an established principle of public finance.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	F2	Brenda Adelman (L), (Cont'd.)	What basis is the City using to decide which studies to fund and which to eliminate? Is it based on satisfying the regulatory agencies and possible future judicial decisions or on providing long-range protection of beneficial uses of the River for future generations?	NA	NA	NA	To the extent possible, the BPU and the Council make choices based on the requirements of CEQA and NEPA, how well a proposed study is likely to solve the wastewater disposal problem, meet agency legal requirements, satisfy the objectives of the Subregional System and meet the environmental evaluation criteria adopted for the Study. These decision making criteria include objectives pertaining to preservation of beneficial uses as well as fiscal responsibility. Applying all these factors does involve subjective opinion and judgement about which each of the stakeholders in this process may differ. As a result, it may appear at times that the City is supporting one set of values over another, when, in fact, there are always numerous tradeoffs, both financial and environmental, which must be made.
83	G		Compare the overall cost and operation & maintenance of phasing a series of smaller reservoirs (i.e., 500 mg to 1000 mg) over a 20-year period with single, large reservoir sites (1000 mg or more) in light of the fact that reservoir sites of less than 1,000 mg were eliminated from the environmental study. Also compare these smaller, phased reservoirs with the single larger facility with respect to the likely need for condemnation.			X	All things being equal, costs are lowest if the fewest reservoir sites are involved. Fewest storage sites allows taking advantage of economy of scale; i.e., avoided duplicate permitting and construction costs (cheaper to buy and maintain one house worth \$200,000 than two houses each worth \$100,000). We have no information to indicate that condemnation would be less likely on a smaller versus larger reservoir site.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	H1	Brenda Adelman, (L) (Cont'd.)	Apply issues/impacts analyzed in the EIR/EIS to both the existing system and the proposed additions to it.	TASK 40			Existing conditions will be characterized, but not evaluated, in the EIR/EIS. Potential effects of the proposed projects, however, will be evaluated and described.
83	H2		Check the completeness of the Russian River portion of the project mailing list.	NA	NA	NA	The City of Santa Rosa has added names as requested to the mailing list. In addition, everyone who signed in at Workshops, BPU Study Sessions, etc. has been added to the list. However, it is always possible that some names were overlooked. The commenter has also been contacted and asked to review the existing Russian River mailing list for completeness, add names of any additional parties as appropriate and forward these to the City.
83	I		Why was Alternative 2M, which received the greatest amount of public support during the Scoping Phase Public Workshops and which was of moderate cost, not selected for further study in the EIR/EIS? Does this mean that public input will not really be seriously considered and that the public involvement program is merely a charade?	X		X	Alternative 2M was dropped from consideration prior to Formal Scoping after review and evaluation by the BPU and Council. 2M was based on maximum water conservation (35%), an objective which the BPU and Council concluded was not quantifiable, reliable and sustainable. To stay aware of new opportunities, conservation and new technology ideas will be continually evaluated and the results reported to the BPU. South County irrigation and the Adobe Road Reservoir site, which were part of Alternative 2M, have been retained as components to be studied.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	J	Brenda Adelman (L), (Cont'd.)	Use of computer analysis, via the Russian River Model, to analyze wastewater impacts and River water quality creates an impenetrable barrier between the public and the City. The complexity of computer modeling prevents the interested public from assessing the validity of the information being analyzed and the conclusions drawn. As a result, please delineate which Russian River water quality numbers are computer generated and which are based on actual data collected in the field in all EIR/EIS studies.	TASKs 20, 21, 25, 28	TASKs 20 and 25		The scope provides for additional data collection to validate the model. The HBA team is available as needed to work with the public to describe the water quality model at 707-575-1933. Consultants meet with the RWQCB's Water Quality Modeling Group. The EIR/EIS supporting technical reports will distinguish computer generated from field collected data.
83	K1		Analyze all systems currently discharging to the Russian River watershed as well as projected, future discharges to adequately assess the cumulative impacts of discharging Subregional System treated wastewater to the River.	TASKs 20, 21, 27, 28, 32, 34			In scope.
83	K2		Analyze potential impacts in relation to Russian River flow measured on a daily basis, showing the variable range. Using monthly averages does not provide a true basis for meaningful analysis.	TASK 28			Daily river flows from 1926 to the present will be used to simulate daily system operations. Time step for water quality simulations model is generally on the order of hours, not a month.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	K3	Brenda Adelman (L), (Cont'd.)	Will cumulative impacts analysis of Russian River include such wastewater constituents as pathogens, heavy metals, and chemicals as well as conventional pollutants?	TASKs 21, 25, 28, and 32	TASKs 21, 25, 28, and 32		Model is adequate to represent nutrients, algae and dissolved oxygen. Evaluation of other constituents such as metals or pathogens is being addressed using other study approaches.
83	K4		Analyze the cumulative impacts to Russian River water quality for all possible discharge scenarios from 1% to 20%, assuming all municipalities simultaneously discharge to the River at the same rate.	TASK 28			The buildout discharges of the other cities in the Russian River watershed will be addressed as part of the cumulative effects analysis. For the purposes of this study, it will be assumed that if an exception to the Basin Plan discharge limit is needed, an exception would be granted to the other cities.
83	L		Evaluate the potential for increased risk to the Russian River from exposure to pathogens, carcinogens, viruses and parasites from the cumulative wastewater discharge of all pertinent River communities for all possible discharge scenarios (1% to 20%).	TASK 32			In scope. The study will evaluate the risk of exposure to pathogens, carcinogens, viruses and parasites from the cumulative discharge for scenarios of 1% to 20%.
83	M		Evaluate the impacts to the lower Russian River economy from the cumulative discharge to the River and the resulting perception of the River as dirty, for all discharge scenarios (1% to 20%).	TASK 33	TASK 33		Cumulative economic impacts are included in the scope. Potential impacts on Russian River tourism have been added.
83	N		How will current and future cumulative wastewater discharges affect the health and reproductive capacity of anadromous fish in the Russian River and harbor seals in the River's estuary?	TASK 14 and 19			If hydrological modeling of Russian River determines potential water quality and hydrology impacts in the Russian River Estuary and associated biota (harbor seals), scope would need to be revised to determine study topics. Studies of anadromous fish are ongoing.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	O1	Brenda Adelman (L), (Cont'd.)	For all discharge scenarios, analyze stream flows to determine the actual percentages of River flows comprised of treated wastewater at different times of the day.	TASK 28			Future flows from other cities need to be characterized. The actual wastewater concentrations in the lower Russian River can be modeled using the existing hydraulic element of the water quality model. Modeling will be done using daily flows.
83	O2		Evaluate specific impacts of higher loadings on dissolved oxygen in the lower Russian River for all discharge scenarios.	TASK 28			In scope.
83	O3		For all discharge scenarios, evaluate their contribution to growth in the study area and to increased imperviousness of the Santa Rosa Plain due to growth-related urbanization and paving.			X	A very small percentage of the Russian River watershed is presently covered by an impervious surface. This project addresses wastewater discharge effects, not effects of urban growth on stormwater flows and flooding. However, increased flows will be identified and considered as background condition in the evaluation of the flood effects of wastewater discharge. Increased urban runoff should be considered as part of the background water quality condition when evaluating the effect of future discharges.
83	O4		Evaluate the extent to which winter runoff from urban growth supported by Subregional system expansion increases winter flows in the Laguna and adds toxins to local creeks.	TASKs 28 and 38		X	See response to comment 83 O3.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	O5	Brenda Adelman (L) (Cont'd.)	What is the true discharge rate to the Russian River for all study flow scenarios, if calculations are based on the actual time the treated wastewater enters the River?	TASK 28			In scope.
83	O6		To what extent does Santa Rosa's discharge to the Russian River contribute to downstream flooding?	TASK 38			In scope
83	O7		How does increased sedimentation from upstream development affect the City's discharge rates to the River? What effect does high discharge have on bank erosion?	NA	NA	NA	Sedimentation from upstream development does not change river flow volumes and, therefore, does not affect the System's discharge rates. High velocity, high flow conditions cause erosion. Under these conditions, wastewater is not a major component of the flow and, therefore, not a major factor in bank erosion.
83	O8		Do upstream diversions affect Santa Rosa's need for higher discharge percentages to the Russian River? If so, how?	TASK 31			The EIR/EIS will use Sonoma County Water Agency flow projections for the Russian River which incorporate projected diversions.
83	O9		What are the upper-end restrictions on Santa Rosa's river discharge limits? What is the most Santa Rosa could discharge in a single day? Can these be superseded? How do Santa Rosa's treated wastewater discharges reduce Laguna flood plain capacity?	TASKs 31, 39 and 40			These characteristics of the existing system will be described in the EIR/EIS studies and technical reports in the existing condition and No-Project Alternative. See also response to comment 71 B.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	O10	Brenda Adelman (L), Cont'd.	What are the respective wastewater percentages under each of the discharge and flow scenarios to be studied with respect to the following reaches of Laguna waterways; (a) Laguna Treatment Plant to Santa Rosa Creek; (b) Santa Rosa Creek from Delta Pond to Laguna; (c) Laguna at Santa Rosa Creek to the confluence of Mark West Creek; (d) Mark West Creek to Russian River.	TASK 28			The water quality analysis will include this information.
83	O11		For various Russian River discharge percentages along the continuum of 1% to 20% to be studied, determine what percent of the discharge season (October 1 to May 14) treated wastewater flows in the Laguna System would exceed 50%. Indicate if and when discharges over 50% in the Laguna System occur during anadromous fish runs for all discharge scenarios to be studied.	TASKs 14 and 28			The water quality analysis will include this information.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	O12	Brenda Adelman, (L) Cont'd.	What are potential impacts on Santa Rosa's treated wastewater (both by itself and in combination with that of all current and anticipated discharges) on dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature, turbidity, conductivity, etc. in the Laguna and Russian River, in the main waterways and along the banks, for all flow/discharge scenarios to be studied? Will this include diurnal dissolved oxygen studies?	TASKs 21, 25, 28 and 32	TASKs 21, 25, 28 and 32		In scope.
83	O13		How do the degraded Laguna and cumulative wastewater discharges affect exotic plant growth in the Russian River?	TASKs 21 and 28			In scope.
83	O14		How does discharged wastewater affect Russian River and Laguna water temperature and, in turn, the vitality of fisheries there?	TASK 28			In scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	O15	Brenda Adelman (L), Cont'd.	Study the potential role wastewater discharges play in helping transport to the Russian River the chemicals, pesticides and herbicides used by farmers, the Sonoma County Water Agency vegetation control program, and by the Cal Trans weed abatement program. What are the potential effects, both individually and cumulatively, of these substances on aquatic life and human health? What happens to alum in the treatment process and what are its potential environmental effects?	TASKs 28, 32, and 34.			In scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	P	Brenda Adelman (L) (cont'd)	<p>Evaluate the potential environmental effects of chlorine and Santa Rosa's overall wastewater disinfection process with respect to the following issues and concerns:</p> <p>1) What happens to the chlorine which is allowed to evaporate from the wastewater stored in the City's holding ponds in summer and what are the potential environmental effects, especially the risk from airborne contaminants?</p> <p>2) What are the potential effects on birds who may eat the fish who live in the City's holding ponds? How does the chlorine in the holding ponds affect other wildlife (otters, deer, racoons, etc.) that utilize the ponds but which may inhabit other locations?</p> <p>3) What are the potential environmental effects of the chlorine in the holding ponds on other nearby waterways?</p> <p>4) Why is the treated wastewater dechlorinated on a year-round basis before it is stored in the holding ponds?</p>	NA	NA	NA	Existing conditions will be described but not evaluated.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS[illegible]

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	R1	Brenda Adelman (L) (Cont'd.)	Will chronic toxicity studies completed for Kelly Pond, Delta and Santa Rosa Creek be used as a basis for analysis in the EIR/EIS? Will the follow-up testing recommended in these studies be carried out as part of the EIR/EIS process? Exactly what chronic toxicity testing will be included in the EIR/EIS?	X		X	Chronic toxicity studies are being conducted separately from the EIR/EIS. However, the study results will be utilized in the EIR/EIS.
83	R2		If chronic toxicity monitoring is being performed quarterly, is this sufficient to identify all important periods of toxic exposure?			X	See response to 83R 1. No chronic toxicity "monitoring" is occurring. A chronic toxicity testing study is being conducted to characterize variability of toxicity, control strategies and sources. This study is not part of the EIR/EIS.
83	R3		How do the sediments in the ponds, which the City says eventually absorb most of the toxins from the treated wastewater stored there, affect the algae plant life and aquatic life in the ponds?	TASK 34			In scope.
83	R4		Is there a way to map toxic exposures in the waterways in addition to their duration? Can toxic levels of key pollutants be traced between the treatment plant and the Mark West Creek outlet to the Russian River? What information is available about past exposures and what test will be proposed for the future?	TASK 28		X	Toxicity is related to exposure, and exposure is related to concentration. A description of concentration throughout the receiving water will be provided per comment 83 O10. No map of toxic exposures will be included.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	R5	Brenda Adelman (L) (Cont'd.)	Can the total annual load of each heavy metal in the treated wastewater be calculated, especially for those constituents for which trace or nondetectable amounts are recorded during single tests? Can the metals content of sediments upstream vs. downstream be compared?	TASK 21	TASK 21		In scope. Also, monthly measurement of total and dissolved metals in the Laguna from July, 1995 through September, 1995 has been added to the scope.
83	S		Does the subregional system use PVC piping? If so, what toxic constituents, if any, are attributable to its use?	TASK 32			In scope.
83	T		How will the EIR/EIS studies <i>prove</i> what effects of the system's treated wastewater are, either alone or in combination with other toxins, on the life of fish and their reproductive abilities?	TASKs 14 and 20		X	The method will not yield statistical proof of no effect, but is capable of statistically proving a correlation between wastewater and fish migration.
83	U1		What are the potential effects on groundwater and on nearby wells of wastewater irrigation where farmers irrigate over 24' per year?	TASKs 18 and 30	TASKs 18 and 30		The EIR/EIS will evaluate the potential impacts of irrigation on groundwater. We are not aware of any applications which approach 24' annually. See also 83 U2
83	U2		Has the potential impact of heavy irrigation on nearby wells been studied?	TASK 30	TASK 30		A locational survey of potentially affected water wells is in the scope of work. A comprehensive monitoring wells and technical study element to evaluate the impact of irrigation wastewater on water supply wells has been added to the work scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already in Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	U3	Brenda Adelman (L) (Cont'd.)	What are the potential impacts to the groundwater from salts, heavy metals, etc., which may accumulate in soils irrigated with reclaimed water?	TASK 18	TASK 18		See response to comment 41 C. Special hydrology studies to evaluate the potential impacts to groundwater arising from agricultural irrigation with reclaimed water have been added to the work scope.
83	U4		Can the range and amounts of pesticide application to land irrigated with the system's reclaimed water be documented? Do these pesticides enter waterways or the groundwater as a result of irrigation runoff?	TASK 18	TASK 18		Studies of soil and water chemistry of irrigation return flow have been added to the work scope.
83	U5		How do grazing cows contribute to Laguna degradation in the context of agricultural irrigation? Do farmers rotate irrigation and grazing, and is the land given a chance to dry out before grazing is allowed?			X	These are issues related to existing system which is not the subject of this EIR/EIS.
83	U6		To what extent has the irrigation suitability and classification study to be completed during Scoping been conducted for land currently irrigated with reclaimed water from the Subregional System? To what extent are such studies planned for future irrigation?	TASK 18		X	See response to comment U5. An Irrigation Management Plan is being prepared for management of future irrigation.
83	U7		Given the Laguna Area's undulating landscape (there are many gullies and swales which could enable irrigation water to drain into waterways), how would this be monitored and controlled and how would this be mapped?	TASK 18		X	See response to comment U6.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	U8/ U9	Brenda Adelman (L) (Cont'd.)	How has irrigation with Subregional System reclaimed water affected Valley Oaks in the Laguna? What is the oak population now compared to ten years ago? What measures or monitoring programs have been established to assure protection of the trees? Will the oaks be studied in the EIR/EIS? Have vernal pools and endangered plant species on irrigated lands been assessed? What policies are in place to protect them?	TASK 19		X	EIR/EIS will describe but not evaluate the existing conditions within the study area.
83	U10		Will the soils of agricultural land currently irrigated with reclaimed water be analyzed for heavy metals, salts accumulation and other contaminants?			X	See response to comment U5.
83	U11		Will existing irrigation land in the Laguna be subject to the same type of irrigation suitability and land classification analysis that is planned for potential irrigation sites? What type of irrigation monitoring plan would be put into effect to ensure appropriate irrigation amounts, techniques and applications are followed?			X	See response to comment U5.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	U12	Brenda Adelman (L) (Cont'd.)	What contractual constraints are in place to assure that farmers do not overirrigate to fulfill contractual obligations or receive additional subsidies? Are there limits established regarding the amount of reclaimed water which can be applied to clay soils annually?			X	The City will not be studying existing conditions. See response to comment U8/9.
83	U13		What is the potential impact of long-term agricultural irrigation on the constituency of the soil? Do the potential impacts to the soil differ for those lands receiving one acre foot versus those receiving three acre feet annually?	TASK 18			Effects of agricultural irrigation are in scope.
83	U14		What are the potential impacts to the flood control capacity of the Laguna from soils saturated as a result of agricultural irrigation with Subregional System reclaimed water.		TASK 38	X	Effects of existing irrigation on Laguna flood capacity will not be analyzed in EIR/EIS. Analysis of future impacts have been added to scope.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	V1	Brenda Adelman (L) (Cont'd.)	How are sediments in wetlands affected by flooding? What is the potential impact on the functioning and overall life span of the wetlands from sedimentation produced during flooding? How would wetlands, if constructed in the flood plain, impact the flood control capacity of the Laguna? What are the potential flood impacts of operating constructed wetlands in the flood plain? Will the proposed wetlands serve as mitigation for fill in other areas?			X	Created wetlands have been dropped as a study component due to the lack of suitable lands. Created wetlands may be a mitigation.
83	V2		How would mosquitoes and other natural pests be controlled in wetlands? How would this type of program be carried out in the absence of a summer discharge?			X	Created wetlands have been dropped as a study component.
83	V3		What causes unusually high concentrations of nitrate conductivity, TDS and chloride in the groundwater at well MW-6 at Kelly Farm? What implications does this have for other potential wetland sites?	TASK 30		X	An analysis of groundwater monitoring data from the Laguna area is being conducted as part of a different study, and will be used in preparing the draft EIR/EIS. However, a specific evaluation of the constituents in the groundwater at well MW-6 will not be analyzed. See also response to 83 V1.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	V4	Brenda Adelman (L) Cont'd.	Will the City be able to demonstrate how created wetlands would be managed and monitored to protect beneficial uses? How will occurrence of botulism be minimized?			X	Created wetlands for non-mitigation purposes have been removed from the project. See also response to comment 83 V1.
83	V5, V7		What quality wastewater would be discharged to proposed wetlands and would this water be dechlorinated? Would marsh enhancement be attempted and would the resulting wetlands be fully protected as waters of the state? How would the proposed wetlands be managed when ground water and saturation levels are high, usually in late fall/early winter? How much water is expected to evaporate during different types of weather conditions? Do toxins evaporate and, if so, what effects do they have on the environment?			X	Created wetlands for non-mitigation purposes have been removed from the project.
83	V6		Would created wetlands reliably remove heavy metals and other toxins from the treated waste water? If so, where do these substances go when the plants die and can heavy metals and other toxins be prevented from entering the sediments?			X	See response to 83 V4.

TABLE 2: SCOPING LETTERS/PHONE CALLS

Communication No.	Comment	Source (L) = Letter (T) = Telephone	Items Suggested For Incorporation in EIR/EIS Scope	Status of Suggested Scope Item			Responses/Remarks
				Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope	
83	W1	Brenda Adelman (L) (Cont'd.)	Given the State Department of Health Services' determination three years ago that the 5% wastewater discharge limit is a guideline, not a regulation, why have they had no visible input to the study process? What is their authority in this environmental review process and how are they likely to plug into it as it moves ahead? What has the City done to keep DOHS informed of the study process and which DOHS staff has the City been dealing with?	NA	NA	NA	The City has met with DOHS and provided DOHS with relevant written information throughout Scoping. Bruce Burton is the contact person from DOHS. DOHS is a "responsible agency" for the Long-Term Project EIR/EIS.
83	W2		Commenter refers to concerns contained in two letters from Bruce Burton of DOHS. Commenter would like to know if all concerns raised in the letters have been adequately addressed.	NA	NA	NA	Mr. Burton's letters were submitted 3 years ago in reference to other studies. The scope of work for this EIR/EIS will address current DOHS issues.
83	W3		Will the environmental study evaluate the City's wastewater for viruses and parasites? Will protecting against cryptosporidium be evaluated?	TASK 32	TASKs 21 and 39		In scope

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