



Subregional Long-Term Wastewater Project

**FINAL SCOPING REPORT
AND FEEDBACK REPORT
VOLUME II**

August 31, 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
INTRODUCTION	<i>i - iv</i>
INDEX OF COMMENTERS	a
Speakers at the November 17, 1994 Scoping Meeting	a
Individuals/Organizations Submitting Comments in Writing or by Telephone During Formal Scoping	d
FEEDBACK REPORT SUMMARY TABLES	
Table 1: Summary Of Issues/Concerns Presented By The Public At The November 17, 1994 Scoping Meeting	1 - 27
Table 2: Summary of Issues/Concerns Received In Writing Or By Phone From The Public During Formal Scoping	1 - 258

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

Volume II of the Scoping Report presents a summary of the comments and concerns received from public agencies and members of the public during the Formal Scoping Period for the Santa Rosa/Subregional Long-Term Wastewater Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). Volume II also describes how this input was used in shaping the final scope of work for the environmental study and provides responses by City staff and consultants to the issues and concerns raised by the public. This report is to be submitted to the Santa Rosa Board of Public Utilities (BPU) and City Council which will consider the comments and responses in finalizing the scope of work for the environmental study.

FORMAL SCOPING UNDER CEQA AND NEPA

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which establish the legal requirements for preparation of an EIR/EIS, require or encourage "scoping." Scoping is a process by which a lead agency solicits guidance from public agencies and citizens about the scope and content of the environmental information and analysis to be included in an EIR/EIS. Informal scoping activities completed between September, 1993 and August, 1994 for the Long-Term Project EIR/EIS involved the public in the selection of the alternatives to be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. Formal Scoping, as carried out under both California and federal regulations, was intended to finalize the alternatives to be studied, and define what studies will be needed to provide the public and decision makers with enough information about the alternatives' potential effects. Formal Scoping for the Long-Term Project EIR/EIS began on October 21, 1994 and was to end after a 45-day comment period on December 5, 1994. Because of extensive public comment, the time for accepting input was extended to December 14, 1994.

Specifically, the public's role during this Formal Scoping period was to comment on and help:

1. Finalize the alternatives to be studied
2. Shape the EIR/EIS consultants' Scope of Work for preparing the EIR/EIS including the:
 - Issues to be studied
 - Methods of analysis
 - Level of study detail
3. Finalize the criteria for judging the significance of potential impacts

PUBLIC CONSULTATION DURING FORMAL SCOPING

Pursuant to CEQA and NEPA, the lead agencies for the Long-Term Wastewater Project EIR/EIS (the City of Santa Rosa and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) solicited views from members of the public and public agencies about the adequacy of the environmental consultants' proposed scope of work. To obtain input, the City of Santa Rosa and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers: (1) held a Scoping Meeting to receive oral comments; and (2) solicited written and telephone comments through the circulation of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Notice of Intent (NOI). The Scoping Meeting was held on November 17, 1994 at the Steele Lane Community Center in Santa Rosa, California. As a convenience to the public, the Scoping Meeting consisted of two equivalent sessions -- one in the afternoon beginning at 3 p.m. and the other in the evening beginning at 7 p.m. The combined attendance for both sessions was approximately 152 people. Approximately 90 people presented oral comments to staff from the City of Santa Rosa, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the EIR/EIS consultant team.

During the Formal Scoping Comment Period, interested public agencies and members of the public also submitted written comments about the adequacy of the proposed EIR/EIS workscope to the City of Santa Rosa's Department of Community Development. A total of 129 letters/ telephone responses were received during this formal comment period.

The draft Feedback Report which comprises the body of this Volume II Scoping Report summarizes the issues, suggestions and concerns presented orally by the public at the November 17, 1994 Scoping Meeting, and in writing or by telephone in response to circulation of the NOP/NOI.

HOW TO READ THE FEEDBACK REPORT SUMMARY TABLES

The tables found in the body of Volume II of the Scoping Report catalogue the comments received from the public during Formal Scoping and indicate how each of these was used in shaping the environmental consultants' final scope of work. Table 1 summarizes the oral comments presented by members of the public at the November 17, 1994 Scoping Meeting. Table 2 presents the comments received from the public in writing and by telephone during the Formal Scoping review and comment period.

Symbols are used in each of the tables to provide some of the information about the fate of public input items. To help readers use the tables effectively, these symbols, and some of the ways in which they are used, are illustrated and explained on the next page:

Status of Suggested Scope Item		
Already In Scope	Incorporated Into Scope	Not Incorporated Into Scope
X		
TASK 21	TASK 39	
TASK 18		X
NA	NA	NA

EXPLANATION

- = Suggested scope item is reflected throughout much of the final workscope.
- = Some of the suggested scope items were already part of the workscope task(s) cited; others were added as a result of commenter suggestion(s).
- = Some of the suggested scope items were already part of the workscope task(s) cited; some items have not been included in the final workscope.
- = Not applicable. Comment not pertinent to the scope of work, but may have some value to the Long-Term Project in other ways.

TRACING PUBLIC INPUT ITEMS IN THE FINAL SCOPE OF WORK

Public input items which have been added to the study are noted with underlined text in the environmental consultants' final scope of work. Elements which have been eliminated from the study are denoted by lined out text. Readers who wish to trace the fate of public comments should consult the environmental consultants' final scope of work found in Volume I of this Scoping Report. Volumes I and III (Technical Memos) can be found at the libraries listed on the following page:

Central Library
3rd & E Streets
Santa Rosa, CA 94504

Rohnert Park-Cotati Regional Library
660 Hunter Drive Rohnert Park, CA 94928
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Northwest Santa Rosa Regional Library
150 Coddington Center
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Sebastopol Regional Library
7140 Bodega Avenue
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Gerneville Regional Library
14107 Armstrong Woods Rd.
Guerneville, CA 95446

Novato Regional Library
1720 Novato Blvd.
Novato, CA 94947

Petaluma Regional Library
100 Fairgrounds Drive
Petaluma, CA 94953

INDEX OF COMMENTERS

November 17, 1994 Scoping Meeting (Table 1)

Speaker	Community / Organization	Page
Brenda Adelman	Guerneville / Russian River Watershed Protection Committee	15
Ellery Akers	Pt. Reyes Station	10
Bob Anderson	Grape Growers Association	16
Elizabeth Anthony	Bodega Bay / Sierra Club's Water Committee	17
David Bannister	Santa Rosa	7
Phillip Bertolli	Santa Rosa	8
Loretta Borges	Santa Rosa	5
John Brown	Santa Rosa / Sonoma County Taxpayers Association	17
William Browning	Meadow Lane & Llano Road	23
Sue Buxten	Petaluma	21
Don Camacho	Bloomfield	12
Sarah Cameron	Inverness/Land Conservation League	22
Andrew Camozzi	Cotati	10
Richard Charter	Bodega Bay	6
Martin Coopender	Santa Rosa	1
Stan Denner	Santa Rosa/Denner Ranch, Sonoma County Farm Bureau	1
Duane DeWitt	Santa Rosa	17
Jim Dickinson	Santa Rosa	9
Tracy Dunhill	San Anselmo/Calif. Shrimp Club	5
Megan Eoyang	Sebastopol	10
Lawrence Folzter	Occidental / Friends of the Esteros	23
Tom Foster	Petaluma	8

Speaker	Community / Organization	Page
Rue Furch	Sebastopol	24
Frank Glazier	Two Rock	10
Laura Graham	Santa Rosa	9
Mark Green	Sonoma County Conservation Action	24
Stan Griffin	Trout Unlimited/Mill Valley	8
Jim Groom	Sonoma County Taxpayers Association	1
Betty Guggolz	Cloverdale / Calif. Native Plant Society	11
Hamilton Hess	Lake County and Santa Rosa	12
Frank Hilder	Santa Rosa	5
Frank Hilder	Santa Rosa	26
Frank Hilder	Santa Rosa	27
Erin Hill	San Anselmo/Calif. Shrimp Club	5
Jim Jacobs	Petaluma	3
Bill Jahn	Santa Rosa	10
Steve Klausner	Glen Ellen/Sonoma County Taxpayers Association	1
Steve Klausner	Glen Ellen/Sonoma County Taxpayers Association	4
Steve Klausner	Glen Ellen/Sonoma County Taxpayers Association	25
Bill Kortum	Petaluma	14
Rob Levinsky	Forestville	9
Al Marcucci	Petaluma/Sonoma County Taxpayers Association	1
Al Marcucci	Petaluma	2
Nan McGuire	Guerneville	4
Richard Nissin	Santa Rosa	5
Ernest Noyes	Tomaes	24
Ernest Noyes	Tomaes	27
Ned Orrett	Petaluma	14
Clifford Ostrem	Sebastopol	10
Bob Ottensmeyer	Santa Rosa	19
Joan O'Brien	Petaluma	18

Speaker	Community / Organization	Page
Gabor Patay	Santa Rosa	15
Chris Peterson	Forestville	10
Ed Pozzi	Rancher, Estero de San Antonio	12
Krista Rector	Cloverdale / Sierra Club	18
Russell Ridge	Pt. Reyes Station	9
Beverly Rudolph	Sebastopol	23
Roz Scholze	Bloomfield	2
Ethan Silva	Duncan Mills	22
Leonard Stewart	Stewart & Associates, Geyser Energy Development Corp.	23
Martin Strain	Tornales	15
Eric Sunswheat	Potter Valley	22
Joe Tresch	Walker Road, Petaluma	20
Kathy Tresch	Walker Road, Petaluma	20
Kathy Tresch	Walker Road, Petaluma	26
Dale Wright	Santa Rosa	8
Dale Wright	Santa Rosa	25
Tom Yarish	Mill Valley / Friends of the Esteros; Environmental Action Committee of West Marin	14

INDEX OF COMMENTERS

Summary of Issues/Concerns Received in Writing or by Phone (Table2)

Source Letter (L) Telephone (T)	L	T	Community / Organization	Page
Nancy Adams	■		Penngrove	15
William Adams	■		Penngrove	15
Brenda Adelman	■		Guereneville / Russian River Watershed Protection Committee	163
Brenda Adelman	■		Guereneville / Russian River Watershed Protection Committee	239
Brenda Adelman	■		Guerneville / Russian River Watershed Protection Committee	248
Bob Anderson	■		United Winegrowers for Sonoma County	236
Elizabeth Anthony	■		Sierra Club	18
David Asimov	■		Santa Rosa	31
Philip Badal	■		Caltrans District 4	9
David Banninster	■		Sierra Club, Sonoma Group	14
R. Bartley	■			10
Kathy Baskin	■		Santa Rosa	33
Leon Beck	■		Bloomfield	227
Nadine Beck	■		Bloomfield	226
Fred Beeman	■			252
Terry Bell	■		Sebastopol	126
Rosemary Benz	■			255
Charles Bishop	■			252

Source Letter (a) Telephone (b)	(c)	(d)	Community / Organization	Page
Charles Black	■		Santa Rosa	32
Loretta Borges	■		Santa Rosa	119
Johanna Brandriff	■		San Geronimo	135
Colleen Briggs	■		Two Rock	158
Colleen Briggs	■		Two Rock	163
Kenneth Brown	■			243
John Calomiris	■		Point Reyes Station / Tomales Bay Association	155
Don Camacho	■			199
Marcia Camacho	■		Sierra Club Water Committee	159
Marcia Camacho	■			199
Marcia Camacho	■			239
Richard Charter	■		Bodega Bay / Friends of the Esteros/Environmental Action of West Marin	122
John Chiappe	■			240
Dean Cooley	■		Healdsburg / PG&E	104
Ed Cooper	■			258
Martin Coopender	■			7
Kim Cordell	■			245
Suzanne Curtiss	■			255
Gary DeWeese	■		University of California	7
Duane DeWitt	■		Santa Rosa	21
Mary Donatelli	■			258
Gene Dyrhang	■			240
H. Eichstaedt	■		Sonoma	154
Lee Erickson	■			255
Mark Feldman	■		Sebastopol	41

Source Letter (✉) Telephone (☎)	✉	☎	Community / Organization	Page
Richard Fiore (Mr. and Mrs.)	■			254
Erika Florie	■			255
Lawrence Foltzer	■		Occidental	155
Kenneth Fox	■		Point Reyes Station / Tomales Bay Association	136
Pauline Gilbert	■			240
Bea Glazier	■		Two Rock	12
Frank Glazier	■		Two Rock	12
Charles Gresch (Mr. and Mrs.)	■			240
Stan Griffen	■		Mill Valley / Trout Unlimited of California	120
Betty Guggolz	■		California Native Plant Society	19
Betty Guggolz	■		California Native Plant Society	222
Alan Haramati	■			252
Dennis Harter	■		Santa Rosa	156
Joel Hedgpeth	■		Santa Rosa	157
Hamilton Hess	■		Friends of Cobb Mountain	15
Hamilton Hess	■		Friends of Cobb Mountain	41
Brian Hines	■		Santa Rosa	153
James Hollibaugh	■		Romberg Tiburon Centers	255
Phyllis Honodel	■			255
Kenneth Hower	■			255
Wayne Hubbard	■		State Water Resources Control Board	38
Brian Hunter	■		California Dept. of Fish and Game	7
Geoffrey Johnson	■		Santa Rosa	41
Leigh Jordan	■		Rohnert Park / Historical Resources Information System, Sonoma State University	44

Source Letter (✉) Telephone (☎)	✉	☎	Community / Organization	Page
Michelle Julene	■		Sonoma County Water Agency	253
Steve Klausner	■		Santa Rosa / Sonoma County Taxpayers Association	105
Benjamin Kor	■		Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region	9
Bill Kortum	■		Petaluma	79
Jerry Levy	■		Healdsburg	119
K. Lo		■	Highway 37	10
Jack Macy	■		Santa Rosa / Sonoma County Alliance	127
Anne Magnie	■		City of Sebastopol	128
Monica Maguire	■		Santa Rosa	46
Genevieve Malmstrom	■			255
Allen Marcucci	■		Petaluma	46
Ann Maurice	■		Ad Hoc Committee on Clean Water	211
Donald McIssac	■		Marin County Resource Conservation District	1
Art McNulty	■			258
Robert Miller	■		Alameda / Operating Engineers Union, Local 3	104
Davitt Mullen	■		Novato	119
Gerry Murphy		■		162
William Murray	■			255
Abe Newman		■		1
Paul Ogasawara	■		Sebastopol	44
Edwin Orrett	■		Petaluma / Pacific Technology Associates	152
Ned Orrett	■		Petaluma / Pacific Technology Associates	17
Clifford Ostrem	■			222
Joan O'Brien	■			241
Joan O'Brien	■			255

Source Letter (✉) Telephone (☎)	✉	☎	Community / Organization	Page
Joseph Pence	■		Farmer	7
Joseph Pence	■		Sebastopol	79
Gloria Potter	■			252
John Prunuske	■		Western Sonoma County Rural Alliance	31
Krista Rector	■			22
Lindsay Rehm	■		Larkspur / The Environmental Forum of Marin	61
Vicki Reynolds	■			221
Susan Richter	■			240
Russell Ridge	■		Point Reyes Station	81
Caroll Robillard	■		Bodega Bay / California Native Plant Society	149
Kenneth Roe	■		Redding	12
John Rosenblum	■			250
Barbara Salzman	■		Mill Valley / Marin Audubon Society	82
Roz Scholze	■		Bloomfield	12
Jean Severinghaus	■		Mill Valley	77
Thomas Sharkes	■			240
Ernestine Smith	■		Santa Rosa	33
Robert Smithfield	■		Fairfax	137
Lynn Stafford	■		Bodega Bay	135
Jean Starkweather	■		San Rafael / Marin Conservation League	51
Helene Steinlauf	■		Two Rock	150
Leonard Stewart	■		Geyser Alt. Energy Development Corporation	162
Susan Stompe	■		Novato / Sierra Club, Marin Group	110
Martin Strain	■		Tomaes	19
Martin Strain	■		Tomaes	42
Eric Sunswheat	■		Potter Valley	121

Source Letter (25) Telephone (27)	25	27	Community / Organization	Page
Richard Swan	■			240
Len Swenson	■		Santa Rosa / Sierra Club, Sonoma County Group	77
Joe Tresch	■		Two Rock	139
Kathy Tresch	■		Two Rock	139
Edward Ueber	■		Gulf of Farrallones National Marine Sanctuary	33
Edward Ueber	■		Gulf of Farrallones National Marine Sanctuary	64
James Vantine	■		Santa Rosa	34
William Walton	■		Dillon Beach / Estero Mutual Water Company	58
Elizabeth Whitmore	■			255
Ken Wilson	■			258
Trish Wilson	■			240
Farrell Winter	■			252
Denise Wright	■		Santa Rosa	150
Thomas Yarish	■		Mill Valley / Friends of the Esteros	47
Anonymous	■			258
	■		San Anselmo/Shrimp Club	11
Unidentified Commenter	■			156

DRAFT FEEDBACK REPORT ON PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING FORMAL SCOPING

Santa Rosa/Subregional Long-Term Wastewater Project EIR/EIS

Prepared For:

City Managers Office
City of Santa Rosa
Santa Rosa, California

Prepared By:

Urban Alternatives
(Planners and Public Involvement Consultants)
Novato, California

Harland Bartholomew & Associates
(Environmental Consultants)
Sacramento, California

August 31, 1995

**TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF ISSUES/CONCERNS PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC
AT THE NOVEMBER 17, 1994 SCOPING MEETING**

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
"3:00 PM SESSION"							
1		Stan Denner, Denner Ranch and Sonoma County Farm Bureau, Santa Rosa	As the largest current user of Santa Rosa wastewater, he believes the South County Alternative would make the most cost effective use of a valuable resource with the least negative impacts.	X			South County Alternative is one of the five to be studied in the EIR/EIS.
2		Jim Groom; Al Marcucci; and Steve Klausner, Sonoma Co. Taxpayers Association	Conduct front-end analysis of costs and economic viability of each alternative for average ratepayer before proceeding with EIR/EIS.	TASK 33			Cost analysis was done as part of the screening of alternatives. Volume IV of the Screening Report contains costs for the 30 screened alternatives, and these cost figures were used by the BPU in making their decision about which alternatives to evaluate in the EIR/EIS. Costs of alternatives will be further refined in the EIR/EIS.
3	A	Martin Coopender, Santa Rosa	Should use wetlands for treatment.	TASKs 20, 21, 22			The Community Separator Alternative included substantial wetlands creation. This alternative was eliminated because suitable acreage for wetlands creation is lacking in the Santa Rosa Plain. However, use of wetlands for water quality mitigation is still a possibility.
	B		Cost impacts of each alternative on senior citizens with fixed incomes	TASK 33			Analysis of the potential impacts of rate increases on various income groups is in the scope of work.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
4		Al Marcucci, Petaluma	The economic impact of forced condemnation on cow/cattle ranchers' livelihood and the small agricultural economy of Sonoma County.	TASK 33		X	Although the EIR/EIS will not determine the effects of condemnation, impacts on the agricultural industry are in the scope of work.
5			The specific crops to be irrigated with reclaimed water. (food crops, grazing crops, vegetable crops, etc.)	TASKs 18 and 33			A component of the Irrigation Suitability Studies includes identification of existing agricultural land uses, future (with irrigation) crop choice, and farm water requirements for consumptive water use. Soil and local micro-climate will be considered in the irrigation water use determination and will follow U.C. Extension procedures. A comparison of production costs, increased yields and crop prices for existing and future conditions will be completed by study team economists and will enable an assessment of agricultural economic impacts and benefits. The viability of agricultural irrigation will be discussed.
6			Impact of reclaimed irrigation water on drinking water of local farms.	TASKs 18 and 32			The EIR/EIS will provide an analysis of the impacts on drinking water as a result of irrigating with reclaimed water.
7		Roz Scholze, Bloomfield	Opposes West County Alternative.			X	All the alternatives examined, including West County, have potential problems and difficulties. Nevertheless, to satisfy the regulatory requirement that a full range of alternatives be studied, West County Reclamation has been included in the final workscope as one of the five alternatives to be studied.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
8		Jim Jacobs, Petaluma	Evaluate suitability of West County soils and grasses for irrigation	TASK 18			An irrigation soil suitability study was completed for the West County area in 1990, following standard U.S. Bureau of Reclamation procedures. This study is being verified and updated. A similar study is currently being completed for the South County area. The studies identify areas of existing poor drainage, soil conditions where a high water table may develop following irrigation, and other soil and topographic limitations (i.e., slopes >15%, infertility and high erosion hazard). Only suitable lands will be included in the irrigation project design. This may include irrigation of lower capability levels, such as Reyes Soils, if impacts are insignificant or can be mitigated through application of Irrigation Best Management Practices.
9			Assess impact of reservoirs/ponds on water in West County underground springs.	TASK 30			In Scope.
10			Study impact of West County reservoir on large dairy ranch 50 to 100 yds. below damsite.	TASK 38 TASKs 18, 19, 20	TASK 38		The scope of work was expanded to include a reservoir inflow analysis. This analysis will be used to size surface water runoff diversion facilities. These facilities may have an impact on downstream areas. Impacts to downstream properties will be evaluated.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
11		Steve Klausner, Sonoma County Taxpayers Association, Glen Ellen	Eliminate study of migratory steelhead salmon in Santa Rosa Creek, because of electro-fishing methodology proposed to disable salmon for study purposes.	TASK 14			These special studies have been completed and electro-fishing was not used.
12			Eliminate evaluation of the impact of treated wastewater on migratory fish in local spawning streams during the dry season. Fish can't migrate during the dry season when these streams have little or no flow.	TASK 14		X	Damage from netting is generally low for these studies. Agencies believe the study is necessary to address issues related to wastewater and fish migration. Therefore, these studies remain in the scope.
13			Focus the study of potential wastewater impacts to the Esteros on the effects of freshwater on the Esteros' hyposalinity.	TASK 21			An Estero evaluation which addresses hyposalinity is included in the scope.
14		Nan McGuire, Guerneville	Favors urban irrigation. Wants environmentally safe project.	X			Urban irrigation components such as golf course irrigation projects will be studied in the EIR/EIS. This comment has been forwarded to the BPU.
15		Steve Klausner, Sonoma County Taxpayers Association, Glen Ellen	Evaluate the potential benefits of increased discharge of treated wastewater to streams and wetlands (flows augmentation) with respect to: 1. Biological productivity 2. Pacific Coast Flyway migratory waterfowl 3. Enhanced flood control via Laguna wetlands management.			X	Flow augmentation has been eliminated as a study component, because the potential water consumption in relation to the costs was low.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
16		Frank Hilder, Santa Rosa	Study the potential for polio viruses in the treated wastewater and the wastewater's link to polio cases in the area .	TASKs 21 and 32			The potential for polioviruses in the treated wastewater is in the scope of work.
17		Erin Hill and Tracy Dunhill, Calif. Shrimp Club, San Anselmo	With respect to a proposed reservoir on the Button Ranch, evaluate: a) Endangered species on the site; b) How clean would the effluent be; c) Potential impacts of the effluent on the California Freshwater Shrimp in Stemple Creek; d) Potential impact on vegetation on the banks of the creek; e) Impacts on groundwater; and f) wastewater effects on detritus.	TASKs 19, 21, 30 & 34			In scope.
18		Loretta Borges, Santa Rosa	Study the potential impact of septic tanks on water quality along the lower Russian River.	TASK 21		X	Impacts will be addressed incidentally in Task 21; however, no specific evaluation of septic systems is in scope.
19			Identify the potential impacts of treated wastewater holding ponds (especially along Todd Road in Santa Rosa) on nearby wells.	TASK 30			Groundwater well monitoring is included in scope.
20		Richard Nissin, Santa Rosa	Concerned about project costs. Need to control growth.	TASK 33		X	See response to comment 1 about costs. The Subregional System does not have authority over its members' general plans. As a result, the general plan growth projection of the member communities as of the spring of 1994 will serve as the basis for determining wastewater flows to the System for the study period.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
21		Richard Nissin, (Cont'd.)	Evaluate the potential for small amounts of toxic materials in water.	TASK 31			In scope.
22		Richard Charter, Bodega Bay	Trace where effluent from ocean discharge option and/or runoff into the Esteros from ag. irrigation is carried via 5-year Near-Shore Ocean Current Studies.	TASK 21			An evaluation of the quantity of wastewater and effects in the Estero would be conducted first. The results of this study will provide the basis for determining if any significant potential exists for effects in Tomales Bay. The Ocean Outfall Alternative has been dropped from consideration.
23			Study the presence of species either endangered, listed, threatened or pending at proposed reservoir sites in West County.	TASK 19			The presence of terrestrial and botanical species endangered, threatened, or pending is included in the scope for all alternatives.
24			Locate, via detailed GIS-based mapping, seasonal and year-round wetlands near reservoir sites and near Esteros' watersheds.	TASK 18			The location of seasonal and year-round wetlands near reservoir sites is in the scope.
25			Include a chronology at the beginning of the EIR/EIS of the past litigation history of the Long-Term Project.	TASK 40			The EIR/EIS will identify the project history including past litigation.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
26		Richard Charter (Cont'd.)	Incorporate by reference all previous comments made by Friends of the Esteros in writing and in oral testimony at previous hearings about the Long-Term Project. Also incorporate by reference the videotape of the U.C. Board of Regents meetings of March 17th and 18th, 1994 as evidence that a project alternative has been pre-selected prior to the scoping process. City of Santa Rosa officials testified at those meetings that they needed to acquire the Button Ranch, because it was their only possible alternative.	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	The commenter was contacted by the study team and asked to make specific reference to the previous comments and information which he felt should be incorporated in the scope. Except for his foregoing comments, the commenter declined to further identify this information. There is no pre-selected alternative. The West County Reclamation Alternative, which includes a possible reservoir at the Button Ranch, has been included to satisfy the regulatory requirement that a full range of alternatives be studied. Each of the 5 alternatives will be studied at an equal level of detail in the EIR/EIS. The study results will provide the primary basis for future project selection.
27		David Bannister, Santa Rosa	Evaluate potential impacts from proposed wetlands on existing wildlife habitat in those areas.			X	Created wetlands have been removed as a project component due to the lack of suitable lands.

NA = Not Applicable. Comment not pertinent to the scope of work but may have some value to the Long-Term Project in other ways.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
28		David Bannister (Cont'd.)	Evaluate the potential for bioaccumulation of heavy metals in the food chain for wetlands proposed for creation.	TASK 34		X	Wetland creation has been removed as a project component, however, a study of bioaccumulation in Kelly Pond is in the scope in case the development of wetlands becomes a potentially useful mitigation measure.
29		Dale Wright, Santa Rosa	Suggests using reclaimed water to irrigate redwoods or replenish aquifer. Also suggested discharge above Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) intake.	TASKs 22 & 31		X	Aquifer storage and recovery is being evaluated as a project component. However, aquifer replenishment is not. The Russian River discharge alternative includes evaluation of discharge above the SCWA intakes. Irrigating redwoods was nominated as a component during the Scoping Public Workshops but dropped from consideration during the screening process.
30		Philip Bertolli, Santa Rosa	Determine the potential demand for reclaimed water by farmers in and around Sebastopol.	TASKs 18 and 33			A survey of demand for reclaimed water by property owners is in the scope of work. Irrigation in the Sebastopol area is being studied.
31		Stan Griffin, Trout Unlimited, Mill Valley	Study the impact of effluent discharge and the Laguna de Santa Rosa's status as an impaired water body, (due to low levels of dissolved oxygen) on fish mortality and migration.	TASK 14			This matter is addressed by the RWQCB's Waste Reduction Strategy (WRS). The WRS notes that wastewater discharge is not the primary cause of DO depletion in the Laguna. The Long-Term Project will be developed to be consistent with the strategy. Fisheries studies are continuing.
32		Tom Foster, Petaluma	Concerned about potential discharges and impacts to the Esteros and downstream impacts to Bodega Bay.	TASK 21			An evaluation of the quantity of wastewater and effects in the Estero would be conducted first. The results of this study will provide the basis for determining if any significant exists for effects in Tomales Bay.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
33		Laura Graham, Santa Rosa	Suggests evaluating geysers discharge or bay discharge.	X		X	The geysers alternative is one of the five included in the scope. Bay discharge was dropped from consideration due to regulatory constraints.
34		Russell Ridge, Pt. Reyes Station	The effect of heavy metals in the tertiary treated wastewater runoff to the Esteros on organisms, plants and animals in the Esteros.	TASK 21			Studies conducted in the West County will allow the consultant team to adequately evaluate the potential impacts to the Esteros in the EIR/EIS. If a West Co. alternative were selected, on-going monitoring would be conducted.
35		Jim Dickinson, Santa Rosa	Prefers alternative 2M; concerned about rate increases.	TASK 31 TASK 33		X	Alternative 2M was dropped from consideration during Formal Scoping after review and evaluation by the BPU and Council. 2M was based on maximum water conservation (about 35%), an objective which the BPU and Council concluded was not attainable in the near-term. South County irrigation and the Adobe Road Reservoir site, which were part of Alternative 2M, have been retained as components to be studied, however. Rate increase impacts will be addressed in scope.
36	A B	Rob Levinsky, Forestville	Prefers South County Alternative, concerned about growth. Evaluate the impact of treated wastewater (no matter the quantity and purity) discharged to the Russian River on the perception of the Russian River area as a desirable tourist destination.	X TASK 39			No change in scope as a result of the comment which supports Alt. 2: South County Reclamation. Impacts on recreation are addressed in the scope of work.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
37		Frank Glazier, Two Rock	Identify the specific location from which the freshwater for the Two Rock Valley originates and where it would come from during and after project construction.	TASK 30			In Scope
38		Andrew Camozzi, Cotati	Requests that Meacham Reservoir be dropped from further consideration.		X		Because of problems associated with proximity to the landfill, the Meacham Reservoir site has been dropped.
39		Clifford Ostrem, Sebastopol	Suggests wastewater be transported to San Pablo Bay.			X	See response to comment 33.
40		Chris Peterson, Forestville	Consider the published studies of environmental microbiologists David Grimes and Betty Olson (on pathogens in water and treated wastewater) in carrying out the EIR/EIS.	TASKs 32 and 39			In scope.
7:00 PM Session							
41		Ellery Akers, Pt. Reyes Station	Study potential effects on shore birds' reproduction in Esteros and Farallones.	TASK 19			Will be addressed in Task 19, Ecological Risk Assessments.
42			Evaluate potential effects of organo-chlorines on stellar sea lion reproduction.	TASK 19			Will be addressed in Task 19, Ecological Risk Assessments.
43		Bill Jahn, Santa Rosa	Balance between the environment and economy needed; determine the cost performance for each of the alternatives.	TASK 31			In scope.
44		Megan Eoyang, Sebastopol	Study potential effects on nesting pair of golden eagles at Button Ranch site.	TASK 19			In scope.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
45		Megan Eoyang (Cont'd)	Research who was there before using the Button Ranch site (cultural resources).	TASK 36			In scope.
46		Betty Guggolz, Calif. Native Plant Society, Cloverdale	Evaluate the potential of the South County Alternative to impact tidal marshes, lower reaches of Adobe Creek, Petaluma River, Petaluma salt marsh, several endangered plant species and Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse.	TASKs 18 & 21 TASK 19			Salinity impacts will be identified in Tasks 18 & 21. Salinity impacts on marsh flora and fauna will be addressed in Task 19.
47			Evaluate the impact of the Community Separator Alternative on the conversion of seasonal wetlands to agricultural uses and effects on vernal pools; effects on Blucher Creek & endangered freshwater shrimp.			X	This alternative has been dropped from consideration due to potential difficulties in assembling the land needed for wetlands.
48			Study the potential impacts of the West County Alternative to Blucher Creek; potential impacts to Chileno Valley Wetlands, Estero Americano, Stemple Creek, San Antonio Creek, and Estero de San Antonio, which support significant wetland habitats; potential loss of significant plant communities and wetlands on Button Ranch, including only remaining woodland plant community in Petaluma Gap. Evaluate the effects of converting rangeland to cropland on several endangered plant species.	TASKs 18 & 19		X	The areas cited will be studied except for the Chileno Valley Wetlands and San Antonio Creek.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
49		Betty Guggolz, (Cont'd.)	Study the potential effects of the Geysers Recharge Alternative on endangered plants restricted to serpentine soils, including <i>erigonum nervulosum</i> .	TASK 19			In scope.
50			Give environmental consultants adequate time to conduct and complete biological studies.	TASK 19			The scope of work provides biological studies at appropriate seasons.
51		Hamilton Hess, Lake County and Santa Rosa	Assess the likely seismic effects of injecting large volumes of wastewater into the Geysers geothermal field. Consult USGS records and seismographic station at UC Berkeley.	TASK 35			In scope.
52			Study "stress loading" process on neighboring faults resulting from wastewater injection.	TASK 35			In scope.
53			Treat seismic issue in depth; provide "up-front" mitigation in the form of a recompense plan.		TASK 35		Evaluation of induced seismicity has been added to the scope. Appropriate mitigation will be considered.
54		Ed Pozzi, rancher, Estero de San Antonio	Study side effects of wastewater (leaching) chemicals from the solid waste landfill on Meacham Road and percolation of effluent from the landfill into existing creeks.	TASK 30			In scope.
55		Don Camacho, Bloomfield	Compare cost of each alternative to the alternative of each sewage user providing enough land to install his/her own sewage disposal system.			X	This component was considered and dropped from the study during scoping. It is not practical to require individual septic systems in urban areas.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
56		Don Camacho (Cont'd)	Clarify whether reclaimed water will or will not disrupt soils.	TASK 18			Possible water quality impacts to soil fertility/sustainable agriculture from metals, salts or erosion will be addressed in the Irrigation Management Plan and summarized.
57			Will irrigation with reclaimed water increase flood potential by reducing fields' ability to absorb rain, thereby increasing runoff?	TASK 18			This question will be addressed in the Hydrology Scope of Work. Normally sprinkler irrigation will occur during the late spring through early fall period, when rainfall events, if they occur, are not heavy, and soils are not saturated. Application immediately prior to a forecast fall or spring storm even, or during rainfall is not allowed. The Irrigation Management Program will include use of real-time climatic forecast models and soil moisture sensing devices to preclude sprinkler irrigation of wet soils or irrigation at a time when major storms which can cause flooding are expected to occur.
58			How will water quality be monitored; how will public feedback be included in this monitoring? What chemicals, toxins, nutrients and by-products will be tested for in the treated wastewater??	TASK 21			See response to written comments 79 B1 through 79 B3 in Table 2.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
59		Bill Kortum, Petaluma	Look into a partnership with Petaluma in the EIR/EIS; opportunity for economy of scale by combining facilities for both.			X	There may be an opportunity to achieve some cost savings due to economy of scale by sharing facilities for a South County project with Petaluma's wastewater disposal project, or by joining systems and gaining Petaluma's financial participation. This issue currently is not in the scope of this project, but could be considered during project implementation.
60		Tom Yarish, Mill Valley; Friends of the Esteros; Environmental Action Committee of West Marin	Confusion about costs of urban buildout; need a baseline analysis of cost of public services with no growth, slow growth and full urban buildout. Analyze short-term benefits versus long-term costs.	TASK 33		X	The EIR/EIS will address the potential impacts of the alternatives on public services. The EIR/EIS will not analyze the potential growth impacts of Subregional System communities' general plans but will evaluate the potential growth inducing impacts of the project alternatives as required by CEQA and NEPA.
61			Relying on existing Sonoma County water quality studies is problematic. Analyze hydrology of West County watersheds to establish basis for water quality studies.	TASKs 30 & 38			In scope.
62			Will West County irrigation-based agriculture be viable?	TASKs 18 & 33			The studies will include the agricultural viability of each alternative.
63		Ned Orrett, Petaluma	Primary mitigation is water conservation. How will the studies of water conservation measures be integrated into the various project alternatives? Analyze cost-effectiveness of conservation measures.	TASK 29			In scope.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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		Gabor Patay, Santa Rosa	How much will this cost property owners? People on fixed incomes?	TASK 33			Costs to property owners, including those on fixed incomes will be evaluated.
65		Brenda Adelman, Guerneville, Russian River Watershed Protection Committee	Concerned about impacts on the lower Russian River.	TASKs 25 & 28			In scope.
66			Concerned about reliance on QUAL2E computer model to analyze water quality impacts; input data are inadequate; base the model on actual data, not mean monthly averages.	TASKs 21 & 28			In scope. Also see response to comment 83 J in Table 2.
67			Concerned about the use of chlorine for disinfection of wastewater.	TASK 21			In scope.
68			Assess characterization of nutrient contamination in the Laguna; separate out the contribution of irrigation from the nitrate contribution from treated wastewater.	TASK 28			In scope.
69		Martin Strain, Tomales	Study potential impacts from nutrient loadings of direct or indirect discharges of treated wastewater on the Esteros, Bodega Bay and Tomales Bay. Concerned about nutrient loadings and red tide.	TASK 21			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.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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		Martin Strain (Cont'd)	How does the Subregional System propose to identify and remove any and all chemical compounds from wastewater downstream from industrial pretreatment processes?			X	The EIR/EIS is an evaluation of disposal, not treatment alternatives. The EIR/EIS will not include an analysis of how the alternatives might remove all chemical compounds.
71		Bob Anderson, Grape Growers Association	Analyze the pieces (components of alternatives) as if they were building blocks, so they can be put back together (to form a complete alternative) at the end.	TASK 31			Variations and combinations of components are being considered for evaluation in scope.
72			Please look at the concept of "horizontal" or buffering storage to deal with the highs and lows of Russian River flow.			X	Shallow embankment type storage has not been determined to be cost effective. As a result, shallow embankments have been eliminated from the scope.
73			Evaluate "pieces" (of alternatives) to show incremental costs, so that pieces can be compared. Please provide the water balance numbers early on, so we can evaluate some of the alternatives and how they would work.	TASK 31			Incremental costs are included. Water balance numbers will be provided in the fall of '95.
74			In reference to irrigable land requiring slopes less than 15%, contact vineyard people and see if they are irrigating slopes in excess of 15%.	TASK 18			See response to comment 8.
75			See whether solids conservation, such as reducing kitchen disposal waste might reduce total loadings to the treatment plant.			X	Solids conservation will not be studied as part of this water disposal project. Various water conservation options will be explored. The total saving and reduction for each option will be calculated.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
76		Bob Anderson (Cont'd)	Use the work from Sonoma County's consultant who reviewed Russian River riparian habitat in the ARM Plan.	TASK 19			Literature review is included in the scope. The County's ARM Report was included in this review.
77		John Brown, Santa Rosa, Sonoma County Taxpayers Association	A major taxpayer concern is not just environmental, but also cost impacts. Please give an early read on costs.	TASK 33			Preliminary cost impacts are included in scope.
78		Elizabeth Anthony, Bodega Bay, Sierra Club's Water Committee	Wetlands are a very high priority for the Sierra Club. Concerned about contaminants in the treated wastewater used in or discharged to wetlands; analyze the following contaminants and their potential effects: dioxin, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), low-level radioactivity, and chemical weedkillers.	TASK 32 TASKs 21 & 32 TASK 19			An evaluation of current knowledge about environmental estrogens such as dioxin and PCB's is in the Scope. Radioactivity in wastewater is being evaluated in Tasks 21 and 32. Wastewater effects on aquatic life are being evaluated in Task 19. Wetlands creation was dropped from study in the EIR/EIS.
79		Duane DeWitt, Santa Rosa	Concerned about costs; growth outstripping Santa Rosa's capacity to provide services. Consider a low-tech approach to wastewater management, such as that used in Tijuana.	TASKs 33 & 39		X	Potential costs for each alternative will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. See response to comment 22A in Table 2 for information on Tijuana's experience.
80			Combine Geysers Recharge Alt. with pumping geysers outflow to Lake Sonoma.			X	Discharge to Lake Sonoma was evaluated during screening and was dropped because there was no dilution benefit when compared with Russian River discharge.
81			Treat wastewater as an economic resource; develop an economic "outlook" that makes money from wastewater.	X			Using treated wastewater as a resource will be evaluated in reclamation and Geysers Recharge alternatives.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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		Joan O'Brien, Petaluma, land owner potentially affected by reservoir siting	Coordinate planning with Petaluma.			X	There may be an opportunity to achieve some cost savings due to economy of scale by sharing facilities for a South County project with Petaluma's wastewater disposal project, or by joining systems and gaining Petaluma's financial participation. This element currently is not in the scope of this project. However, plans are being designed to avoid areas needed for Petaluma's proposed system.
83			Water conservation and growth limitation must be part of any selected plan; study successful wetlands plans; site wetlands closer to the treatment plant.	TASK 29		X	Water conservation is in the scope of work. For remarks about growth limitation, see response to 40 B, Table 2. Wetlands creation has been dropped from further consideration.
84			This program is reactive, not proactive.	NA	NA	NA	Comment noted.
85		Krista Rector, Cloverdale, Sierra Club	Assess using pricing to encourage water conservation.	TASK 29			Costing is included in the conservation studies.
86			Assess population limits and the maximum carrying capacity of the Santa Rosa area.			X	The project capacity is driven by the General Plans set forth by each Subregional System community. This concern should be addressed within the context of each community's General Plan update.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
87		Krista Rector (Cont'd.)	Address the cumulative impact of introducing the System's effluent into the Geysers area.	TASKs 19, 32 & 38			Cumulative impacts will be analyzed for Geyser Recharge Alternative. That scope will determine if the Geysers aquifer is hydrologically connected to drinking water aquifer. This would not involve any surface water hydrology unless there is specific streamflow data or precipitation data required for the analysis that cannot be obtained from published references. Toxicity effects on fish and wildlife will be evaluated for pipeline breakage.
88			Address the cumulative impact of mercury mine injection, such as at the Taylor Mine site in the Geysers area.	TASK 39			Evaluation of projects in the Geysers area will be reviewed as part of the cumulative impacts analysis in the EIR
89			Address the potential impacts of pipe breaks due to seismicity.	TASK 19			Impacts of pipeline breaks will be evaluated and will include an ecological risk assessment.
90			Studies show high levels of heavy metals in fish tissues. Look at potential effects from treated wastewater as well as at potential increases in radon and sulfur dioxide from increased injections.	TASK 39		X	Toxicity effects on fish and wildlife will be evaluated for a pipeline breakage scenario. Air quality impacts of alternatives are being evaluated, but incremental load of radon and sulfur dioxide in particular are not in scope. It is not expected that air emissions would increase due to the project.
91			Address the potential impacts of partnership with PG&E as part of the financial analysis	NA	NA	NA	Determination of contractual issues with PG&E is relevant to project selection, but is not part of the environmental analysis.
92		Bob Ottensmeyer, Santa Rosa	Watch out for ratepayers' interests, particularly those on fixed or low income.	TASK 33			In scope. Analysis will look at estimated rate increases and effects on those with fixed incomes.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
93		Joe Tresch, Walker Road, Petaluma	Bay Area water agencies are studying feasibility of sending treated wastewater to Central Valley; please consider this alternative.			X	This alternative was considered in the screening process that occurred during 1993, but was subsequently dropped from consideration because of prohibitive pipeline costs. See also response to comment 80A in Table 2.
94		Kathy Tresch, Walker Road, Petaluma	Review whether you need to study a West County alternative.			X	One reason West County needs to be included is that it helps contribute a reasonable range of alternatives to the study.
95			How will wetlands for the West County alternative be acquired?	TASK 33			Wetland creation has been dropped from consideration as a component. However, wetlands may be considered as mitigation. Methods of acquisition will be evaluated. Specific methods of acquisition would be determined at the time of project selection.
96			What will be the impacts to the ecosystems along Stemple and Americano creeks if their historical seasonal flows are changed to year-round flows? Erosion impacts? Impacts from saturation of soils in and near the creeks?			X	Flow augmentation has been eliminated as an alternative to be studied in the EIR/EIS.
97			Address potential impacts on property owners and property owners' rights. Total acreage needed in West County for damsites, wetlands, irrigation, pipeline cut-and-cover corridors.	X		X	The EIR/EIS will address impacts on the environment and does not evaluate legal issues. Acreage required for project components would be included in the project description.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
98		Kathy Tresch (Cont'd)	Explain how the irrigation contracts will work; will treated wastewater users pay or be paid?	TASK 33		X	Economic impacts on the farming community will be evaluated; however, actual contract terms would be negotiated at the time of implementation after the EIR/EIS process.
99			Previous studies show wells downstream from reservoir could be inundated with wastewater. If the City were to provide substitute fresh water, where would it come from? What would be the cost to users? To ratepayers? Water meters? Economic impacts to land owners with multiple dwellings on their land?	TASK 30			Groundwater impacts will be evaluated. The need for mitigation such as providing substitute fresh water and its possible cost will be evaluated as part of the EIR/EIS.
100			Address potential effects of wastewater stored at T-5 site on leachate from the County landfill.	TASK 30			Leachate studies are in scope and will include the Two Rock Reservoir site.
101			Potential effects of treated wastewater on freshwater shrimp in the Esteros?	TASK 19		X	Freshwater shrimp don't live in the Esteros. Impact on shrimp in creeks is considered in Task 19.
102			Potential seismic effects: How will residents be protected against massive breaks during a seismic event? Secondary trace of Bloomfield fault near dam?	TASK 35			In scope.
103		Sue Buxten, Petaluma	Address the following relative to the Button Ranch: Impacts on wildlife, erosion, local personal property, esteros, the Meacham Road Landfill, and percolation of toxins.	TASK 19, 30 & 35			In scope.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
104		Ethan Silva, Duncan Mills	The only way the quality of the wastewater will be monitored accurately is if it is going into the City's drinking water. Concerned about recent algae growth in the Russian River.	X	X		Potential impacts on the Russian River with respect to algae growth are included in the scope. One of the sub-alternatives includes discharge above the SCWA intakes.
105		Sarah Cameron, Inverness, Land Conservation League, Rural Land Use Committee	Evaluate the impact of project on growth into rural areas of the County and the cost of any growth these plans might encourage, including tax impacts.			X	The project's capacity is driven by the growth identified in the General Plans set forth by each community in the System. Comment should be addressed within the context of each community's General Plan.
106			Assess impacts to Hwy 101, main arterials and back roads in Marin and Sonoma Counties.	TASK 39			Traffic impacts are in scope.
107			Study suitability of soils for irrigation; impacts to agricultural economy if promised irrigation water is not provided; would overpumping of aquifers occur? potential effects on drinking water wells.	TASKs 18, 30 & 33		X	Soils suitability is in scope. There would likely be a prioritized delivery system with guaranteed water to sensitive field crops and no guarantee to a lesser amount of irrigated hay and pasture crops. Indemnification for a "No-delivery" scenario would be part of contractual negotiations with future users. This issue will not be evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
108			Saw no task addressing "sustainability" or growth inducement.	TASKs 33 & 39		X	Evaluation of sustainability is not in scope; growth inducement is in scope.
109	A	Eric Sunswheat, Potter Valley	Consider a partnership with agriculture; dual irrigation system would be a good idea.	X		X	Agricultural and urban irrigation are both project components to be evaluated. Residential dual irrigation is not in the scope.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
110	B	Eric Sunswheat, (Cont'd.)	If pumping to the geysers, irrigate orchards and vineyards along the way.			X	Irrigation is not included in the geysers alternative.
111			Concerned about sludge management and reinjection of treated wastewater into drinking water supply; analyze potential effects of chlorine	TASK 21	TASK 39	X	Sludge management is not a component to be studied. Discharge to the Russian River water supply and evaluation of potential chlorine effects are included in scope.
112		Leonard Stewart, Stewart & Associates, Geyser Energy Development Corp.	Supports Geysers Recharge Alt. and secondary reuse of wastewater after geysers injection.	X			No change in scope as a result of this comment favoring Geysers Recharge.
113		William Browning, Meadow Lane & Llano Road	Concerned about use of a holding pond at treatment plant for recycling waste; supports irrigation reuse; discharge would be waste of a resource.	X		X	Although, the EIR/EIS will not evaluate the use of a holding pond for recycling waste, it will address the impacts of the disposal of the treated wastewater.
114		Lawrence Foltzer, Occidental, Friends of the Esteros	Concerned about water quality of lower Russian River; have water quality standards been reviewed? Do water quality models take into account such things as toilet paper on the lower Russian River?	TASKs 21 and 28			Water quality standards are addressed in Task 21. See Task 28 for model description. It is physically impossible for toilet paper to be contained in treatment plant effluent. The paper pulp-like material observed in the River may be dried attached algae, and attached algae are a major concern being evaluated in the EIR/EIS.
115		Beverly Rudolph, Sebastopol	Look at treating wastewater by putting it through natural systems; consult work of Dr. John Todd in eastern U.S. and Fremont's treatment system; wastewater is a resource.			X	The EIR/EIS will analyze the potential effects of disposal, rather than treatment options. Most of the options to be studied involve the reuse of wastewater.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
116		Ernest Noyes, Tomales	Concerns: Incursion of suburban development into agricultural lands; are people looking at cutting off pollutants at source? Alternatives to copper and lead plumbing? Are these the only sources of heavy metals? Any plans to incorporate double plumbing?	X		X	Suburbanization of ag land will not be studied. This falls within the general plans of each jurisdiction. City has a substantial source control program. Urban irrigation is a project component which will be studied in the EIR/EIS. Evaluating alternatives to copper and lead plumbing is not in scope. Residential dual plumbing is not included in the scope.
117		Mark Green, Sonoma County Conservation Action	Why spend millions to study "pipedreams" like West County, ocean outfall and geysers alternatives?	NA	NA	NA	A reasonable range of alternatives was selected during Scoping, which considered financial and operational feasibility.
118			Concerned that the public debate will be framed as cost/ratepayers' concerns versus the environmental protection question; how project is implemented will affect costs; need "real-world" numbers right now.	TASKs 33, 39 and 40			Refined costs are not available right now. These will be developed in the EIR/EIS. The potential tradeoffs between cost and environmental protection are part of the public debate for a project such as this. The EIR/EIS will provide the information needed to weigh these and other choices.
119			Using treated effluent for geothermal energy generation does not meet The System's reuse objective; reuse should = agricultural consumption or supporting biotic community.	X			By using the wastewater to produce energy the System will achieve the reuse objective. To qualify as a reuse, the treated wastewater need only serve a lawful purpose. Legitimate reuse is not restricted to agricultural or biological applications. Therefore, the Geysers Alternative meets the System's reuse objective and will remain in the scope.
120		Rue Furch, Sebastopol	Do cost/benefit analysis "apples-to-apples", so that everyone can understand it.	TASK 33			In scope.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
121		Dale Wright, Santa Rosa	Use treated wastewater to develop a redwood park on the Santa Rosa Plain.			X	This component was eliminated during screening.
122		Steve Klausner, Sonoma County Taxpayers Association	Process very nearly "fatally flawed." It will cost a lot more because there are no more federal grants. Issues for ratepayers: Project's overall and supporting objectives; endless special studies; excessive cost of EIR/EIS.	TASK 33	TASK 33		Total cost of the System does not depend on grants but does affect who pays. Ratepayer impacts are in scope.
123			Financing and economic feasibility should be part of the overall objectives rather than a supporting objective.	NA	NA	NA	Comment noted.
124			Evaluation of the financial burden on ratepayers should be the next study done, not the last one. Cost associated with meeting overall objectives, like public health, should be separated from those supporting reuse or conservation. We want a clear understanding of what we're buying and why.	TASK 33			In scope. See response to comment 53D in Table 2.
125			Are all the special studies really necessary? Do the economic analysis, then study those projects that are feasible and practical.	TASK 33			The special studies are necessary to respond both to the public's concerns about this project and to established regulations. The screening process narrowed the components and alternatives down to those which are financially and operationally feasible.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
126		Steve Klausner (Cont'd)	Are there benefits to augmenting streams and wetlands during drought? Could this affect biological productivity and how? Impacts on migratory waterfowl of Pacific Coast Flyway? Could wetlands be constructed in the Laguna De Santa Rosa to enhance flood control as well as wildlife values? Is wetlands restoration a legitimate form of reuse? Could freshwater augmentation actually enhance the biological productivity of the Americano and San Antonio estuaries?		TASK 19	X	Although there may be potential benefits to flow augmentation, wetland creation, and wetland restoration, these have been removed as project components at the direction of the BPU. The consultants will consider these components as mitigation measures. Impacts to waterfowl will be considered in the ecological risk assessment.
127		Frank Hilder, Santa Rosa	Who is monitoring what is coming out of all the wastewater treatment plants discharging to the Russian River?	NA	NA	NA	Dischargers and the State Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) carry out the monitoring.
128			Taxpayers are scared about how much this is going to cost.	TASK 33			The EIR/EIS will evaluate the economic impacts of the project.
129		Kathy Tresch	The Summary of the Proposed Scope of Work indicates that the consultants will: "Define groundwater quality using existing data." Concern: Some of the previous studies in West County were flawed; sampling data from test wells in West County skewed because of nitrates in water below T-5 site.	TASK 30			Existing data as well as new groundwater monitoring data will be used in the analysis.

TABLE 1: SCOPING MEETING ORAL COMMENTS

Communication No.	Comment	Speaker	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	
130		Ernest Noyes	Don't consider wastewater as a resource; we don't need more of it. What will be the long-term effect of irrigating crops with this water?	TASK 18		X	Three of the four action alternatives selected for study reflect the view that the System's treated wastewater is a resource to be used. This is consistent with Subregional System objectives. The impact on irrigated crops and soils is in the scope.
131			Ratepayers should pay all the cost of the alternatives. Those outside Sub. Sys. are inheriting "hidden costs": (Effects on ag. land, quality of life, environment.)	X			The economic analysis will include costs to ratepayers. The EIR/EIS will evaluate impacts on land use, agricultural land and the environment.
132		Frank Hilder	Other cities have same problems, not just the City of Santa Rosa. Several communities are dumping in the River above Santa Rosa.	X			Water quality analysis will include an evaluation of other dischargers.

**TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF ISSUES/CONCERNS RECEIVED IN WRITING OR BY PHONE
FROM THE PUBLIC DURING FORMAL SCOPING**

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	
1	A	Abe Newman (T)	Can support only Alt. 1: No Project or Geysers Recharge (then Alt. 5; now Alt. 4)	X			No change in Scope as a result of this comment letter, which supports Alt. 1: No Project, or Alt. 4: Geysers Re-charge.
2	A	Donald Mc Isaac, Marin County Resource Conservation District (L)	Evaluate the impacts of a 12% reduction in total surface runoff from the Button Ranch sub-watershed (Loss of 410 acre-feet/year.)	TASK 38	TASK 19		Impacts resulting from a reduction in the amount of surface water runoff from the Button Ranch sub-watershed will be estimated. Potential impacts would be related to aquatic and riparian habitats. The previous hydrologic analysis cited in the comment provides the basis for estimating impacts to aquatic and riparian habitat. The analysis of impacts will be considered in the scope of work for biological studies.
2	B		Evaluate impacts of a 68% reduction (310 acre-feet) in shallow ground water outflow from the Button Ranch sub-watershed.	TASK 30	TASK 30		In scope.
2	C		Evaluate impacts of wastewater in shallow aquifer immediately downstream of dam.	TASK 21	TASK 21		Analysis of nutrients and salts in scope, metals and organics have been added.
2	D		Evaluate Impacts of infiltration of wastewater into Wilson Grove Aquifer.	TASK 21	TASK 21		Analysis of nutrients and salts in scope, metals and organics have been added.
2	E		Evaluate impacts of hydrogen sulfide and ammonia produced in anoxic layer of reservoir as they travel into shallow/deep groundwater aquifers.	TASK 21	TASK 21		Analysis of nutrients and salts in scope, metals and organics have been added. Base reservoir quality analysis in previous Technical Memorandum (TM) R10.

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	
2	F	Donald McIsaac (cont'd.)	To what extent will hydrostatic pressure of reservoir increase movement of water within and between the three watershed aquifers?	TASK 30			In scope.
2	G		Evaluate the impact of the proposed Button Ranch Reservoir in the event of an earthquake; evaluate the impact of the weight of the dam on activity along the underlying fault.	TASK 35			In scope.
2	H		Evaluate the impact of the loss of riparian, upland forest and perennial grassland habitat in button ranch area, on wildlife communities within the site and in the larger region. How will the reservoir affect nesting Golden Eagles?	TASK 19			In scope.
2	I		Will high TDS (total dissolved solids) in irrigation runoff raise TDS levels in surface and groundwater so that fish reproduction is inhibited and drinking water standards are violated?	TASK 18	TASK 18		Total Dissolved Solids evaluation is included in existing scope. Irrigation return flow/drainage studies are proposed to provide qualitative information on the volumes, pollutant loads and timing of any irrigation drainage flow. Data from the on-going groundwater monitoring programs of the wastewater irrigation projects for Novato, Petaluma, Sonoma, Napa and

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	
		Donald McIsaac (cont'd.)					Santa Rosa will be evaluated as they represent similar soil and hydrogeologic conditions and may be indicative of project impacts and long-term trends. The studies will also develop irrigation and drainage management measures to be built into the project and identify appropriate mitigation measures. The drainage return flow hydrologic studies will be closely coordinated with water quality and aquatic ecology investigations to identify impacts and mitigations.
2	J		Current groundwater discharges to Estero reduce high salinity; will salinity increases in irrigation runoff exacerbate salinity fluctuations or hypersaline condition?		TASKs 20 and 21		Estero effects will be evaluated using existing biological and water quality information about both Esteros in the bar-open and bar-closed conditions and using new information about irrigation effects such as that identified in responses to 2 I.
2	K		To what extent will groundwater mounding (as much as a 3-to-4 foot increase) elevate septic system failures and well contamination?	TASK 30	TASK 30		Ground Water mounding impacts are addressed in the scope.
2	L		To what extent will mounding increase groundwater discharge to the stream during base flow periods?	TASK 18	TASK 18		See response to 2I.
2	M		What are the impacts of increased groundwater discharge to Stemple Creek and the Estero?	TASK 21	TASK 21		Creeks are within scope. Esteros impacts are evaluated.

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	
2	N	Donald McIsaac (cont'd.)	How many more nutrients (in total amount, not rates or percentages) will reach the creek with the use of reclaimed water?	TASK 21	TASK 21	X	Scope revision will not result in quantification of discharge of nutrients. The analysis will be qualitative only.
2	O		Will future water quality tests for metals have detection limits below the thresholds of the current aquatic life criteria and drinking water standards?	TASK 21			Detection limits for water quality data are currently below drinking water standards and aquatic life criteria. However, the detection limits are not always below aquatic life criteria. The lowest achievable reporting limits using EPA-approved methods are being provided.
2	P		Will the total amount of metals leached from soils increase with irrigation? (rate may remain same, while totals increase.)	TASK 18 TASK 30	TASK 18	X	See response to 2I. This qualitative estimate is a part of the groundwater analysis and irrigation feasibility studies, which are part of the current scope of work.
2	Q		What will the impacts be if a high degree of irrigation efficiency is not achieved.	TASK 18	TASK 18		The proposed additions to the irrigation acreage for the Alternative projects will be sized according to the expected water consumption versus the type of crop identified for that acreage. Consumptive rates will differ for the different types of crop. Irrigation Management Plans are included in scope and include an analysis of farm water required/crop consumptive use. The EIR/EIS will also provide mitigation for impacts related to irrigation efficiency.
2	R		How will the "services of an independent professional irrigation management service" be provided at each irrigation site? Who will pay?	TASK 18			The EIR/EIS will evaluate mitigation should there be any impacts from irrigation. A private irrigation management service may be a mitigation. Cost would be evaluated.

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	
2	S	Donald McIsaac, (Cont'd.)	How will lands with bedrock less than 3 feet below the soil surface be excluded from irrigation? Who will delineate and enforce?	TASK 18			An irrigation soil suitability study was completed for the West County area in 1990, following standard U.S. Bureau of Reclamation procedures. This study is being verified and updated. A similar study is currently being completed for the South County area. The studies identify areas of existing poor drainage, soil conditions where a high water table may develop following irrigation, and other soil and topographic limitations (i.e., slopes >15%, infertility and high erosion hazard). Only suitable lands are included in the irrigation project design. Irrigation management plans are in the scope and will be developed to mitigate identified impacts.
2	T		Will lands with summer groundwater levels within 3 feet of soil surface (factoring in irrigation mounding) be delineated and excluded from irrigation? Who will delineate and enforce?	TASK 18			See 2S.
2	U		What are the impacts of controlling grazing and restoring a riparian corridor, independent of wastewater use?	TASKs 18 and 19			Managed grazing patterns and riparian restoration may be considered as project mitigation depending upon the outcome of impact analysis. As mitigation elements, the impacts of these processes would be analyzed in the EIR/EIS. See also the response to item 2S.

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	
2	V	Donald McIsaac, (Cont'd.)	Can impacts demonstrated to occur in the Americano watershed automatically be extended to the Stemple/Estero de San Antonio watershed?	TASKs 20 and 21	TASKs 20 and 21		Studies are being undertaken as needed to address technical issues. Each watershed is being addressed independently.
2	W		What would be the impacts of (the) estimated 1.05-foot rise in the Estero de San Antonio during the summer due to reservoir leakage and irrigation effects?		TASKs 20 and 21		Estero effects will be evaluated per response 2 J.
2	X		Impacts of drain tile installation?	TASK 18			See response for item 2I. This estimate is part of the shallow groundwater analysis and irrigation feasibility studies which is part of the current scope of work.
2	Y		What would be the impacts of changes in current agricultural practices and products due to the availability of reclaimed water?		TASK 18		Changes in crops and associated changes in agricultural land management and cropping practices will be addressed. This will include typical agricultural fertilizer and pesticide impacts.
2	Z		What would be the impact on freshwater shrimp and the ecology of the Estero de San Antonio from changes in water quality due to the proposed reservoir and irrigation?	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21,	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21,		Potential base flows from irrigation and from reservoir sources will be established. Water quality impacts in the Estero will be analyzed per written response 2 J. Freshwater Shrimp and other floral and faunal components distribution in the Estero will be evaluated. Toxicity effects of water quality changes on species will be reviewed.

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	
3	A	Joseph Pence, Farmer, (L)	The scope is overwhelming and voluminous. The (EIR/EIS) will benefit the consultant's bottom line more than us. I would prefer a small pilot project analyzed with the assistance of U.C. Davis.	NA	NA	NA	An EIR/EIS is required by both California and Federal law. The magnitude of the cost is associated with the extended scoping, identification of alternatives, project design for alternatives and subalternatives, and comprehensive studies required by agencies and requested by members of the public.
4	A	Martin Coopender, (L)	Use marshes and wetlands to treat wastewater.			X	Created wetlands have been eliminated from the scope.
4	B		We are paying more than any other city for sewer and water.		TASK 33		In scope
5	A	Gary DeWeese, U. of California (L)	No comment at this time; I would like to receive a copy of Draft EIR/EIS	NA	NA	NA	The commentor has been added to the mailing list.
6	A,B	Brian Hunter, California Dept. of Fish and Game (L)	I am concerned about the impacts of various project alternatives on biotic resources: Special-status species, wetlands, riparian habitat, sensitive plant communities, terrestrial and aquatic wildlife.	TASK 19 TASKs 18, 20			In scope.

NA = Not Applicable. Comment not pertinent to the EIR/EIS Scope of Work, but may have value to the Long-Term Project in other ways.

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	
6	C	Brian Hunter, (L) Cont'd.	Survey results and specific mitigation measures must be included in the environmental document. Future surveys and mitigations to be identified in the future are unacceptable.	TASKs 18, 19 and 20	TASKs 18 and 20		Comment refers primarily to natural resource impacts on potential irrigation sites. The current scope calls for non-specific surveys to review large scale impacts and more site-specific surveys to occur when a property is brought into the system. Mitigation is being provided for known or anticipated impacts. Where future studies are referenced, they would be subject to additional CEQA review.
6	D		It is department policy that a project should cause no net loss of either wetland acreage or habitat value. Identify wetland mitigation sites specifically. Riparian vegetation removed should be replaced on A 3:1 in-kind basis using native species.	TASKs 18 and 19			In scope.
6	E		The Department recommends a minimum 100-foot buffer to protect streams and habitats, and provide a travel corridor for wildlife. No roads or structures within the buffer.	TASK 19			In scope.
6	F		Any work within creeks, including road crossings and culverts, will require a stream bed alteration agreement with CDFG.	NA	NA	NA	The requirement for a streambed alteration agreement has been included in the permitting report for the project.
6	G		Impacts to biotic resources must be addressed not only for construction of projects, but also for their operation. Cumulative impacts must be addressed.	TASK 39		X	Impacts to biotic resources from reservoir fluctuation are not addressed. Impact assessment assumes that all biological resources at each reservoir site would be eliminated. Cumulative impacts will be addressed. See response to 2 I.

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	
6	H,I, J,K	Brian Hunter, (L), Cont'd.	Include evaluation of the existing reclaimed water disposal systems in the Laguna de Santa Rosa. This evaluation is essential so that operational programs and limitations of the existing system can be avoided in the new system.	TASK 39		X	These comments request a study of the effects of the current system which is not required under CEQA or NEPA.
7	A	Philip Badal, Caltrans District 4 (L)	Identify all impacts to State's Highway Right-Of-Way from placement of pipelines including cultural resources, biological and hazardous waste surveys.	TASKs 19 and 36			The current scope includes a sensitivity study of pipeline routes. Once a final project is selected, site-specific cultural studies will be conducted. Hazardous waste and biological surveys are in scope.
7	B		Perform a visual resource assessment, if a visual resource is affected. Perform a traffic study, if an alternative requires road closure or traffic delay.		TASKs 37 and 39		A visual assessment is included in the revised scope of work. Potential traffic impacts addressed in Task 39.
7	C		Working within the Caltrans right-of-way will require a permit	NA	NA	NA	This permit is listed in the permitting report for the project.
8	A	Benjamin Kor, Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region (L)	Discharge to the Russian River greater than 1% would require exception to the Basin Plan prohibitions. The Basin Plan outlines the information needed to obtain an exception. This information should be used as a guideline in evaluating Alternatives.	TASKs 14, 21, 28, 37	TASKs 20, and 32		Now addressed in final 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	
8	B-E	Benjamin Kor, (L) (Cont'd)	Evaluate impacts of reservoirs, constructed wetlands, aquifer storage, rapid infiltration and irrigation on the beneficial uses of groundwater.	TASKs 22 and 30	TASKs 22 and 30	X	See responses to comments for letter 2. Rapid infiltration and created wetlands were thoroughly considered and are no longer components of the Long-Term Project. Rapid infiltration was eliminated because adequate land was not available and it would have provided minimal water quality benefits.
8	D,E		Assess impacts of reservoirs, constructed wetlands, aquifer storage, rapid infiltration and irrigation on the beneficial uses of surface water.	TASK 21 & 38		X	In scope. See response to 8 B-E for components dropped.
8	F,G		Some projects may involve summertime stream flow augmentation. This would be inconsistent with current Basin Plan waste discharge prohibitions. Include evaluation of how flow augmentation could be implemented and comply with the Basin Plan.			X	Flow augmentation has been eliminated as a project component.
9	A	K.M. Lo, Highway 37, (T)	Favors bringing the project to his area.	NA	NA	NA	No change in Scope as a result of this comment.
10	A	R.E. Bartley (L)	Go back to square one; appoint new planners and start over; we're getting nowhere. Listen to Sonoma County Taxpayers' Association on this matter.			X	See response to comment 32 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	
11	A	Shrimp Club, San Anselmo (L)	What endangered species live on Button Ranch Dam site?	TASK 19			In scope.
11	B		How clean would the water be?	TASK 21	TASK 21		In scope.
11	C		What chemicals will be in the water?	TASK 21	TASK 21		In scope.
11	D		Will the chemicals harm the California Fresh Water Shrimp? If so, how?	TASK 19 TASK 34	TASK 19		The scope has been revised to validate previous studies on Freshwater Shrimp at Stemple Creek. A toxicity analysis for Freshwater Shrimp is being conducted. Toxicity and bioaccumulation evaluations are in scope and will provide information relevant to evaluating this issue.
11	E		Will there be copper in the water?	TASK 21			In scope.
11	F		If there is copper in the wastewater will it harm the California Fresh Water Shrimp?	TASK 34			See response to comment 11D. Toxicity and bioaccumulation evaluations are in scope and will provide important information to evaluate this issue.
11	G		Will wastewater kill vegetation on the banks of the creek?		TASK 19		Vegetation will be mapped for entire affected area; toxicity analysis will be conducted.
11	H		Will wastewater seep through the ground and go into Ranchers' wells?	TASK 30			In scope.
11	I		Would wastewater harm the Stemple Creek watershed?	TASK 21			In scope.
11	J		Will wastewater make the Detritus poisonous?	TASK 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	
12	A	Kenneth S. Roe, Redding (L)	Opposed to wastewater reservoir in West County and treated wastewater in Esteros and the Marine Sanctuary. Concerned about impacts to Dillon Beach and Tomales Bay.		TASKs 20, 21, and 39		Esteros studies will be conducted per written response to comment 2 J. The scope of work includes an evaluation of the recreational opportunities that could be impacted by the project, based upon the results of water quality analyses to be provided under other tasks.
13	A	Roz Scholze, Bloomfield (L)	How can you justify Button Ranch as a possible site? Does not believe a reasonable range of alternatives has been chosen.	TASK 18		X	In scope. See Table 1, response to Comment 7.
13	B		Irrigation in West County does not work.	TASK 18			See 2 I and 2S.
14	A	Frank & Bea Glazier, Two Rock (L)	Main concerns are with Alternative 3 (West Co. Reclamation).	X			The EIR/EIS will analyze, at an equal level of detail, the potential impacts of the West County Alternative along with the other alternatives and components.
14	B		Two Rock Reservoir site and irrigation along Stemple and Americano Creeks pose great potential for a vast amount of environmental destruction.	TASKs 18, 19, 20, 21, 38	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	
14	C	Frank & Bea Glazier, Cont'd.	Property owners' wells near S20 site are old, hand-dug, only 12 to 15 feet deep and recovery is slow. S20 site contains all the water that replenishes these well. Alternative water source must be made available to well owners prior to any construction or excavation. Questions: 1) How do you plan to furnish the well owners with potable water? 2) Will this water be an expense to the well owners? 3) When do you plan to bring this water? 4) Will this be prior to any reservoir construction? 5) Where will this water come from?		TASK 30		A well monitoring program is in scope. Mitigation of impacts resulting from the construction and operation of reservoirs would be addressed in the EIR/EIS.
14	D		How will you address well owners having dry wells during several years of construction?	TASK 30	TASK 30		See response to comment 14 C.
14	E		Note: Every rancher has a reservoir to water cows and wash down facility.	TASK 30			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	
14	F	Frank & Bea Glazier, (Cont'd.)	Property owners will not accept wastewater for irrigation if that requires condemnation. Will you request letters of intent from land owners? Do you plan to do field work to identify properties too steep to be irrigated? How do you plan to keep pollutants in the runoff out of the creeks?	NA TASK 18	NA TASK 18	NA	The availability of properties will be considered at the time of project selection, after the EIR/EIS has been completed. Field surveys will be conducted to evaluate irrigability of properties and impacts on the water quality of nearby streams.
14	G		How can you guarantee that Two Rock wells will not be subject to chronic toxicity as a result of this project?	TASK 30			In scope. Monitoring wells are included in scope. Potential impacts to wells will be addressed in the EIR/EIS.
15	A, B	David Bannister, Sierra Club, Sonoma Group (L)	Sierra Club, Sonoma Group supports creation of wetlands, if following conditions are met: 1. Comply with all state and federal laws. 2. Create habitat without undue interruption to existing habitat values. 3. Create wetlands which closely approximate types of wetlands occurring historically in that area. 4. Multidisciplinary expertise will be needed in all project phases. 5. To determine project success, set specific, measurable goals in advance of project design	TASKs 18, 39, 40	TASK 18		The scope includes a review of existing regulations and compliance with them. Evaluation criteria have been developed to determine an impact threshold. The project team is made up of a group of professionals with diverse expertise. Wetland creation as a component has been dropped from further consideration, with the exception of wetland creation for mitigation.

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	
15	C		Before proceeding to early phases of (a created wetlands project) all scientific research on bioaccumulation should be studied, including studies on Kelly Pond.	TASK 34		X	Bioaccumulation will be evaluated. Wetlands creation has been eliminated as a project component.
15	D		Sites selected for wetlands creation do not meet many of the above conditions.	TASK 18	TASK 18		Wetlands creation has been dropped from the project. However, created wetlands could be constructed for project mitigation. The specific design of created wetlands would be determined if wetlands creation is chosen as mitigation. See response to comment 2S.
16	A	Hamilton Hess, Friends of Cobb Mountain (L)	Likely seismic effects of injection of large volumes of wastewater into the geysers geothermal field is a concern. This issue is not alluded to in the Scope of Work. Concerned about earthquakes with a magnitude of 3.0 or greater. These are disturbing to people and hazardous to structures. The prevailing opinion is that fluid injection and steam extraction cause earthquakes.	TASK 35	TASK 35		In scope.
17	A	William & Nancy Adams, Penngrove (L)	(Property affected by storage at Vast Oak site, not willing participants.) Concerned about loss of property; flat acreage will be flooded contaminating septic system and well. Access to our home will be cut off, because the driveway will be under water; a 300-year old oak on our property will die.	NA	NA	NA	The Vast Oak site is no longer part of this Long-Term Project and, therefore, is not being considered in this EIR/EIS. It is, however, being considered as part of a separate project subject to a separate environmental review.

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	
17	B	William & Nancy Adams, (Cont'd.)	Concerned about loss of property value. No one wants a home near a wastewater lake which will be empty half the year and be an eyesore.	NA	NA	NA	See response to 17 A.
17	C		Reservoir site visible from populated area on West Sonoma Mountain. Have all the property owners in the area been notified (about the reservoir)?	NA	NA	NA	Only property owners of potential irrigation and reservoir sites have been contacted about potential facilities on their property. See response to 17 A.
17	D		Crane Regional Park is adjacent to the Vast Oak site. The reservoir will be an attractive nuisance, causing people to trespass on our property.	NA	NA	NA	See response to 17 A.
17	E		Rogers Creek fault lies near this area; a recent study found that there's a high risk of a strong earthquake.	NA	NA	NA	See response to 17 A.
17	F		There is a wide variety of wildlife on our property which would be lost.	NA	NA	NA	See response to 17 A.
17	G		Concerned about the odor that will be emitted since the reservoir will be empty some of the time. What about rotting vegetation?	NA	NA	NA	See response to 17 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	
17	H	William & Nancy Adams, (Cont'd.)	If farmers in this area want this water for irrigation, find a site on their property. Don't take our property to benefit them. A long-term solution such as Tolay is better than an expensive, stop-gap measure like Vast Oak.	NA	NA	NA	See response to 17A.
18	A	Ned Orrett, Pacific Technology Associates, Petaluma (L)	Take steps to more fully integrate the results of the water conservation studies with the analysis of the disposal alternatives, for two reasons: 1) A mechanism for determining the least-cost combination of conservation and treatment/disposal is not evident. 2) It appears that water conservation improvements will be financed on a different basis (cash from rate payers and participants) than those for treatment and disposal (long-term loans spread among rate payers). This financing inequity tilts the playing field against conservation.		TASK 29		The overall scope for the water conservation component includes an inventory of current conservation programs of Subregional System member entities and the estimated reduction in wastewater flow achieved at their full implementation (e.g., toilet, showerhead, faucet aerator replacement), what could be done in addition to these existing programs by application of proven technology (e.g., programs consistent with Best Management Practices - published by California Urban Water Conservation Council) which produce quantifiable and sustainable reduction in wastewater flow, and the potential flow reduction possible with a more aggressive conservation option (e.g., waterless urinals, lower water using appliances, etc.). Cost-effectiveness evaluations will be conducted for each conservation measure considering the reduction in water use and wastewater flow.

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	
18	B	Ned Orrett, (Cont'd.)	<p>The following studies are suggested:</p> <p>1) Evaluate current conservation programs.</p> <p>2) Summarize all wastewater-saving technologies that might apply.</p> <p>3) Evaluate potential water conservation program policy (service delivery and financing options).</p> <p>4) Establish relationship between cost and wastewater flow reduction.</p> <p>5) Establish relationship between cost and incremental wastewater flow additions (differs by disposal alternative)</p> <p>6) Integrate "saved water supply curve" with companion cost curve for each disposal alternative. Identify cost-effective conservation measures. The least cost combination of conservation and disposal measures is the economically (not necessarily environmentally) optimal project.</p>	<p>TASK 29</p> <p>TASK 29</p> <p>TASK 29</p> <p>TASK 29</p>		<p></p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p>	<p>In scope.</p> <p>In scope.</p> <p>In scope.</p> <p>In scope.</p> <p>Study of cost relationships between water conservation and other Long-Term Project components is not required in the EIR/EIS, but may be considered during the project selection process.</p>
19	A	Elizabeth Anthony, Sierra Club (L)	Concerns about wastewater disposal as it may affect Laguna de Santa Rosa wetlands, community separator wetlands and wetlands in several watersheds.	TASK 18	TASK 18	X	Evaluation of existing wetland is in scope. Community Separator Alternative has been dropped from consideration in the EIR/EIS because of insufficient suitable land for new 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	
19	B	Elizabeth Anthony, (Cont'd.)	Concerns about water quality including potential impacts from dioxin, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and low-level radioactivity.	TASK 32			In scope
19	C		Concerns about estrogen-mimicking compounds: infertility, genital deformities, low sperm count, etc.	TASK 32			A literature review is being conducted on estrogenic impacts, and an analysis of likely substances in the wastewater effluent is being conducted.
20	A	Betty Guggolz, Calif. Native Plant Society, Cloverdale (L)	Alt. 2 (South County): Potential impacts to tidal marshes and resident endangered species. Alt. 3 (Community Separator): Potential to convert seasonal wetlands to agricultural uses; impacts on vernal pools/species. Alt. 4 (West County): Impacts on West County watersheds and Esteros; loss of significant plant communities and wetlands on Button Ranch; conversion of rangeland to irrigated crop lands; potential to destroy endangered plant species. Alt. 5 (Geysers Recharge): Impacts to (plant) species in serpentine soils at the Geysers. Make sure consultants have adequate field season time to conduct studies.	TASK 19	TASKs 18 and 19 TASKs 20 and 21	X	The scope has been revised to evaluate impacts to watersheds of Bay flats region. The need to evaluate salinity impacts will depend on estimated irrigation impacts. Alternative 3 was dropped from consideration as a study alternative due to insufficient suitable land for wetlands. In scope. The scope of work provides studies at the appropriate seasons in accordance with established protocols.

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	
21	A	Martin Strain, (L) Tomaes (see also No. 35)	No specific comment appears with the submission of an Aug., 1994 <u>Scientific American</u> article on Red Tide and toxic phytoplankton. The article states that long-term studies at the local or regional level indicate an increase in Red Tides as coastal pollution worsens, presumably because more nutrients are provided to the algae.		TASKs 20 & 21		An evaluation of the quantity of wastewater and effects in the Estero will be conducted first per response 2 J. The results of this study will provide the basis for determining if any significant potential exists for effects in Tomaes Bay.

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	
22	A	Duane DeWitt, Santa Rosa (L)	Submitted "From Pollution to Park" an article appearing in the Winter, 1994 issue of <u>California Coast and Ocean</u> , Vol. 10, No. 1. This article describes a low-tech approach to wastewater management being implemented in Tijuana, Mexico.			X	The article refers to a small scale demonstration wastewater treatment project in developmental stage for Tijuana, Mexico. The treatment processes described in the article are commonly used components in larger treatment facilities operating successfully throughout the developed world. However, the article indicates that the plant in Tijuana is in the developmental and evolving stage. The existing Laguna plant in Santa Rosa uses treatment processes of proven technology and a high level of reliability to meet the stringent requirements of the regulatory agencies which oversee California wastewater facilities. The article indicates that the effluent is used for irrigation. This is already practiced by the Santa Rosa plant, and on a much larger scale. The thrust of this article is about the benefits of low cost treatment applied to otherwise untreated wastewater. This is not the situation in Santa Rosa and does not apply to the Long-Term Wastewater 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	
23	A	Krista Rector (L)	Study Alternatives that can be implemented to reduce the inflow of water to be treated. Include financial analysis and a time line for for implementation. Specify volumes that can be saved with each alternative and the effect on wastewater treatment system longevity.	TASK 29	TASK 29	X	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, what could be done in addition to these existing programs by employing proven technology, and what can be done by considering new technology. Cost-effectiveness evaluations will be conducted for each measure of conservation, as well as the amount of wastewater saved. However, wastewater reductions associated with on-site greywater systems will not be included in this study, primarily due to concerns about public health and sustainability of these systems with changes in ownership.
23	B		Analyze the cumulative impact of introducing effluent into the geysers from Sonoma and Lake Co. cities. What can geothermal resource endure? No. of wells needed? Is this restoring a resource depleted by overdevelopment? Analyze ability of resource to recover from "watering out" and long-term plan of "trickle" injection over a larger area.	TASK 35	TASK 35	X	A review of the Lacosan Study will be conducted to assess the applicability of its analyses and conclusions for the Santa Rosa Project. Wastewater injection scenarios and their potential effects on the resource have been added to the Scope. Information on the geothermal resource will be provided by UNOCAL, PG&E and other geyser operators and is not included in the scope of work.

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	
23	C	Krista Rector (L), (Cont'd)	Address seismic activity and lack of safety for area residents. Analyze increase in seismic activity for last 30 years, including all depths within 50 mile radius. Quantify effect of seismicity in relation to triggering local faults. Quantify volume of water injected and potential seismication. Develop safety element/mitigation plan. Analyze cost to create non-profit entity to hold mitigation funds to reimburse area residents suffering damage from increased seismicity.		TASK 35		Induced seismicity study is in scope. After assessing potential impacts of the Wastewater Project, appropriate mitigation, if required, will be described in the Draft EIR/EIS.
23	D		Analyze financial/institutional arrangements to ensure fiscal responsibility for the project's effects.			X	EIR/EIS is required to assess the impacts of the project and provide mitigation. However, it is not within the scope of the EIR/EIS to ensure fiscal responsibility for the project's effects. The EIR/EIS will not analyze the financial/institutional arrangements for the Geysers project. It is the City of Santa Rosa's responsibility to ensure that required mitigation for the selected project is carried out.
23	E		Analyze fiscal viability of project if participation by PG&E is affected by actions of the Public Utilities Commission; analyze fiscal viability related to the actions of other participants (e.g., UNOCAL) also.		TASK 33		The fiscal viability of all alternatives will be evaluated. However, contractual issues would be addressed at the 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	
23	F	Krista Rector (L), Cont'd.	Analyze the cumulative impact of pipe breakage spills into waterways and effects on drinking water or fisheries.		TASKs 18, 19 and 20	X	Cumulative impacts to a pipeline breakage or spill will not be evaluated, however, potential impacts due to catastrophic pipeline breakage and spills will be evaluated.
23	G		Analyze potential for pipe breakage spills in areas with serpentine or asbestos and cinnabar or mercury soils or mining tailings.		TASK 35		The geyser pipeline alignments and distribution of serpentine soil and mercury tailings will be reviewed. Avoidance of these areas may be possible.
23	H		Analyze potential for injections, well blowouts, costs time to repair, and potential inability to control.	TASK 31	TASK 31	X	The EIR/EIS will evaluate the geysers alternative's environmental impacts, but will not address the cost and timing of repairs.
23	I		Identify Riparian withdrawal of water from area streams and the potential impact if pipeline breaks. Provide cost/implementation plan for removal of pipeline if project fails. Backup plan for use of "unwanted" effluent.		TASKs 18, 19 and 20	X	See 23F. Existing riparian rights are used either for irrigation or potable water supply. Since the reclaimed water is suitable for irrigation, a break should not impact irrigator's riparian water use. The City is preparing a contingency plan that will be designed in case of system failure. There would be no reason to remove the pipeline; typically at the end of the project, the pipeline would be drained and left in the ground.
23	J		Identify regulatory agency with ultimate oversight. Delineate areas of responsibility.	TASK 10		NA	There is no single agency with sole authority. The permitting report in the EIR/EIS will identify the various agencies.

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	
23	K	Krista Rector (L), Cont'd.	Provide substantiated biological study that clearly defines impacts, including percentage of species destroyed compared to what remains in area; show travel patterns & habitat.	TASK 19	TASK 19		Impacts on unique biota for each project component/alternative will be evaluated. Local and regional importance of species and travel corridors will be ascertained from available data and local expertise. The EIR/EIS will not evaluate the effects of the current Geysers Project.
23	L		Comprehensive study of current effects on fish from mine tailings asbestos runoff, current production spills and atmospheric outfall caused by current electricity production. Compare with effects from increased production and spills.		TASKs 20 and 21	X	Project impacts would result from a one-time, catastrophic pipeline failure. Existing information is adequate to evaluate the potential impact on fish in the Geysers area. All streams on Geysers Pipeline corridor will be surveyed for sensitivity to construction impacts. Also see response to 23 K.
23	M		Analyze effect of removing water from its watershed, normal ocean inflow and weather production. Calculate effect of increasing toxic condensate and subsequent effect on environment and cost of energy production.		TASK 39	X	It is true that delivery of water to the Geysers steamfields will remove it from the watershed, so instead of being returned to the ocean and then recycled as rain back into the watershed, some or most of it would be temporarily recycled through the steamfield while the rest is evaporated to the atmosphere. The relatively small volume of this wastewater flow in relation to the watershed annual precipitation would have inconsequential impact on the weather or the normal ocean inflow. There is no reason to expect that this project would increase toxic condensate, because it would not increase Geyser steam production.

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	
23	N	Krista Rector (L), Cont'd.	Analyze effect on increased injection of condensate on the porosity of the resource soils and fractures. Analyze the introduction of silica compounds into a heated system and its influence on porosity.			X	The effect of increased injection of condensate on the porosity of soils and fractures, will not be covered in the EIR/EIS, because there would be no increase in condensate.
23	O		Analyze the increase of toxic substances introduced by effluent into mechanical parts of the steam production facility. What is the resultant cost to maintain/repair?			X	The effect of wastewater on the mechanical parts the steam production facilities will not be evaluated. This is an operations issue and not an environmental issue.
23	P		Identify pesticide residues and chemical compounds in the effluent and their effects on scaling.	TASK 21		X	Effluent quality is being evaluated See response to 23 O.
23	Q		Assess the amount and cost of electricity and storage facilities to pump water to the geysers, hold in tanks and inject into wells.		TASK 33		The cost estimate is included in the economic analysis.
23	R		Compare costs of geysers project with potential for/costs of reducing electrical use through education. Show a timeline for implementation. Show where trend lines of project cost versus a reduction in use would meet and the project would no longer be financially viable.		TASKs 33 and 39	X	Public education for energy conservation is not in the current scope of work. The Geysers alternative would be a high energy user. The alternative will be compared to the other projects on a present worth basis so they can be evaluated fairly. The suggested reduction in electrical energy demand with energy conservation is not considered likely, and, would have no effect on the financial viability of the Geysers alternative.

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	
23	S	Krista Rector, (L) Cont'd.	Show volume of toxics and heavy metals from cumulative increase of Lake Co. wastewater, Lake Co. superfund mercury mine wastewater and Santa Rosa wastewater. Show effects on fisheries, mammals, birds, reptiles and area's water drinkers.		TASKs 19, 20, 32, 35, 38 and 39	X	Cumulative impacts will be analyzed for Geyser discharge. This would not involve any analysis of surface water hydrology unless there are specific streamflow data or precipitation data required for this analysis that cannot be obtained from published references. Toxicity effects on fish and wildlife are evaluated for pipeline breakage. The Geysers aquifer is not hydrologically connected to the drinking water aquifer, due to the great depth at which injection occurs.
23	T		Prepare cost analysis for increasing production of current facilities. Assess feasibility of selling electricity to out-of-area customers to meet schedule of production. Cost analysis of removal of plants and wells, should project fail. Show increased cost of removal of proposed pipeline and facilities, should proposed project occur. Include cost for Lake Co. injection plan.		TASK 33	X	Future negotiations with the Geyser operators could include clauses that address the long-term operation of the system. This is not within the scope of this EIR/EIS. The feasibility of selling electricity to out-of-area purchasers is not in question. There is adequate demand for electricity and systems for transmission.
23	U		Financial analysis of royalties and tax revenue from increased production at the geysers. Financial cost incurred from lost production and from continuing payments on bonds.			X	These concerns will be addressed 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	
23	V	Krista Rector (L) Cont'd.	Analysis of volume and content of steam created from injected wastewater and effect of heating on those elements. What is cumulative load on area residents from atmospheric release?		TASK 39	X	The air quality scope will assess whether there would be any violations in air quality standards. Detailed analysis of volume and content of steam is not in scope.
23	W		What will increase in radon and sulfur dioxide in atmosphere be with increase in production? Cumulative load and health effect from long-term exposure? Where is plume likely to drift?			X	The existing air quality is part of the existing conditions at the Geysers, and will not be evaluated. For effects of the project on air quality, see response to 23 V.
23	X		What are catalogued and uncatalogued areas in the geysers showing archeological and historical sites for Native American use? What is current native use of these sites?	TASK 36	TASK 36	X	The potential project impacts for the Geysers Alternative will be reviewed for existing archeological and historical sites. Traditional cultural properties studies ("current native Indian use") are not part of scope. Specific site information is confidential and may only be provided to relevant state and federal agencies.
23	Y		Perform a comprehensive survey showing all current and potential injection well sites.		TASK s 31 and 35		UNOCAL has furnished the project team with a map showing current and proposed injection well sites at the Geysers. If this project were implemented, development of new injection wells and operation of wells at the Geysers is expected to be the responsibility of the Geysers Operators, not Santa Rosa. As a part of the evaluation of this alternative, the EIR will include a map of the injection wells and interconnecting piping planned for use with 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	
23	Z	Krista Rector (L), Cont'd.	Analyze feasibility and cost for a mitigation plan to allow shipped wastewater to be measured and compared to documentation of injected wastewater to identify wastewater loss through pipe leakage or spills by steam well producers.		TASK 31	X	An operation and maintenance plan will be evaluated as part of the project description. Use of the water once it reaches the steam fields would be under the control of the Geysers Operators, and it is anticipated that a similar monitoring and maintenance program would be employed by them.
23	AA		Cost for safety plan including emergency response to spills or damage from seismicity or slope failures/landslides? Plan should include periodic inspection of approaches into areas without viable roadways. There should be semi-annual drills.			X	A safety mitigation plan could be incorporated into the agreement with the Geyser operators at the time of project implementation. Fiscal analysis of the safety plan is not part of the EIR/EIS.
23	AB		Catalog all area waterways, both surface and groundwater, including water currently used or potentially developable for domestic use or cattle.		TASK 21	X	Surface waters that are potentially affected will be identified. The request for a "complete catalogue of all area surface and groundwater" is beyond the scope necessary for the EIR/EIS. The purpose of this "complete catalogue" is not stated.

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	
23	AC	Krista Rector (L), Cont'd.	Survey area property owners to identify all Riparian and groundwater uses. Location of extraction points should be correlated to potential runoff from spills and potential/current injection well sites.	TASK 32		X	This comment requests a "mail/phone survey of area property owners to identify all riparian and groundwater uses" in order to evaluate potential impacts from spills and injection to extraction points. This is beyond the scope necessary for the EIR/EIS. Simple exposure models are being developed to assess the potential health impacts for all the alternatives.
23	AD		Cost analysis for using pipe and tanks that can withstand substantial landslides or seismicity.		TASK 31		The scope for development of delivery pipeline to the Geysers includes consideration of the type of pipe and associated facilities necessary to withstand the landslides and seismic activity to which the pipeline may likely be exposed.
23	AE		Identify fault lines and landslide areas.		TASK 35		In scope.
23	AF		Identify historical and onsite inspection siting of mercury mines and tailings. Show data on contour map.		TASK 39		Hazardous materials/wastes site within 500 feet of project components will be identified in the Public Health and Hazards Setting Section.
23	AG		Identify asbestos outcroppings and correlate to contour maps showing potential spill runoffs and disturbance potentially entering area waterways		TASK 31		Geological and soil formations will be evaluated in the pipeline breakage assessment.
23	AH		Cost of increased traffic on area roads show amount of new roads to be created and costs of maintenance. Identify who is to pay.		TASK 39		New roads would be used for maintenance. These would be addressed in the impacts and mitigations.

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	
23	AI	Krista Rector, (L) Cont'd.	Identify all currently impacted waterways. Describe areas impacted and levels of contamination. Identify amount of contamination potentially introduced from introduction of wastewater and potential production increase. Identify potential cumulative effects on animals, fish and people over potential life of project.		TASKs 19, 20 and 38	X	The scope does not include an evaluation of the existing effects of the Geysers on waterways. The scope will analyze the potential effects of the project on potentially affected waterways. See response to 23 S.
24	A	David Asimov Santa Rosa (L)	Supports South County/Buffer Plan. Please don't make us pay more to help a few greedy developers.	X		X	Analysis of South County Alternative in scope; Community Separator not retained because suitable land was not available.
25	A	John Prunuske Western Sonoma Co. Rural Alliance (L)	Board of Directors recommends a combination of Alt. 2 So. County Reclamation and Alt. 3, Community Separator, and wetlands option, assuming it includes restoration of the Laguna de Santa Rosa.			X	See response to 24 A.
25	B		These items got short shrift in the Scoping document: 1) Conservation on other methods to reduce the wastewater stream.	TASK 29	TASK 29	X	See response to comment 18 A. Greywater systems and composting toilets 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.

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	
25	C	John Prunuske (L) Cont'd.	2) A method of analysis to consider serious obstacles to the viability of each option early in EIR/EIS process and to discard obviously flawed options. (e.g., suppose Geysers operators can't guarantee that they will be able to accept the water for more than 10 years?)			NA	The purpose of the EIR/EIS is to analyze all the selected alternatives fully, fairly and at an equal level of detail. On the basis of this information, the BPU will decide whether any alternative/component may not be viable and will eventually select an option for implementation.
25	D		3) Consideration of advantages or disadvantages of shipping the effluent out of sight and out of mind as opposed to the idea of keeping it in your own backyard or at least in the vicinity.			X	Alternatives involving shipping treated wastewater out of the area (e.g., shipping it to the Central Valley or disposing of it in the ocean) were considered and not retained during the alternatives evaluation and selection phase of this project. See Table 1, response to comment 93 for reasons why the Central Valley alternative was not retained. Ocean outfall was dropped because it did not meet System objectives.
25	E		Reduction in waste stream considers only a reduction in water use. Should consider other methods, such as greywater use.	TASK 29	TASK 29		See response to 25 B.
26	A	Charles Black, Santa Rosa (L)	Include an estimate of the cost of implementing each alternative.	TASK 33	TASK 33		In Scope
26	B		You are forgetting that many senior citizens are on fixed incomes. For them, increased water and sewer fees would pose a real hardship.	TASK 33	TASK 33		The BPU and City Council are concerned about hardships caused by increasing rates. The EIR/EIS will provide cost information for them to consider before choosing an alternative.

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