

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Project Background

The U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the North Bay Water Reuse Authority (NBWRA) prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS) for the North San Pablo Bay Restoration and Reuse Project. The document is a joint EIR/EIS and satisfies the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The NBWRA, established under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in August 2005, is comprised of four wastewater utilities and one water agency: Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District (LGVSD), Novato Sanitary District (Novato SD), Sonoma Valley County Sanitation District (SVCSD), Napa Sanitation District (Napa SD), and Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA). Additional agencies supporting the NBWRA through contribution of funds and staff time include North Marin Water District (NMWD) and County of Napa.

Under the MOU, the NBWRA is exploring “the feasibility of coordinating interagency efforts to expand the beneficial use of recycled water in the North San Pablo Bay Region thereby promoting the conservation of limited surface water and groundwater resources.” The proposed action would alter the disposition of treated wastewater in the North Bay Region by providing increased recycled water supply for urban, agricultural and environmental uses.

As implementation of the project would likely require external funding assistance, the investigation and development of the project is being carried out in conformance with the requirements of the U.S. Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Reclamation Public Law 102-575, Title XVI, which provides a mechanism for federal participation and cost-sharing in approved water reuse projects. The proposed Federal Action is the provision of federal funds by Reclamation under the Title XVI Program to NBWRA Member and Cooperating Agencies for the implementation of water recycling projects examined in this EIR/EIS. The Bureau of Reclamation is the NEPA Lead Agency for this proposed action.

The North San Pablo Bay Restoration and Reuse Project has been developed in conformance with the requirements of the Reclamation’s Public Law 102-575, Title XVI, including preparation of a Feasibility Study. The Project was authorized in Public Law 111-11. For the purposes of this EIR/EIS, this project or action will be referred to as the **North Bay Water Recycling Program (NBWRP)**. The basic purpose of the NBWRP is to provide recycled water for agricultural,

urban, and environmental uses and to promote the expanded beneficial use of the recycled water system in the North San Pablo Bay region. As noted in Reclamation's NEPA Handbook (Reclamation, 2000), this section has been prepared in accordance with Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 1508.9 to present why the proposed action is being considered. Implementation of the NBWRP would include upgrades to treatment processes and construction of pipelines, pump stations, and storage facilities to distribute recycled water for use in compliance with Article 4 in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations, which sets water quality standards and treatment reliability criteria for recycled water. The Draft EIR/EIS was developed to provide the public and responsible and trustee agencies reviewing the NBWRP an analysis of the potential effects, both beneficial and adverse, on the local and regional environment associated with construction and operation of the NBWRP.

1.2 Draft EIR/EIS Public Review Process

On May 5, 2009, Reclamation as the NEPA Lead Agency, and SCWA as the CEQA Lead Agency, released for public review the Draft EIR/EIS for the North San Pablo Bay Restoration and Reuse Project or NBWRP. Appendix A provides the distribution list of individuals, organizations, and agencies that received the Draft EIR/EIS. A 45-day public review and comment period on the Draft EIR/EIS ended June 26, 2009 and was extended to a 60-day period to July 20, 2009.

Three public hearings on the Draft EIR/EIS were held during the public review period at the following locations:

June 9, 2009 6:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. Margaret Todd Senior Center 1560 Hill Road, Novato	June 10, 2009 2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Sonoma Community Center 276 East Napa Street, Sonoma	June 11, 2009 6:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. Napa Elks Lodge 2840 Soscol Avenue, Napa
---	--	--

1.3 Purpose of the Final EIR/EIS

Both NEPA and CEQA require a lead agency that has completed a Draft EIR or EIS to consult with and obtain comments from public agencies that have legal jurisdiction with respect to the proposed action, and to provide the general public with opportunities to comment on the Draft EIR or EIS. This Final EIR/EIS has been prepared to respond to comments received from agencies and members of the public on the Draft EIR/EIS for the NBWRP.

The Draft EIR/EIS for NBWRP, together with this response to comments document, constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIR/EIS) for the project. The Final EIR/EIS is an informational document prepared by the Lead Agencies that must be considered by decision makers (including the SCWA Board of Directors and Reclamation) before approving or denying the proposed action.

1.3.1 NEPA Requirements

Reclamation has prepared this document pursuant to Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) and 40 CFR 1500 of the CEQ's NEPA Regulations. The Final EIS must include the Lead Agency's responses to all received comments and discussion of any opposing views on issues raised [40 CFR 1502.9(b)]. The Final EIS may contain summaries of the comments, in which case, the Final EIS must list the names and parties commenting on the Draft EIS and prepare a directory of where the summary response in the Final EIS addresses the comment. This Final EIR/EIS incorporates comments from public agencies and the general public and contains appropriate responses by the Lead Agency to those comments.

Lead agency responses may include the need to:

- modify the proposed action or alternatives;
- develop and evaluate new alternatives;
- supplement, improve, or modify the substantive environmental analyses;
- make factual corrections to the text, tables, or figures contained in the Draft EIS; or
- explain why no further response is necessary.

1.3.2 CEQA Requirements

SCWA has prepared this document pursuant Section 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines, which specifies the following:

The Final EIR shall consist of:

- a. The Draft EIR or a revision of that draft.
- b. Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in a summary.
- c. A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.
- d. The response of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in review and consultation process.
- e. Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

1.4 Requirements for Certification and Future Steps in Project Approval

In accordance with NEPA and CEQA, the Draft EIR/EIS was circulated for public and agency review and comment and a 60-day public review period was provided, closing on July 20, 2009. Comments were received from Federal, State, and local agencies; organizations and individuals. Three public hearings to receive public input on the Draft EIR/EIS were held during the review period. The public hearings were recorded and transcripts were made.

Pursuant to Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR/EIS is being made available to the commenters for a minimum 10-day period prior to its consideration by the CEQA Lead Agency for certification.

The SCWA Board will consider the EIR/EIS for certification as complete under Section 15090 of the CEQA Guidelines, and the individual Member Agencies will consider the individual project approvals as Responsible Agencies. Specifically, the projects identified in Phase 1 Implementation Plan will be considered for approval by the Member Agency with jurisdiction over each project. Each Member Agency will consider project approval; prepare and adopt written findings of fact for each significant environmental impact identified in the EIR/EIS; make a Statement of Overriding Considerations, if needed; and adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. A Notice of Determination (NOD) will then be filed.

Reclamation will circulate the Final EIR/EIS prior to taking action on the project and issuing its Record of Decision (ROD). The ROD will address the decision, alternatives considered, the environmentally preferable alternative, relevant factors considered in the decision, and mitigation and monitoring. The EIR/EIS (Draft and Final EIR/EIS) is intended to be used by Reclamation when considering approval of the Proposed Action or an alternative to the Proposed Action.

1.5 Organization of this Document

This document has the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1**, Introduction, describes the purpose and content of the Final EIR/EIS.
- **Chapter 2**, Master Responses, presents responses to environmental issues raised in multiple comments. These have been termed “master responses.” They are organized by topic to provide a more comprehensive response than may be possible in responding to individual comments, and so that reviewers can readily locate all relevant information pertaining to an issue of concern.
- **Chapter 3**, Response to Comments, contains the comment letters received and individual responses to the comments. Responses are keyed to the individual comments as indicated in the right margin of the comment letters.
- **Chapter 4**, Revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS, presents revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS text based on issues raised by comments, clarifications, or corrections. Additions, deletions and corrections to the Draft EIR/EIS are made by indicating the page, and paragraph to be revised and a description of the text changes. Additions are indicated by an underline, deletions are indicated by a “strike-out” where practical.
- **Chapter 5**, “List of EIR/EIS Preparers,” lists the individuals who assisted in the preparation of this Final EIR/EIS.
- **Appendix A**: Distribution List

1.6 Comments Received on Draft EIR/EIS

Table 1-1 below lists the agencies, organizations, and individuals that submitted written and oral comments on the Draft EIR/EIS during the public review period. **Table 1-2** provides the author of each comment letter, the author's affiliation, a letter designation of each author's comments, and a brief summary of each comment.

Written comments on the Draft EIR/EIS were received during the public comment period from May 5, 2009 through July 20, 2009. SCWA staff received the correspondence by mail, email, fax, or other delivery by 5:00 p.m. on July 20, 2009, the publicly-noticed end of the public comment period on the Draft EIR/EIS. Correspondence received after the closure of the public comment period are included and noted.

**TABLE 1-1
COMMENTERS ON DRAFT EIR/EIS**

Designator	Signatory	Correspondence Received	Correspondence Dated
Public Agencies			
A	United States Environmental Protection Agency, Kathleen Goforth	August 6, 2009	no date
B	California Department of Transportation, Lisa Carboni	July 20, 2009	July 20, 2009
C	State Water Resources Control Board, James Hockenberry	July 20, 2009	July 20, 2009
D	Los Carneros Water District, John W. Stewart	June 11, 2009	June 11, 2009
E	County of Sonoma Department of Health Services, James Tyler	June 24, 2009	June 22, 2009
F	Sonoma County Department of Public Works		no date
G	Assembly California Legislature, Jared Huffman	July 22, 2009	July 17, 2009
Organizations			
H	Living Rivers Council (LRC), John Stephens	June 8, 2009	June 5, 2009
I	Valley of the Moon Alliance, Del Rydman	July 14, 2009	July 13, 2009
J	Sonoma County Water Coalition (SCWC), Stephen Fuller-Rowell	July 17, 2009	July 16, 2009
K	Friends of the Esteros (FOEst) and Salmon Protection and Watershed Network (SPAWN), Tom Yarish	July 17, 2009	July 16, 2009
L	Open Space, Water Resource Protection, Land Use (O.W.L) Foundation, HR Downs	July 17, 2009	July 13, 2009
M	Friends of the Eel River (FOER), David Keller	July 20, 2009	July 20, 2009
N	North Coast River Alliance, Frank Egger	July 20, 2009	July 20, 2009
O	San Francisco Bay Trail Project, Maureen Gaffney	August 13, 2009	August 11, 2009
Individuals			
P	Anonymous	June 7, 2009	no date
Q	John Dunlap	June 25, 2009	June 23, 2009
R	Karen and Vagn Nielsen	July 14, 2009	June 10, 2009
S	Barry Buckley	August 3, 2009	August 3, 2009
T	Kathy Pons	July 14, 2009	July 14, 2009
U	Tom Yarish	July 17, 2009	July 17, 2009
Public Hearings			
V	Public Hearing, Margaret Todd Senior Center, Marin County	June 9, 2009	
V1	<i>Barry Buckley</i>		
V2	<i>Drew McIntyre</i>		
V3	<i>Megan Clark</i>		
W	Public Hearing, Sonoma Community Center, Sonoma County	June 10, 2009	
W1	<i>Tom Yarish</i>		
W2	<i>Kathy Pons</i>		
W3	<i>Mitchell Mulas</i>		
W4	<i>Bill Montini</i>		
X	Public Hearing, Napa Elks Lodge, Napa County	June 11, 2009	
X1	<i>David Keller</i>		
X2	<i>Tom Yarish</i>		
X3	<i>John Stewart</i>		

**TABLE 1-2
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Federal Agencies				
A	United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 9	Kathleen Goforth	A-1	Supports project purpose to expand beneficial use of recycled water for agricultural, urban, and environmental uses; asserts recycled water is efficient and sustainable for meeting drought, climate change, and population growth challenges; commends cooperative NBWRA program.
			A-2	Encourages use of recycled water for existing and infill development prior to use for new development.
			A-3	Encourages NBWRA and Member Agencies to support ongoing research on toxicology of microconstituents and emerging contaminants that may be present in recycled water. Encourages collaboration with SWRCB on data collection, monitoring of recycled water use and human, biological, and ecological effects.
			A-4	Recommends FEIR/EIS include a clear commitment to additional project-level environmental review for new storage reservoirs and subsequent project phases once site-specific design alternatives are determined.
			A-5	Rates the DEIR/EIS as "Lack of Objections", indicating that there are no potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes.
State Agencies				
B	California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)	Lisa Carboni	B-1	EIR/EIS should discuss project's fair share contribution, scheduling, and implementation responsibilities for all proposed mitigation measures and be presented in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan.
			B-2	All required roadway improvements should be completed prior to issuance of project occupancy permits. Recommends resolution of Department's concerns prior to application for encroachment permit.
			B-3	EIR/EIS Section 3.7, Transportation should address impacts on bicycle lanes during construction.
			B-4	Location and layout of pipelines should not interfere with existing drainage.
			B-5	Department requires a copy of the Cultural Resource Technical Report (ESA, 2009).
			B-6	Concerns related to allocation, utilization challenges, and health risks of recycled water for Department use.
			B-7	Damage to existing utilities or underground pipelines are SCWA responsibility. Department must be notified prior to commencement of work on these pipelines.
			B-8	NBWRP work will require Transportation permits for movement of oversized or excessive load vehicles on State Roadways.
			B-9	Encroachment permits are required for project work within the State's right-of-way. Traffic related mitigation measures would need to be incorporated into construction plans during the encroachment permit process.
C	State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)	James Hockenberry	C-1	Comment addresses Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) financing requirements, responsibilities and authority of SWRCB, and additional environmental documentation and review under "CEQA-Plus"
			C-2	CWSRF funding applications are subject to the federal Endangered Species Act and U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) approval. SWRCB can consult with USFWS or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on behalf of NBWRA, and NBWRA should continue to be proactive in consulting with resource agencies.
			C-3	SWRCB responsible for ensuring compliance with Section 106 of National Historic Preservation Act. SWRCB Cultural Resources officer consults with the State Historic Preservation Officers and requires map, Area of Potential Effect (APE) information, and surveys.
			C-4	For each project funded by CWSRF, applicant must certify the EIR/EIS, make CEQA findings, adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and if necessary, a Statement of Overriding Considerations. A copy of the NEPA lead agency's Record of Decision is required to be submitted to SWRCB.

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Local Agencies				
D	Los Carneros Water District (LCWD)	John W. Stewart	D-1	LCWD is pursuing an Engineering Feasibility Study for implementing recycled water in district; will likely tier off EIR; supports mitigation measures.
E	County of Sonoma Department of Health Services	James Tyler	E-1	Recognizes water reclamation and recycled water reuse is beneficial to development, reduction of demand on potable water supply, conservation of surface and groundwater which is necessary for good public health. Feels EIR/EIS adequately covers health concerns.
F	Sonoma County Department of Transportation and Public Works	Ken Giovannetti and Steve Urbanek	F-1	Asserts pipeline route shown in Figure 2-5 does not match the text description. Expresses questions regarding pipelines on Orange, Elm, Leveroni.
			F-2	Asserts 25 feet is an inappropriate width for a corridor.
			F-3	Asserts that slurry sealing is required for the full width of the area affected by open trenching in addition to trench paving.
			F-4	Advises of open trenching restrictions on roads with new surfacing.
			F-5	Advises of restrictions on trench plated on high volume roads.
			F-6	Asserts that lane closures subject to discretion of County.
			F-7	Advises of restrictions on trench plated on high volume roads.
			F-8	Asserts that slurry sealing is required for the full width of the area affected by open trenching in addition to trench paving.
			F-9	Advises that circulation and traffic detours are approved at discretion of County.
			F-10	Concerned that impacts from heavy construction vehicles may not be negligible.
			F-11	Advises that repaving and road restoration requirements would be conditions of permits.
			F-12	Design should consider potential future road improvement projects to avoid facility relocation.
			F-13	Advises that project must meet manhole cover requirements and safety.
			F-14	Lists applicable permits.
Other Agencies				
G	Assembly California Legislature	Jared Huffman	G-1	Endorses NBWRP and strongly supports the NBWRA priorities of using recycled water to offset local urban and agricultural demands for potable supplies.
Organizations				
H	Living Rivers Council (LRC)	John Stephens	H-1	EIR/EIS should include an alternatives analysis for Vacuum Retort Anaerobic Digester (VRAD) because it does not have a public stigma, would not require an independent pipeline network, and it is cheaper.
I	Valley of the Moon Alliance	Del Rydman	I-1	Groundwater supply is limited; treated wastewater used in a safe local way can help offset potable water usage.
			I-2	Concerned about water quality and treatment; concerned that contaminates like endocrine disrupters, personal care products, antibiotics, pharmaceuticals are not removed in tertiary treatment process.
			I-3	Concerned that NBWRP is growth inducing and would assist in build out of county and cities and contribute to secondary growth effects
			I-4	Concerned that offering farmers to buy recycled water is not economically sustainable; will be a challenge to convince those currently using groundwater to pay.

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Organizations (cont.)				
I (cont.)			I-5	Treating water to drinking water standards was not evaluated as an alternative; using recycled water as potable water instead of only agricultural irrigation would be more valuable and useable.
			I-6	Concerned with SVCSD WWTP. Support SVRWP but want water to stay in same basin.
J	Sonoma County Water Coalition (SCWC)	Stephen Fuller-Rowell	J-1	Concerned that DEIR/EIS does not incorporate most of the substance of the comments submitted during scoping.
			J-2	Concerned that DEIR/EIS does not adequately address regional water supply constraints, watershed issues, and groundwater management in the Russian River watershed, Eel River watershed and Santa Rosa Groundwater Basin.
			J-3	No Action Alternative must be considered in depth in a revised EIR/EIS.
K	Friends of the Esteros (FOEst) and Salmon Protection and Watershed Network (SPAWN)	Tom Yarish	K-1	Descriptions of project components as "project" and "program" are incomplete and unclear and do not meet CEQA.
			K-2	Environmental analysis should acknowledge toxics in wastewater, fate of dispersed contaminants in a variety of habitats, and analysis of year-to-year variations in rainwater runoff.
			K-3	EIR/EIS should analyze the impacts of establishing new sources of demand for waters derived from Russian and Eel Rivers.
			K-4	EIR/EIS should describe and project future potable water constraints in Russian and Eel Rivers due to regulatory constraints, climate change, increased potable water demand.
			K-5	EIR/EIS should describe current and emerging sciences of toxicology and address toxicity to a variety of terrestrial and aquatic species.
			K-6	EIR/EIS should address impacts to increased discharges of tertiary recycled water to terrestrial and aquatic species in San Francisco Bay, tributaries, wetlands, and marshes.
			K-7	Asserts that the federal Clean Water Act and State water quality regulations do not address man-made contaminants and pollutants that may exist in municipal and industrial waste streams.
			K-8	Asserts that references to Title 22 should be read as incomplete.
			K-9	Concerned with affects from endocrine disrupters.
			K-10	EIR/ EIS should discuss disinfection-resistant pathogens that remain in wastewater post treatment and potential effects of livestock, humans, and other organisms.
			K-11	EIR/EIS uses Title 22 standards which do not address toxicity to wildlife. Mitigation and monitoring projects do not meet CEQA requirements for detail and commitment.
			K-12	Asserts NBWRA Member Agencies should attempt to remove contaminants via comprehensive source reduction.
			K-13	Title 22 standards are inadequate for a comprehensive understanding of all potential toxics; therefore EIR/EIS finding of "no impacts" in regard to Title 22 standards avoids accounting for the total and cumulative burdens from emerging contaminants.
			K-14	Concerned that SWCB "blue ribbon panel" is ineffective.
			K-15	Indicates there are challenges associated with discharge of potable water to surface waters.
			K-16	EIR/EIS does not include project description with clearly-defined objectives for salt ponds. There is no threshold for determining success or failure of the project as it relates to the salt ponds.
			K-17	EIR/EIS does not analyze reverse osmosis or membrane filtration technologies.

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Organizations (cont.)				
K (cont.)			K-18	Asserts that EIR/EIS creates new demand for water that would originate outside the service area and is concerned about impacts to watersheds and wildlife.
			K-19	EIR/EIS does not address long-term water sustainability.
			K-20	EIR/EIS does not account for salts and contaminants accumulation in soil as a result of leaching.
			K-21	Questions net reduction of pollutants; EIR/EIS cites benefits but does not have enough analysis. EIR/EIS does not look at lifecycle of runoff constituents for each irrigation site.
			K-22	EIR/EIS with regard to salt marsh restoration does not appear to address the hard scientific questions regarding the management, recovery and end points of the specific project of applying tertiary wastewater to the bittern ponds.
			K-23	EIR/EIS should include analysis of greenhouse gases over the life of the salt marsh project.
			K-24	EIR/EIS should include mitigation to reduce long-term accumulation of mercury in order to meet CEQA and NEPA intent.
			K-25	Concerned that mitigation is inadequate for impacts to fisheries.
			K-26	EIR/EIS does not look at regional and global issues of greenhouse gas production, climate change, regional and state-wide water supply conflicts, this project's embedded lifetime electrical demand and future energy costs.
L	Open Space, Water Resources Protection, Land Use (OWL) Foundation	HR Downs	L-1	Concerned that pollutants known to exist in tertiary treated wastewater effluent are not addressed and that plans for recycled water use do not account for significant, scientific, peer-reviewed research.
			L-2	Concerned that distribution of recycled water constitutes a public health issue.
			L-3	Concerned that antibiotic resistance will continue as a result of the project.
			L-4	EIR/EIS must discuss possible methods of curtailing or eliminating the spread of antibiotic resistance.
			L-5	Concerned that none of the Member Agencies guarantee ARG, antibiotic resistant pathogens, removal from treated sewage.
			L-6	EIR/EIS does not discuss ARGs or the means by which the project intends to reduce their effects.
			L-7	Concerned that treated wastewater can systemically contaminate crops.
			L-8	EIR/EIS does not address quantities of contaminants would migrate into grapes as a result of agricultural use of recycled water. Discussions of health and economic risks are not included in EIR/EIS.
			L-9	EIR/EIS does not address potential threats to public health, or extent that project would contribute to endocrine disruption in humans and animals.
			L-10	EIR/EIS does not address chemical transformations that occur as a result of chlorine, and various contaminants known to remain in processed wastewater.
			L-11	Concerned about chlorinated triclosan derivative products and health risks associated with use on grapes. Concerned with economic risks of contaminating grapes. Concerned with death of animals associated with contaminated crops. Concerned with phthalate toxicity and dosage.
			L-12	Concerned that exposure to chlorine exacerbates virulence on Staphylococcus, and asserts that the organism would remain in recycled water and would be more virulent due to chlorine treatment.
			L-13	Concerned EIR/EIS does not discuss chlorine-resistant bacteria and effect on human health.

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Organizations (cont.)				
L (cont.)			L-14	EIR/EIS does not account for reactions of chlorine with acetaminophen.
			L-15	EIR/EIS does not account for possible chemical reactions among pharmaceuticals, pathogens, drugs, chemicals, and endocrine disrupters, and other materials found in treated wastewater, or potential effects from discharge or reuse.
			L-16	Concerned with use of UV disinfection processes rather than chlorine at WWTPs.
			L-17	EIR/EIS does not discuss reactivated pathogens in effluent.
			L-18	Concerned with disposal of sewage sludge, by product of wastewater recycling, and potential environmental hazards.
			L-19	Concerned with regulatory compliance with California Health and Safety Code § 5410-5416 and CEQA.
			L-20	Concerned with feasibility of project and alternatives.
			L-21	Concerned with ability of project to comply with regulatory requirements.
			L-22	Wants project to remove all contaminants from recycled water.
M	Friends of the Eel River	David Keller	M-1	The project relies on potable water originating in the Russian and Eel Rivers.
			M-2	EIR/EIS does not include alternatives such as mandatory efficiency, conservation, and restoration.
			M-3	EIR/EIS does not meet the CEQA requirements for public disclosure in an EIR. A revised DEIR/EIS should be recirculated.
			M-4	The EIR/EIS does not substantiate its demand, conservation, and reuse assumptions.
			M-5	Concerned that NBWRP is not successful in reducing discharges of treated wastewater to San Pablo Bay.
			M-6	Concerned with volume of water to be delivered to Napa Salt Ponds. EIR/EIS does not address problems or objections raised by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) related to piping wastewater to pond area.
			M-7	EIR/EIS does not provide data to show significant new urban reuse deliveries that are entirely dependent on the project.
			M-8	Concerned that project will supply over 90 percent of recycled water to new vineyard customers who are not now reliant on Eel River, Russian River, or Santa Rosa Groundwater supplies.
			M-9	EIR/EIS does not substantiate assumptions that influent will increase over the next ten years.
			M-10	The Project Description is vague, incomplete, and misleading.
			M-11	The Project Description lacks clarity on project development, funding sources, scheduling, other necessary agency approval, Phase 1 operations and construction.
			M-12	EIR/EIS does not include possibility for components in Solano County, as allowed for in the Omnibus Public Land Management Act legislation.
			M-13	EIR/EIS does not describe where additional treated wastewater influent would come from.
			M-14	Disagrees with statements prior to issuance of NOP that issues related to source water were beyond the purview of the project.
			M-15	EIR/EIS does not disclose existing arrangements for sale or transfer of recycled water from contractors or purveyors to water districts or beneficiaries. The contractual agreements make a difference in potential impacts. There is no governance or oversight to ensure accountability to the public, ratepayers, or environment. EIR/EIS does not comply with NEPA 40 CFR 1508.8.

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Organizations (cont.)				
M (cont.)			M-16	EIR/EIS does not disclose funding sources.
			M-17	EIR/EIS does not disclose funding sources or user fees. EIR/EIS does not include comparison of costs fro Alternative 1, 2, 3.
			M-18	EIR/EIS does not discuss the availability, willingness, and ability of purchasers for recycled water.
			M-19	EIR/EIS minimizes effects of using recycled water on wine grapes as several countries prohibit this practice.
			M-20	EIR/EIS does not list or map parcels that would likely accept recycled water.
			M-21	EIR/EIS does not include length of recycled water contracts, cost sharing structure among participating agencies, or costs to ratepayers to subsidize revenue shortfalls.
			M-22	EIR/EIS does not discuss future legal requirements of water contractors to reduce reliance on Russian River supplies and subsequent unreliable and unpredictable operation of the NBWRA plants.
			M-23	EIR/EIS does not discuss contracts as they relate to future reduced wastewater supplies.
			M-24	There is no sinking fund or financing mechanism for dismantling the project's utility, practicality, or lifespan end.
			M-25	Concerned about sizing of 18-inch pipeline to Napa Salt Marsh.
			M-26	EIR/EIS does not include fee structures for recycled water by Member Agencies.
			M-27	EIR/EIS division of the project into project-level and program-level components is inconsistent, confusing, and misleading.
			M-28	EIR/EIS does not explain which portions of recycled water provision would be accomplished by existing facilities or new facilities. Concerned about sizing of 24-inch pipeline to Napa Salt Marsh to serve future uses.
			M-29	EIR/EIS does not meet CEQA requirements for project- versus program-level analyses.
			M-30	EIR/EIS does not accurately describe the project baseline environmental setting.
			M-31	EIR/EIS does not acknowledge the relationship of recycled water used in the project with source waters in the Russian and Eel Rivers and Santa Rosa Plain Groundwater.
			M-32	EIR/EIR mischaracterizes and minimizes the relationship between source waters and recycled water.
			M-33	EIR/EIS incorrectly asserts the recycled water will be used to offset Russian River water supplies.
			M-34	Concerned that Phase 1 is responsible for most of the project potable water offset and would most likely occur without the project itself.
			M-35	EIR/EIS does not address changes to flow, diversion, storage, and watershed conditions of source waters.
M-36	EIR/EIS does not consider reasonably foreseeable future changes in flows resulting from implementation of the Russian River Biological Opinion.			
M-37	EIR/EIS does not consider reasonably foreseeable future changes in flows resulting from modification of Decision 1610.			
M-38	NBWRP must be analyzed in the context of changes to Decision 1610.			
M-39	EIR/EIS fails to evaluate NBWRP in the context of a court order invalidating SCWA's Urban Water management Plan 2005.			
M-40	Concerned that EIR/EIS states that there is no relationship between NBWRP and the Urban Water Management Plan.			

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Organizations (cont.)				
M (cont.)			M-41	EIR/EIS does not consider minimum flow changes and cumulative impacts as a result of implementation of AB 2121.
			M-42	EIR/EIS does not evaluate the possibility that Eel River diversions will be reduced or curtailed legally or structurally.
			M-43	EIR/EIS does not discuss existing, pending, or unexercised water rights on the East Branch Russian River, tributaries to Lake Mendocino, or Eel River which could reduce total flow. EIR/EIS does not address frost and heat protection proposals from grape growers being considered by SWRCB and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).
			M-44	Concerned that there is no prioritization for recycled water use in response to impaired wastewater deliveries.
			M-45	Concerned with the long-term reliability of Eel River diversion.
			M-46	EIR/EIS does not discuss whether obligations can be met without reliance on continued diversions from Eel River through the Potter Valley Project.
			M-47	EIR/EIS does not evaluate changes in water supply resulting from severe drought conditions.
			M-48	EIR/EIS does not adequately disclose, analyze, and propose mitigation for NBWRP's significant environmental impacts.
			M-49	EIR/EIS does not consider the cumulative impacts of increasing SCWA's reliance on the Eel River Diversion.
			M-50	A revised and recirculated EIR/EIS must include continuing impact on fisheries resulting from increased reliance on Eel River supplies.
			M-51	EIR/EIS does not analyze cumulative impacts related to recycled water and local supply projects implemented by SCWA's contractors.
			M-52	EIR/EIS does not specifically analyze the potential availability of recycled water to offset additional demands for potable water that are currently met by SCWA potable water supplies, as was the case with the City of Petaluma.
			M-53	A revised and recirculated EIR/EIS must include cumulatively considerable impacts related to local supply and recycling projects that rely on surface impoundment or groundwater extraction in conjunction with NBWRP.
			M-54	EIR/EIS does not adequately disclose, analyze, and propose mitigation for the NBWRP growth-inducing impacts.
			M-55	Concerned with use and conclusions related to Urban water Management Plan 2005 in Table 5-7.
			M-56	Analysis of alternatives is inadequate because the project is defined such that it precludes meaningful analysis of alternatives.
			M-57	There is no reasonable range of alternatives, and the EIR/EIS does not analyze an alternative related to serious demand reduction and efficiency.
M-58	Asserts that an efficiency alternative would require offset of potable demands on water that originates locally and therefore shift capital expenditures to a broader area and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.			
M-59	An efficiency alternative would shift away from voluntary conservation to efficient technology.			
M-60	An efficiency alternative would be mandatory, save money, and exceed water savings generated by voluntary measures considered in EIR/EIS.			
M-61	EIR/EIS should analyze efficiency measures that could be purchased for a capital investment of \$100 million to \$600 million (or over the lifespan of the project).			

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Organizations (cont.)				
M (cont.)			M-62	EIR/EIS should include SCWA authority under the Restructured Agreement for Water Supply, as it allows SCWA to require contractors to implement conservation measures.
			M-63	An efficiency alternative would meet project objectives. EIR/EIS should be revised and recirculated to include analysis of feasibility of this alternative.
			M-64	EIR/EIS does not analyze alternative methods of increasing local water supply, reducing demands within the project service areas, and reducing project size or eliminating need for NBWRP.
			M-65	Adoption of best management practices for existing vineyards in proposed service area could substantially reduce groundwater overdraft and saline intrusion, and reduce demand and size for NBWRP.
			M-66	EIR/EIS does not show what service area lands are currently under vineyard use, their existing water use, agricultural yields by parcels, pumping capabilities and history, and local storage capacity.
			M-67	EIR/EIS does not disclose current service area lands planted with grapes, and those that use a common practice of draining fields during the rainy season, which reduces groundwater percolation and infiltration.
			M-68	EIR/EIS does not provide a water balance model or map for service areas to show naturally occurring water, changes over time, and changes resulting from agricultural cultivation of specific crops.
			M-69	Asserts that eliminating vineyards in areas of groundwater overdraft and saline intrusion would reduce the need for NBWRP and the size of the project.
			M-70	EIR/EIS does not include analysis why vineyards currently planted in areas of groundwater overdraft or areas with saline intrusion should not be removed and planted with other crops. EIR/EIS does not include crop/water demands.
			M-71	Asserts that prohibition on new vineyard customers within the project service area will reduce water demands and project size.
			M-72	Asserts local storage ponds and infiltration ponds can increase availability of water for project participants.
			M-73	EIR/EIS does not acknowledge seasonality and variability of water needs for vineyards and other agricultural crops; frost and/or heat protection is not discussed.
			M-74	EIR/EIS does not discuss how recycled water would or should be used for agricultural activities. EIR/EIS should provide information and context of other alternatives that could increase efficiency.
			M-75	EIR/EIS does not respond to suggested alternatives accurately, fully, and in good faith.
			M-76	Concerned that alternatives are driven by pre-judged decision-making.
M-77	EIR/EIS does not consider comments submitted during the scoping process; improper interference with commenter and public hearing.			
M-78	EIR/EIS must be revised and recirculated based on new significant information that must be added to the document related to alternatives and project description.			
N	North Coast Rivers Alliance	Frank Egger	N-1	DEIR/EIS does not address the fact that the proposed 18" pipeline from Marin and Sonoma Counties to Napa County and to Solano County can transport treated wastewater and potable water
			N-2	DEIR/EIS must address impacts of transport of water out of Russian and Eel Rivers in Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, and Marin Counties to the Napa Solano area which could connect to California Water Project

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Organizations (cont.)				
N (cont.)			N-3	Impacts to listed species under Endangered Species Act in Russian and Eel Rivers have not been properly addressed.
			N-4	Concerned the EIR/EIS does not address the amount of Russian River/Eel River water that could be reused locally to reduce diversions.
O	San Francisco Bay Trail	Maureen Gaffney	O-1	Concerned about impacts and associated mitigation for Bay Trail within NBRWP area.
			O-2	Errata to Draft EIR/EIS. Asserts that Marin Countywide Bicycle Plan has been recently updated. Identifies additional Class I bikeways within the NBWRP area
			O-3	Errata to Draft EIR/EIS. Identifies additional proposed bikeways within the NBWRP area.
Individuals				
P	Anonymous		P-1	Concerned with potential conflict of NBWRP with future development of bike path along railroad tracks along 8th Street.
			P-2	Concerned with noise effects of increase pumping at SVCSD; pump stations should be noise attenuated; Recommends use of Sonoma County 2020 General Plan as guideline for unincorporated areas.
			P-3	Disagrees with characterization of noise impacts as temporary.
Q	John Dunlap		Q-1	Supports successful implementation of project; EIR does not reflect a lack of intent.
R	Karen and Vagn Nielsen		Q-1	Concerned that noise from booster pump station between Napa Road and Welzel Lane is classified as a "less than significant impact"; feel noise could contribute to property devaluation. Concerned with noise from generator during power outages and/or open door during equipment maintenance. Concerned that EIR did not adequately analyze alternative locations for booster pump. Concerned with winter flooding and increase in impermeable surface. Think the water could be pumped directly from sanitary plant without the need for booster pump.
S	Barry Buckley		S-1	Would like project to install infrastructure beneath Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit System (SMART). Concerned with allocation of recycled water to Hamilton residents, homeowners associations, public spaces, parks, school, and ranch properties. Implementing the pipelines within the SMART right-of-way represents costs savings and reduced impacts to traffic. Concerned with allocation of recycled water to SMART for landscaping.
T	Kathy Pons		T-1	No Action Alternative is the same for the Sonoma Valley area as Alternative 1 since the Final EIR for the Sonoma Valley Recycled Water Project has already been circulated. The same amount of recycled water is available under either alternative.
			T-2	Draft EIR/EIS should consider treating wastewater to drinking water standards to create more potable water as an alternative to the project.
			T-3	The project would be growth inducing and could assist in build out of the counties' and cities' general plans and contribute to secondary growth.
			T-4	Supporting new agricultural growth is not sustainable if recycled water is suspended; not economically fair.
			T-5	Recycled water should be used within the same basin because pumping would generate greenhouse gas emissions and could contribute to climate change. This contradicts the initiatives SCWA has set forth to reduce greenhouse gas emissions even within Sonoma County and the State.
			T-6	EIR does not consider effects of conservation, expanded use of grey water, capture of infiltration/ stormwater on wastewater supply and ability to produce recycled water.

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Individuals (cont.)				
T (cont.)			T-7	Recognizes benefit of offsetting potable water use, but that only works if groundwater users can be convinced to pay for recycled water.
			T-8	Concerned about water quality and treatment; concerned that contaminants like endocrine disrupters, personal care products, antibiotics, pharmaceuticals are not removed in tertiary treatment process.
			T-9	Concerned about SVRWP; would like to see more utilization of SVCSD's recycled water locally by extending implementation of this project within NBWRP.
			T-10	Recognize Napa Salt Marsh is good use of recycled water; Concerned there is no quantitative amount of recycled water that would be needed.
			T-11	Questions why 4 miles of 24-inch pipeline is needed; seems project would be better served by Napa.
			T-12	Acknowledges Alternative 2 involves connection of Sonoma Valley and Napa.
			T-13	Expresses support for No Action Alternative.
U	Tom Yarish		U-1	Concerned with CEQA process and governance of SCWA.
			U-2	Concerned with public trust issues related to acquisition of Cargill/ Napa Salt Ponds.
			U-3	Concerned with Novato SD approval to privatize operations.
			U-4	Concerned with relationship of NBWRP to source water from Russian and Eel Rivers.
			U-5	Concerned with public hearing facilitation as it relates to CEQA process.
			U-6	Concerned with public participation process.
Public Hearings				
V	Public Hearing, Margaret Todd Senior Center, Marin County			
V1	Barry Buckley		V1-1	EIR/EIS should include an analysis of LGVSD Phase 1 pipeline options.
			V1-2	Concerned that rate payers will not get the water.
			V1-3	Would like some recycled water to be used for bike path landscaping, condo, Hamilton Landing center.
V2	Drew McIntyre		V2-1	Recycled water is allocated for use in Hamilton Landing, Spanish housing, ball fields, large homeowner's associations, the amphitheater, and Lannan Village.
V3	Megan Clark		V3-1	Concerned about sea level rise.
W	Public Hearing, Sonoma Community Center, Sonoma County			
W1	Tom Yarish		W1-1	Concerned with water quality and the disinfection byproducts in wastewater that survive tertiary treatment and remain active and produce toxic byproducts that would conflict with discharger's ability to meet state standards
			W1-2	Concerned with O&M costs. Would like to see hard analysis of cost advantages of infrastructure project versus reverse osmosis.
			W1-3	Notes challenges associated with discharge of potable water.
			W1-4	Would like to see more analysis of trace constituents.

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Public Hearings (cont.)				
W1 (cont)			W1-5	Concerned about impact to Russian River.
			W1-6	Concerned with impacts to fish resulting from providing additional water to support new vineyards that use traditional farming methods.
			W1-7	Would like reverse osmosis, microfiltration, conservation, localized distribution to be considered as alternatives.
W2	Kathy Pons		W2-1	Concerned with water quality and the disinfection byproducts in wastewater that survive tertiary treatment and remain active and produce toxic byproducts that would conflict with discharger's ability to meet state standards.
			W2-2	Would like EIR to look at economic basis; compare cost of doing NBWRP versus filtering and treating to a potable level.
			W2-3	Concerned that future conservation, expanded use of greywater, climate change impacts to meteorology would reduce supply of wastewater such that the project would be infeasible
W3	Mitchell Mulas		W3-1	Concerned agricultural users will not want to pay for water.
			W3-2	Asserts that CDFG is buying the property the project proposes as candidates for recycled water use.
			W3-3	Concerned about funding.
			W3-4	Concerned about growth in cities.
W4	Bill Montini		W4-1	Concerned about impacts to agriculture; EIR does not address pipeline routes that cut through vineyards; economic costs.
X	Public Hearing, Napa Elks Lodge, Napa County			
X1	David Keller		X1-1	Concerned that comments previously submitted during scoping were not incorporated in DEIR/EIS.
			X1-2	Comment asserts that Draft EIR/EIS project objectives are incomplete and that the document does not address impacts to source waters and other watershed.
			X1-3	The commenter is concerned with funding mechanism and the relationship between the size of the project and the potential funding.
			X1-4	The comment asserts that recycled water for vineyards will be subsidized by local taxpayers. Concerned with financial burden placed on taxpayers by grape growers.
			X1-5	Asserts that City of Vallejo is a better location and use of funding for recycled water program and Napa Salt Marsh because it generates large amounts of polluting discharge and would not impact the Russian River. Asserts that a recycled water project in the City of Vallejo would meet project objectives and questions why this potential alternative was scoped out.
X2	Tom Yarish		X2-1	Would like EIR to include a hard analysis about who will pay for use of this water.
			X2-2	Provided comments about conservation and need for SCWA to comply with DWR sanctions. Concerned that the predicted uses for the recycled water (lawns, landscaping) are not subject to scrutiny in terms of conservation.
			X2-3	EIR needs to include hard math that shows the constraints on source water.
			X2-4	EIR should include cost benefit analysis of recycled water as it relates to the consumer.
X3	John Stewart		X3-1	Concerned about leveraging local dollars effectively.
			X3-2	Asserts that Regional Board has strict conditions for discharging to the Bay.

**TABLE 1-2 (Continued)
COMMENT ISSUES SUMMARY**

Designator	Public Agency	Signatory	Comment Designation	Comment/Topic
Public Hearings (cont.)				
X3 (cont.)			X3-3	Agrees with concept of recycling water for additional uses.
			X3-4	Would like to see a well developed, legally defensible document to tier from.
			X3-5	For the record City of Vallejo does not operate wastewater facility as a sanitation district, they are on independent funds.