

From: evoice@mchsi.com
To: [execofficer](#); [administrator](#); [John Miller](#); [John Ford](#); [Michael Richardson](#)
Cc: [Lynne Saxton](#)
Subject: Fwd: Garberville Sanitary District Water System Improvement Project SCH # 2009122069
Date: Wednesday, March 07, 2018 11:09:35 AM
Attachments: [Finally the right one GSDs Chlorine Chamber.jpg](#)

Dear Humboldt County LAFCo Commission, Staff and County of Humboldt Planning Department,

Please see email below to the Garberville Sanitary District (GSD).

Just to give you some background information about what I am requesting; the GSD water treatment plant underground chlorine contact chamber failed in November 2017 and generated a boil water notice from the State to the ratepayers of GSD:

<http://kymkemp.com/2017/11/26/more-information-on-the-gsd-boil-water-notice/>

And during a GSD Board meeting on November 28, 2017; the following was stated concerning the failed underground chlorine contact chamber:

"When the plant was built, the contact chamber was installed to accommodate potential water needs for the Community Park. All other customers can be served without having a contact chamber. However, in summer, higher water demand will shorten the delivery time. This means using twice the chlorine that has been needed according to Arreguin"

<http://kymkemp.com/2017/12/03/lots-of-gsd-water-news/>

And there is a recording of the meeting where Mr. Dan Arreguin (GSD Drinking Water Operator/Employee) stated and I quote:

"The reason that we could count this contact time coming up the hill into town is because they put in that chlorine contact chamber to add for potential growth at the Park. So we had to have, if they put a house down at the park, and we connected down there right off the water treatment plant, we had to have that contact chamber. But they don't have houses. There's no water connection going to them from the treatment plant. So we can count all the way up here to town as our contact time."

And just to remind you, the "Park" (Southern Humboldt Community Park) is contiguous with the GSD Water Treatment Plant.

So, given this new information was not made available, studied, included, mitigated, adopted or approved by the lead agency (GSD) in the Water Treatment Plant MND (SCH # 2009122069), GSD Boundary Change Annexation MND (SCH # 20122032025) or the Southern Humboldt Community Park Rezone EIR (SCH # 2010092037) until now. And given the fact GSD wants to replace the underground chlorine contact chamber with a new above ground chlorine contact chamber, that is somehow connected to the potential water needs for the Southern Humboldt Community Park; I feel this project warrants review under CEQA with an amendment disclosing the growth inducing effects to the environment, reasonably foreseeable and future growth of the Southern Humboldt Community Park.

Thank you for you time, I look forward to your official response.

Ed Voice & Voice Family

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: evoice@mchsi.com

To: rthompson@garbervillesd.org, randerson@garbervillesd.org, dbryan <dbryan@garbervillesd.org>, lbroderson@garbervillesd.org

Cc: m nieto <m.nieto@garbervillesd.org>, Ralph Emerson <remerson@garbervillesd.org>, Ronnean@WaterboardsLund <ronnean.lund@waterboards.ca.gov>, Jennie Short <jmshort@garbervillesd.org>, Lynne Saxton <lynne@saxtonlegal.com>

Sent: Wed, 07 Mar 2018 00:50:25 -0500 (EST)

Subject: Garberville Sanitary District Water System Improvement Project SCH # 2009122069

Dear Garberville Sanitary District Board (GSD),

I wanted to know if GSD will conduct an amended initial study for this revision to the Water Treatment Plant (SCH # 2009122069 MND) under CEQA; i.e. new above ground replacement chlorine contact chamber? Given the fact this revision/project change is only used for the potential future growth of the Southern Humboldt Community Park and was never disclosed in the original/approved project MND (SCH # 2009122069) or GSD Boundary Change Annexation MND (SCH # 20122032025); I feel this revision to the project should allow public input, public comment and amended under CEQA:

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of how the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Induced growth is distinguished from the direct economic, population, or housing growth of a project. Induced growth is any growth that results from new development that would not have taken place in the absence of the project and that exceeds planned growth. CEQA Guidelines also state that growth in any area should not be assumed to be necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

Growth-inducing impacts are caused by those characteristics of a project that tend to foster or encourage population, either directly or indirectly. Indirect inducements to growth include the establishment of infrastructure or other conditions at the project site that would potentially lead to growth in surrounding areas. The proposed project involves short-term construction and would not include construction of housing or development of new utility infrastructure that could induce growth into undeveloped areas. Construction workers would be sourced from the local labor force and would not generate a short-term or long-term rise in local population.

https://www.garbervillesd.org/files/7af87ae2a/Att7-Recirculated_Draft_and_Final_IS-MND_Comments_Received.pdf

Thank you,
Ed Voice & Voice Family