

**COMMENT LETTER 119 - CALPINE, J.M. RUDISILL (OCTOBER 4, 1996),  
RECEIVED OCTOBER 7, 1996**

**Response to Comment 119-1**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that the limitation of the evaluation for the Geysers Recharge Alternative to a Russian River discharge of less than 1% misrepresents the competitiveness of Alternative 4 and a reevaluation based on discharge from zero to 5% should be done.*

Refer to Responses to Comments 11-4 and 103-3.

**Response to Comment 119-2**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that average flows should be used so that the Service Charge is not overstated.*

Refer to Response to Comment 103-9.

**Response to Comment 119-3**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that smaller tanks and ten or less wells would actually be required for the 16,000 gpm design and that reductions in these number should occur with higher Russian River discharges, as suggested in Comment 119-1.*

Refer to Response to Comments 103-7, 103-8, and 119-1.

**Response to Comment 119-4**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS ignores funding opportunities from public and private sources, thereby making mitigation feasible for the Geysers Recharge Alternative, and should be included in the socio-economic evaluation.*

Refer to Response to Comment 11-3.

**Response to Comment 119-5**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS does not give sufficient weight to the impact of the Laguna Discharge Alternative on the Russian River itself and that if a properly-weighted value assessment of the impact to the river was performed, the Geysers Recharge Alternative would be the least significant.*

Refer to Response to Comment 103-17.

### **Response to Comment 119-6**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that a design of the transport pipeline should be more direct, which would significantly lower costs and avoid mitigation requirements along Pine Flat Road.*

Refer to Responses to Comments 26-6 and 103-5.

### **Response to Comment 119-7**

*Comment Summary: The comment asserts that the cost of electrical power for the Geysers Recharge Alternative is overstated.*

Refer to Response to Comment 11-5.

### **Response to Comment 119-8**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS does not take into account the benefits in jobs or property tax base that the additional energy the Geysers would produce during the full life of the project.*

Refer to Responses to Comments 11-6 and 11-7.

### **Response to Comment 119-9**

*Comment Summary: The comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS is so constrained and focused in its preparation and misrepresents the real costs and benefits of the Geysers Recharge Alternative and it underweights the impact of the various options of the Russian River ecosystem. A more accurate and realistic design and cost estimate of the Geysers Recharge Alternative is necessary before the document should be accepted.*

Refer to Responses to Comments 11-4 and 103-17. The purpose of the EIR/EIS process is not to develop the most cost-competitive Geysers Project but to evaluate the environmental impacts of alternatives and alternative components.

### **Response to Comment 119-10**

*Comment Summary: The comment states the opinion that with changes in the calculation of environmental impacts, the Geysers Recharge Alternative might be the Environmentally Superior Alternative.*

Based on the Responses to Comments 119-1 through 119-9, no changes will be made to the findings in the Draft EIR/EIS. Refer to Responses to Comments 103-17 and 103-18 for further explanation about the determination of the environmentally superior alternative.