

**PUBLIC COMMENTOR 213 - BILL KORTUM, SEPTEMBER 24, 1996**

071

Bill Kortum , 180 Ely Road, Petaluma. I want to cover three areas, if I have the time. One is the environmental damage --

**Mayor Wright:**

Could you pull the microphone over closer to your mouth? Thank you.

**BILL KORTUM:**

I want to cover three areas -- environmental -- least environment project proposed at the river; the overpricing that you've seen in this EIR report; and the opinion of a rate payer. To begin with, the Laguna discharge is not the least damaging, because you're not looking on -- the EIR writers are not looking at ever increasing discharge to the river, which might at the end of the project have to go to 45 or 50 percent rather than 25.

They're not looking at how you would strengthen agriculture if you delivered it to agriculture, which will preserve agriculture, which preserves open space and prevents the ranchetting of this county. And fail to say in the EIR that if you reuse this water, particularly in the urban project, that you will further that time when you have to develop new water resources for this county at a very expensive project. Our last project was 350 million dollars to build warm springs. I'd like to make a case for the South County. Not that I'm advocating a large project, but to make the case that the EIR is vastly overpriced in the alternative other than Laguna discharge.

First of all, I am submitting in more detail my final report, but I have eight pages of the Petaluma EIR which describes a partnership with Petaluma. Petaluma is designing a 37 million dollar storage distribution system, and there's a real chance that a partnership could be formed there. When we look at the dam project in the South County project there's an elaborate 15 million dollar catchment area around the dam.

If you go back to the original Koretsky-king report, that doesn't even exist. Koretsky says catch that water. And most damaging is an elaborate distribution system that essentially requires \$66 million added to the project and takes -- does not take into consideration that you could use your transmission line to the South County to deliver that water to the farming communities. I'd like to put an overhead on to demonstrate Kortum's economies of scale. There's the HBA cost, 186 million, and then of course you add 55 percent to that, and that's what gets it up into the -- over 300 figure. As compared to an HBA reconfigure. But you notice the Tolay storage is at 46 million. It could be 31. You notice that the distribution line -- pipe lines could be 20 million instead of the 66 million. You can notice that a Petaluma partnership would save you 20 million dollars. The project comes in at 105 instead of 186. You add your contingencies, which is only 40 percent discharge, but it's really 55. Gets it back up to 150 or so. Million dollars.

But the big question which is not really well addressed in the EIR is the carrying costs of the debt service. And if you take 147 million at 20 years, you're spending 111 million and paying the debt service. So I took half of that and added 60 there, so the cost of the project is 87 million. I'm not an engineer, folks, but there's a lot of investigation that could be done of that South County project.

079

Finally, the EIR fails to discuss smaller sites. That's been repeated a number of times here. A transmission line to the South County with the potential of irrigating along the way. That the South County makes available bay lands, which you did accommodate with your EIR study, but it doesn't go into the description that the bay lands allows you at the end of project to expand the project.

080

081

082

There is no discussion in the EIR of what you do at build out, and what are the financial problems at that time. And that could amount to a great deal of money. Thank you.

083

**Mayor Wright:**

Your time's up, Mr. Kortum. Thank you.