

Megan Steer

From: George Riley <georgetriley@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2015 1:30 PM
To: MPWSP-EIR
Cc: George Riley
Subject: Fwd: Conflict of Interest:

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Here again is my email of August 11th.

Do you intend to extend the investigation of potential conflicts of interest to the relationship between Geoscience and the driller Bourt Longyear?

The issue of feasibility is rapidly being replaced by the issue of credibility.

Besides this, there are two additional desal proposals to serve this area.

As the dark side of Cal Am's contractors receive some light, it is time for the others to get serious light as well.

I hope you can share the intentions of the CPUC on my question.

Thank you.

**George
T. Riley**

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **George Riley** <georgetriley@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Aug 11, 2015 at 12:16 PM

Subject: Conflict of Interest:

To: MPWSP-EIR@esassoc.com

Mary Jo Borak
CA Public Utilities Commission
c/o Environmental Science Associates
550 Kearney Street, Suite 800
San Francisco CA 94108

RE: A.12-04-019 Energy Division Notice of 7/9/2105 Inviting Comments re Extension of DEIR

Dear Ms Borak,

The patent/royalty relationship between Dennis Williams/Geoscience and the driller – Bourt Longyear – has not been investigated. They have a long relationship, having been together at Dana Point in that test well project. Now they are together again here.

Common sense suggests the obvious -- check it out. After all, if Williams' patent will apply worldwide, and Bourton Longyear is an international driller, it is crucial to investigate that relationship. Millions of income to both is possible, IF the slant well here is successful. Success here is critical for success in the future. "IF successful" is a powerful challenge, and a worthy one, IF millions are at stake. Success here depend on data and opinions are clean and free of sleaze. The sleaze potential is real. CPUC will have only done part its job if it stops its investigation at the Cal Am and Williams relationship.

The RBF agreement with Geoscience after 2012 does not contain any language that the design will include any patented technology. Many design features were mentioned, and clearly some of the lessons from Dana Point and details from Williams' patents were the foundation for Williams' work. But again, there was no disclosure of actual patented technology is mentioned. Later Williams informed some that he held patents, and that all ownership would remain with Geoscience. He was staking out his ground. The suspicion remains that this project, and his patents, must succeed in order for later millions to be made.

Furthermore, all the contract relationships preceding the patents are irrelevant and wastes time and rhetoric. The initial issue is disclosure. Pure and simple disclosure. And that part was proven -- there was no public disclosure. Now the question must be on why. Millions of income is a powerful silencer.

So the unaddressed issue is the relationship between Geoscience and Bourton Longyear.

Is it possible that substantive financial relationships exist between these two that could cause the data to be skewed to serve ulterior motives? Will CCC look into the contract relationship between Williams and Boart Longyear? Will CCC investigate royalty and shared self interests in the contracts, and in other communications, that could lead to suspicion or fact? All modeling, test well operations, reports and interpretations should be reviewed. Will CCC question the financial relationship of these two key sources of data, operations, activity and opinion?

The credibility of Cal Am is already damaged, first denying any use of the patents, then admitting otherwise. Now the credibility of CPUC is on the line.

Thank you.

George T. Riley

Managing Director

Public Water Now.

[831-645-9914](tel:831-645-9914)

