

*District Mission:  
Dedicated to Satisfying  
our Community's  
Water Needs*

September 1, 2011

The Honorable John Laird  
Secretary for Natural Resources and Chair,  
California Ocean Protection Council  
California Natural Resources Agency  
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**FRED R. BOCKMILLER**  
President  
Division I

**JAMES F. ATKINSON**  
First Vice President  
Division IV

**SHAWN DEWANE**  
Vice President  
Division V

**JAMES FISLER**  
Vice President  
Division II

**TRUDY OHLIG-HALL**  
Vice President  
Division III

**PAUL E. SHOENBERGER, P.E.**  
General Manager

**COLEEN L. MONTELEONE**  
District Secretary

**VICTORIA L. BEATLEY**  
District Treasurer

**BOWIE, ARNESON,  
WILES & GIANNONE**  
Legal Counsel

**SUBJECT: Draft OPC Strategic Action Plan Recommended Amendments**

Dear Secretary Laird:

On behalf of the Mesa Consolidated Water District (Mesa Water) Board of Directors, I commend the Ocean Protection Council (OPC) staff for an ambitious draft Strategic Action Plan for 2012-2017 dated August 1, 2011. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment upon the draft. We have several concerns with the Draft Plan and respectfully submit the following comments.

Mesa Water's comments are limited to Issue 9: Desalination and Once-Through Cooling. While we appreciate the staff's ambitious five-year work plan, we are troubled by some of the conclusions in the draft of Issue 9. For example, the last three sentences of the second full paragraph on page 35 conclude that Desalination should be treated consistent with the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) May 2010 Once-Through Cooling (OTC) Policy. Mesa Water disagrees and submits that there are substantial reasons to differentiate desalination from once-through cooling. As abundantly demonstrated in large-scale, recently constructed plants in Australia, ocean-water desalination facilities have widely different design and operational characteristics from power plants. Therefore, the OTC Policy cannot be rationally applied to ocean-water desalination intakes. For example, water intake and discharge volumes are substantially less with ocean water desalination. Moreover, the use of ocean water is secondary to the primary use of power production whereas it is the primary purpose for desalinated water production. Because ocean water desalination is an important water supply option for local or regional water managers, rational methods of implementation must be preserved as an option when appropriate for the circumstances.

Therefore, we respectfully request that the OPC delete the last three sentences of the second full paragraph of page 35. (See amendment 1 attached).

*District Mission:  
Dedicated to Satisfying  
our Community's  
Water Needs*

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**FRED R. BOCKMILLER**  
President  
Division I

**JAMES F. ATKINSON**  
First Vice President  
Division IV

**SHAWN DEWANE**  
Vice President  
Division V

**JAMES FISLER**  
Vice President  
Division II

**TRUDY OHLIG-HALL**  
Vice President  
Division III

**PAUL E. SHOENBERGER, P.E.**  
General Manager

**COLEEN L. MONTELEONE**  
District Secretary

**VICTORIA L. BEATLEY**  
District Treasurer

**BOWIE, ARNESON,  
WILES & GIANNONE**  
Legal Counsel

Mesa Water also has concerns with Action 9.2.1, which establishes an OPC measure of success that states: "Take appropriate actions to underscore the need for desalination facility intakes to be consistent with the SWRCB's May 2010 executive order and the OPC's 2006 Resolution to phase out OTC technology." Again, the OTC policy does not apply to desalination and there are significant construction and operational characteristics that warrant differentiating desalination from OTC. Therefore, for the same reasons we used in support of our suggested Amendment 1, we also submit that Action 9.2.1 and most of its metrics should be deleted and replaced with direction for the OPC to submit input into the development of the SWRCB pending desalination policy. (See Amendment 2 attached).

One metric under Action 9.2.1 that is particularly troubling states: "Position adopted of no open-ocean intakes for ocean desalination facilities and no co-location of ocean desalination facilities using OTC."

Mesa Water respectfully submits that the science and technology do not support such a metric and would encourage the OPC not to favor one intake technology over another. Selection of the best technology for each desalination project is dependent on a number of site-specific factors. The area's need for additional supplies will drive the location and size of the project. Site-specific issues that will influence the type of intake technology to be employed involve the availability of land, geology, the presence of water bearing materials, water quality, and environmental issues. It is important to understand that the use of slant-well beach intakes is limited to areas of suitable geology and environmental conditions and that their yield is limited by the permeability of the offshore alluvial formation. Slant-well intake technology is only one alternative to be considered and cannot be used at every location. Other alternatives, such as the use of low-velocity screened intakes may also have minimal adverse environmental impacts on the marine environment. In particular, this metric should be deleted. (See amendment 2 attached).

The final issue we would like to raise is found in the first metric for Action 9.1.1. That metric would have the OPC staff performing cost-benefit analyses of desalination compared with other water supply options. Such cost benefit analyses are the purview of each water agency. Under the Urban Water Management Planning Act, each urban agency is to perform such a cost-benefit analysis of various water supply options including ocean water and brackish water desalination. (See Water Code section 10631(i).) Mesa Water recommends that the OPC staff review the Urban Water Management Plans of the water agencies if they are interested in such information. In addition, we are concerned that the OPC staff does not have the necessary expertise or the resources to perform these duplicative analyses. For these reasons, we submit that this metric should be deleted. (See Amendment 3 attached.)

*District Mission:  
Dedicated to Satisfying  
our Community's  
Water Needs*

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. If you have any questions relating to Mesa Water's comments, please do not hesitate to contact General Manager Paul E. Shoenberger at (949) 631-1206.

Sincerely,



Fred R. Bockmiller, Jr., P.E.  
President, Mesa Water Board of Directors

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**FRED R. BOCKMILLER**  
President  
Division I

**JAMES F. ATKINSON**  
First Vice President  
Division IV

**SHAWN DEWANE**  
Vice President  
Division V

**JAMES FISLER**  
Vice President  
Division II

**TRUDY OHLIG-HALL**  
Vice President  
Division III

**PAUL E. SHOENBERGER, P.E.**  
General Manager

**COLEEN L. MONTELEONE**  
District Secretary

**VICTORIA L. BEATLEY**  
District Treasurer

**BOWIE, ARNESON,  
WILES & GIANNONE**  
Legal Counsel

c: Mesa Water Board of Directors  
OPC Members  
Amber Mace, PhD, Executive Director, Ocean Protection Council  
Samuel P. Schuchat, OPC Secretary, Executive Officer State Coastal Conservancy  
Ron Davis, CalDesal Executive Director

*District Mission:  
Dedicated to Satisfying  
our Community's  
Water Needs*

### Amendment No. 1

Delete the last three sentences in the second full paragraph of page 35 to state:

~~Per the SWRCB's May 2010 policy to phase out OTC at most coastal power plants, most of these cooling systems are scheduled to be decommissioned over the next decade. Therefore, state guidance on siting and design considerations (e.g., alternative intake systems such as subsurface intake methods, improved screening methods, etc. should be consistent with the SWRCB's May 2010 policy and should focus on technologies that can have minimal impact.~~

#### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**FRED R. BOCKMILLER**  
President  
Division I

**JAMES F. ATKINSON**  
First Vice President  
Division IV

**SHAWN DEWANE**  
Vice President  
Division V

**JAMES FISLER**  
Vice President  
Division II

**TRUDY OHLIG-HALL**  
Vice President  
Division III

**PAUL E. SHOENBERGER, P.E.**  
General Manager

**COLEEN L. MONTELEONE**  
District Secretary

**VICTORIA L. BEATLEY**  
District Treasurer

**BOWIE, ARNESON,  
WILES & GIANNONE**  
Legal Counsel

### Amendment No. 2

Delete all of Action 9.2.1 on Page 36:

~~**Action 9.2.1: Take appropriate action to underscore need for desalination facility intakes to be consistent with the SWRCB's May 2010 executive order and the OPC's 2006 Resolution to phase out OTC technology.**~~

~~Metrics (measures of the OPC's Actions):~~

- ~~• OPC input into development of the SWRCB's pending desalination policy.~~

~~Metrics (measures of effectiveness):~~

- ~~• Position adopted of no open-ocean intakes for ocean desalination facilities, and no location of ocean desalination facilities with facilities using OTC.~~
- ~~• State's position reflected in the SWRCB's Desalination Policy.~~

And insert the following to state:

**Action 9.2.1: Provide OPC input into development of the SWRCB's pending desalination policy.**

### Amendment No. 3

Delete the first metric under Action 9.1.1 on page 35 to state:

~~*Regional contexts (costs and benefits of desalination compared with other water supply options; alternative water supply options) analyzed.*~~