

From: Nikola Lakic
To: [commentletters](#)
Subject: Comment Letter - Region 7 Administrative Basin Plan- FW: water import proposal memorandum - / Respond to Assistant Secretary Mr. Bruce Wilcox's rejection of the proposal for the Request for Information (RFI) for the Salton Sea Water Importation Projects.
Date: Sunday, October 28, 2018 7:36:14 PM
Attachments: [Geothermal Worldwide \(003\).docx](#)

October 28, 2018



Jeanine Townsend, Clerk to the Board
State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 100, Sacramento, CA 95812-2000 (mail)
1001 I Street, 24th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814 (hand delivery)
commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov

Subject: "Comment Letter - Region 7 Administrative Basin Plan Amendment"

Greetings Ms. Jeanine Townsend,

I am writing this email in response to the email with the subject: "NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT - ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENT TO THE BASIN PLAN" which I received late on Thursday, October 25, 2018. I apologize for the late response, but I didn't see the message on time and deadline was less than 21 hours from sending it to me.

I have been present in several workshops (meetings) as well on October 18, 2018. I noticed that several board members said that – "... the Salton Sea issues are under the different jurisdiction and that issue here is the water quality ...".

My intention was and still is to say that the issue of water quality of our region is closely related to my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea because my design provides a substantial amount of potable water that has not been counted on before and improves quality of water in the Salton Sea which is quite opposite from current course of action that the California Water Board has endorsed. Also, my intention was and still is to point out that, therefore, my proposal cannot be separated as a completely different issue, neglected or ignored and/or deflected responsibilities to others.

I am aware that there are other groups/organizations such as the SSA's Technical Advisory Group, Evaluation Group, etc., but if they failed in their task for whatever reason – whether lack of knowledge or being under influence of one person or a group of people - it is the State responsibility to get involved. Also, I wanted to remind board members that the California Water Boards bear responsibilities for water quality of our region and should be involved more passionately in this case and not just passively wait for others to make the decision for them.

I believe that we are still in time to save and restore the Salton Sea despite

unreasonable opposition which the California Water Board currently support.

Since I am in dispute with Assistant Secretary Mr. Bruce Wilcox, who recently rejected my proposal without any scientific argument, and because I already exhausted all options with him and hope that he will inform higher officials including Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., about the existence of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea, I am forwarding to you my response to Assistant Secretary Mr. Bruce Wilcox, which contains a lot of important information including the link to my video (about 1 hour) in which I am explaining my proposal and technologies involved.

I respectfully urge every decision-maker of the State of California, especially those in Energy, Water and Environment sectors to review my proposal and to get involved because it is in interest to all of us and the future generations.

I would be glad to answer any question.

Sincerely,

Nikola N. Lacic
Graduate Eng. Architect
Geothermal Worldwide, Inc.
78-365 Hwy 111, #402
La Quinta, CA 92253
01-760-347-1609
01-760-333-3851 cell
www.GeothermalWorldwide.com
nlacic@GeothermalWorldwide.com

From: Nikola Lacic [mailto:nlacic@geothermalworldwide.com]

Sent: Friday, October 12, 2018 10:59 AM

To: 'Wilcox, Bruce@CNRA'

Cc: 'secretary@resources.ca.gov'; 'Karen.Douglas@energy.ca.gov'; 'prosenrater@ssajpa.org'; 'ryankelley@co.imperial.ca.us'; 'podowd@cvwd.org'; 'district4@rivco.org'; 'PCooper@RivCo.org'; 'mashley@rcbos.org'; 'johnrenison@co.imperial.ca.us'; 'ejortega@iid.com'; 'jchanks@iid.com'; 'cestrada@cvwd.org'; 'tmtortez@torresmartinez.org'; 'tmasantillanes@torresmartinez.org'; 'PJohnson@ssajpa.org'; 'dfarris@cvwd.org'; 'jpowell@cvwd.org'; 'Robert.Hargreaves@bbklaw.com'; 'lseroy@ssajpa.org'; 'Jacqueline.lopez@mail.house.gov'; 'Alexander.strizak@mail.house.gov'; 'Glenn.Miller@sen.ca.gov'; 'senator.stone@senate.ca.gov'; 'Hector.Araujo@sen.ca.gov'; 'Senator.hueso@senate.ca.gov'; 'John.Garcia@Sen.ca.gov'; 'senator.anderson@sen.ca.gov'; 'senator.deleon@senate.ca.gov'; 'sweiss@rctlma.org'; 'doug_barnum@usgs.gov'; 'lross@rctlma.org'; 'Miguel.romerochoa@asm.ca.gov'; 'Assemblymember.Mayes@assembly.ca.gov'; 'tbradley@uci.edu';

'mcohen@pacinst.org'; 'doug_barnum@usgs.gov'; 'Scott.haase@nrel.gov'; 'exsec@ios.doi.gov';
'crb@crb.ca.gov'; 'Matthew.Rodriguez@calepa.ca.gov'; 'Gordon.Burns@calepa.ca.gov';
'Grant.Cope@calepa.ca.gov'; 'paul.penn@calepa.ca.gov'; 'ttrujillo@crb.ca.gov'; 'csharris@crb.ca.gov';
'Felicia.Marcus@waterboards.ca.gov'; 'Steven.Moore@waterboards.ca.gov';
'Tam.Doduc@waterboards.ca.gov'; 'Dorene.Dadamo@waterboards.ca.gov';
'maria.davydova@waterboards.ca.gov'; 'joakin.esquivel@waterboards.ca.gov';
'jeff.geraci@waterboards.ca.gov'; 'jose.angel@waterboards.ca.gov'; 'adriana.nunez@waterboards.ca.gov';
'Frances.Spivy-Weber@waterboards.ca.gov'; 'vsimon@usbr.gov'; 'mrichard@mail.smu.edu';
'Hjb84@cornell.edu'; 'DOE.Geothermal@ee.doe.gov'; 'Susan.Hamm@EE.DOE.Gov';
'Andrew.McAllister@energy.ca.gov'; 'BenLubbon@JudeBenedict.com'; 'aschriener@earthsystems.com';
'Lauren.Boyd@ee.doe.gov'; 'Eric.Hass@ee.doe.gov'; 'Timothy.Reinhardt@ee.doe.gov';
'Matthew.Kalmuk@ee.doe.gov'; 'Michael.Gabaldon@aecom.com'; 'Krystal.Beckham@lhc.ca.gov';
'ian.james@thedesertsun.com'; 'Sammy.roth@desertsun.com'; 'exsec@ios.doi.gov';
'kenos@iplawusa.com'; 'Janea.Scott@energy.ca.gov'; 'Michael.brune@sierraclub.org'

Subject: RE: water import proposal memorandum - / Respond to Assistant Secretary Mr. Bruce Wilcox's rejection of the proposal for the Request for Information (RFI) for the Salton Sea Water Importation Projects.

October 12, 2018

Mr. Bruce Wilcox
Assistant Secretary for the Salton Sea Policy
at California's Natural Resources
Bruce.Wilcox@resources.ca.gov

Cc: secretary@resources.ca.gov; Karen.Douglas@energy.ca.gov ;
prosenrater@ssajpa.org; ryankelley@co.imperial.ca.us; podowd@cvwd.org;
district4@rivco.org; PCooper@RivCo.org; mashley@rcbos.org;
johnrenison@co.imperial.ca.us; ejortega@iid.com; jchanks@iid.com; cestrada@cvwd.org;
tmrtortez@torresmartinez.org; tmasantillanes@torresmartinez.org; PJohnson@ssajpa.org;
dfarris@cvwd.org ; jpowell@cvwd.org ; Robert.Hargreaves@bbklaw.com;
Iseroy@ssajpa.org; Jacqueline.lopez@mail.house.gov; Alexander.strizak@mail.house.gov;
Glenn.Miller@sen.ca.gov ; senator.stone@senate.ca.gov ; Hector.Araujo@sen.ca.gov ;
Senator.hueso@senate.ca.gov ; John.Garcia@Sen.ca.gov ; senator.anderson@sen.ca.gov
; senator.deleon@senate.ca.gov ; sweiss@rctlma.org; doug_barnum@usgs.gov ;
lross@rctlma.org ; Miguel.romerochoa@asm.ca.gov;
Assemblymember.Mayes@assembly.ca.gov; tbradley@uci.edu; mcohen@pacinst.org ;
doug_barnum@usgs.gov ; Scott.haase@nrel.gov ; exsec@ios.doi.gov ; crb@crb.ca.gov ;
Matthew.Rodriguez@calepa.ca.gov ; Gordon.Burns@calepa.ca.gov ;
Grant.Cope@calepa.ca.gov ; paul.penn@calepa.ca.gov; ttrujillo@crb.ca.gov ;
csharris@crb.ca.gov ; Felicia.Marcus@waterboards.ca.gov ;
Steven.Moore@waterboards.ca.gov; Tam.Doduc@waterboards.ca.gov ;
Dorene.Dadamo@waterboards.ca.gov; maria.davydova@waterboards.ca.gov;
joakin.esquivel@waterboards.ca.gov; jeff.geraci@waterboards.ca.gov;
jose.angel@waterboards.ca.gov; adriana.nunez@waterboards.ca.gov; Frances.Spivy-Weber@waterboards.ca.gov ;
vsimon@usbr.gov ; mrichard@mail.smu.edu ;
Hjb84@cornell.edu ; DOE.Geothermal@ee.doe.gov ; Susan.Hamm@EE.DOE.Gov ;
Andrew.McAllister@energy.ca.gov; BenLubbon@JudeBenedict.com ;
aschriener@earthsystems.com ; Lauren.Boyd@ee.doe.gov ; Eric.Hass@ee.doe.gov ;
Timothy.Reinhardt@ee.doe.gov ; Matthew.Kalmuk@ee.doe.gov;
Michael.Gabaldon@aecom.com ; Krystal.Beckham@lhc.ca.gov;
ian.james@thedesertsun.com; Sammy.roth@desertsun.com;
exsec@ios.doi.gov; kenos@iplawusa.com ; Janea.Scott@energy.ca.gov ;

Michael.brune@sierraclub.org ;

Subject: Respond to Assistant Secretary Mr. Bruce Wilcox's rejection of the proposal for the Request for Information (RFI) for the Salton Sea Water Importation Projects.

Greetings Mr. Wilcox:

Thank you for the letter in which you notify me of the decision that my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea will not be considered further. I am not surprised by your decision - we have been through this before - but I am very disappointed in how you have handled the issue of the Salton Sea so far.

We interacted many times in the last 5 years and it is no secret that your vision and my vision of the fate of the Salton Sea are completely opposite.

Your vision, which you tirelessly promote, is a "Smaller and *Sustainable Lake*" (Perimeter Lake); and supporting programs - the "Salton Sea Management Program" (SSMP); "Task Force" and "10-year Plan" - which would require constant infusion of money (in billions of dollars) from state and federal governments for fixing never-ending problems and at the end lousing the lake. The Salton Sea will, without any doubt, sooner or later become a smaller sustainable cesspool. A few companies and a few contractors would benefit at the expense to the environment and population of nearby communities.

My vision is to divide the lake into three sections and import seawater into the central section and restore the water level and the glory of the lake in the 1950s and 60s. My proposal would provide a condition for tourism (beaches, hotels, motels, resorts); Exclusive real state; and vast wildlife sanctuary.

My proposal incorporates several of my patented breakthrough technologies in the energy industry and provides solutions such as:

- a)** Harnessing geothermal energy with a completely closed-loop system (not limited to the geothermal reservoirs) that would generate electricity many times more than what has been projected with conventional geothermal systems;
- b)** Importing seawater with unique pipeline system (my design) with a single downhill pipeline with a diameter of only 48" with a capacity of importing about 2 million acre-feet seawater per year and in the process generating revenue in about 100 million dollars per year (just from the process of importing seawater. The amount of revenue depends on which corridor is selected);
- c)** Generate potable water (about a third of imported seawater) with inexpensive new technology (no expenses for reverse osmoses and no expenses for electricity for distillation as would be the case with conventional desalinization systems);
- d)** Providing water for farmland and wildlife sanctuaries on the northern and southern part of the lake from Colorado River (canal) that is in harmony with recent

restrictions by enforcement of the Quantification Settlement Agreement (QSA) – (it would provide full functional lake with less than 500,000 acre-feet per year from Colorado River);

e) Employing many people during the construction and after the construction of the project;

f) Generating revenue of hundreds of billion dollars in several decades;

g) Providing a solution for waste material;

h) Providing a clean environment.

In my proposal, I have explained how functional lake can be accomplished in 4-5 years costing only about 10 billion dollars.

Because of several inadequate criteria that you used in making the decision on this issue, I have to respond to your letter. Your letter is included as an attachment.

Regarding your comment in the second paragraph of your letter that the Committee and Evaluation group did not find your (my) submittal to be a clear description of a proposed course of action:

When you use the phrase "... a proposed course of action" - it is obvious that you are referring to a "Smaller and Sustainable Lake" and supporting programs - the "Salton Sea Management Program" (SSMP) and "10-year Plan", which you tirelessly support and promote. With all due respect, sir, your proposed course of action is not in the best interest of the Salton Sea, our environment, the health of the population the surrounding communities of, and the economy.

In my Proposal (submittal), I pointed out at falseness of the current course of action which is a "Smaller and *Sustainable* Lake", etc., and I respectfully urged you for a radical change of current course of action with a hope that fairness and common sense will be used - because importing seawater which is a good idea, and current course of action, which is a bad idea cannot logically coexist. Sorry to say, but that is another failure of your task – not being objective and not being able to distinguish between good and a bad idea, and not being able to make radical changes, when needed, in the interest of final goal of saving the Salton Sea, environment and our communities.

Regarding your comment in the second paragraph of your letter that there was no description of the project team, as required; a project of the proposed scale will require expertise on a broad range of topics:

I am providing a solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea which is needed for the last half of the century. It is irrelevant whether the solution is provided by a single author or by a team of people.

The essence of our conflict is that you think that you have a solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea and that you need only funding and a contractor to implement it. First of all, you don't have a feasible solution and I am trying to tell you that many times in the last 5

years. Secondly, I am trying to explain to you that only when there is a feasible solution, only then, you can proceed with next stage which is working on the funding for the project and looking for contractors – not the other way around. In my proposal (papers), in the last chapter “Additional Information, Observation and Suggestions” I am explaining it.

In my submittal (proposal) I have explained that I am not either a contractor nor I have the intention to become one – I am an architect providing a preliminary design explaining feasibility and the function of a unique solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea. My mission is global. I am in the business of selling licenses for my patented technologies and the solutions, as it is common practice in many industries. Between my design and implementation of it will be involved several contractors with means and experience such as AECOM, ORMAT, EQT, FLUOR, ABB, SIEMENS, MITSUBISHI, FUJI, GE, etc., companies capable of implementing projects of grand scale. In my opinion, the selection of the contractor(s) should be done on the state level by the well-informed state officials. This project could be considered the project of the century.

Regarding expertise: I would be glad to help any selected contractors with final production design and implementation of my methodologies. As you might know, I am the inventor of a breakthrough methodology for harnessing geothermal energy which is prevalent in the Salton Sea area. I am also the inventor of a breakthrough methodology for importing seawater through the pipeline using the “In-Line-Pump” for uphill routes and the “In-Line-Generators” for downhill routes. This system also consists of “Split and Join” mini-hydropower plants and “Delta” mini-hydropower plants. I am also the inventor of the new methodology for harnessing solar energy the “Thermo-Optical Solar” system (TOS) which can be assembled on the pipeline. I am also the inventor of a new methodology for desalinization of seawater and production of potable water by using geothermal and solar energy. I am also providing a solution for depositing waste material. I am also the inventor of a breakthrough methodology for drilling deeper and wider wellbores. Mr. Wilcox, you don’t need to look very far for expertise on a broad range of topics.

Regarding your comment in the second paragraph of your letter that I did not address the environmental or permitting process:

-
If you read and completely understood my proposal, you would find that I have addressed the environmental issue very well. By filling the lake with seawater to the level of the 1950s and 60s and by covering exposed lakebed with seawater (central section) and with potable water (northern and southern section) it eliminates threat of formation of toxic dust storms and subsequently making the Salton Sea Management Program (SSMP) unnecessary; By using my patented breakthrough systems for desalinization of the lake it would provide a substantial amount of potable water with almost no expense for it. My proposal would also provide a vast wildlife sanctuary – all three sections.

Providing permits is something that you and the Salton Sea Authority (SSA), should be involved in, at least partially, and use the same effort as you did in promoting and providing approvals and permits for a “Smaller and Sustainable Lake” (Perimeter Lake); Salton Sea Management Program (SSMP); and “10-year Plan”; etc., - only this time the effort should be redirected in useful and proper direction – which is saving and restoring the Salton Sea.

Regarding your comment in the first paragraph of your letter that the SSMP Long Range

Planning Committee and the RFI Evaluation Group reviewed all responses, with specific attention to the information provided in response to the specific questions and information required by the RFI:

- Base on such comment and base on your reaction after several of our meetings, it is obvious that you are a strong supporter of the current course of action which is a “Smaller and *Sustainable Lake*” and supporting programs; and it also obvious that you never consider saving the Salton Sea; and it also obvious that you never had the honest intention to hear, see and/or consider any proposal that is not in line with your plan, especially if such a proposal is completely opposite of your plan.

Also, I would like to mention that I didn't receive a single call or request for clarification of the proposal and/or additional explanation of my technologies from any member of the SSMP Long Range Planning Committee and the RFI's Evaluation Group which means that - whether they are not interested to learn about new technologies and solutions, or that they are under your strong influence and chose to remain subjective. It is a common understanding that reasonable people, especially those who are selected to evaluate proposals, would be at least curious to learn about new technologies, especially if such technologies are going, sooner or later, to change the energy industry, and provide potable water and clean environment.

I am using this opportunity for additional 20 important observations and comments:

1. Since we are in the late stage and so much is at stake (the Salton Sea; our environment and health and lives of the population) - and as a member of the community with expertise on this field – it is my moral obligation to do my best in explaining the situation with hope that someone with knowledge, influence, and courage would be able to inform higher authorities including Governor Brown about the existence of my proposal.
2. After 5 years working (on my own) on the solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea and meeting you in many occasions, my first observation of the situation was/is that your leadership (team) is lacking architectural and technical expertise. So far all critical decisions have been made by experts with a background in biology and/or environment. Such experts are helpful in frequently monitoring and reporting degradation of the Salton Sea, but they are not, and have not been, capable of finding a valid solution that requires architectural and other technical expertise. I don't blame those experts – designing is not their expertise – but I am pointing out on the problem of this particular case so that that can be corrected.
3. I don't know who, but whoever initiated the idea that the California Natural Resource Agency (CNRA) be assigned the task to find the solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea has made a serious mistake. An analogy - It is like assigning a plumber or dentist to perform bypass heart surgery to a needed patient.
4. Everyone who provided a proposal for the Restoration of the Salton Sea to the best to his/her abilities, especially if someone did it on his or her free time, deserves appreciation and congratulation – not criticism - but because of the late stage and because so much is at stake, and because of special attention that has been given to those proposals (several times in several years, and by doing so limiting time for serious debate between current course of action and my proposal) - I have to point out on several obvious deficiencies in some of those proposals:

a) All 10 competing proposals are “speculative” and “wishful thinking” and some of their authors, although nice people, lack adequate technical knowledge.

b) Most of those proposals are part of and/or are in line with “current course of action” which is the “Smaller and Sustainable Lake” / the “Perimeter Lake”, etc., - the projects that you support - which are not in the best interest of the Salton Sea, nor of the environment, nor of the people of the surrounding communities.

c) Most of the presenters have proposed slightly different corridors for a canal and conventional pipeline claiming that they have necessary contacts with officials in Mexico. The emphasis of most of those presenters was/is on their offers of administrative services;

To mention just a few noticeable deficiencies:

d) Presenter Mr. Tom DuBose representing the AECOM admits that he has no solution but that he is associated with the AECOM which, he believes, has the expertise and will be able to find some solution for the Salton Sea in the future.

(COMMENT: The successful solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea already exist – my design - and the AECOM is well suited as a potential contractor for the implementation of it. Mr. Tom DuBose would be a welcome asset as a local expert in contributing to the implementation of my proposal.)

e) Presenter Mr. Nathan White from the Agess, Inc., who is deeply involved in the current course of action, says that the combined power from all 11 local geothermal power plants is not enough to fully desalinate imported seawater using “reverse osmoses”. Also, he is talking about pipeline (culvert) diameter of 6 meters (19.6 feet = 236 inches).

(COMMENT: Such statements come from a typical conventional thinking that has been around for several decades. Although mentioned statement about “reverse osmoses” is correct – such technologies would not be a proper solution for the Salton Sea situation. My proposal uses different more efficient and inexpensive technologies for the generation of electricity and desalinization of the Salton Sea. In my system the potable water is a free byproduct after electricity is generated).

Also, he is talking about generators on the pipeline (produced by LucidEnergy) that supposes to generate electricity during the flow of seawater through a pipeline.

(COMMENT: The design of presented generators (LucidEnergy) is highly inefficient because several spherical turbines rotate around a vertical axis inside the pipe which is perpendicular to the central line of the pipe. Only $\frac{1}{4}$ of the rotation of the spherical turbines inside the pipe is in direction of the fluid flow and $\frac{3}{4}$ of the rotation of the spherical turbines is against the fluid flow - therefore such design is inefficient and has no future. My design of the pipeline system in downhill routes has a single pipeline with a diameter of only 48 inches with a capacity to bring about 2,000,000 acre-feet of seawater

per year. Also, my design of “In-Line-Pump/Generator” is a very efficient design. The pipeline segments can work as a “Pump” in uphill routes and as a “Generator” in downhill routes. Also, the whole pipeline system (my design) can be used in reverse function (fluid flow can be in either direction) if needed with minor adjustments.)

Also, he and others are saying that the permitting process takes time especially for importing seawater and dealing with other countries governments and that there are a short-term, medium-term and long-term solutions, therefore, at this time, we should focus on a short-term solution and continue with small projects to “somehow” try to deal with some area of exposed lakebed of the shrinking lake to prevent formation of toxic dust-storms.

(COMMENT: The permitting process is difficult and time-consuming because, besides the administrative process, regulatory agencies have difficulties issuing permits for projects that are not compliant with basic environmental regulations. Also, investors have difficulties to invest in projects that don't generate revenue and/or are not feasible. With my proposal, we would not have such difficulties.

f) Presenter Ms. Lucy Labruzzo from Cordoba Corporation and others are saying that it is important to continue with the “current course of action” so that all previous efforts and money already spent would not be lost in vain. She was repeating a statement that you said on many occasions.

(COMMENT: Such reasoning is not in the best interest of finding the solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea. Refer to the closing segment (17) regarding late Steve Jobs at the end of this letter.)

g) Presenter Mr. Tom Sephton from Sephton Water Technology, who is also involved in the current course of action having expertise in desalination says that he is willing to do his best on a smaller scale but desalinating the Salton Sea on a larger scale would be extremely difficult and very expensive task and therefore infeasible.

(COMMENT: His statement is based on conventional thinking and on that base he is absolutely right. My proposed system for desalination of the Lake is quite different.

Mr. Tom Sephton would be welcome assets as a local expert in contributing to the implementation of my proposal.)

h) Presenter Mr. Lane Sharman from Transform Water & Power proposes collecting water from air with a device “dehumidifier” which supposes to be positioned on many floating platforms (floating islands) on the Salton Sea. He states that the size of each such floating island (float-rack) would be about 2,000 acres and would collect 33 acre-feet of potable water per year.

(COMMENT: The Salton Sea loses by evaporation approximately 1,200,000 acre-feet per year. Therefore, it would be needed 3,636 such floating islands to balance evaporation of the lake. It doesn't make a sense. Also, the proposed system requires a substantial amount of electric energy to operate. His proposal doesn't remove any salt from the lake – in fact, the lake would be saltier by day. Also, production and maintenance of such floating islands

(platforms) would require substantial capital with no chance of ever making any revenue.

i) For those who propose importing seawater from the Gulf of California by digging a canal – filling Laguna Salada in Mexico - and then importing seawater into the Salton Sea.

(COMMENT: Importing seawater through Laguna Salada would bring water that is saltier than seawater into already salty Salton Sea. Also, tides would play a negative role – it would frequently pull back and forth seawater through the canal).

j) All those who claim that have a connection with Mexican Government would be useful assets although my proposal requires serious negotiation with highest officials in Mexico for exchanging waters (New River and Alamo River to be redirected to Mexico for their benefits - and in return a corridor for the pipeline to bring seawater in the USA). Therefore, I think that such negotiations should be done on the State level, preferably a treaty, as I have explained in my papers – here are two sentence from my papers “The *Logan Act* (18 U.S.C.A. § 953 [1948]) is a single federal statute making it a crime for a citizen to confer with foreign governments. Specifically, it prohibits citizens from negotiating with other nations on behalf of the United States”.

Also, I included in my papers a framework and a few tips for a successful negotiation of our (USA) team with Mexico’s team.

k) All competing proposals suggest slightly different routes for importing seawater preferring a canal, but they have no feasible solution for desalinization and are hoping that someone else, in the future, will find a solution to that problem. They believe that just importing seawater would solve the problem. They don’t understand that there is much more involved in such a complex situation than just importing seawater. They are lacking technical knowledge and experience in designing. Mentioned deficiencies usually happen when someone pretends “want-a-be” an architect.

l) All competing proposals require a substantial amount of money for its implementations and also would require money for purchase of seawater, and would require an indefinite and substantial infusion of money from State and Federal Governments for maintenance of proposed projects (their solutions) with no chance of ever returning the initial investment and with no chance of saving the Salton Sea.

5. The fact is that all 9 sub-competing proposals are in line with the “current course of action” which is the 10th competing proposal – the “Perimeter Lake” – which you tearlessly support. The fact is that the “current course of action” is not in the best interest of the Salton Sea, nor of the environment, nor of the communities. The fact is that the “Perimeter Lake” consists of making a barrier around perimeter of the Lake directing flow of the New River and Alamo River (and possibly proposed seawater) around perimeter of the Lake and then ending the flow in the central part of the Lake which would be filled with brine which would be saltier, smellier, and more polluted every year because of evaporation and constant inflow of pollutants such as fertilizers, pesticides, salt and sewer from Mexicali, Mexico. The author(s) of such proposal, including you, have no plan for effective and inexpensive desalinization. They, including you, speculate where will be the waterline in 10 – years. They, including you, are hoping (wishing) that - by separating flow of the New River and

Alamo River, during the flow around central portion of the lake – would provide a condition for tourism (for beachgoers), and exclusive real state because quality of water from the New River and Alamo River would be better than quality of water (brine) in central portion of the lake.

All those proposals are accessible on the following link: <http://resources.ca.gov/salton-sea>. Videos of all presentations from May 21, 2018, at El Centro, CA, are accessible on the following link: http://imperial.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=1274

6. With all due respect, sir, I am sorry to say, but so far you completely failed in your task – which was/is after reviewing proposals to find/select/recommend the best solution for saving and restoring the Salton Sea. This is second time in 30 months (1st - time - during the Long-Range Plan for the Restoration of the Salton Sea, on Feb. 25, 2016, in Palm Desert; and 2nd – time - during RFI, on May 21, 2018, in El Centro) that you officially rejected the proposal that would save and restore the Salton Sea and at same time you supported and promoted proposal that would destroy the Salton Sea and bring ecological and economic disaster to our communities.

7. NOTE: I am using wording “destruction of the Lake” reluctantly, but “Smaller and *Sustainable Lake*” and supporting programs are just that – legalized and systematic destruction of the Salton Sea.

8. I don't know who - but whoever initiated programs such as the “Salton Sea Management Program” (SSMP) and “10-year Plan” - either made unintentional serious mistake because of lack of knowledge and/or ignorance, - or is part of a scheme, which is to legalize destruction of the Salton Sea and ensuring that the State pay for it.

9. I am confident that, sooner or later, the reasonable people with vision will recognize the value of my proposal and supporting technologies and that it will be used, preferably sooner than later, because the Salton Sea area has a unique position to become a hub for desalinization of seawater and production and distribution of potable water through the desert. I am also confident that my proposal will be implemented because it is going to be difficult for reasonable people to say “no” to the revenue of billions of dollars and a clean environment. Therefore, for the sake of the Salton Sea, environment and our economy, it is very important that reasonable and knowledgeable people see my proposal. When recognition of my proposal happens, and if you are still in power, sir, please don't “butcher” my design – it is a comprehensive design that incorporates several breakthrough technologies creating a self-sustaining organism. I feel awkward that I have to clarify it for you, but sir, - it is also an art.

10. Sooner or later the following question will need to be answered: Who is responsible for the loss of time and billions of dollars of taxpayers' money for the current failure in respect to the Salton Sea situation? Also, it will be interesting to see – which kind of excuses will be made and who is going to blame whom for the current misconduct?

11. In the meantime, I will continue promoting my proposal and technologies through conferences relevant to energy and environment and hopefully knowledgeable and environment conscious people will see my proposal and hopefully some of them will be honorable and influential enough to contact and inform Governor Brown so that Governor can, after being familiarized with my proposal, abolish futile programs such as “Smaller and *Sustainable Lake*” and the “Salton Sea Management Program” (SSMP) and redirect

already allocated money \$200 million towards the “Long-term solution for the Lake” - which is my proposal.

12. Some people have a big ego and have difficulties to admit their mistakes. Let’s hope that that is not your case. Despite our clear disagreements during the last 5 years regarding the fate of the Salton Sea, I respectfully urge you again, sir, to read my proposal completely, several times if necessary, and to reconsider your and yours obeying “Evaluation Group” decision. Also, I urge you to inform higher authorities about our dispute (for example this letter summarizes it) and to inform officially higher authorities of the existence of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea. I assume that it would not be an easy task for you, but it would be an honorable thing to do.

13. If you are so sure that you are right and that I am wrong – then for the sake of due process, fairness and common sense - let “impartial” experts review and make a comparison of both concepts. My suggestion to avoid conflict of interest is that the “impartial” experts should not be under your influence and should not be receiving paychecks for any work related to the “current course of action”.

The “impartial” experts should evaluate and compare several critical points:

- a) Which proposal provides the best corridor and the system for importing seawater in terms of cost, efficiencies, and revenue?
- b) Which proposal provides the best solution and technology for desalinization of the lake and generation of potable water in terms of cost, efficiencies, and revenue?
- c) Which proposal provides the best solution and technology for harnessing geothermal energy in terms of cost, efficiencies, and revenue?
- d) Which proposal provides the best solution for the wildlife sanctuary in terms of area, isolation (natural ambient and privacy), and a healthy environment?
- e) Which proposal provides the best solution for providing a condition for tourism in terms of the healthy environment, cost, and revenue?
- f) Which proposal provides the best solution for a clean environment in terms of cost, efficiencies, and revenue?
- g) Which proposal provides the best solution for depositing salt and waste in terms of cost, efficiencies, environment, and revenue?
- h) Which proposal provides the best solution for providing potable water for nearby farmland in terms of cost, efficiencies, and revenue?
- i) Which proposal is in harmony with the Quantification Settlement Agreement (QSA) and provides a solution for current and future drought situations?

14. I would like to emphasize that this is not a political issue and that any particular company doesn’t own the Salton Sea. This is a citizens’ issue and there is no good reason for keeping public, local and state officials uninformed about the existence of my proposal. By the way, if you read my proposal and completely understood it, you would found out that both - the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) - would benefit more with my proposal then would with the “current course of action”.

15. You need to understand, sir, that the only way to save and restore the Salton Sea is to divide the Salton Sea in three sections and import seawater into central section – which is the essence of my proposal – by the way patented concept.

16. Also, I would like to remind you that withholding important information from higher

authorities during the period of time in which certain approval and permits are achieved for a competing project, which you prefer, is unlawful conduct. If you did inform Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., of the existence of my proposal before his approval of the “Salton Sea Management Program” (SSMP) and “10-years Plan”, in May 2015, then the blame for this serious mistake would be on Governor Brown, and I would apologize to you for my tone in this letter, but, I doubt that you informed Governor Brown and relevant agencies about the existence of my proposal.

17. I will finish this letter by repeating the relevant statement from the last segment of my proposal (papers): “The virtue of the late Steve Jobs, the CEO of the Apple, was the ability to make so-called a “turn on a dime” when he saw a better solution despite previous investments. That is a characteristic of the intelligent people – that is quite different from those who continue with projects doomed to fail just because they have already committed to something or have invested in something - quite often taxpayers’ money”.

18. Also, have in mind that this case is not about you and/or me. It is about the Salton Sea; - it is about our environment; - it is about the health of the population of surrounding communities; - it is about California’s economy and on the larger scale the USA’s economy; – It is about future generations.

19. Because I don’t have direct access to Governor and because my access through you is not responsive because you are, for some reason, persistently and systematically ignoring and rejecting my proposal without a single scientific argument (NOTE: Arguments such as “I don’t like it” or “Majority voted against it” are not scientific arguments), I am including in the “cc” address people that I believe, should be interested in saving the Salton Sea and our environment and who might have access and are influential and honorable enough to contact and inform Gov. Brown about the existence of my proposal. If Governor is informed he could declare emergency situation and organize a special team of “independent” and knowledgeable reviewers, preferably composed of “impartial” experts on several relevant technologies, from Universities, Institutes, and National Laboratories, so that we could change the current course of action in time and save the Salton Sea, prevent incoming ecological disaster, and boost our economy.

20. Since I was invited to make a presentation only for 15 minutes in El Centro, which was enough only for a summary of one route, and since I did not receive any additional questions from you nor from any committee member to clarify technologies and proposal and since official video did not show screen on which I was pointing laser during my PowerPoint presentation, I have made a video explaining the concept, and several routes/corridors, and technologies involved so that you and those who are interested to learn about the practical long-term solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea – the solution that could save and restore the Salton Sea and generate revenue in billions of dollars - can see it at own pace.

Here is the link to the video of complete presentation - about 1:00 hour:

<https://youtu.be/pcYTUPCiljQ>

Sincerely,

Nikola N. Lakic
Graduate Eng. Architect

Geothermal Worldwide, Inc.
78-365 Hwy 111, #402
La Quinta, CA 92253
01-760-347-1609
01-760-333-3851 cell
www.GeothermalWorldwide.com
nlakic@GeothermalWorldwide.com

From: Wilcox, Bruce@CNRA [<mailto:Bruce.Wilcox@resources.ca.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 11:08 AM
To: Nikola Lakic (nlakic@geothermalworldwide.com)
Subject: water import proposal memorandum

Hi Nikola:

Please find attached a memorandum regarding your water import scenario for the Salton Sea.

Thanks
Bruce Wilcox
Assistant Secretary Natural Resources Agency
760-200-1618
Bruce.Wilcox@resources.ca.gov



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.
www.avast.com



Nikola Lakic
Geothermal Worldwide, Inc.
Nlikola@Geothermalworldwide.com

Thank you for your response to the Salton Sea Management Program's Request for Information (RFI) for Salton Sea Water Importation Projects. On April 11th, the SSMP Long Range Planning Committee reviewed your response, along with ten other submittals. On July 19th, the RFI Evaluation Group further reviewed all responses, with specific attention to the information provided in response to the specific questions and information required by the RFI."

The Committee and the Evaluation group did not find your submittal to be a clear description of a proposed course of action. There was no description of the project team, as required; a project of the proposed scale will require expertise on a broad range of topics. Also, the submittal did not address the environmental or permitting process. Because of these deficiencies, the Committee and the Evaluation Group have not recommended your submittal for further consideration.

We have scheduled two Informational Sessions to discuss the process we used to make these determinations and how this RFI process fits into the State's broader planning. The sessions will be held in mid September, the dates, times and locations will be included on the web page. A long range planning committee meeting is also scheduled for 29 August (see web page for details) and there will be a public comment period at that committee meeting.

Thank you again for your submittal. I hope to see you at one of the Informational Sessions in September. If you have remaining questions or concerns, you are always welcome to call or email me.

Bruce Wilcox

Bruce.Wilcox@resources.ca.gov