Ph: 760-347-1609

Geothermal Worldwide, Inc., 78-365 Hwy 111, #402, La Quinta, CA 92201,

December 1, 2023

To: Honorable Wade Crowfoot

Secretary for California Natural Resources Agency 715 P Street, 20th Floor. Sacramento, California 95814

Wade.Crowfoot@resources.ca.gov; secretary@resources.ca.gov;

Cc: Governor Gavin Newsom gavin@gavinnewsom.com; The California Natural Resources Agency's Salton Sea Management Program. cnra-saltonsea@resources.ca.gov; ExecutiveOffice@energy.ca.gov;

Yana Garcia, Secretary for Environmental Protection Yana.Garcia@calEPA.ca.gov; SectyGarcia@calEPA.ca.gov:

Moises Moreno-Rivera, Deputy Secretary for Environmental Justice, Tribal Affairs, and Border Relations Office of the Secretary California Environmental Protection Agency Moises. Moreno-Rivera@calepa.ca.gov.

David Hochschild - chair of the California Energy Commission David.Hochschild@Energy.ca.gov;

J. Andrew McAllister, California Energy Commission. Andrew.McAllister@Energy.ca.gov;

Noemí Otilia Osuna Gallardo Comisionar CommissionerGallardo@energy.ca.gov;

Kourtney Vaccaro, California Energy Commission. Ollie.Awolowo@Energy.ca.gov; - Administrative assistant.

The Bureau of Reclamation CRinterimops@usbr.gov; Karla Nemeth, Director of the California Department of Water Resources lea.garrison@water.ca.gov (assistant for Karla Nemeth).

Joaquin Esquivel, Chair of the California State Water Resources Control Board joaquin.esquivel@waterboards.ca.gov;

James Newcomb, SSMP Lead for Long-Range Planning and Asst. Dep. Dir., California Dept. of Water Resources. James. Newcomb@water.ca.gov;

Vivien Maisonneuve, SSMP Lead for the California Department of Water Resources Vivien.Maisonneuve@water.ca.gov;

Tonya Marshall, Salton Sea Program Manager, California Department of Fish and Wildlife. tonya.marshall@wildlife.ca.gov

Christopher Harris, Executive Director, Colorado River Board of California. csharris@crb.ca.gov:

California Attorney General Rob Bonta info@oag.ca.gov;

Eduardo Garcia, Assemblymember, AssemblyMember.EduardoGarcia@assembly.ca.gov;

Raul Ruiz, M.D. Congressman (Shayra Hernandez, Director at Office of Congressman Raul Ruiz, Shayra.Hernandez@mail.house.gov;

Ph: 760-347-1609

Col. Julie Balten, commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Los Angeles District sally.m.desimone@usace.army.mil; - administrative assistant DeSimone, Sally M CIV USARMY CESPL (USA).

Brig. Gen. Antoinette Gant, Commander, South Pacific Division. (nancy.e.allen@usace.army.mil; honey.e.nixon@usace.army.mil; Public Affairs representatives)

Thomas Tortez Jr., Tribal Chairman, Torres Martinez (Desert Cahuilla Indians) Thomas.Tortez@torresmartinez-nsn.gov;

Assemblymember Eloise Gomez Reyes, Majority Leader, 50th Assembly District, <u>Assemblymember.Reyes@assembly.ca.gov; (Marina Espinoza, Legislative Director, Marina.Espinoza@asm.ca.gov)</u>.

Miguel Hernández, Public Affairs Officer, California Natural Resources Agency, Salton Sea Management Program, Miguel. Hernandez@resources.ca.gov;

<u>Patty.Monahan@Energy.ca.gov</u>; <u>Michelle.Sinclair@calEPA.ca.gov</u>; <u>CRB-info@usbr.gov</u> (Bureau of Reclamation);

J.B. Hamby, Chair, Colorado River Board of California. Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation jbhamby@iid.com.

Steve Padilla, California State Senator, District 18. Senator. Padilla Senate.ca.gov.

Alex Padilla, U.S. Senator for California Senator Padilla@senate.gov.

Deb Haaland, U.S. Secretary of the Interior (Doug Hendrix dhendrix@usbr.gov)

Tanya Trujillo, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, U.S. Department of Interior. ttrujillo@crb.ca.gov.

Tracy Stone-Manning - Director of the Bureau of Land Management (apautz@BLM.gov Secretary for BLM Director); CESPL-Imperial-Streams-Salton-Sea@usace.army.mil; kenos@iplawusa.com;

NOTE: Although I am addressing this letter to the Honorable **Wade Crowfoot**, secretary of CNRA, and including Governor **Gavin Newsom**'s email, which I am aware of, in the "cc" address, I respectfully urge Yana Garcia, Secretary for Environmental Protection Agency and David Hochschild - chair of the California Energy Commission and everyone with consciousness and any power or influence to inform directly Governor **Gavin Newsom**, about my letter.

<u>Subject:</u> Response to the news article titled "Initial work begins on North Lake Salton Sea project" with a price tag of \$19.25 million.

CONTENT:

Ph: 760-347-1609

Section 1.0 - INTRODUCTION	. Page 4
Section 2.0 - Comment in Response to Article with a few additional	
relevant information:	Page 4
Section 3.0 - Comments in Response to Video with a few additional	
relevant information:	Page 12
Section 4.0 - Summary in Response to Article and Video	Page 16
Section 5.0 - Facts	Page 18
Section 6.0 - Recommendations	Page 19
Section 7.0 - A few additional information and Observations	
that may Help understanding this Case:	Page 24
Section 8.0 - In Closing	Page 33
Section 9.0 - A few words about my Work	Page 38
Section 10.0 - The Summary of the Summary of the Proposal	J
for the Restoration of the Salton Sea	. Page 41
Section 11.0 – Links to several of relevant correspondence	Page 44
Section 12.0 - Link to several of my 3-minute Comments to SSA	

Greetings, Secretary Wade Crowfoot,

Since the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA) is overseeing the restoration of the Salton Sea, I am writing to you sir, to inform you, as I did several times in the past about serious problem caused by relatively small group of people that interferes with real restoration of the Salton Sea. Also, to inform you, again, that the State's format for dealing with the issue of the Salton Sea is inadequately set up and needs radical change.

The recent article in "The Desert Sun' and video on KESQ News regarding the "North Lake Pilot Demonstration Project" reinforces my assertions. In this letter, I am commenting in response to comments by the 'local leaders' mentioned in the article and video. I am criticizing the 'current course of action' with verifiable evidence. I am also providing the solution for the current grave situation.

There are several comments in the article and video that the local leaders made that are misleading and deceptive. The local communities and State officials need to know about that. I am using this opportunity to expose a few flaws mentioned in the article with hope that you, and other top officials that oversee the situation of the Salton Sea, will act properly on time to stop destruction of the Salton Sea and defend and enforce policy of the State of California and environmental law1.

Email: <u>nlakic@GeothermalWorldwide.com</u> Ph: 760-347-1609

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

I am writing in response to the news article titled "Initial work begins on North Lake Salton Sea project" with a price tag of \$19.25 million written by Ms. Erin Rode, Palm Springs Desert Sun, posted on October 20, 2023.

Also came to my attention a short video at KESQ News titled: "Survey work begins on Salton Sea restoration project" posted by Mr. Marco Revuelta KESQ News Team.

Since the article in the Desert Sun and the video at the KESQ describe the event (project) accurately, I am using text and video as a base for my comments.

Both the article, and video, are correlated to the same event. Although the project described in the article and video is presented as "North Lake Pilot Demonstration Project" it summarizes (shows) the short-sightedness, immaturity, and incompetence of local leadership in dealing with so serious issue such as dying the Salton Sea, incoming ecological disaster, and declining health of nearby population. Also, the comments in the article and video shows diversion of the fundamental problem as well as an indication of illegal conduct.

2.0 <u>COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE NEWS ARTICLE with a few additional</u> relevant information:

2.1 Here is the link to the news article titled "Initial work begins on North Lake Salton Sea project" posted by Ms. Erin Rode, Palm Springs Desert Sun, posted on October 20, 2023 – Please read it: https://news.yahoo.com/initial-begins-north-lake-salton-224712422.html?fr=sycsrp_catchall.

The current "Pilot Demonstration Project" with a price tag of \$19.25 million supposedly would help 'local leaders' to understand what kind of water quality and water supply was available as a part of a bigger project "North Lake". I am sorry to say but such a practice is a scam that has been going on for some time. I am using the word "scam" reluctantly but if local leaders, - some of them mentioned in the article - intentionally deceive the local population, the state, and the federal officials, in order to receive funding from the State from which they will personally benefit ('designing fee", salaries, and frequent bonuses) at the expense of the environment, the health of the local population, and economy in general, then the word "scam" is appropriately used.

a) 2.2 The article has the following statement quoting local leaders (copy/paste *italic* lettering): "What seemed to fit was starting up with a demonstration project

that would help us understand what kind of water quality and water supply was available to us".

2.2.1 **My Comment:** There is no logical reason for spending \$19.25 million to supposedly understand what kind of water quality and water supply was available. It is about getting funding without a feasible functional plan... It is getting money for a project that is not in harmony with the real restoration of the Salton Sea and is doomed to fail.

Ph: 760-347-1609

- b) 2.3 The local leaders which are mentioned in the article, avoid mentioning the whole grave situation of the Salton Sea and consequences if the "current course of action" continues. The 'current course of action' which local leaders strongly support, is based on acceptance of the disappearance of the Salton Sea as a normal situation that needs to be followed.
 - 2.3.1 **NOTE**: The "current course of action" which is "Pilot Demonstration Project" which is part of bigger project so-called the "North Lake" which is part of the bigger project so-called the "Perimeter/Brine Lake" which is recently renamed to the "In-Basin Solution" or "In-Basin Long-Range Solution" which include related dust suppression projects that implement the 'hay bales' on exposed lakebed (not mentioned in this article) is based on <u>false assumption</u> that importation of seawater is not feasible solution. The "current course of action" does not make sense because the final product would be a <u>smaller</u>, <u>saltier</u>, <u>smellier</u>, and more <u>polluted</u> lake with serious consequences to the environment, the health of the nearby population and economy in general. Such a result is an indisputable fact.

Here is the link to the report filed by CNRA / SSMP on December 15, 2022, about the 'current course of action':

Salton-Sea-Long-Range-Plan-Public-Draft-Dec-2022.pdf (ca.gov).

Please read it. In this report are shown several alternative options for the 'Perimeter/Brine Lake". Based on several statements, during the Zoom meetings, by Mr. James Newcomb, SSMP Lead for Long-Range Planning and Asst. Dep. Dir., California Department of Water Resources, he/they intend to continue 'designing' for the next 4-5 years to select the best option presented in the report. NOTE: Such practice is ridiculous and needs to be stopped. By the way, Mr. James Newcomb, in one of Zoom meetings, admitted his involvement in the UCSC Panel's review process in which my proposal – the only feasible long-term solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea was eliminated from evaluation based on two baseless 'fatal flaws criteria' that Mr. James Newcomb contribute to insert (See correspondence at section 11.8; 11.10 – 11.12).

2.3.2 NOTE: Assigning the CNRA – Water Boards to 'find' a solution for the dying Lake was a serious and expensive mistake made by the State. The CNRA / Water Board / SSMP <u>failed</u> to submit a feasible long-term solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea at the deadline on December 31, 2022, as required by Order WRO 2017-0134. Therefore, the task of finding ('designing') a long-term solution by the CNRA / Water Board / SSMP was/is officially <u>finished</u> on December 31, 2022.

Ph: 760-347-1609

An appropriate analogy for assigning the CNRA / Water Board / SSMP to find a solution ("designing") would be like: Assigning a dentist to perform thorax (bypass surgery) on a needed patient. Similarly, biologists, chemists, environmental scientists, geologists, etc., - although nice people - should not do architectural work on a project of this magnitude and importance. Unfortunately, it appears that the local leaders enjoy being in charge and 'playing architects' in finding a solution for the Salton Sea and insisting on having the final word on the fate of the Salton Sea because in their title the "Salton Sea Authority" there is a word <u>authority</u>. That is the main reason for the current grave situation of the Salton Sea. The State must bear responsibility for not preventing such dysfunctional set up in the first place and allowing such failure to continue.

It is time for a new approach to the restoration of the Salton Sea without involvement of unnecessary organizations and manipulative conducts. A feasible and profitable long-term plan for the restoration of the Salton Sea already exists since 2013 but has been systematically ignored and suppressed by local leadership. The official acceptance of the architectural plan is needed and its implementation by professional companies with experience, means, and reputation (See section 6.8 - 6.9.2).

2.3.3 NOTE: To understand the current grave situation of the Salton Sea, needs to be mentioned that there are several influential companies (not mentioned in the article) that are in the business of cultivation of farmland on exposed lakebed, and extraction of lithium from geothermal brine. Those companies strongly support and promote the "current course of action" for their benefits at the expense of the environment, health of the nearby population, and economy in general.

That is an open 'secret' that most people are not aware of. My assertion is reinforced by a public statement by Mr. Rod Colwell, founder of Controlled Thermal Resources in the Desert Sun article titled "In search of 'Lithium

Valley' – subtitle: "Why energy companies see riches in the California Desert". Here is the link to the article:

https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/sep/27/salton-sea-california-lithium-mining. Or alternative link:

<u>In search of 'Lithium Valley': why energy companies see riches in the California desert | California | The Guardian</u>

Ph: 760-347-1609

In the article above, Mr. Rod Colwell, from Controlled Geothermal Sources, Commissioner at Lithium Valley Commission, and colleague (friend) of Vice-Chair Mr. Ryan E. Kelley was quoted saying the following referring to shrinkage of the Lake: "Let private enterprise deal with it". Also, he said, "We're trying to commercialize an environmental disaster." Also, was written, "Colwell keeps track of the Salton Sea's water levels because as it evaporates, more land becomes available for Controlled Thermal Resources". This article reinforces (proves) the accusations that I have made about the current grave situation in my numerous public comments.

- c) 2.4 The current article mentions the "North Lake" which is a part of the 'Pilot Demonstration Project'. The project is a small part of the whole 'grave' situation of the Salton Sea that local leaders systematically avoid mentioning because they are participants in a scam. In this case, the scam is a process of getting rid of the Salton Sea (shrinking it), legally, with the help of drought and 'no appropriate action' (doing nothing productive for many years), and then using the exposed lakebed for cultivation of farmland and geothermal projects at the southeastern side of the Salton Sea.
 - 2.4.1 NOTE: The geothermal projects that include the extraction of lithium from geothermal brine need a substantial amount of water that we do not have. With the "current course of action", there is no water even for sustaining (balancing evaporation) of the shrinking Salton Sea nor for "dust suppression projects" which are also nonsensical projects doomed to fail, introduced and supported by local leaders.
 - 2.4.2 **NOTE**: By the way, the absurdity of the situation is that my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea, which has been systematically ignored, is not in conflict with the projects for the extraction of lithium from geothermal brine. In fact, my proposal would provide the necessary water for those geothermal projects. It appears that the proponents of the 'current course of action' including local leaders mentioned in the article, just do not have time to study it properly and understand it or very possibly have some other intentions that are illegal. That remains to be seen though I will elaborate on a few indications in the process further below.

d) 2.5 Also, the article states the following: "Estrada said Thursday that potential sources of that water could include pumping water from the ground or using canal or drainage water. The eventual water quality of the lake will dictate whether or not it can be used for recreational opportunities like swimming".

2.5.1 **My Comment:** It shows the incompetence of people (local leadership) involved in decision-making on the issues of the Salton Sea. It needs to be said that whatever source of water (*ground or canal or drainage water*) is used for such a project ("current course of action") would not be enough because there is already a shortage of water. It would be taken from some other allocated use. By the way, groundwater is limited and depleted. Drainage water in the area of the Salton Sea for such a project is not enough. Water from the canal is an option but that is only as part of the complete project for the restoration of the Salton Sea (my proposal) which local leadership systematically refused for 10-years without a single scientific argument against it.

- e) 2.6 Continuation with the "current course of action" that includes the North Lake which is a joint project of Riverside County and the Salton Sea Authority in collaboration with the state's Salton Sea Management Program (SSMP), and a joint project of the Salton Sea Authority and Imperial County in collaboration with geothermal projects which include several proposed projects (the Black Rock Geothermal Projects, Morton Bay Geothermal project, and Elmore North Geothermal, an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of BHE Renewables, LLC.) also means "Goodbye" to the Salton Sea.
 - 2.6.1 NOTE: The public, state, and federal officials needs to be aware of the serious consequences related to incoming environmental disasters (toxic dust storms, etc.), the health of nearby populations, especially tribes which would suffer the most because of proximity of the community, and the economy fall in general if the 'current course of action' continues, and disappearance of the Salton Sea is achieved by the local leadership.
- f) 2.7 The "current course of action" that includes the disappearance of the Salton Sea, even though the feasible solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea has existed for over 10 years, is a serious violation of the state policies. State policy is clear in supporting and promoting projects that lead towards a clean environment, clean renewable energy, the well-being of the population, and the economy in general.
- g) 2.8 The 'current course of action' especially the project mentioned in the article is without any doubt a waste of time and money. Very possibly we would need to

spend the same amount of money (\$19.25 million or more) to clean up the mess that the announced project would cause.

- h) 2.9 Besides a blatant violation of the state policies that clearly promote and support projects that lead towards a clean environment, clean renewable energy, the well-being of the population, and the economy in general, - the local leaders, some of which have been mentioned in the article, are also engaged in infringement of several of my patents. That is a violation of patent law intellectual property rights.
- i) 2.10 The article also states the following: "... when officials looked into a larger perimeter lake project a few years ago, budget calculations showed the entire project would cost about a billion dollars. Instead, officials <u>pivoted</u> to the North Lake project as an initial demonstration project, with a price tag of \$19.25 million covered by state funding through Proposition 68, a \$4 billion state bond for parks and environmental projects voters approved in 2018 that allocated \$200 million for Salton Sea projects". (Underlining added).
 - 2.10.1 **NOTE**: It is important to clarify that the concept of the 'Perimeter/Brine Lake' is a "C" shaped or "U" shaped or "Horseshoe shape" a <u>single</u> Lake, formed by a peripheral wall around the periphery of the Salton Sea that would supposedly funnel water from New River and Alamo River around periphery wall into the central part of the Salton Sea which would be the Brine Lake. At that time (2016) the "authors" of the proposal did not know the exact size of the 'Brine Lake' in the middle of the Lake would be, so 'they' left it open (unidentified grayish area). Please see the illustration in the link in the point "j" (2.11) below.
 - 2.10.2 **NOTE**: It is important to mention the statement at point "i" above which states the following: "State funding through Proposition 68, a \$4 billion state bond for parks and environmental projects voters approved in 2018 that allocated \$200 million for Salton Sea projects". It needs to be exposed that during that period of campaign for the restoration of the Salton Sea (their concept) was falsely presented by local leaders to the public as a project that would be beneficial to the environment and public. In numerous workshops at which I was present, the local leaders never even mentioned the existence of my proposal. So, the public voted on something that the real situation (the pros and cons of both options) has not been disclosed to the public. Such conduct is classified as 'scam'.
 - 2.10.3 **NOTE**: The statement in the 2.10 point "i" above states the following "... when officials looked into a larger perimeter lake project a few years ago, budget calculations showed the entire project would cost

about a billion dollars. Instead, officials <u>pivoted</u> to the North Lake project as an initial demonstration project, with a price tag of \$19.25 million covered by state funding through Proposition 68, a \$4 billion state bond for parks and environmental projects voters approved in 2018 that allocated \$200 million for Salton Sea projects". (Underlining added).

Ph: 760-347-1609

Such a statement is deceptive and misleading because it conveys message that the money was/is issue that it was too expensive therefore they (officials) <u>pivoted</u> to the "North Lake" concept. The truth is that even if local leaders (officials) had money (billion dollars) the final product would be <u>smaller</u>, <u>saltier</u>, <u>smellier</u>, and more <u>polluted</u> Lake. Therefore, the problem was/is a 'nonsensical concept' and not lack of money as has been stated in the article.

- j) 2.11 Also, it needs to be clarify that the "Perimeter/Brine Lake was accepted and endorsed by the Salton Sea Authority (SSA) and most of the state's agencies in 2016. Here is the link to the document (Report) "Salton Sea Funding and Feasibility Action Plan Benchmark 7: Project Summary May 2016." Microsoft Word SS Benchmark 7: 5-11-16 (saltonseaauthority.org).
 - 2.11.1 **NOTE:** The report (above link) presents the concept of the famous "Perimeter Lake" that was designed by Tetra-Tech in cooperation, and approved, by Salton Sea Authority and several other agencies in 2016. Please pay attention to Figure 14 on page 48 of the report.
- k) 2.12 Also, relevant to the statement at point "i" above in this letter, "... officials <u>pivoted</u> to the North Lake project" in 2018 (underlining added). It is important to clarify that the 'pivoting' happened <u>after</u> I spoke with members of Salton Sea Authority several times, personally, in their offices and made several presentations at important events.
 - 2.12.1 NOTE: Supervisor Mr. Manuel Perez took credit for introducing the North Lake concept as his contribution at the Southern California Energy + Water + Green Living Summit in Rancho Mirage on January 11, 2018. Here is the link to an article regarding that event:

will require about 2,000 acre-feet of water per year.).

I was present at that event. By the way, as presented by Mr. Manuel Perez, the concept of North Lake was neither feasible nor functional concept. It showed the "Coachella Valley Stormwater Cannel" which is the inflow at the northern part of the Salton Sea - which is 'dry wash' most of the year – as half of mile-wide blue river. That illustration is now altered. No water circulation was present. No relationship to the rest of the Salton

Sea was present. Mr. Manuel Perez 'borrowed' just a shape "C" of the North Lake. It was/is ridiculous, colorful, amateurish, work. Fortunately, even for stealing (borrowing) someone's technology (concept or part of concept), one needs to have the necessary knowledge.

- I) 2.13 The essence of my proposal is dividing the Salton Sea into three sections and importing seawater into the central section. That way we would need water from the Colorado River only for farmlands and for balancing the evaporation of the North Lake and South Lake. That is in harmony with the reduced inflow of water from the Colorado River as required by the Quantification Settlement Agreement (QSA) and possible additional reductions in the future because of drought. Such a creative concept is a key factor, and the only solution, for successfully saving and restoring the Salton Sea despite restriction from Colorado River.
 - 2.13.1 NOTE: Although the importation of seawater is not mentioned in the article, because the 'current course of action' which local leaders promote and support, is based on acceptance of the disappearance of the shrinking Salton Sea, the importation of seawater is an essential part of the functional restoration of the Salton Sea.
 - 2.13.2 NOTE: It is important to clarify that dividing the Salton Sea into three sections which include North Lake, South Lake, and Central Lake, is a fundamental component of my architectural plan (proposal) for the restoration of the Salton Sea. I introduced my concept for the restoration of the Salton Sea in 2013 and have several patents already issued for my well-protected concept. Unfortunately, for some unclear reason, my concept was systematically ignored by the Salton Sea Authority and CNRA. (See Segments 11.0 and 12.0).
 - 2.13.3 Now, local leaders just 'conveniently' <u>pivoted</u> from their previous design "Perimeter/Brine Lake" to North Lake concept stating that "Perimeter/Brine Lake" was too expensive about \$1 billion. The truth is that the money was/is <u>not</u> an issue. Even if they have money, the "Perimeter/Brine Lake" is a completely dysfunctional concept. No intend to insult anyone ... sorry to say ... but the fact is, as record show, they (local leaders) are not architects. But 'somehow' they inserted themselves in 'designing' (finding solution) for very complex problem of the Salton Sea. That is arrogance beyond comprehension. It is mindboggling. The project for the restoration of the Salton Sea deals with unique conditions (distance from Ocean, depression below sea level, topography of the terrain, geothermal sources, desert, wildlife sanctuary, lack of water, etc.) that requires certain expertise, talent, and knowledge of different technologies. A feasible solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea could be

> considered as project of century. To 'butcher' my design, by bunch of amateurs, as they are in process of doing it, is heartbreaking and highly inappropriate conduct. It is an insult.

Ph: 760-347-1609

2.13.4 **NOTE**: As in every project or product, there are always involved the 'architectural fees' or 'designing fee' which are based on the cost of the project(s) and revenue involved. In this case that is a substantial amount of money. That might be a primary reason why the 'local leaders' want to 'play architects' and want me out of the 'picture'. The secondary reason could be a combination of incompetence and naiveness. That remains to be seen. But to think that a presentation at a show or publishing an article in a newspaper will override the patent law is being naive.

3.0 COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO THE VIDEO with a few additional relevant information:

3.1 Here is the link to a short video at KESQ News titled: "Survey work begins on Salton Sea restoration project" commented and posted by Mr. Marco Revuelta KESQ News Team:

(It is only one minute and forty-three seconds (1:43) – Please see it twice – before and after my comments).

https://kesq.com/salton-sea/2023/10/20/survey-work-begins-on-salton-sea-restoration-project/ I am commenting on most of the segments.

- 3.2 (0:00-0:12) John White, anchor KESQ News, announcers: "Local leaders are celebrating the beginning of the new effort in helping to revitalize the Salton Sea ... "News Channel 3" Marco Revuelta reports ... It is called "North Lake Pilot Demonstration Project".
- 3.3 (0:12 0:22) Marko Revuelta KESQ News: Engineers are busy studying the soil near the Salton Sea. This is where they are planning on transforming more than 150 acres into modern and natural habitat.
 - 3.3.1 **My comment:** Local leaders are planning to start a completely unnecessary project to practice their architectural skills. This is an expensive project that does not contribute to overall restoration of the Salton Sea. Even if so-called "North Lake Pilot Demonstration Project" would be functional – which is not as presented – the 150 acres is insignificant surface compared to destruction of the Salton Sea (about 224,000 acres) that local leaders are persistently working on for 20 years.
 - 3.3.2 **NOTE**: Salton Sea surface is about 350 square miles, which is equal to about 224,000 acres; Shoreline is about 110 miles long; The length is about 35 miles; The average wideness is about 15 miles.

> The North Lake is about 5% of the whole Salton Sea, which is about 17.5 square miles, which is equal to about 11,200 acres.

Ph: 760-347-1609

The South Lake is about 10% of the whole Salton Sea, which is about 35 square miles, which is equal to about 22,400 acres.

Central Lake is about 85% of the whole Salton Sea, which is about 297.5 square miles, which is equal to about 190,400 acres.

- 3.4 (0:22 0:31) Castulo Estrada, Vice President Coachella Valley Water District. "This is one of the biggest projects ...probably the biggest project ... the only project that we have initiated here in the North end of the Lake which is in Riverside County."
 - 3.4.1 **My Comment:** So-called the "North Lake Pilot Demonstration Project" is completely unnecessary project. There is nothing to learn from such experiment that is not already known. Riverside County and Imperial County need to be synchronized in dealing with issues of the Salton Sea. Either County should not make decisions that obviously would negatively impact the other County, the environment and wellbeing of other nearby communities (population). For example, if leaders of Imperial County decide to get rid of the Salton Sea it would affect the population in Riverside County too, and environment of San Diego County which is close nearby.
- 3.5 (0:31 0:35) Marko Revuelta KESQ News: State and local leaders have assigned 20 million dollars to materialize the effort. (Shoving big check to Eduardo Garcia of \$19,250,000 by the State of California. dated October 19, 2023).
 - 3.5.1 **My Comment:** That is a complete loss of money and time. Very possibly we would need much more money for cleaning the mess (dike) that this experimental project will cause. Such a dike will be a barrier for waves (water circulation) when a real project for the restoration of the Salton Sea is implemented.
- 3.6 (0:36 0:42) Eduardo Garcia, Assemblymember, District 36: "The goal of this project is to make sure that it is within proximity of the residence who live in the community surrounding the Salton Sea".
 - 3.6.1 My Comment: Assemblymember Eduardo Garcia needs to be reminded that so-called "North Lake Pilot Demonstration Project" besides being unnecessary, nonsensical, dysfunctional, and expensive project, it does not contribute to overall restoration of the Salton Sea. Even if it were functional – which is not as presented – its size is insignificant and would serve only a very small number of people compared to communities

surrounding the Salton Sea – which would suffer the most if the 'current course of action' continues. The 150 acres is insignificant surface compared to destruction of the Salton Sea which is about 224,000 acres.

Ph: 760-347-1609

3.7 (0:42 - 0:49) Marko Revuelta KESQ News:

"The "North Lake - Pilot Demonstration Project" would create a brilliant environment for fish and birds and control dust".

- 3.7.1 **My Comment:** Obviously Mr. Marko Revuelta is conveying the statement that local leaders stated. It is a 'wishful thinking' and 'speculative' statement. That statement has no scientific support. The 150 acres is insignificant surface compared to destruction of the Salton Sea which is about 224,000 acres.
- 3.8 (0:49 1:08) Castulo Estrada, vice president of the Coachella Valley Water District: "But that ... can we do both of those which are critical ... then we also create the most benefits ... and what we think that would be is actually allowing some recreational uses of this Lake that might include canal, canoeing, it might include swimming, fishing, things like that".
 - 3.8.1 **My Comment**: Such comment is highly irresponsible. Mr. Estrada needs to be reminded that if the 'current course of action' continues there will be about 224,000 acres of toxic salty brine and exposed lakebed that will have frequent toxic storms.
- 3.9 (1:08 1:11) Marko Revuelta KESQ News:

 Officials think it is an initiative that could pave the way for future ones.
 - 3.9.1 **My Comment**: Officials' thinking is wrong. It is 'wishful thinking'. There is no accountable water for this one and cannot be for the 'future ones'. Two wrongs do not make right. Every successful project needs to have a well-thought-out a functional design and 'blueprint' to follow. That is not the case here with the 'current course of action'.
- 3.10 (1:11 1:17) Castulo Estrada, Estrada, vice president of the Coachella Valley Water District: "It is going to answer questions ... help as answer questions that we yet do not have answer for".
 - 3.10.1 **My Comment:** So-called the "North Lake Pilot Demonstration Project" is completely unnecessary project. There is nothing to learn from such experiment that is not already known.
- 3.11 (1:17 1:21) Marko Revuelta KESQ News:

"Crews will continue to survey the ground surface and subsurface for the next few weeks".

3.11.1 **My Comment:** It is loss of time and taxpayers' money. It bolsters 'drive in the wrong direction'.

Ph: 760-347-1609

3.12 (1:21 – 1:31) Bob Olund, Dudek VP of Engineering:

"Now we are actually doing 'boots on the ground' Actually, something physical that is kicking of physical side of the project ... it allows us to get information on the base of the design".

- 3.12.1 **My Comment:** There is nothing to learn from such an experiment that is not already known. There is not a functional design. It is a loss of time and taxpayers' money. It would be much better to start surveying and preparing for 10 depression zones for providing 'vertical circulation' which is part of desalination process which are indicated in my architectural plan. But the problem is the dysfunctional system (lack of cooperation) and the 'current course of action' that I am exposing.
- 3.13 (1:32 1:37) Marko Revuelta KESQ News:

"As of now, there is no set timeline for when construction will begin or when it would be completed."

- 3.13.1 **My Comment:** Hopefully the common sense will prevail, and top State's official will stop this unnecessary project on time, and open speedy evaluation of my proposal and join my endeavor in saving and restoring the Salton Sea to its original glory of the 1950's and 60's and much more.
- 3.14 (1:37 1:43) Manuel Perez, Supervisor, Fourth District: *"Although this is a milestone, let's complete the project".*
 - 3.14.1 **My Comment:** Such comment does not make sense. This project is a milestone for what? Let's assume that this project is completed. Then what? Obviously, Mr. Manuel Perez would like to continue with the "Perimeter/Brine Lake" or recently renamed to the "In-Basin Solution" or "In-Basin Long-Range Solution" which include related dust suppression projects that implement the 'hay bales' on exposed lakebed that Mr. Manuel Perez support and promote. Mr. Manuel Perez is strong opponent of importation of seawater which is an essential part of the restoration of the Salton Sea. Mr. Manuel Perez is a strong proponent of the 'current course of action' that leads to a smaller, saltier, smellier, and more polluted lake with serious consequences for the environment, the health of the nearby population and economy in general.

 $Email: \ \underline{nlakic@GeothermalWorldwide.com}$

Ph: 760-347-1609

4.0 SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSE TO THE NEWS ARTICLE AND THE VIDEO:

The comments mentioned in the news article and in the video highlight a fundamental issue regarding the Salton Sea situation that are patently wrong and that negatively impact the environment, wellbeing of the population, and economy in general. The mentioned project was/is about funding a project of \$19.25 million without a feasible functional plan.

There is no logical reason for proceeding with the mentioned "North Lake Pilot Demonstration Project". There is nothing to learn from a such project that local leaders supposedly expect to learn. This is not time for bunch of amateurs (local leaders) to use their power to spend \$19.25 million for their learning lessons to find out what quality of water will be, etc. If local leaders want to become architects and to claim 'expertise', then, there is a process for it – assigning at appropriate universities and study the subject first.

We already have lost 10 years and hundreds of millions of dollars unnecessarily just because of incompetence of the same local leaders who, now, want community to lose several more years for fulfilling ill-conceived 10-years plan which is based on 'their' false assumptions that importation of seawater is not feasible solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea. This project is ridiculous and needs to be stopped. The Salton Sea is dying. We are facing incoming ecological disasters. Most fish are already dead because of increase of salinity and pollution. People are already getting sick because of air pollution. And now, local leaders want to 'play architects' with their expensive nonsensical experiments that do not contribute to overall restoration of the Salton Sea.

Now <u>is not</u> the time for saving someone's ego and wrongdoing. Now <u>is not</u> the time for expensive nonsensical experiments and for the amusement of the local leaders. Now <u>is the time</u> for the top state's official to stop nonsensical projects and redirect the current course of action towards the restoration of the Salton Sea or bear responsibility and liability for its loss. I respectfully urge you and remaining top state's official to reverse current decision to fund a such project and choose saving and restoring the Salton Sea and enforce State's policies based on Environmental Law^[1].

By continuation of the 'current course of action' – which includes the current "Pilot Demonstration Project" with a price tag of \$19.25 million, and its proponents (local leaders mostly members of the Salton Sea Authority – and a few from Imperial County not mentioned in this article and video) blatantly violate several State and Federal laws relevant to the Environment.

4.1 First, proponents of the project (local leaders) violate fundamental policies of the State of California and Federal law of the USA which are based on Environmental Law^[1]. The current "Pilot Demonstration Project" although unnecessary project, is a part of the bigger project that leads to <u>smaller</u>, <u>saltier</u>, <u>smellier</u>, and more <u>polluted</u> Lake. Without mentioning specific code/article/provision, the 'current course of action' is blatant violation to the State and Federal policies that clearly promotes and enforce the Environmental laws^[1] that protect the environment, wellbeing of the population and economy in general.

- 4.2 Secondly, proponents of the project (local leaders) violated administrative law by suppressing critical information from state and federal officials during process of preparing documentation for receiving funding for the 'restoration' of the Salton Sea, and misleading and misinforming (scamming) nearby population, state and federal officials about the 'quality of the final product' during the process of preparing documentation.
- 4.3 Thirdly, proponents of the project (local leaders) violate patent Law by promoting concept or part of concept as its own. Although the presented illustration of the project is sloppy (amateurish) as is the whole remaining projects of the 'current course of action' (it does not show elevations nor accountable source of water nor how it would fit in surrounding area of the "North Lake" or how it would fit and function in the whole Salton Sea) it is promoted as a part of the "North Lake" (see 4.3.1).
 - 4.3.1 **NOTE:** The North Lake is a fundamental part of the concept that has been already introduced as a part of the <u>patented</u> architectural plan for the restoration of the Salton Sea (my proposal). Dividing Salton Sea into three segments is the defining feature of my concept and the North Lake, South Lake and large Central Lake are essential elements of the concept.
- 4.4 During watching the video, in preparation for this letter, I noticed one sentence in accompanying text (not voiced in the video). It says the following (copy/paste): "We need to replicate this project 100 times right in order to cover the perimeter of the sea but this project is going to help us answer that we don't have answers for, Estrada said".
 - 4.4.1 **My Comment:** Replicating a 100 times a project for which there is no accountable water indicates that local leaders have no understanding of what they are doing, or it is a cover-up for other intentions and motives. Possible combination of both incompetence and participation in 'group stealing' of my concept. (See sections 7.3 7.3.9).

5.0 FACTS:

5.1 The <u>fact is</u> that despite colorful presentations that local leaders, mostly members of the Salton Sea Authority (SSA) frequently present, as in this case, - the "Pilot Demonstration Project" with a price tag of \$19.25 million which is part of the "current course of action" which include the "North Lake" which is part of the "In-basin long-range plan" or previously called the 'Perimeter/Brine Lake" with related dust suppression projects, - is based on the <u>false assumption</u> that importation of the seawater <u>is not</u> a feasible concept.

- 5.2 The <u>fact is</u> that the "In-basin long-range plan" which is part of the "current course of action" inevitably leads to the <u>smaller</u>, <u>saltier</u>, <u>smellier</u> and more polluted Lake.
- 5.3 The <u>fact is</u> that the "current course of action" <u>blatantly violates</u> Environmental laws^[1] which is a foundation of the State of California and Federal policies and regulations which fundamentally support initiatives towards a clean environment, clean air, clean water, resiliency to climate change, clean renewable energy, protection of the health of the population, and economy, etc.
- 5.4 The <u>fact is</u> that two attempts by State to find the solution for saving and restoring the Salton Sea were 'sabotaged' by a relatively small group of people associated with local leaders and members of the Salton Sea Authority.
 - 5.4.1 **NOTE:** My proposal which is architectural plan for saving and restoring the Salton Sea was rejected twice without a single scientific argument against it. My proposal was excluded from evaluation based on ridiculous criteria inserted by a relatively small group of people associated with local leaders and members of the Salton Sea Authority. (See section 7.3 7.3.9).
- 5.5 The <u>fact is</u> that introduction of the 'North Lake' concept, by local leaders which is departure (<u>pivoting</u>) from the <u>single</u> "Perimeter/Brine Lake" concept which was accepted in 2016, by the SSA and several State agencies, despite being dysfunctional at the present form, it <u>infringes</u> competing <u>patented</u> concept (my proposal) which has "North Lake" as an essential part of the architectural plan that also includes the "South Lake" and large "Central Lake". By the way, my concept has been systematically ignored for 10 years and officially rejected by the local leaders. (See Segment 11.0 and 12.0). I was aware of the importance and value of my concept and have filed patent application before I spoke with local leaders. I knew that my concept would be accepted, whether it will be during current set of leadership or a new one, or during current generation or future generations. I know that sooner or later common sense will prevail because it would be foolish to ignore revenue of at least \$500 million per year.

> Here are a few of my issued US Patents No.: 11,098,926; Issued on August 24, 2021; US Patent No.: 9,995,286; Issued on June 12, 2018. I still have several patent pending applications with more details.

Ph: 760-347-1609

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 6.1 Because there is an obvious disconnect between higher officials (Governor, Secretaries of California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), California Energy Commission) that facilitate and enforce policies of the State which are based on environmental law – and the Salton Sea Authority (SSA) that promote their own policy that leads towards smaller, saltier, smellier and more polluted Lake - which means the destruction of the Salton Sea – which blatantly violate the State and Federal policies. I am respectfully recommending that after my proposal is thoroughly reviewed and hopefully accepted, that you, Wade Crowfoot, Secretary of CNRA in cooperation with secretaries of , EPA, CEC, DoE, and Governor Gavin Newsom open an investigation of this case, based on provided verifiable evidence, and form a 'mechanism' (office of a special counsel or Commission) formed by the honorable members of the CNRA, EPA, CEC, DoE, and several relevant agencies and stakeholders, tasked with overseeing funding and implementation of the long-term solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea (my proposal) until its completion in 5-6 years period. After its completion, the Commission can be abolished or reduced to overseeing maintenance issues and appropriate distribution of the revenue of at least \$500,000,000 per year.
 - 6.1.1 **NOTE:** Came to my attention a report, prepared for policymakers and stakeholders by the UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RIVERSIDE SALTON SEA TASK FORCE Sponsored by the EDGE Institute and the Center for Science to Policy published on July 2021. Titled "CRISIS AT THE SALTON SEA" subtitle: "The Vital Role of Science". Here is the link to the report:

Od73bf_f8133ee80a30473ca565ecab181e31a1.pdf (ucr.edu). Or alternative link:

https://www.saltonseataskforce.ucr.edu/ files/ugd/0d73bf f8133ee80a30473ca565ecab181e31a1.pdf.

6.1.2 **NOTE:** In the first paragraph of the report, is mentioned about the disconnect between higher officials and agencies stating that a combination of mismanagement and competition among federal, state, and local agencies exist.

6.2 It is important that the State officially renounces the report of the UCSC Panel of independent reviewers based on verifiable evidence of blatant breach of their task of being 'independent' that I provided in my letter to You (See segment 11.8). That is important because the proponents of the destruction of the Salton Sea have already used fraudulent UCSC Panel's report as reference to continue with their nonsensical projects that leads to smaller, smellier and more polluted Salton Sea. By the way, the UCSC Panel received \$2.5 million that is known, for their lousy work, - that known amount just from the State.

- 6.3 Because several key agencies CNRA, CalEPA, CEC are not well synchronized at the moment Each of those agencies are involve in funding different projects relative to their subject (water, air, energy) but those projects are not coordinated in fulfilling master plan (because, at the moment, there is no officially accepted a functional master plan to follow) the agencies need to be united in creating a 'mechanism' (a special office commission) to deal with issue of the Salton Sea in interest of the Salton Sea, environment, and health of nearby population. That can be achieved by accepting the master plan (my architectural plan) and then synchronizing specific projects in fulfilment of the master plan which includes projects dealing with all three agencies' subjects such as importation of seawater, clean environment (water, air, wildlife, health), harnessing hydropower, solar energy, geothermal energy, etc.
 - 6.3.1 **NOTE:** Based on the record, the Salton Sea Authority (SSA) are <u>not</u> working in the best interest of the Salton Sea, environment, health of nearby population, and economy in general. Since the formation of the SSA in 1993, with yearly budget of about \$30 million, there has not been a single program (project) that contributed to the long-term solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea. In fact, the SSA ignored and suppressed the project for the long-term solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea. (See Segment 12.0; 7.3 7.3.9).
- 6.4 My concept is a creative, simple, and brilliant solution. Such a concept is not difficult to understand. Therefore, not wanting to cooperate with me is the absurdity of the current situation. It also raises my concern about 'stealing in process' that I mentioned in segments 2.4.2; 2.9; 2.13 2.13.4.
- 6.5 Based on chronology of the events and provided evidence (See sections 11 and 12), it appears that the 'current course of action' is the result of incompetent people with limited technical knowledge, who are short-sighted, ignorant, arrogant, and have no desire to learn about other options (solutions), occupying important leadership positions (seats) and make critical decisions on the fate of the Salton Sea that will be catastrophic to the environment, health of the nearby

population, wildlife, economy, and wellbeing of the future generations. Such catastrophe needs to be stopped on time.

- 6.6 In order to expedite the investigation process and to clarify the situation, I am respectfully recommending that the State proceeds with simple following steps by sending a request to all those key people who promote destruction of the Salton Sea and oppose the restoration of the Salton Sea, including all members of the UCSC Panel, to provide a written statement explaining their position. Also, I am recommending sending a request for a written comment to all consulting firms that have been involved in evaluation of any phase for the restoration of the Salton Sea including firm Kennedy Jenks and Kennedy Jank's sub-consultants to comment on my proposal - issue by issue - page by page (not on bunch of other amateurish proposals which, by the way, main purpose was to muddy the water and reduce time for evaluation of my proposal) even if it covers only their specialty - hydrology - importation of seawater. With a written answer "they" (all participants) would need to speak their mind individually (proving that they read it and understood it) and would reduce the possibility to hide behind the group or transfer the blame and responsibility on someone else. By the way, the State paid \$2.5 million and deserves to have a written answer from each participant of the UCSC Panel. I would be glad to help with a few questions/answers if needed.
- 6.7 At the same time <u>my proposal</u> for the restoration of the Salton Sea can be reviewed, separately by <u>several</u> universities, laboratories, and companies (preferably potential contractors / producers with means). That way negative influence (pressure), as was in the case with the UCSC Panel, can be minimized. The proper evaluation should not take more than one month.
 - 6.7.1 **NOTE:** I am emphasizing that the focus is reviewing 'my proposal' because 'experts' from universities and laboratories have tendencies to believe that they are contacted (hired) to 'find' the solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea themselves. I am emphasizing again the solution already exists. The state needs them (the experts) only for evaluation, based on their 'expertise' whether my concept is feasible or not. By the way, my proposal is a comprehensive design that involves besides the unique architectural plan several technologies that need several experts with several expertise to evaluate it properly.
- 6.8 Many companies such as AECOM, FLUOR, ORMAT, TENGDI MACHINERY, EQT, FUJI, GENERAL ELECTRIC, SIEMENS, ABB, MITSUBISHI, etc., to mention just a few, would be able to mass-produce and implement all proposed elements including the pipelines (about 1,100 miles), new solar panels, geothermal power plants, etc. As the author of the architectural

plan and the inventor of the new technology involved, I would be glad to help the selected contractors with additional information, and several experimental prototypes (different sizes, etc.), and a final design.

6.8.1 **NOTE:** Although I provided more the enough of essential information about my concept, in my proposal, for the interesting parties to evaluate validity and function of the concept, I do have more detailed information for those that will express interest in participating in any segment for the restoration of the Salton Sea.

- 6.8.2 **NOTE:** My proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea is a creative architectural design that follows the law of physics. There is nothing mysterious about my proposal. An average high school student should be able to understand it. I am a graduate engineer architect. My expertise and talent are in locating (asserting) the problem and finding a solution for the problem mostly related to energy and environmental issues, - whether it be a failure of the "Blow Out Preventer" (BOP) in the Macondo well in Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010, or problem with dying Salton Sea. My work is well documented (See my website). But for reinsurance, - and after the obvious 'collapse' of the UCSC Panel of independent reviewers (by blatantly breaking a fundamental rule of being 'independent' by collaborating with opponents of my proposal and following the advice of my adversary to exclude my proposal from further evaluation – (See my response to the UCSC Panel' report at Section 11.8), - the appropriate way forward would be that the You and honorable top officials of the State and Federal governments initiate a speedy evaluation of my proposal with the new team of professionals that have the necessary expertise in all issues involved and that are really 'independent' with a 'backbone' (not succumbing to anyone's pressure).
- 6.9 It might not be necessary at this point because I have already solved the problem, but because I am very confident in the validity and feasibility of my concept for the restoration of the Salton Sea, I would not mind if you initiate an contest in which all capable companies around the world could compete for a design (a feasible long-term solution) provided that all competing companies will respect the patent law.
 - 6.9.1 **NOTE:** I am insisting that the patent law must be respected because the only feasible solution for saving and restoring the Salton Sea, despite restriction of water flow from Colorado River, is by dividing the Salton Sea into three sections. I have several already issued patents with broad claims for such concept.

6.9.2 **NOTE:** In the case of opening an international contest, after providing an overview of the situation the criteria for the contest should be very simple. Here is a sample:

- **A)** Solution must be viable and technically sound for the importation of seawater whether from the Sea of Cortez or the Pacific Ocean or both.
- **B)** Solution must be viable in stopping pollution of the Salton Sea.
- **C)** Solution must be viable in respecting the Quantification Settlement Agreement (QSA) because of the limited inflow from the Colorado River.
- **D)** Solution must be viable in providing wildlife sanctuaries.
- **E)** Solution must be viable in reducing the salinity of the Salton Sea.
- **F)** Solution must be viable in providing conditions for tourism and other activities to benefit the local population, employment, and economy.
- **G)** Solution must be viable in harmonizing existing projects for the extraction of lithium from the geothermal brine and the restoration of the Salton Sea which includes the importation of seawater.
- **H)** Solution must be economically viable having a positive ratio of cost expense for the project and revenue generated from the project.
- **I)** If there are several proposals having similar but different parts or technologies, then, they should be evaluated by comparison on each difference including cost, feasibility, efficiency, and revenue generated.
- 6.10 Since You, and Yana Garcia, Secretary for California Environmental Protection Agency, and David Hochschild chair of the California Energy Commission, with Governor Gavin Newsom oversee the situation of the Salton Sea and have final word and power to make changes (executive orders, opening investigation, etc.), I respectfully urge You to engage more decisively and take initiative in solving the current problem, (which is the 'current course of action' which is a 'drive in wrong direction') by checking provided evidence and stopping nonsensical projects, and enforcing state's policies regarding environmental law and patent law. Accountability matters.

Ph: 760-347-1609

Geothermal Worldwide, Inc., 78-365 Hwy 111, #402, La Quinta, CA 92201,

7.0 <u>A FEW ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND OBSERVATIONS THAT MAY HELP</u> UNDERSTANDING THIS CASE:

7.1 It is common practice that when the members of an organization that are involved in making important decisions, but have limited technical knowledge, invite an expert to make a presentation on a particular subject. I was present at numerous Salton Sea Authority (SSA) Board meetings in the last 10 years and that was frequent practice – about 95%. Many experts have been invited to make presentation on the subject of the Salton Sea that supposedly is useful (economical) to the Salton Sea and community, such as presentation about how to cultivate algae for production of energy in form of oil, biodiesel, etc., or presentation about how to monitor air quality, or presentation about history of the Salton Sea - how was formed, glory days of the 1950's and 60's, and inevitable decline. I remember one meeting where experts promoted exclusive real estate around the "Perimeter/Brine Lake" that sooner or later will become a cesspool.

Members of the SSA followed legal protocol that requires transparency and 'supposedly' study all available options. The fact is that the key members of the SSA decided a long time ago that the Salton Sea must 'go away' so that they can cultivate some area of lakebed for farmland and for the extraction of lithium. They have ignored any concept that interfered with their already preset decision. That is evident from systematically ignoring (suppressing) my proposal. (See section 12.0). Also, strangely, there is indication since 2018 of vague switching / pivoting (switching in disguise) towards my proposal. That reinforces my assertions of illegal conduct as I stated in Section (2.13.3 & 2.13.4) on pages 11 and 12 in this letter.

- 7.2 Although the official 'current course of action' leads to smaller, saltier, smellier, and more polluted Salton Sea there is also organized attempt towards "pivoting" (changing) from the original design of the 'Perimeter/Brine Lake' their concept which was officially accepted in 2016 (see section 2.11) towards my concept which was officially presented to local leaders in Long Range Plan Committee, CVWD, Palm Desert, CA on February 25, 2016, and at 'Request for Information (RFI) presentations at EI Centro on May 21, 2018 (See my proposal in section 9.0). Such 'pivoting' (changing) at this stage after my proposal was 'strangely' excluded from evaluation by the UCSC Panel and systematically ignored by the SSA is illegal conduct ... it is an attempt to steal It is stealing in process piece by piece.
 - 7.2.1 **NOTE:** See 'press release' published by Mr. Phil Rosentrater, Executive Director of the SSA at the time of formation of the "Enhance Infrastructure Financial District" on around **October 24, 2018**, in which Mr. Phil Rosentrater gave credit to Mr. Manuel Perez, Director of the SSA and supervisor at of Fourth District, Riverside County, and Mr. Marion Ashley,

also supervisor, for the concept of the "North Lake". In the article they indicated that the Imperial County should do similarly at the southern part of the Lake which is in Imperial County. Here is the link to the document:

Ph: 760-347-1609

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1vnuuxwEMKhgvK9ors1KKXYJokgvx0o5b/view?usp=sharing.

- 7.2.2 **NOTE:** The document 'press release' published by Mr. Phil Rosentrater (the link is above) was made <u>after</u> I made several presentations to Mr. Manuel Perez directly (personally) and <u>after</u> I made official presentations at CVWD, Palm Desert on February 25, 2016, and at El Centro on **May 21, 2018**, where Mr. Bruce Wilcox, assistant Secretary for California Nature Resources Agency (CNRA) was present and in charge.
- 7.2.3 **NOTE:** Although Mr. Phil Rosentrater did not type date on his 'press release', (7.3.1) he did state in his letter the following: "A healthier, more prosperous Salton Sea is the intended result an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) launched today by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors" (underline added). Just to be sure, I google and find out that the board of supervisors voted to create an 'Enhance Infrastructure Financing District' (EIFFD) on Tuesday, October 23, 2018. That is five months after Mr. Bruce Wilcox informed me in his letter (see section 11.21) that they will not use my concept. Neither Mr. Phil Rosentrater's 'press release nor Mr. Bruce Wilcox's letter to me was properly dated and I doubt that it was an unintentional omission. That indicates that the official 'stealing' of my concept started on October 23, 2018, which proves my assertions that I made about the process of slowly stealing 'piece by piece' of my original concept. By the way, I made a short presentation in front of SSA's Technical Advisory Group on May 14, 2014. Mr. Bruce Wilcox, Mr. Roger Shintaku, P.E., and the third person that did not have a business card (I do not remember his name) were present at the meeting.

See also the article by Sammy Roth in the Palm Springs Desert Sun. Here is the link: Riverside County's new Salton Sea plan could generate \$1 billion (desertsun.com). In this article is also shows manipulative conduct by Mr. Bruce Wilcox in selecting three proposals for consideration, and his vague plans for possible development in the future. Importation of seawater was mentioned as a far possibility in future, but his initial position was to keep the status quo. That was also the position of the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) where Mr. Bruce Wilcox worked earlier. The video of presentations of all 11 proposals are accessible at: Salton Sea Public Workshop (granicus.com). Please see it. Although the recording is about 3 hours and 48 minutes long, it is worth seeing it.

Ph: 760-347-1609

Geothermal Worldwide, Inc., 78-365 Hwy 111, #402, La Quinta, CA 92201,

- 7.3 The State made several efforts to save and restore the Salton Sea in accordance with the State's environmental policies. The first attempt was the 'Request for Information' (RFI) initiated by the State in 2017- 2018 with 11 presenters, including myself, presenting their concepts in El Centro on May 21, 2018. The second attempt was later in 2021- 2022 involving the University of California Santa Cruze (UCSC). Unfortunately, those two attempts have been 'sabotaged' (refusing to review the only feasible and competing proposal) by a relatively small group of people mostly members of the Salton Sea Authority (SSA) with their influenced consultants from Tetra–Tech, Pacific Institute, and California Water Boards. My proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea was excluded in both cases without a single scientific argument against it. By the way, members of the mentioned consulting firms competed with their own proposals (several variants of the "Perimeter/Brine Lake") during the second attempt in 2021 2022.
 - 7.3.1 Here is an alternative link for the recording of that meeting in El Centro, CA on May 21, 2018:

http://imperial.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=1274.

7.3.2 Here is the link to the letter 'memorandum' (1 page) from Mr. Bruce Wilcox, Assistant Secretary for CNRA sent to me on around **August 16**, **2018**, explaining the reasons for rejecting my proposal:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1L6hDCm6H0WAEJzoDtHNVKFsgfN05iRrO/view?usp=sharing.

Please read it. Mr. Bruce Wilcox did not disclose who were Committee and the Evaluation group members and what was their background and expertise. Most importantly, he did not point out a single scientific argument against my proposal. He just brushed off.

7.3.3 Here is the link to my response (11 pages) to Mr. Bruce Wilcox's letter that I sent on **October 12, 2018**:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ZCKncH0DjO834opjcXmCZSKbjX27JE7a/view?usp=sharing.

7.3.4 Here is the link to my response (28 pages) to the **UCSC Panel's** decision regarding two Fatal Flaws – filed on June 20, 2022.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1GZVU1FRSS4bFu1J2n3d31vNjfCu3brCz/view?usp=sharing.

This letter has a substantial amount of information including my correspondence (**argument**) with the Panel of independent reviewers. Please read it.

7.3.5 **NOTE:** Here is the link to the letter (62 pages) that I sent to You **Honorable Wade Crowfoot**, Secretary for California Natural Resources Agency, on **December 30, 2022**, in response to the Salton Sea Independent Review Panel Summary Report published on or around September 29, 2022. In my response, I provided plenty of evidence of blatant breach of the Panel' task and requested abolishment of the fraudulent report. Here is the link:

Ph: 760-347-1609

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wzN6xylytehWJu0Nz_wZFkTtAi9mYC-S/view?usp=sharing.

This letter has a substantial amount of information including my correspondence with the Panel of independent reviewers. Also, have the links to a recorded meeting in which principal investigator **Professor Dr. Brant Haddad explained the reasons for not reviewing my proposal** (See page 14 out of 62). Please read it.

7.3.6 Here is the link to my response (10 pages) to the **UCSC Panel after** the televised meeting on July 20, 2022 - filed on **July 22, 2022**.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1 3C4HqL3tan6TFz5iM5q1dyuFXz-TkwQ/view?usp=sharing.

7.3.7 Here is an important video from the meeting conducted on July 20, 2022.

Video: Independent Review Panel Fatal Flaw Report Public Meeting – July 20, 2022.

https://saltonsea.ca.gov/planning/water-importation-independent-review-panel/

7.3.8 **NOTE:** Please pay attention to the answer of Dr. Brant Haddad after my comment at segment 1:19:07 – 1:26:50. He is talking about the relationship between the Panel and Tetra-Tech which supposedly is implementing the State's policy on the Salton Sea. It is important to clarify that Tetra-Tech is only a consulting firm and, in this case, gives bed advice to the State on matters that are not in harmony with environmental law. I am pleased that Dr. Brant Haddad admits that he asked Tetra-Tech for their Salton Sea Management Program (SSMP) model, which then the Panel used for analysis.

I do not mean to be disrespectful to the Panel's Dr. Brant Haddad, but such a practice (conduct) is highly inappropriate and illegal. Here is his exact answer:

> "The most important thing that I can address Nikola in your comment has to do with the relationship between the Panel and Tetra-Tech. So, Tetra-Tech is consulting firm that is working with the State on its ... I guess you would call it the In Sea Solution – in any way – the Tetra-Tech is working with State on the Salton Sea issue and the independent review Panel is operating independently from Tetra-Tech and the only connection that we have with Tetra-Tech has been in asking them for their version of the SSMP model which then we used for our analyses. ... So, I think that we might have a training session where Tetra-Tech said here is how you use it But that is the extent of the relationship The rest of the analyses have been done by the Panel and its support team and the support team has included professors, graduate students from UC Santa Cruz as well as consultants firm Kennedy Jenks and Kennedy Jenks' subconsultants. So, there has been a separation between the State and this project, and we have really gone out of our way so that we maintain that wall ... so that the Panel is **seen as** independent".

Ph: 760-347-1609

7.3.8.1 **NOTE:** The reality is that Tetra-Tech and Pacific Institute with their influential and persuasive friends from SSA and IID, used their status as State's consultants - acting as the State's voice or enforcers of State policy - to overcome the Panel's 'independent' status and took over evaluations of the proposals for the restoration of the Salton Sea. They excluded the only competition (my proposal), and then later easily eliminated those three proposals that supposedly passed the "Fatal Flaw Criteria" and reinstated their ill-conceived proposal as a front-runner and the only feasible proposal to follow. By doing so, they made the Panel of independent reviewers irrelevant. Therefore, the Panel's report must be abolished (rejected), and an investigation opened with reevaluation of my proposal. By the way, evaluation of my proposal did not happen. They just brushed off.

Also, it is important to mention on this point that Tetra-Tech's using "State's consultant status" to act as enforcers of State's policy is a blatant breach of their task and clearly manipulative conduct.

I am pleased that the meeting on July 20, 2022, has been recorded. This is an unbelievable, but truthful admission (confession). The Panel's Dr. Brant Haddad's words and conduct, especially Panel's Report are legitimate grounds for a tribunal. It is strong evidence for the abolishment of the UCSC Panel's Report and for opening an investigation and starting a speedy new evaluation of my proposal with adequate reviewers (See my recommendation in Segment 6.0.

7.3.9 **NOTE:** Just to back up a little bit. In 2021 the State initiated, rightfully so, the new request for information (RFI) for the re-examination of the 11 initial proposals with the assistance of the University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC). The UCSC formed the Panel of independent reviewers (Panel) chaired by Dr. Rominder Suri and the principal investigator Professor Dr. Brant Haddad.

Ph: 760-347-1609

Here is the link to the agreement between the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the UCSC Panel, based on Executive Order N-10-19, to conduct a Feasibility Study to <u>objectively</u> evaluate the merit of water importation as a potential long-term strategy for the restoration of the Salton Sea: Agreement Summary - Contract for UCSC panel 1[22396].pdf.

The authors of the initial 11 proposals had an opportunity to update their original proposals if needed. Also was given an opportunity to submit new proposals if there are any. An additional 7 new proposals were submitted by the deadline of October 12, 2021. Since the authors of each proposal believe that their proposal is the best and needs to be implemented, we needed a "referee". The main purpose of the UCSC Panel was/is to evaluate <u>all</u> submitted proposals and select the best one that is feasible, and most beneficial to the restoration of the Salton Sea, the environment, the nearby communities, and the economy in general. The UCSC Panel blatantly failed to fulfil its main task but they did receive \$2.5 million for their lousy work.

- 7.4 Back to the "Pilot Demonstration Project". It is important to clarify that beside the mentioned article, at the link below, there is also an access (window on the top of the page), to a 'set of 24 photos' about the shrinking Salton Sea, exposed lakebed, and cultivated farmland on exposed lakebed (The Elmore Desert Ranch near Brawly). Please see it. It reinforces my assertions mentioned in Section 2.3.3. Here is the link:
 - Salton Sea North Lake Project unveiled by Riverside County, state authorities (desertsun.com).
- 7.5 It is obvious that the local leaders, mostly the members of the SSA, especially those that represent the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and Imperial County, that do not want to restore the Salton Sea and support the concept of a smaller Lake, is because, very possible, they are influenced by a few 'friendly' farmers who already cultivated exposed lakebed at southside of the Salton Sea (Please see the link above and 24 photos). It is unfortunate, sad, and at this point questionable, that those members of the SSA, after so many of my attempts, do not want to consult with me and learn that, by building a dike around the edge of the already cultivated lakebed, they would not need to destroy the Salton Sea.

7.6 The same applies for those that promote three proposed geothermal projects for the extraction of lithium from geothermal brine (the Black Rock Geothermal Projects, Morton Bay Geothermal project, and Elmore North Geothermal, an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of BHE Renewables, LLC.).

- 7.6.1 **NOTE:** During writing this letter, came to my attention the response by Jacobs to CEC's inquiry titled: "Black Rock Geothermal Project Air Quality Operational Emissions Spreadsheet" Docket Number **23-AFC-03** Bleck Rock Geothermal Project (BRGP). The document is a spread sheet with information (data) about "Project Emission Summary" etc. I have seen quite a few similar documents earlier about air monitoring stations, efficiency of cooling tower, etc., trying to prove validity of their project. I am using this opportunity to comment on that issue because it is relevant to the overall gray situation of the Salton Sea and the disconnect between agencies (CNRA, CalEPA, CEC) which I mention in segment 6.1 and 6.3 above.
- 7.6.2 **NOTE**: The applicants of those three geothermal projects are focused on their particular projects and they are not concerned about overall situation of the Salton Sea because they might not be <u>fully</u> aware of the existence of the master plan (architectural plan) for the restoration of the Salton Sea because my concept has not been officially accepted yet, and because they are not in business of taking care of Salton Sea nor the environment. There are in business of getting certificate from the CEC and making money from geothermal projects. That is another strong reason for the State to speed up evaluation of my proposal and provide condition for proper development of the situation around the Salton Sea that includes the restoration of the Salton Sea, synchronization of mentioned geothermal project to fit into master plan, and implementation of States policies regarding environment, energy, and wellbeing of the population.
- 7.6.3 **NOTE:** Without going into specifics of those several responses by applicants that I have seen, the data presented is from 'Modeling Emission Summary' provided from an obsolete system. Also, as presented, those geothermal projects are not in harmony with the long-term plan (master plan) for the restoration of the Salton Sea. Making colorful diagrams with estimates (predictions) of the water level, salinity level, air quality, and algae, etc., will be in 10, 20, or 50 years does not contribute at all to the restoration of the Salton Sea.
- 7.6.4 **NOTE:** It is important to understand that by building a dike around the edge of their preferred location (lot(s)), as I explained and illustrated in my architectural plan (proposal), means that they would be able to

continue with their 'obsolete' systems without destroying the Salton Sea. Preferably those three applicants could work with me (consult with me) and accept my 'patented' system that uses a completely closed-loop system, - both, for cooling system (without cooling towers that requires a substantial amount of water) and for production of potable water and concentrated brine - that are superior to conventional systems.

- 7.6.5 Also, it is important to clarify that the applicants had provided several faulty information in order to boost support for their projects such as the number of households that they will provide power to. For example, applicants stated on several occasions that 1 MW of generated electricity would provide power for about 700 households. The more realistic number is about 250 300 households.
- 7.6.6 Also, the applicants stated on several occasions that they relied on a promise by the IID to supply the necessary water that they need for the functioning of their proposed geothermal plants for the extraction of lithium.
 - 7.6.6.1 **NOTE**: The IID cannot supply water that does not have. Unless it is openly disclosed that allocated water (promised water) is at the expense of the dying Salton Sea. The nearby population, including tribes, needs to understand that. So far that has not been voiced. That is my assertion that I am repeating frequently and requesting the straight answer. Unfortunately, I have been ignored so far. That is another reason for the top state officials to act with a proper evaluation of my proposal.
 - 7.6.6.2 **NOTE**: Because of drought and restriction of water from Colorado River, with the 'current course of action' we do not have enough water neither for balancing evaporation of the Salton Sea nor for managing exposed lakebed of the shrinking Salton Sea. The 'current course of action' leads to destruction of the Salton Sea. That is my assertion that I am repeating frequently. I respectfully urge commissioners of the CEC to pose those questions and request a solid answer. Such critical information should not be ignored or hidden from the population. Unfortunately, so far that is the case.
- 7.6.7 In one televised meeting, the applicants mentioned that they intend to use 'their' system for recycling water, therefore, they will need less water but did not disclose technology for proprietary reasons. In such case the members of the CEC should have access to verify the uniqueness of such technology and check on available patents and priority dates. I am

ving that because I have been proposing for guite

78-365 Hwy 111, #402, La Quinta, CA 92201,

saying that because I have been proposing for quite a few years about using 'closed-loop environmental' system for generation of potable water in geothermal power plants that could be very useful for providing (increasing concentration) concentrated brine that can be used for extraction of lithium regardless of specific technology that can be implemented for the extraction of lithium from geothermal brine.

Ph: 760-347-1609

7.6.8 NOTE: In order to make right decisions, it is important that You, Governor Gavin Newsom, Yana Garcia, Secretary of CalEPA, and especially David Hochschild - chair of the California Energy Commission knows that the applicants of three geothermal projects (Black Rock Geothermal Projects, Morton Bay Geothermal project, and Elmore North Geothermal, an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of BHE Renewables, LLC.) are aware of the existence of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea. I sent my introductory letter with links to my proposal to Ms. Christina Fleming, VP of Mineral Development for BHER, on July 18, 2023, and a letter to Mr. Rob Berntsen, Senior Vice President and General Counsel, BHE Infrastructure Group, on September 3, 2023, and a letter to Mr. Jon Trujillo, GM Geothermal Development, BHE Renewables on October 5, 2023.

Also, I did mention the existence of my proposal and summarized it in a few minutes in my public comment during televised meeting in High School in Calipatria where representatives of BHE Renewables, LLC., were present on August 31, 2023. In my introductory letters, I offered them cooperation and suggested to them to extend their involvement in restoration of the Salton Sea beyond just geothermal projects. I have not received any response from them yet. Obviously, they are not in a position, as applicants, to make radical changes in their primary mission, which is not the restoration of the Salton Sea (see 7.6.2). Also, there is no incentive for them to be involved in the project unless my proposal is officially accepted by the State. That is another strong reason for the top state officials to initiate a speedy evaluation of my proposal and officially accept it as master plan to follow.

7.7 I have provided more than enough verifiable information for opening an investigation in this case. If honorable top state's officials cannot take necessary measure to stop the 'local leaders' from destroying the Salton Sea and if State continue with funding non-sensical projects or participate in illegal conduct initiated by local leaders then, the State must bear responsibility for such negligent conduct and subsequent liabilities.

> 7.8 The absurdity of the current situation is that instead of being grateful and supportive to my work because I have solved a big problem of the dying Salton Sea – my proposal transfers situation of incoming ecological disasters with unimageable liabilities into situation of clean environment and prosperity – I still, after 10 years, have to argue and write letters like this one in order to protect the Salton Sea and our environment against 'local leaders' that want to continue with non-sensical projects and destruction of the Salton Sea in order to protect their ego, wrongdoing, and pitiful personal interest.

Ph: 760-347-1609

7.9 Since I did not give any reason to the 'local leaders' to develop animosity towards me (except exposure of their wrong doing) and based on evidence that I have provided in my numerous public comments about the situation (the links to some included in Section 11.0 in this letter), and my correspondence with the members of the Salton Sea Authority (the links to some included in Section 12.0 in this letter), it is realistic to conclude that my assertion, about the 'stealing in process' mentioned in section 2.13.4 on page 12 of this letter is correct.

8.0 IN CLOSING:

- 8.1 The restoration of the Salton Sea is of enormous importance not just for the local population but for the environment and the State of California and United States of America. We have already lost a lot of time and money unnecessarily iust because of the incompetence of 'local leadership' and a few state officials.
- 8.2 The "current course of action" which is "Pilot Demonstration Project" which is part of bigger project so-called the "North Lake" which is part of the bigger project so-called the "Perimeter/Brine Lake" which is recently renamed to the "In-Basin Solution" or "In-Basin Long-Range Solution" which include related dust suppression projects that implement the 'hay bales' on exposed lakebed (not mentioned in this article) - does not make sense because the final product would be a smaller, saltier, smellier, and more polluted lake with serious consequences to the environment, the health of the nearby population and economy in general. That is an indisputable fact.
- 8.3 Although it should be standard practice by the State officials before issuing funding for any project, in this case, I am respectfully requesting, because I am deeply involved in this case and because state's interest and liability is involved. that the State (officials in charge of delivering the funding) ask applicants (the local leadership) the following questions and request solid answers (not vague ones such as "we will check on it later" or "we are working on it" and alike). It is important to point out that local leaders have been working (participating) on design for the restoration of the Salton Sea already for over 20 years and come up with non-functional long-term solution.

- 8.4 The Questions that should be asked are:
- 8.4.1 (a) What is the functional purpose of the "Pilot Project Lake" if there is any?

- 8.4.2 (b) If there is none, then why proceed with the "Pilot Project Lake"?
- 8.4.3 (c) Where exactly water will be supplied from for the "Pilot Project Lake" and accountability for it?
- 8.4.4 (d) Where exactly water will be supplied from for the "North Lake" project and accountability for it?
- 8.4.5 (e) Who will lose the water that will be used for the "Pilot Project Lake"?
- 8.4.6 (f) How will the "Pilot Project Lake" fit in whole project for the restoration of the Salton Sea?
- 8.4.7 (g) Will dike (barrier) that form the "Pilot Project Lake" be dismantled after local leaders' supposedly find what the quality of the water will be or will dike (barrier) stay there permanently as an obstacle to the water flow when real functional solution is going to be implemented?
- 8.4.8 (h) To provide dated blueprint of their plan illustrations with water level (elevation) in the "Pilot Project Lake", and water level (elevation) in the "North Lake", and water level (elevation) in Central part of the Salton Sea where their "Brine Lake" will be?
- 8.4.9 (i) Since the Salton Sea is relatively shallow lake, the difference in water level (elevation) between body of water (Pilot Project, North Lake, and Brine Lake) increases the surface of exposed lakebed (playa) the distance between those bodies of water What they intend to do with exposed lakebed (playa) formed between the "Pilot Project Lake" and "North Lake" and between the "North Lake" and "Brine Lake" according to their design?
- 8.4.10 (j) Are they infringing anyone's patent rights, partially or wholly, by proceeding with 'their' "North Lake" design'?
- 8.4.11 (k) If so, do they intend to transfer liability for their mistakes (illegal conduct) to the State?

Ph: 760-347-1609

Geothermal Worldwide, Inc., 78-365 Hwy 111, #402, La Quinta, CA 92201,

Those questions above are relative to the "Pilot Project Lake". Since 'local leaders' does not want to answer to me any of my questions posed to them, I am respectfully requesting that You and governor Newsom ask the 'local leaders' and request straight answer on the following questions before delivering the check of \$19.25 million, because the questions are of great importance and answer on those question will help understand the situation which is in interest to State and all stakeholders. Also, the State needs to be extra aware of the answer to question (k) (7.4.11) above.

My statements (claims) are extraordinary and should be challenged but have not been challenged either by local leaders or by the State.

- 8.5 The second set of challenging question are:
 - 8.5.1 When I say: "with the implementation of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea, we could generate revenue at least about \$500,000,000 per year just from clean renewable energy". That should be challenged with the question: "How that could be done?" If needed debate and cross-examination questions should be allowed and welcomed. If local leaders prefer not to have revenue for the community (stakeholders) of at least about \$500,000,000 per year just from clean renewable energy, then, they need to write reasoning for such decisions.
 - 8.5.2 When I say: "With the implementation of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea, we could fill up the Lake to the water level of the 1950's and 60's and restore original beaches and marines despite lessen water inflow from Colorado River". That should be challenged with the question: How that could be done?" If needed debate and cross-examination questions should be allowed and welcomed. If local leaders prefer not to have restored the Salton Sea to glory of the 1950's and 60's, then, they need to write reasoning for such decisions.
 - 8.5.3 When I say: "With the implementation of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea, we could import seawater from Gulf of California (Sea of Cotez) and save about \$100,000,000 per year". That should be challenged with the question: How that could be done?" If needed debate and cross-examination questions should be allowed and welcomed. If local leaders prefer not to save \$100,000,000 per year, then, they need to write reasoning for such decisions.
 - 8.5.4 When I say: "With the implementation of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea, we could put the Salton Sea on the World Map as a tourist destination". That should be challenged with the question: How that could be done?" If needed debate and cross-examination questions should be allowed and welcomed. If local leaders prefer not to have the

Salton Sea on the World Map as a tourist destination, then, they need to write reasoning for such decisions.

Ph: 760-347-1609

- 8.5.5 When I say: "With the implementation of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea, we could have constant production of lithium of about 1,000 750 tons per year from imported seawater". That should be challenged with the question: How that could be done?" If needed debate and cross-examination questions should be allowed and welcomed. If local leaders prefer not to have about 1,000 tons of lithium per year from imported seawater, then, they need to write reasoning for such decisions.
- 8.5.6 When I say: "With the implementation of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea, we could have several recreational parks with small lakes with nearby fisheries on industrial scale without additional water for it". That should be challenged with the question: How that could be done?" If needed debate and cross-examination questions should be allowed and welcomed. If local leaders prefer not to have several recreational parks with nearby fisheries on an industrial scale, then, they need to write reasoning for such decisions.
- 8.5.7 When I say: "With the implementation of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea, we could have the Salton Sea as a hub for production of potable water". That should be challenged with the question: How that could be done?" If needed debate and cross-examination questions should be allowed and welcomed. If local leaders prefer not to have the Salton Sea as a hub for production of potable water, then, they need to write reasoning for such decisions.
- 8.5.8 When I say: "With the implementation of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea, we could harness geothermal energy, which is prevalent in the area, with no limitation to geothermal reservoir" meaning, we could harness much more geothermal energy than estimated with conventional systems. That should be challenged with the question: How that could be done?" If needed debate and cross-examination questions should be allowed and welcomed. If local leaders prefer not to harness much more geothermal energy than estimated with conventional systems, then, they need to write reasoning for such decisions.

Brushing off those claims above in 8.4-8.4.11 and 8.5-8.5.8 and avoiding challenges and open discussions proves arrogance, ignorance, naiveness, and incompetence by local and some state officials. Also, it indicates an anticipation of illegal conduct as I mentioned in Sections 2.13.3; 2.13.4; 7.1; 7.2; 7.3-7.3.9.

8.6 As I explained in many of my public comments, I will repeat it again. There are really two options for the State to choose about the fate of the Salton Sea with two completely different outcomes:

Ph: 760-347-1609

- 8.6.1 Option I To proceed with the current project already in motion the "North Lake Pilot Demonstration Project" which is part the "Smaller, Sustainable Lake" "10-year plan" "Perimeter/Brane Lake" The projects that will be constantly asking the State and Federal Governments for help (for more money) for fixing never-ending problems and at the end losing the Lake with tremendous liabilities in billions of dollars (environmental disaster toxic dust storms, health issues, and economic fold). NOTE: In the process would benefit a few "friendly" companies on the expenses of the environment and communities; and
- 8.6.2 **Option II** Based on new revealing critical information, redirecting efforts and allocated money toward implementation of the long-term solution (my proposal) which would restore the Salton Sea to the water level of the 1950s and 60s; provide the condition for tourism, wildlife sanctuary, clean environment, and generate revenue in 100s Billion Dollars in several decades and would continue so in the future costing only about \$15,000,000,000. NOTE: A few companies that would benefit from Option (I), would benefit even more with Option (II). ... That is the absurdity of the current situation.
- 8.7 Since the check of \$19.25 million is delivered, according to the article and video, it appears that my numerous public comments in which I exposed faultiness of the 'current course of action' did not make any effect, and because disconnect between local leaders (members of the SSA) and top State officials exist, I am contacting you again directly, for the record, urging you to inform Governor Gavin Newsom and stop nonsensical projects and start working towards the restoration of the Salton Sea option (II) above 8.6.2.

Because the local leaders – members of the Salton Sea Authority – are not functioning properly – they are not working in the interest to the Salton Sea and nearby communities as originally intended at their formation in 1993, - therefore honorable top state officials must use its power to save and restore the Salton Sea and enforce the fundamental State's policies regarding the Environmental Law. Based on attitude and the record, it is obvious that 'local leaders' will not change their intentions unless they must.

8.8 The absurdity of this case is that I am defending fundamental policy of the State against 'local leaders' and agencies that the State keep funding.

9.0 A few words about MY WORK and the PROPOSAL for the RESTORATION of the SALTON SEA:

My proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea – terminal Lake in California - involves an architectural plan which incorporates several breakthrough technologies in the energy industry which I have invented and modified to incorporate local conditions of the Salton Sea area with the final product – the self-sustained long-term solution for the restoration of the Salton Sea. It might be considered a project of the century costing only about \$15 billion and generating at least \$500,000,000 in revenue per year just from clean renewable energy – in addition to revenue from other activities including tourism.

Ph: 760-347-1609

Here I will just summarize the subjects of my breakthrough methodologies:

- I am the inventor of the new system for harnessing geothermal energy (a completely closed-loop system) which is not limited to geothermal reservoirs.
- I am also the inventor of the new system for drilling deeper and wider wellbores.
- I am also the inventor of the new system for harnessing solar energy (thermo-optical solar system) having the "power unit" with pistons, which is at least several times more efficient than Photo Voltaic (PV) systems.
- I am also the inventor of the new system of cross-country pipelines for importing seawater or other fluids, having the "in-line pump" as segments of the pipeline for uphill routes, and having the "in-line generator" as segments of the pipeline for downhill routes with the "Delta Power Plant" at the last section.
- I am also the inventor of the new system for using the pipeline as a foundation for solar panels which eliminates expenses for purchasing or leasing huge sections of land, which is an expensive requirement for conventional solar facilities on an industrial scale. My system decentralizes the conventional centralized systems.
- I am also the inventor of the new system for the desalinization of salty water using solar and/or geothermal energy to generate electricity and having potable water as a free byproduct, and concentrated brine to be used to produce Lithium.
- After the accident offshore of Louisiana in the Gulf of Mexico on April 20, 2010, and a failure of the "Blow Out Preventer" (BOP) in the Macondo

> well, it became a challenge how to stop uncontrollable bursts of crude oil in the Gulf of Mexico and prevent disasters of epic proportions. Out of over 3,000 proposals and many universities and laboratories participating, my proposal for controlling dysfunctional "Blow out Preventer" was used to stop uncontrollable bursts of crude oil. By July 15, 2010, the Macondo well was successfully sealed, if only temporarily, for the first time in 87 days. That was only 34 days after my submission. The implementation of the control valve on top of the dysfunctional BOP was televised on CNN.

Ph: 760-347-1609

I graduated from the School of Architecture, University Cyril and Methodius, Skopje, North Macedonia, in 1982, and immigrated to the United States in 1983, as a student at the Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture, Taliesin West in Arizona, and Taliesin East in Wisconsin. The University Cyril and Methodius – School of Architecture consists of nine semesters, around 38 exams, plus graduate work which takes an additional 5-6 months. I am proud to say that my graduate work scored 10 out of 10, which is rarely given.

My mission is global – which is licensing technologies worldwide to capable companies/contractors with means. The Salton Sea project is a small part of it, but it is an important part. It is imperative to save the Salton Sea and our environment despite unreasonable opposition. I am providing a solution and the "know-how" to the desperate situation.

Also, I am including links and a summary of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea where they are divided into five segments for easier understanding. Each of the segments (phases) is essential for the final product of the self-sustained Salton Sea.

On February 6-8, 2023, Stanford University hosted Geothermal Workshop (SGW 2023). I made three presentations at the SGW 2023. The subject of the SGW 2023 was 'Geothermal' and had limited time for presentations, therefore, I did not submit two papers about harnessing the solar and hydropower in more detail.

Here below are links to my papers from the Stanford Geothermal Workshop (SGW 2023) where I made three presentations on February 7, 2023, each lasting 30 minutes including Q & A. Although 90 minutes was a short time for a substantial material, I am thankful for such an opportunity. It is a summary of the larger material ... It is worth seeing it.

9.1 Papers - Segment (I) - Harnessing Energy and Water in the Salton Sea. <u>Click here to see</u> or click the link below:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1oowNJNodUNIfT Jq5byczZTKbm1z9qlW/view?usp=sharing

Ph: 760-347-1609

9.2 Papers – Segment (II)

Harnessing Geothermal Energy in the Salton Sea Area.

Click here to see or click the link below:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1W8Au4FTwwJf8NaBBxfFTDfub5golqLtv/view?usp=sharing.

9.3 Papers – Segment (III)

System for Drilling Deeper and Wider Wellbores.

Click here to see or click the link below:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BgS5RzXerJym0YGVajK7HFEyKbr-O3XL/view?usp=sharing.

PowerPoint Presentation – Slides – are bigger files. I am including links to them below.

The slides are summaries of the papers and are easy to review after the papers are read. In the text of the papers, I referred to certain illustrations (See Fig. so and so), which are in a separate segment. In the PPT files, the illustrations are smaller, and on the right side of the slide, there is a short description (summary power points).

I have included all files on my website www.GeothermalWorldwide.com => OUR TECHNOLOGY => Presentation at Stanford University.

9.4 PowerPoint Presentation – Slides – Segment (I) – Harnessing Energy and Water in the Salton Sea. Click the link below:

PowerPoint Presentation – Slides – Segment (I) – Harnessing Energy and Water in the Salton Sea.

9.5 PowerPoint Presentation - Slides - Segment (II) - Harnessing Geothermal **Energy in the Salton Sea Area. Click the link below:**

PowerPoint Presentation - Slides - Segment (II) - Harnessing Geothermal Energy in the Salton Sea Area.

For more information and for those two additional segments about harnessing **solar** and **hydropower** please visit the page <u>PRESENTATION AT EL CENTRO</u>." It is just above the link "Presentation at Stanford University".

Here are all five links from my website to be handy. Here are Segments I-V.

The segment about Harnessing Hydro Power is presented here as Segment II.

The segment about Harnessing Solar Energy is presented here as Segment III.

The segment about Harnessing Geothermal Energy is presented here as Segment IV. And

The segment about System for Drilling Deeper and Wider Wellbores is presented here as Segment V.

Here are the links:

9.7	Harnessing Energy and Water in The Salton Sea (Segment I) (System for Importing Seawater). Here is the link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1PWZblnYIV2dHnFXQqVwZwV56P6rqPZHI/view?usp=sharing.
9.8	Harnessing Energy and Water in The Salton Sea (Segment II) (Harnessing Hydro Power).
	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wEoi3VNNscX6SkH7dWIrmNMZO7oRb5vu/view?usp=sharing.
9.9	Harnessing Energy and Water in the Salton Sea (Segment. III)
	(System for Harnessing Solar Energy). https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ZLuZbt6RsLo3x19x2sKB_XVPjkJJuNwv/view?usp=sharing.

9.10 Harnessing Geothermal Energy with the Self Contained In-Ground Geothermal Generator and Self Contained In-Ground Geothermal Heat Exchanger (Segment IV)

(Harnessing Geothermal Energy in The Salton Sea Area). https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wqRUgmib_Si-odYmWV8F5TILOL-U7R7I/view?usp=sharing.

Ph: 760-347-1609

9.11 Harnessing Energy and Water in The Salton Sea (**Segment V**) (**System for Drilling Deeper and Wider Wellbores**).

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Aig8tuELSdkvfFakK-SEMvyW-bUQd76r/view?usp=sharing.

The architectural plan is a comprehensive design. In order to be understood it needs to be studied as a whole by people preferably with an engineering background. Also, it is an art.

10.0 The Summary of the Summary of the proposal for the Restoration of the Salton Sea:

10.1 The architectural plan successfully restores and refills the Salton Sea to the level of the 1950s and the '60s and reestablishes huge wildlife sanctuaries despite reduced inflow of water from the Colorado River.

By redirecting the New River and Alamo River back to Mexico before it gets polluted with fertilizers and pesticides, it provides an option for filling up the Laguna Salada – dry Lake in Mexico - and reestablishes flaw in the Gulf of California (Sea of Cortez). Everyone should love that. In return, through negotiation by the 'International Boundary and Water Commission' (IBWC) and their counterparts in Mexico, through a treaty to negotiate a corridor with a service road for a pipeline for importing seawater into the central section of the Salton Sea. Since such a solution is of great interest to us (USA) and to Mexico, the negotiation should not be a difficult task. We could exchange at least the same amount of water, although, through negotiation, we could have an opportunity to get 1,000,000 acre-feet of seawater and to keep a certain amount from the Colorado River. Also, it would be an opportunity to negotiate 100 years deal with an option to renew the deal after 100 years. This solution would save us around \$100,000,000 per year that otherwise we would need to pay for importing 1,000,000 acre-feet of seawater. I elaborated on it in more detail in original papers submitted in 2018 following the Request for Information (RFI) issued by the State in 2017.

Also, it is important to mention, that I, as the author of the Architectural Plan and the inventor of a new system for the desalinization of salty water using geothermal and/or solar energy, should be included as a part of the team of the IBWC as a contributing consultant during a negotiation with Mexico because my

> presence would improve our leverage because by using my system (methodology) Mexico can provide potable water for nearby city Mexicali that desperately needs potable water and concentrated brine that can be used to produce lithium. Both elements are in demand. The same system that I am proposing for the Salton Sea.

Ph: 760-347-1609

Also, an essential part of my proposal is that by dividing the Salton Sea into three sections, we would need water from the Colorado River only for farmlands and for balancing the evaporation of the North Lake and South Lake. That is in harmony with the reduced inflow of water from the Colorado River as required by the Quantification Settlement Agreement (QSA) and possible additional reductions in the future because of drought.

Also, it is important to mention, that an essential factor of my proposal is utilizing a dike around the desired area allocated for the extraction of lithium to provide dry land and prevent destruction of the Salton Sea as would be the case with the current course of action.

Also, it is important to mention that the implementation of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea would cost only about \$15,000,000,000. It can be completed in about 5-6 years and would generate at least \$500,000,000 in revenue per year - out of the blue – literally. The revenue numbers in my papers are conservative. A more realistic revenue estimate would be about \$1,000,000,000 per year. That is in addition to achieving a clean environment, a substantial amount of potable water, lithium, tourism, and other activities that generate revenue.

10.2 **NOTE**: Those who make policies, including all stakeholders, need to understand that the Salton Sea situation is unique in the whole World. The depression of over - 220 feet below sea level is in a desert about 200 miles from both - the Gulf of California (San Felipe) and the Pacific Ocean (Long Beach). In the area, there is a prevalent geothermal source and many sunny days throughout the year.

Importing seawater and using those natural sources (geothermal and solar), as I explained in my proposal, the Salton Sea can and should become a hub to produce potable water that can be used in many applications. Although I have explained the function of the feasible concept with a pipeline diameter of 48", through which can be imported about 1,000,000 acre-feet of seawater from the Sea of Cortez and about 2,000,000 acre-feet from Long Beach, the system can be multiplied – something for future generations to do.

Think for a moment about the alternative – the 'current course of action' – the disappearance of the Salton Sea – exposed lakebed (playa) – toxic dust storms, degrading environment, the health of the population, and economy.

Ph: 760-347-1609

This is a rare opportunity that should not be ignored and suppressed as was the case in the last 10 years.

- 10.3 **NOTE:** Those involved in decision making on the Salton Sea issue, including all stakeholders, needs to understand that every year that the implementation of my proposal for the restoration of the Salton Sea is postponed, we are losing revenue of at least \$500,000,000 per year just from clean renewable energy not to mention other activities including tourism.
- 10.4 Here is the link to the video of my short presentation in front of members of the CEC. It is about 60 minutes. I am grateful for such an opportunity from the CEC although the material is substantial, and I needed more than a few hours. Here is the link: https://energy.zoom.us/rec/share/d4tAFmZFYEoqg4_VQzKgnbEbbjsTG-o8xeJX9KRklp4uLlvOr7dCOz-9zrcMW-tW.JZXVajNyKAb3E9Of.
- 10.5 Here is the link for a short presentation to the CUSC Panel of independent reviewers on October 22, 2021: Geothermal Worldwide_Zoom.mp4 Google Drive. (It is about an hour (52:02). Here is an optional link: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1aFacKaq-jppZuNF-00v88mYAiNa3vUAk/view?usp=drive_link.

11.0 LINKS TO SEVERAL RELEVANT CORRESPONDENCES:

Here below are links to several important correspondences (letters) that I referred to and included as attachments in my original letters. To avoid overcrowding documents with attachments, I transferred them on Google Drive as links to be easily accessible if needed.

11.1 Here is the link to the letter (36 pages) that I sent to the **Bureau of Reclamation**, / **Department of Interior** - in response to "Request for Comment" regarding "Post-2026 Operation" on **August 15, 2023**.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RTVL7xEZZeE5Nr7d13MBkH0sZg7RzR-X/view?usp=sharing.or alternative link:

<u>Comment in response to the Bureau of Reclamation, Interior - "request for comments" regarding "post-2026 operation".pdf - Google Drive</u>

Ph: 760-347-1609

Geothermal Worldwide, Inc., 78-365 Hwy 111, #402, La Quinta, CA 92201,

> In that letter, I respectfully urged the Department of the Interior / Bureau of Reclamation to include the Salton Sea in consideration for the Development of Post-2026 operations. Also, I urged BOR / DOI to get involved because there is an obviously noticeable disconnect between - higher officials (Governor, Secretaries of California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA), California Energy Commission) that enforce the fundamental policies of the State - and several local agencies that promote their own policy that leads towards smaller, saltier, smellier and more polluted Lake - which means the destruction of the Salton Sea - that is against the State and Federal policies which are based on Environmental Law. Also. there is a link in that letter on page 9 (2.1) to a document mentioning, in the first paragraph, about the disconnect between higher officials and agencies stating that a combination of mismanagement and competition among federal, state, and local agencies exist. Also, I pointed out that the 'current course of action' which is the 'Perimeter/Brine Lake" with related dust suppression projects recently renamed to the "In-basin long-range plan" is based on the false assumption that importation of the seawater is not a feasible concept.

11.2 Here is the link to the letter (18 pages) that I sent to the **State Water** Resources Control Board on July 28, 2023, in response to the Draft Desalination Siting and Streamlining Report to Expedite Permitting.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/14TUXunA12gfkJWydgUMZUiGs55bqI2tw/view?usp=drive_link. or alternative link:

"Comment Letter to State Water Resources Control Board – Draft Desalination Siting and Streamlining Report to Expedite Permitting.".pdf - Google Drive

In that letter, I pointed out that the 'current course of action' is not synchronized. Many contractors are asking for funding for their individual projects which are not synchronized into a bigger project which is an architectural plan for the restoration of the Salton Sea. Therefore, it is imperative that the architectural plan (my proposal) is accepted and then focuses on its implementation which includes many synchronized projects (hydro, solar, geothermal, desalinization, etc.). It is important to mention that my system for desalinization of the Salton Sea can be used in many different locations including our coastal cities.

In my comment, I have respectfully proposed that after my proposal is thoroughly reviewed and hopefully accepted, to be formed a mechanism (special counsel or Committee/Commission) from the members of the CNRA, EPA, CEC, and several relevant agencies and stakeholders to deals strictly with the implementation of the project for the restoration of the Salton Sea until its completion in 5-6 years. After its completion, the Committee can be abolished or reduced to overseeing maintenance issues and alike.

Ph: 760-347-1609

11.3 Here is the link to the letter (18 pages) that I sent to the **Environmental Justice (EJ) Action Grants** on **July 28, 2023**.

<u>Comment - EJ Action Grants - Nikola Lakic.pdf - Google Drive</u>. or alternative link:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1P6141RA6OVY-in8PbOXqBOmxMBQdqDD8/view?usp=drive link.

In that letter, as in the letter to the State Water Resources Control Board above, that I sent the same day, I pointed out that the 'current course of action' is not synchronized. Many contractors are asking for funding for their individual projects which are not synchronized into a bigger project which is an architectural plan for the restoration of the Salton Sea. Therefore, it is imperative that the architectural plan (my proposal) is accepted and then focuses on its implementation which includes many synchronized projects (hydro, solar, geothermal, desalinization, etc.).

It is important to mention that my system for desalinization of the Salton Sea can be used in many different locations including our coastal cities.

In the letter, I elaborated on a recent meeting (video) in which a representative of Controlled Thermal Resources, Mr. Jim Turner COO, talked about shrinking the Salton Sea as a positive development.

In my comment, I have respectfully proposed that after my proposal is thoroughly reviewed and hopefully accepted to be formed a mechanism (special counsel or Committee/Commission) from the members of the CNRA, EPA, CEC, and several relevant agencies and stakeholders to deal strictly with the implementation of the project for the restoration of the Salton Sea until its completion in 5-6 years. After its completion, the Committee can be abolished or reduced to overseeing maintenance issues and alike.

11.4 Here is the link to the letter (20 pages) that I sent to the **California Energy Commission** Docket Unit, MS-4 Docket No. 17-GRDA-01 on **July 11, 2023**, in Response to the Pre-Solicitation Workshop conducted at San Diego State University (SDSU) - Imperial Valley Camus - in Calexico on June 27, 2023.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1u2R6iTXjTH_QPYg_bTW0sGpAOMAqEYqa/view?usp=sharing.or alternative link:

<u>07-11-2023 - Response to Pre-Solicitation Workshop conducted at San Diego State University</u> (SDSU) - Imperial Valley Camus in Calexico on June 27, 2023 (1).pdf - Google Drive

> In that letter, I pointed out that the 'current course of action' is not synchronized. Also, many contractors are asking for funding for their individual projects which are not synchronized into a bigger project which is an architectural plan for the restoration of the Salton Sea. Therefore, it is imperative that the architectural plan (my proposal) is accepted and then focuses on its implementation which includes many synchronized projects (hydro, solar, geothermal, desalinization, etc.).

Ph: 760-347-1609

It is important to mention that my system for desalinization of the Salton Sea can be used in many different locations including our coastal cities.

In that letter, I also respectfully proposed that after my proposal is thoroughly reviewed and hopefully accepted, to be formed a mechanism (special counsel or Committee/Commission) from the members of the CNRA, EPA, CEC, and several relevant agencies and stakeholders to deal strictly with the implementation of the project for the restoration of the Salton Sea until its completion in 5-6 years. After its completion, the Committee can be abolished or reduced to overseeing maintenance issues and alike.

11.5 Here is the link to the letter (36 pages) that I sent on June 6, 2023, to the **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers** in response to the State Water Board Salton Sea Workshop and Public Meetings for the Imperial Streams Salton Sea and Tributaries Feasibility Study conducted on May 18, 2023.

Comment to U.S Army Corps of Engineers - May 30, 2023.pdf - Google Drive. or alternative link:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/13iey9OWKNkKDP7h9ATrjALHs1iEFe2TW/view?usp=sharing.

In the letter, I urged the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to study my proposal thoroughly and not succumb to the pressure of a group of influential people from several local agencies who openly talked about getting rid of the Salton Sea.

11.6 Here is the link to the letter (15 pages) that I sent in response to the "Salton" Sea Long Range Plan Public Draft" prepared by the California Natural Resources Agency / SSMP Long-Range Plan on March 10, 2023.

Response to the "Salton Sea Long Range Plan Public Draft (3-10-23) copy.pdf - Google Drive. or alternative link:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/19xYLJDAoiNUvbzzIX1t-2oUJY-thLF8g/view?usp=sharing.

In that letter, I pointed out the ridiculous projects of which they are proud. I pointed out that using a faulty UCSC Panel Report leads to a 'drive in the wrong direction'. I pointed out several very important facts. Please read it.

Ph: 760-347-1609

11.7 Here is the link to the letter (7 pages) that I sent on **January 25, 2023**, to the Salton Sea Long-Range Plan Review - **California Natural Resources Agency** as a Public Comment in response to the "Salton Sea Long Range Plan Public Draft" prepared by the California Natural Resources Agency - **SSMP Long-Range Plan**.

Response to the "Salton Sea Long Range Plan Public Draft.pdf - Google Drive. or alternative link:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/19xYLJDAoiNUvbzzIX1t-2oUJY-thLF8q/view?usp=sharing.

In the letter, I have pointed out that the "current course of action" for the restoration of the Salton Sea is a "drive in the wrong direction". I pointed out the facts and urged CNRA / SSMP to stop "driving in the wrong direction". I also urge the California Natural Resources Agency not to use the University of California, Santa Cruz Panel's report (UCSC Panel) as a reference because it is a fraudulent report. Please read it.

11.8 Here is the link to the letter (62 pages) that I sent to **Honorable Wade Crowfoot**, Secretary for California Natural Resources Agency, on **December 30**, **2022**, in response to the Salton Sea Independent Review Panel Summary Report published on or around September 29, 2022, and Request for its abolishment.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wzN6xylytehWJu0Nz_wZFkTtAi9mYC-S/view?usp=sharing. or alternative link:

Response to the Report of Panel of independent reviewers.pdf - Google Drive

This letter has a substantial amount of information including my correspondence with the Panel of independent reviewers. Also, have the links to a recorded meeting in which principal investigator **Professor Dr. Brant Haddad explained the reasons for not reviewing my proposal** (See page 14 out of 62). Please read it.

11.9 Here is the link to the letter (6 pages) that I sent on **September 23, 2022**, to the **Lithium Valley Commission** convened by the **California Energy**

Commission (CEC) to review, investigate, and analyze eight specific topics relating to lithium extraction meetings and facilitated by the **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**.

Ph: 760-347-1609

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1g-5ZVt-M9L_tGlmb2F7pN8iFI4Zeobzo/view?usp=sharing. or alternative link:

Letter to Lithium Valley Commission -September 22 - Copy.pdf - Google Drive.

In that letter, I wrote that my proposal does not interfere with the extraction of lithium from geothermal brine if there is a dike built around the desired area for the extraction of lithium. In fact, my proposal unites those two contradictive projects (a) and (b) successfully and provides the needed water for the extraction of lithium which obviously with the current plan (or lack of plan) is lacking.

Knowing that the Chair of the Lithium Valley Commission was Silvia Paz a close associate of Michael Cohen from Pacific Institute who is a strong opponent of the importation of seawater and that the co-Chair was Ryan E. Kelley also a strong opponent of the importation of seawater, it is understandable why I have not been invited to make presentation to the Lithium Valley Commission despite my frequent offers.

11.10 Here is the link to the letter to the **Salton Sea Task Force** Members (6 pages) – filed on **September 7, 2022**.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HizXsctbKWLnh_PPGa_Mmp6N1I5SIqYp/view?usp=sharing. or alternative link:

Letter to the Salton Sea Task Force - September 7, 2022 - Copy.pdf - Google Drive

In this letter, I have summarized the problems and a solution. Please read it.

11.11 Here is the link to my response (10 pages) to the **UCSC Panel after** the televised meeting on July 20, 2022 - filed on **July 22, 2022**.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1 3C4HgL3tan6TFz5iM5g1dyuFXz-TkwQ/view?usp=sharing. or alternative link:

Response to Panel's decision after meeting on July 20, 2022 -Copy.pdf - Google Drive.

11.12 Here is the link to my response (28 pages) to the **UCSC Panel's decision** regarding **two Fatal Flaws** – filed on **June 20, 2022**.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1GZVU1FRSS4bFu1J2n3d31vNjfCu3brCz/view?usp=sharing.or alternative link:

Ph: 760-347-1609

Response to the Panel's decision - two Fatal Flaws - 6-20-2022 - Copy - Copy.pdf - Google Drive

This letter has a substantial amount of information including my correspondence (**argument**) with the Panel of independent reviewers. Please read it.

11.13 Here is the link to the letter (3 pages) that I sent on **October 1, 2021,** to President **Joseph Biden** requesting **NOT to assist the IID** in fast-tracking the federal permitting process for the geothermal lithium project in Hell's Kitchen, Salton Sea, Ca, in response to the IID request for fast-tracking the federal permitting process of the geothermal lithium project in Hell's Kitchen at that time before the report from Dr. Rominder Suri is finished and issued. At that time, I did not foresee "collapse" of the Panel of independent reviewers.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QLHA-cyCE3fnmUAAKACWJZOkbnRWM_jt/view?usp=sharing.or alternative link:

<u>Letter to President Joe Biden - October 1, 2021.pdf - Google Drive.</u>

11.14 Here is the link to the letter (13 pages) that I sent to the California Energy Commission / Lithium Valey Commission on December 19, 2021, pointing out several noticeable departures from the policies of the California State and from the original task of the commission.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1I7YkrDCYLWjTen1feqQeWyM84MVDyp81/view?usp=sharing. or alternative link:

Letter to Lithium Valley Commision - December 19, 2021.pdf - Google Drive.

11.15 Here is the link to the letter (13 pages) that I wrote to the CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD COLORADO RIVER BASIN REGION in response to the Notice of opportunity for the "**Public Comment**" regarding the water quality control plan for the Colorado River Basin Region sent on **October 21, 2020**.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1iSfU_RCnRADIYiGwTuXvW6ZHDt9L92jg/view?usp=sharing.or alternative link:



Email: <u>nlakic@GeothermalWorldwide.com</u> Ph: 760-347-1609

<u>Public Comment - 2020 Trinnial Review - California Regional Water Quality Control Board Colorado River Basin Region.pdf - Google Drive.</u>

In that letter, as in previous ones, I reminded them about the existence of my proposal and what it does. I also mentioned the paragraph on their website reinforcing my statement: "The Water Quality Control Plan for the Colorado River Basin (Basin Plan) is designed to preserve and enhance water quality in the Region and to protect the beneficial uses of all regional waters for the benefit of present and future generations".

11.16 Here is the link to the letter (12 pages) that I wrote to the **California**Natural Resources Agency / Salton Sea Management Program (SSMP) in response to the "Community Input Sought for SSMP Projects", sent on September 29, 2020.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1kb-YN-siYd4iwcS7iast2nS6fmzy_5sj/view?usp=sharing.or alternative link:

Public Comment Letter - (9-29-2020) California Natural Resources Agency - SSMP.pdf - Google Drive.

In that letter, I strongly oppose the "Current Course of Action" which is the "Perimeter Lake" and related dust suppression projects because those projects are based on the false assumption that importing seawater is not a feasible concept and contributes to incoming ecological disaster. I pointed out that I watched several of their workshops (presentations) and that I watched the recent hearing "FEDERAL AND STATE EFFORTS TO RESTORE THE SALTON SEA" televised on September 24, 2020, and criticized their acceptance of the concept that leads to destruction of the Salton Sea.

11.17 Here is the link to the letter (5 pages) to Dr. Marilyn L. Fogel, Chair of the Salton Sea Task Force – sent on July 30, 2020.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1HqMpHx9gVTIr5cjQhV9QZLbWU_C7wtyy/view?usp=sharing. Or alternative link:

Letter to Professor Marilyn Fogel - SS Task Force - July 30 - revised.pdf - Google Drive.

In this letter, I have summarized the problems and a solution. Please read it.

> 11.18 Here is the link to the letter (16 pages) that I wrote to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Colorado River Basin Region - c/o Maria Davydova in response to "2020, Triennial Review Proposal" on May 26, 2020.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1VmMBH03qiRsHnNSqWsTfNWSbXnezPGYK/view?usp=sharing. or alternative link:

Ph: 760-347-1609

Letter to Water Boards - 2020 Triennial Review Proposal - Salton Sea - May 18, 2020.pdf - Google Drive.

In that letter, I let them know about my proposal and pointed out my struggle to get their attention. I included several notes that I read at SSA Board meeting. Also, I told them that it is difficult to come to any other conclusion but that there is a group of influential people who would like to get rid of the Salton Sea for their relatively small interest and that they are working very hard to achieve their goal through the "current course of action".

11.19 Here is the link to the press relies (1 page) titled "Riverside County Launches Salton Sea Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District" Released by Mr. Phil Rosentrater, GM/Executive Director, SSA on October 24, 2018.

SSA New(s) Release - Riverside County Launches Salton Sea Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District -Copy.pdf.

or alternative link:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1vnuuxwEMKhgvK9ors1KKXYJokqvx0o5b/view?usp=sharing.

In that document Mr. Phil Rosentrater gave credit to Mr. Manuel Perez, Director of the SSA and supervisor at of Fourth District, Riverside County, and Mr. Marion Ashley, supervisor, for the concept of the "North Lake" in which he suggested that the Imperial County should do similar at the southern part of the Lake which is in Imperial County. That document was made after I made several presentations to Mr. Manuel Perez directly.

11.19.1 **NOTE:** Although Mr. Phil Rosentrater did not type date on his 'press release', he did state the following: "A healthier, more prosperous Salton Sea is the intended result an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) launched today by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors". (Underlining added). I googled and found out that the board of supervisors voted on Tuesday to create an 'Enhance Infrastructure Financing District' (EIFFD). Tuesday was October 23, 2018. That was after I made a presentation in El Centro on May 21, 2018. See also the article by Sammy Roth in the Palm Springs Desert Sun. This article also contains information about manipulative conducts of leadership. Here is the link:

Email: <u>nlakic@GeothermalWorldwide.com</u> Ph: 760-347-1609

Riverside County's new Salton Sea plan could generate \$1 billion (desertsun.com).

11.20 Here is the link to **my response** (11 pages) to **Bruce Wilcox's** memorandum explaining why he is wrong in rejecting my proposal which I sent to him on **October 12, 2018.** Please read it.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ZCKncH0DjO834opjcXmCZSKbjX27JE7a/view?usp=sharing.or alternative link:

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. - Copy.pdf - Google Drive.

11.21 Here is a link to **Mr. Bruce Wilcox's letter (memorandum**) (1 page) on **August 16, 2018**, to me explaining the reasons for rejecting my proposal:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1L6hDCm6H0WAEJzoDtHNVKFsgfN05iRrO/view?usp=sharing.or alternative link:

Geothermal Worldwide (003)[2305843009220410774].pdf - Google Drive.

11.22 Here is the link to the letter (8 pages) that I sent letter to Secretary **John Laird**, Natural Resource Agency on **June 6, 2017**, asking him to inform Governor Brown about the existence of my proposal.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jH-qLL6VobdyfhGD0LyDsq-z6KzW3LrZ/view?usp=sharing.

or alternative link:

Secretary John Laird - June 6, 2017.pdf - Google Drive.

11.23 Here is the link to the letter (6 pages) that I sent to Secretary **John Laird**, Natural Resource Agency on **September 7 (12), 2016**, asking him to consider terminating Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) before September 30, 2016, which was signed on August 31, 2016, based on new information that has been presented by local leaders, neither to the Secretary, Sally Jewell, DOI nor to him nor to Deputy Secretary Michael L. Connor, prior or during signing the MOA agreement.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RSoHljbyrngDwPLSupwXnJZFdJ4EWPGn/view?usp=sharing.

or alternative link: Secretary John Laird, September 12 (7), 2017.pdf - Google Drive.

 $\underline{\textbf{Email:}} \quad \underline{\underline{\textbf{nlakic@GeothermalWorldwide.com}}}$

Ph: 760-347-1609

12.0 <u>Links to NOTES of my 3-minutes comment at Salton Sea Authority</u> meetings.

I was present at numerous Salton Sea Authority (SSA) Board Meetings and frequently made my 3-minutes public comments. I am including here only several (11) out of over thirty such comments / meetings. Also here is included a note for 10 minutes comment in front of California Water Quality Control Board Colorado River Basin Region on April 12, 2018.

The message in all of my 3-minutes comments is similar - urging the SSA to stop promoting the "current course of action" because it leads to destruction of the Salton Sea and speeds up incoming ecological destruction with serious consequences to our community. Also, at every meeting, I offered them my time to make a complete presentation of several hours (whatever time is necessary for them to understand the concept) because 3-minutes is not adequate time for me to explaining it to them nor is enough for them to understand a comprehensive solution (architectural plan) for the restoration of the Salton Sea.

Unfortunately, they would thank me for my 'passion' and then, they would move quickly to the next item on the agenda which was frequently related to "Perimeter/Brine Lake" and how to improve their approach in how to be more efficient in getting funding from state and federal governments.

Just before pandemic (COVID 19), I stopped attending SSA Board meeting because Board Members have not been responsive to my offers, and especially after a few members consulted the SSA's attorney asking him, openly at the meeting, if there is any legal way to exclude me from making my 3-minutes comments. Their attorney, rightfully so, referred to the first amendment and that I have the right to speak.

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **December 19, 2019**. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qGVuiD1nKhPPp9pvUr2MkaF46C8Z_PNQ/view?usp=sharing.

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **May 23, 2019**. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uLUr4vGMIMDhmDM_atS4MVe3KOWQb1yJ/view?usp=sharing.

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **June 28, 2018.** https://drive.google.com/file/d/1DqtV_YI-BavyX7spph_OooK8Cw3Sq9B4/view?usp=sharing.

NOTE: 10-minutes comment at Salton Sea Public Workshop California Water Quality Control Board Colorado River Basin Region on **April 12, 2018.** https://drive.google.com/file/d/1elW2SlBlypJFzXC69yX8kppdcQ7lDl__/view?usp=sharing.

Ph: 760-347-1609

Geothermal Worldwide, Inc., 78-365 Hwy 111, #402, La Quinta, CA 92201,

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **September 28, 2017.** https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Ao8nUz-V6kfdJv4O_0bMMe4itA7wnfLa/view?usp=sharing.

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **May 18, 2017.** https://drive.google.com/file/d/1incAdzK0znkxyOdA2CDME8rnePKMP0F /view?usp=sharing.

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **September 22, 2016.** https://drive.google.com/file/d/1aVf6onz-F2jkP-8VbJUCGnECp6ZU1Jcz/view?usp=sharing.

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **July 28, 2016.** https://drive.google.com/file/d/1JXY42mbieQDTt8pC-CQUbJnnESQlowoF/view?usp=sharing.

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **June 30, 2016.** https://drive.google.com/file/d/1aW5JaowRmBSgTqWssr-NFerPm7uEf9gb/view?usp=sharing.

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **April 20, 2016.** https://drive.google.com/file/d/17hwlNKKqoniBsqGCAiragNtAtCNdac0-/view?usp=sharing.

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **October 22, 2015.** https://drive.google.com/file/d/15fBueTYoaG92utyaTUSu4KgtD2YPgsj-/view?usp=sharing.

NOTE: 3-minutes comment at SSA Board Meeting on **December 10, 2015.** https://drive.google.com/file/d/1tshGNXun61hh0b62vdamX8fLeEC6mm2q/view?usp=sharing.

I would be glad to answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Nikola N. Lakic
Graduate Engineer, Architect, / Inventor
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

