

43

84

OC Print-Mail Center

From: Catherine Hagan (George) [CHagan@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 5:45 PM
To: Halter, Amanda (OC); Garrett, Christopher (SD); Chiara Clemente; Deborah Woodward
Cc: Singarella, Paul (OC); PMacLaggan@poseidon1.com; dmayer@tenera.com; Philip Wyels
Subject: RE: Poseidon: 2004-2005 EPS Flow Data

Thank you.

>>> <CHRISTOPHER.GARRETT@LW.com> 3/24/2009 5:11 PM >>>

Catherine,
David Mayer will be directly responding.

However, let me attempt to summarize the answer he gave me.

The data set that Tenera has does not show any flow on those five dates, and those dates were not considered part of normal operations for purposes of the Tenera study.

He tells me that these dates were not used as part of the data set used as part of the analysis to predict impingement impacts from Poseidon's operations, but he can elaborate.

Chris

From: Catherine Hagan (George) [mailto:CHagan@waterboards.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2009 1:06 PM
To: Halter, Amanda (OC); Chiara Clemente; Deborah Woodward
Cc: Garrett, Christopher (SD); Singarella, Paul (OC); PMacLaggan@poseidon1.com; dmayer@tenera.com; Philip Wyels
Subject: Re: Poseidon: 2004-2005 EPS Flow Data

Chris, Amanda, et al.,

We have a follow-up question concerning the 2004-05 flow data provided with your email of 3/5, below, which, we assume was compiled by Tenera from the EPS operator pump logs.

The data indicate that on five days (i.e., 12/25/04, and 1/7/05 to 1/10/05), there was zero flow. We understand this to mean that on those days, there was no flow to the condensers, i.e., the EPS cooling water pumps were undergoing maintenance or not-operational. However, we see from the Cabrillo monitoring reports submitted to the Board that there were discharges on those days of about 580 to 660 MGD. We are not clear how there can be discharges of these volumes on a day with no intake. It is possible that we are not interpreting the data correctly and would very much appreciate if Poseidon (or Dr. Mayer) can help us understand the flow conditions on those days, as well as a couple other days on which the calculated intake flows are far lower than the reported discharge.

Thank you for your assistance with this request.

Catherine

Catherine George Hagan
Senior Staff Counsel
Office of Chief Counsel
State Water Resources Control Board
chagan@waterboards.ca.gov

9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100

4/1/2009

San Diego, CA 92123-4340

Telephone: 858.467.2958

Facsimile: 858.571.6972

>>> <Amanda.Halter@lw.com> 3/5/2009 10:44 AM >>>

Debbie and Chiara,

Attached is the 2004-2005 EPS flow data collected by Tenera that you requested, in Excel and Word formats. Now that we have this data in hand, the discrepancy between the average flow calculation in the 3/06/08 Minimization Plan, 632 MGD, and the 657 MGD number provided by Dr. Mayer is explained. The 632 MGD represents the average flow for *all* days during the period. In contrast, 657 MGD is the average flow for the 52 days on which impingement data were collected.

Please let us know if you have any questions. We look forward to speaking with you this afternoon.

Best regards,
Amanda

Amanda Halter

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

650 Town Center Drive, 20th Floor

Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Direct Tel: 714-755-2238

Fax: 714-755-8290

Email: amanda.halter@lw.com

<<Copy of DailyFlow-Survey.xls>> <<EPS 2004-2005 Flow Data.pdf>>

To comply with IRS regulations, we advise you that any discussion of Federal tax issues in this e-mail was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used by you, (i) to avoid any penal imposed under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) to promote, market or recommend to another party transaction or matter addressed herein.

For more information please go to <http://www.lw.com/docs/irs.pdf>

This email may contain material that is confidential, privileged and/or attorney work product for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, reliance or distribution by others or forwarding without express permission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

Latham & Watkins LLP

4/1/2009

Section 1: Introduction

This document provides a comprehensive overview of the project's objectives, scope, and timeline. It is intended for use by all stakeholders involved in the project.

Section 2: Objectives and Scope

The primary objective of this project is to develop a new software application that will streamline the workflow of our department.

The scope of the project includes the design, development, testing, and deployment of the software. It also includes the training of staff on the new system and the ongoing support and maintenance of the application.

The project is expected to be completed within a timeline of six months.

Section 3: Project Management

The project is managed by a dedicated team of professionals with extensive experience in software development and project management.

Regular communication and reporting are essential for the success of the project. The project manager will provide weekly updates to the steering committee.

Section 4: Risk Management

Identifying and managing risks is a critical component of project management. The project team has identified several potential risks and has developed mitigation strategies to minimize their impact.

The risks identified include budget overruns, scope creep, and resource availability. Mitigation strategies include regular budget reviews, strict change control, and ensuring adequate resource allocation.

Section 5: Conclusion

The project is well-positioned for success, provided that the team remains committed to the project's goals and maintains effective communication throughout the process.

Section 6: Appendix

This section contains additional information related to the project, including a detailed project schedule, a list of project team members, and a glossary of terms.

Section 7: References

This section lists the sources of information used in the preparation of this document.