



Desalination: A truly reliable water supply for Santa Cruz (/initiative/4Wir/desalination-a-truly-reliable-water-supply-for-santa-cruz)

A regional desalination plant should be considered as one option to provide a reliable, drought-proof water supply for our region. Desalination has undergone more thorough study and review by the City and Soquel Creek Water than any other option. It is the only solution that provides a reliable and sustainable *new* source of water that does not depend on rainfall and uses proven technology. Desal would be net carbon neutral, with no significant environmental impacts on sea water and marine life, and pump stations could be located on the desal plant site away from neighborhoods. Costs would be about \$5/household/month.

Submitted by The Sustainable Water Coalition

Comments

Peggy Kenny 2w, 2d ago

PRO

We need a solution that adds more water, and does not depend on rainfall or snowpack

Candace Brown 1m ago

QUESTION

\$5/month x 12 x 30,000+ separate hook-ups served by the City Water Department is \$1.8 million per year. So the money will have to come from some other source such as state grants. Can you speak directly to the monies available in this area? Are the grants tied to regional / interagency grants only or can the City submit a grant independent of the Soquel Water District? Is there any additional debt that would be planned with a capital expenditure of this size and what would that look like? The City has just requested and received approval for 62% increase in water over 5-years for \$47 million in capital expenditures and additional \$3.25 million drought recovery fee to cover fixed operational costs of the Department. And the City Water Department recently refinanced debt at 30-year debt at 5%. What further debt load is anticipated and what is the true cost to the consumer for this solution over the life of the project and life of the debt load?

Bill Smallman 1m ago

NEUTRAL

Just remember, the City and SqCWD were fully ready to spend 125 million on Desal. Likewise, the SCRTC wants to spend about the same amount, 125 mill, on a train and parallel bike path. That is 250 million! For the same 125 million, you could install a superior Recycle system, including a bike path, solving the water issues. Please explain why you believe Desal is better than Recycle, in cost, water quality, and community benefits.

Bill Smallman 1m ago

(comment disabled) NEUTRAL

Douglas Doherty 4w ago

Development Build and Operational costs need to be allocated re proportional benefits for UCSC and the service industry..Eventual lot assessments to cover runaway development and operational costs should be applied only to primary beneficiaries

Bill Smallman 3w, 5d ago

CON

In my opinion, you need to argue and show exactly why it is more cost effective, environmentally friendly, and produce higher quality water at less cost than Recycle, otherwise fahgettaboudit!

Fred Martinez 2w, 6d ago

PRO

Should have been built already. All the stalling has just driven up the cost to a plan that in the end will be the best option.

Stephen Steward 2w, 5d ago

CON

Nonsense

Joel Isaacson 6d, 21h ago

CON

Oh how we love buying our way out with a costly techno-fix. So much simpler than living within our means.

Jude Todd 4d, 15h ago

CON

There are major reasons to set this aside, including its local environmental harms and the bogus claim of carbon neutrality (see my and others' critiques of that shell game in the dEIR). Also, RO wouldn't be able to remove all radionuclides, as Dorah Shuey clearly explained in the dEIR. Santa Cruzans won't vote for this, even if it were to make it that far. WSAC should pass this one up and look to the many less energy intensive and less costly proposals offered at the convention instead.

Leslie Smith 2d, 22h ago

CON

No. I do NOT want desalination here. How about we stop building 20 houses on a piece of property where there once stood only one ?

Purea Koenig 2d, 20h ago

NEUTRAL

I am not opposed to desalination, in fact before watching the video 'Water for Santa Cruz County' i thought we did not have an alternative. The video however made it apparent that there are lots of things we can do to improve our current system including harvest water that currently goes unused.

Scott McGilvray 2d, 18h ago

CON

Desalination is too expensive to build. Desal it too expensive to operate. Desal requires at least 10x the energy of any other alternative supply method on this list.

Ron Pomerantz 2d, 9h ago

(comment disabled) CON

Ron Pomerantz 2d, 9h ago

(comment disabled) CON

Ron Pomerantz 2d, 9h ago

(comment disabled) CON

Ron Pomerantz 2d, 9h ago

CON

After years of investigation and squandering \$15 million down the desal drain this plan belongs permanently on the shelf. This project is riddled with so many fatal flaws that proponents shelved the million dollar Environmental Impact Report before it would've self destructed. So much effort and resources have gone into an industrial desal plant that other worthy projects were delayed and now we are years behind getting our water security in order. Look no further than the array of plans presented to the Water Supply Advisory Committee that are less expensive, more environmentally benign, and give us the water we require. Increasing rates are now needed to fund them. This is the direction to follow. Put this permanently flawed proposal down in the dustbin of history of misguided ideas and expensive lessons.

Jim Mekis 4w ago

PRO

This has to be considered as a viable component of an integrated solution if we have no other *new* source of water. See the 2014 Santa Cruz County Grand Jury Report for all the reasons why. FO would reduce operating costs substantially.

Jean Brocklebank 3w, 6d ago

CON

No. No. No.