

**GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE  
FOR THE  
MONTEREY PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY PROJECT**

---

California American Water • Monterey County Board of Supervisors  
Monterey Peninsula Regional Water Authority • Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

**FINAL MINUTES  
Regular Meeting  
Governance Committee  
for the  
Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project  
*April 27, 2015***

- Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:05 pm in the conference room of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District offices.
- Members Present:** Jason Burnett, Chair, representative for Monterey Peninsula Regional Water Authority (JPA) (arrived at 2:09 pm)  
Jeanne Byrne, representative for Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (alternate to Robert S. Brower, Sr.)  
David Potter, representative for Monterey County Board of Supervisors  
Robert MacLean, representative for California American Water
- Members Absent:** Robert S. Brower, Sr., Vice Chair, representative for Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
- Pledge of Allegiance:** The assembly recited the Pledge of Allegiance.
- Public Comments:** Michael Warburton, representing the Public Trust Alliance, requested that a future committee agenda include an opportunity for the community to comment on whether circumstances have changed over time in providing water. He stated that circumstances have changed incredibly since this project was proposed. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has changed profoundly since applications were submitted on the project and decisions have been made, but we are not in the same place we were before. He has brought up the subject of changed circumstances to this committee many times, and perhaps it is time to ask the entire local apparatus in Monterey County whether circumstances have changed in providing water. He stated that there is a discussion that has been entered into. Agricultural water does not fall from the sky and isolate itself from urban water, and when it's possible for less than one-half of one percent of agricultural water use to solve the urban question 100 percent, its time to take a look and see what we are talking about. He suggested that people on the Peninsula decide that circumstances have changed so much that they should give reasonableness a chance.

## Presentations

### 1. **Progress Report from California-American Water on the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project Including Update to Test Slant Well**

Ian Crooks, Engineering Manager for Cal-Am's Coastal Division, presented an April 21, 2015 update on test slant well pumping results from a recent five-day continuous pump test. His presentation can be reviewed on the Governance Committee website. He stated that an upward trend in salinity is shown by a slight upward trend in conductivity, and that he expected the salinity trend would increase with time to 96 percent. The plan is to continue pumping for two years. The monitor wells show no effects from the test slant well pumping, including Monitor Well 4 that exhibited no drawdown. The inland Salinas Valley will be the source of the 4 percent of fresh water expected to be pumped from the well. That water will be returned to the Salinas Valley. (Mayor Burnett arrived during Crooks' presentation.) Crooks advised that the well had been pumping continuously since April 22, 2014 at 2,000 gallons per minute.

Public Comment: **(a) George Riley** asked about possible impacts that might be revealed in monitoring well data, and asked how soon Cal-Am would report on those impacts. He also asked if the Hydrologic Working Group will prepare a written analysis of the well data. *Crooks responded that the monitoring well data is posted every week on the project website. If the Hydrologic Working Group determines there are impacts, they would be reported immediately, as required by coastal development permits.* **(b) Michael Warburton** asked if only Cal-Am experts are analyzing the monitoring well and test slant well data, or are non-Cal-Am reviewers also involved. *Crooks explained that Cal-Am is currently reading the well monitoring data, and is in discussions with Monterey County Water Resources Agency for long-term monitoring. He also noted that laboratory results are certified.*

## Action Items

### 2. **Adopt Minutes of March 27, 2015 Governance Committee Meeting**

No comments were directed to the committee during the public comment period on this item. On a motion by Potter and second of Burnett, the minutes of the March 27, 2015 meeting were adopted on a vote of 3 – 0 by Potter, Burnett and Byrne.

### 3. **Receive Update from California-American Water on Pipeline Procurement Contract Schedule and Request for Qualifications – Provide Direction to California-American Water**

Crooks reviewed a Pipeline/Terminal Reservoir/Pump Station Procurement schedule that can be viewed on the Governance Committee website. He stated that at the May 20, 2015 committee meeting the request for qualifications will be presented for review. In June the request for proposal will be submitted to the committee. By September 2016, the committee will review Cal-Am's recommendation for a contractor. The schedule for procurement of pipe and equipment will be developed after the contractor is selected. The contractor will begin work as soon as approvals for the project are obtained. He also stated that a value engineering study will need to be completed. MacLean advised that within the next few months, an updated estimate of the costs for the project should be developed. Burnett advised that Secretary Laird has offered to host a joint meeting with the Coastal Commission, the CPUC and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to review the project schedule and determine if any improvements could be made. Burnett will also submit a formal invitation to

the Chair of the SWRCB to visit the Monterey Peninsula and review progress on water supply project development.

Public Comment: Michael Warburton, representing the Public Trust Alliance, stated that the public is being assured that this is actually a legitimate public process, but it is not. Planning for the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project should engage honestly the question of what sort of process is required before ratepayers are charged. The CPUC can only pass prudent and reasonable costs. These are not prudent and reasonable costs. The CPUC is making the determination in three months that this is a necessary project. What if the CPUC actually had the freedom to decide that this is not necessary, and from the very beginning this project has been engaged as something that is inevitable and yet our environmental laws require that you actually look and entertain the question and ask the public whether this is necessary. That is part of the certificate of public convenience and necessity. I have been unable, as a citizen, to even ask. I've asked the contractor that is preparing the EIR if there are other alternatives under consideration in the EIR. But I have received no response. Mr. Warburton stated further that the alternative that should be considered is: wells in the Salinas area owned and operated by the MCWRA and a pipeline through the Route 68 corridor to the Peninsula.

#### **Discussion Items**

##### **4. Suggest Items to be Placed on Future Agendas**

Public comment: **(a) George Riley** asked that the definition of feasibility used by the California Coastal Commission and the SWRCB be scheduled for discussion. **(b) Tom Rowley**, representing the Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association, requested that the Governance Committee consider contracting with a technical consultant for a thorough review of the Pure Water Monterey and Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project draft EIRs. **(c) Michael Warburton** requested that the committee discuss development of a credible, legal analysis of changed circumstances. He noted that a legal analysis is needed, in addition to technical and scientific review.

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00 pm.