

**BRAINSTORMING TEMPLATE FOR WATER SUPPLY ALTERNATIVES—
MPWMD Special Workshop, August 25, 2011**

Alternative Category: _____ (ASR, desal, recycle, etc)
Project Name: _____ (be specific)
Project Sponsors: _____ (suggested sponsor)
Location: _____ (describe)
Project Description: _____
 _____ (describe concept)

ATTRIBUTE	NOTES and COMMENTS Identify tasks needed to obtain essential information
YIELD (AFY) *Avg./long-term *Minimum *Maximum	Consider factors that might affect yield; what is expected life?
COST *Capital cost *O&M *Unit cost (\$/AF)	Consider factors that might affect costs
TIMELINE *CEQA/NEPA *Permits (see below) *Site Acquisition *Design *Construction *Water Delivery	Consider factors that affect timeline to water delivery.
PROS & CONS	
*Benefits	Ex: timely, drought-proof, affordable
*Drawbacks	Ex: uncertain technology, high cost, weather dependent
OTHER	

PERMITS		
*Federal Agencies	NEPA, ESA, 404, 401	USFWS, NMFS, Corps, EPA, Sanctuary
*State Agencies	CEQA, Water Rights, 1601/1603	SWRCB, RWQCB, CDFG, CCC, CDPH
*Local Agencies	Traffic, Air Quality, Wells	TAMC, MBUAPCD, County (Health and Planning), cities

**BRAINSTORMING TEMPLATE FOR WATER SUPPLY ALTERNATIVES—
MPWMD Special Workshop, August 25, 2011**

Alternative Category: RESERVOIR/RECONSIDER NEW LOS PADRES DAM
Project Name: 24,000 AF New Los Padres Dam and Reservoir (or smaller size)
Project Sponsors: suggested to be MPWMD
Location: River mile 24, about one-half mile downstream of existing Los Padres Dam
Project Description: Construct a new dam and reservoir to store 24,000 AF, with 22,000 AFY usable storage; operate to maintain year-round flow in Carmel River as feasible; smaller options have also been considered
Prepared By: Henrietta Stern, MPWMD Project Manager

ATTRIBUTE	NOTES and COMMENTS Identify tasks needed to obtain essential information
YIELD (AFY) *Avg./long-term *Minimum *Maximum	*Cal-Am supply of 21,000 AFY (1995 original) or constrained growth version (17,641 AFY) proposed by Cal-Am after 1995 vote failed *Smaller 9,000 AF version would not inundate Wilderness and could be combined with desalination
COST *Capital cost *O&M *Unit cost (\$/AF)	*Cap cost-- \$207 million (2011), based on \$127 million (1995) for 24,000 *AF Operations -- \$4.4 million per year (2011)
TIMELINE *CEQA/NEPA *Permits (see below) *Site Acquisition *Design *Construction *Water Delivery	*EIR/EIS certified in 1995 for original; litigation overturned *Carmel River Dam and Reservoir Project EIR/EIS prepared November 1998 *SWRCB Water rights permit obtained and is still valid; some portion has been used for ASR project water rights *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 obtained, but may have expired; *Supplemental environmental documentation likely needed *5+ years for design and construction
PROS & CONS	
*Benefits	*Gravity fed, lower cost than desal *Helps restore river flow in nearly all years and replenishes aquifer
*Drawbacks	*Agency opposition to dams; prefer removal; significant environmental issues *Cachagua community and Native Americans mobilized against the project in 1995 *Not drought proof
OTHER	*One writer suggests funding fishery enhancement projects with the money saved with constructing a dam as compared to the costs of a desalination project *Others suggest a smaller 9,000 AFY version combined with a smaller desal plant in order to retain flow benefits with less inundation impact

PERMITS		
*Federal Agencies	NEPA, ESA, 404, 401	USFWS, NMFS, Corps, EPA, Sanctuary
*State Agencies	CEQA, Water Rights, 1601/1603	SWRCB, RWQCB, CDFG, CCC, CDPH
*Local Agencies	Traffic, Air Quality, Wells	TAMC, MBUAPCD, County (Health and Planning), cities