



# Supplement to 10/16/17 MPWMD Board Packet

Attached are copies of letters received between September 8 and October 6, 2017. These letters are listed in the October 16, 2017 Board packet under Letters Received.

Author	Addressee	Date	Topic
Keith Van Der Maaten	David Stoldt	9/27/17	Proposals to Sell Water to the MPWMD for use on the Peninsula
Gary Cursio, John Turner, Bonnie Adams	David Stoldt	9/19/17	Thank you for participation as sponsor for 27 <sup>th</sup> Annual Nick Lombardo Memorial Golf Tournament
Jean Bracy	Robert S. Brower, Sr.	9/19/17	No Paid Property/Liability Claims in 2016-17
Julie Vance	Felicia Marcus CC: David Stoldt	9/18/17	CDFG Response to 8/26/17 Letter from Dr. Roy Thomas Re: CAW Compliance with SWRCB Resolution 2016-0040
Dolly Trout	MPWMD	9/11/17	Broken Water Meter Covers

U:\staff\Boardpacket\2017\20171016\LtrsRecd\LtrsRecd.docx



# MARINA COAST WATER DISTRICT

11 RESERVATION ROAD, MARINA, CA 93933-2099  
Home Page: [www.mcwd.org](http://www.mcwd.org)  
TEL: (831) 384-6131 FAX: (831) 883-5995

### DIRECTORS

HOWARD GUSTAFSON  
*President*

THOMAS P. MOORE  
*Vice President*

WILLIAM Y. LEE  
JAN SHRINER  
HERBERT CORTEZ

September 27, 2017

RECEIVED

OCT 02 2017

MPWMD

Mr. David Stoldt, General Manager  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District  
PO Box 85  
Monterey, CA 93942-0085

Re: Proposals to Sell Water to the MPWMD for use on the Peninsula

Dear Mr. Stoldt:

Nothing in these proposals or any other agreement between the Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) and the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD): (a) commits either Party to any particular decision regarding the proposed water sale; (b) confers any vested rights on either Party; or (c) restricts MCWD's or the MPWMD's discretion with respect to any activity or project developed in accordance with this offer, including MCWD's consideration of any alternatives and mitigation measures for such activities or projects. In addition, MCWD intends that CEQA, and all other applicable environmental compliance laws, will be fully complied with prior to any binding decisions with respect to the water sale. (See *Save Tara v. City of Los Angeles* (2008) 45 Cal. 4th 116.)

MPWMD's issue (No. 56), included in the Joint Statement of Issues for Further Evidentiary Hearing in the MPWSP proceedings at the CPUC, stated in part the following:

IF it is determined:

- (i) Cal-Am consumer demand does not justify current project sizing or may allow an alternate project to meet the newly determined demand, OR if
- (ii) modular increments to the desalination plant are deemed feasible, but fixed costs warrant examination of other supply alternatives due to economic ratepayer impacts, OR if
- (iii) concerns exist related to delay or abandonment of the desalination project due to legal or technological concerns.

THEN and in response to any or all of these issues, MPWMD shall present testimony on whether any of the following alternatives can meet all or a portion of the supply needs based on consumer demand, cost to ratepayer, and/or reasonable timeline:

- Expansion of the Pure Water Monterey project.

\* \* \*

Mr. David Stoldt  
 September 27, 2017  
 Page 2

- Salinas River water rights, via either (a) negotiation for a portion of the existing WR 11043, or (b) application for a new winter-only water right, to provide feed water for an advanced water treatment facility in North Marina in conjunction with Pure Water Monterey or to provide feed water to the MPWSP desalination plant, with storage to occur in the Seaside Groundwater Basin or another location.

On August 7, 2017, the Assigned Commissioner and the Administrative Law Judge's Ruling (AC/ALJ Ruling) identified issues for further hearings. Among the listed issues is the following:

2. Supply: updated estimates and analysis of supply including but not limited to:
  - 2.1. Plans for expansion of the Pure Water Monterey (PWM) project, if any; and
  - 2.2. Can expansion of the PWM project provide water to applicant in excess of 3,500 acre-feet per year, the amount provided in the Water Purchase Agreement approved in the Phase 1 D.16-09-021.

MCWD had proposed water supply alternatives similar to those listed in MPWMD's Issue No. 56 in MCWD's March 29, 2017 MPWSP DEIR/EIS comments to the CPUC. MCWD has now gone the next step and refined those comments into the following proposals and provide detail for MPWMD's above conceptual alternatives of utilizing more Pure Water Monterey Project water and utilizing excess Salinas River water.

### **MCWD's Excess Pure Water Monterey (PWM) Project Water – PWM Phase 1 and Phase 2**

While the AC/ALJ Ruling's Issue 2 talks about a possible but currently unplanned expansion of the PWM Project, which we will call here PWM "Phase 3." The CPUC has not recognized that the PWM Project already has two planned phases – Phases 1 and 2 – and that possibly for a significant period of time, additional advanced treated water (ATW) could be available for sale for use in the Monterey Peninsula.

MCWD is already entitled to 600 AFY of PWM Phase 1 ATW and an additional 827 AFY under PWM Phase 2 for a total of 1,427 AFY for use within MCWD's Ord Community service area. The Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) pursuant to its Resolution No. 07-10 has allocated the 1,427 AFY to its land use member agencies. MCWD has reached out to those agencies to get commitments to buy and use the 600 AFY of Phase 1 ATW, but there does not appear to be a large existing or projected demand for that ATW within the near term. MCWD currently projects that approximately 500 AFY of its Phase 1 entitlement and an additional 500 AFY of its Phase 2 entitlement could be available for an interim transfer to MPWMD. MCWD with FORA's assistance will determine the amount of recycled water available for sale to MPWMD and the period of time when the ATW would actually be needed within the Ord Community.

**Terms of PWM Phase 1 Water Sale:**

1. Based upon the current demand information, MCWD proposes to sell to MPWMD 500 AFY of MCWD's PWM Phase 1 ATW for use on the Peninsula when the ATW becomes available from MRWPCA, which is currently estimated to be in 2019. As with MRWPCA's PWM water to be sold to MPWMD, the ATW sold would be injected into the Seaside Basin via MRWPCA's injection facilities and later recovered for delivery to the Peninsula.

MCWD reserves 100 AFY of PWM Phase 1 ATW for used by MCWD's own Ord Community customers during the months of May, June, July, August, and September.

2. The sales price would \$2,200 per AF. The price per AF shall be adjusted annually based upon the percentage increase in MCWD's price to its Ord Community users, but in no event shall the price per AF be less than \$2,200 per AF.

3. The initial term of this sale is estimated to be ten (10) years from the date PWM Phase 1 ATW is available for delivery.

**Terms of PWM Phase 2 Water Sale:**

1. MCWD is entitled to an additional 827 AFY under PWM Phase 2. MCWD would sell to MPWMD as much of MCWD's PWM Phase 2 ATW not needed to serve projected demands for recycled water within the Ord Community, which is currently estimated to be an additional 500 AFY of ATW. As with MRWPCA's PWM water to be sold to MPWMD, the ATW sold would be injected into the Seaside Basin via MRWPCA's injection facilities and later recovered for delivery to the Peninsula.

2. The sales price would the same per AF price for PWM Phase 1 water then in effect when the PWM Phase 2 water becomes available for delivery to MPWMD. The price per AF shall be adjusted annually based upon the percentage increase in MCWD's price to its Ord Community users, but in no event shall the price per-AF be less than \$2,200 per AF.

3. Timing of Implementation of Proposal. MRWPCA General Manager Paul Sciuto estimates that a 2½-year lead time would be needed to obtain all necessary approvals and construction of Phase 2. Assuming that acceptable pre-project planning, feasibility, environmental, and permitting work can possibly be accomplished by mid-2019, a projected commercial operation date for Phase 2 could be approximately 2022.

4. The initial term of this sale is estimated to be ten (10) years from the date PWM Phase 2 ATW is available for delivery to MPWMD.

**Benefits to MPWMD of Phase 1 and 2 Water Sales:**

First, these sales could help prevent the SWRCB from reducing CalAm's authorized Carmel river diversion limit because of missed CDO milestone deadlines. This sale would need the approval of the CPUC. A preliminary and then final filing once approved by the CPUC would need to be

made with the SWRCB by CalAm pursuant to Footnote 17, page 20, of SWRCB Order WR 2016-0016 (July 19, 2016), which states:

If at any point prior to completion of the facilities listed in these Milestones the CPUC authorizes Cal-Am to acquire more than 1,000 afa of water from an alternative source, then the following shall occur. Cal-Am shall submit to the [SWRCB] Executive Director within 60 days a revised set of milestones taking this water supply source into account. If the proponents of the alternative project are unable to reach concurrence with Cal-Am on revised milestones to propose, the proponents may also submit revised milestones within that time period. The Executive Director shall determine whether to bring forward a recommendation to the State Water Board regarding amendment of the milestones.

For example, the SWRCB's Cease and Desist Order (CDO) Milestone Deadline for the issuance of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct the MPWMD by the CPUC is September 30, 2018. Implementation of MCWD's Phase 1 and Phase 2 Proposals could possibly delay that milestone and the corresponding reductions in CalAm's authorized Carmel River diversion limit based on a missed CDO milestone deadline.

Second, these sales would be at a significantly lower price per AF than the per AF price of desalinated water from the proposed 6.4 MGD MPWSP, which the Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster (based upon information from the CPUC and MPWMD) has estimated to be \$6,147 per AF.

### **MCWD's Armstrong Ranch Project (Southern Component) Water**

EKI Technical Memorandum: The January 16, 2017 Technical Memorandum (copy enclosed), entitled "Preliminary Feasibility Assessment – Potential to Conduct Augmented Groundwater Recharge at the Armstrong Ranch Property," by Erler & Kalinowski, Inc. (EKI) shows that its Option 2A is feasible. Option 2A is to construct a 1.5 MGD Surface Water Treatment Plant (SWTP) on the Armstrong Ranch Property to treat high Salinas River flows for direct use. Flows higher than the treatment capacity would be infiltrated via on-site infiltration ponds into the Dune Sand Aquifer. During those periods when flows were not available for diversions, such as during summer months, the stored water could be extracted from the Dune Sand Aquifer for treatment at the SWTP for direct use. Further investigation and data collection are needed, but the project yield is estimated to be 1,500 AFY with an estimated cost of \$2,400 per AF. See especially the EKI summary and conceptual map of Option 2A.

Salinas River Water Rights: The Armstrong Ranch Project would need to obtain a long-term lease of water or water transfer from MCWRA utilizing MCWRA's existing water rights licenses and permits, including Permit No. 11043. The Project may also need to utilize MCWRA's rubber dam. Alternatively, MCWD could apply to the SWRCB for a water rights permit to divert water not being diverted by MCWRA.

SGMA Groundwater Recharge Benefits: While the Southern Component of the project would benefit the Monterey Subbasin, the project is located within the 180/400 Foot Aquifer Subbasin,

which is classified by the State as a Critically Overdrafted Basin, so in the groundwater sustainability plans for both subbasin, this project should be characterized as a groundwater recharge project benefiting both subbasins.

Need for a Northern Component: Any Armstrong Ranch Project should include a Northern Component consisting of groundwater recharge projects in the Castroville and Northwest Salinas area, without necessarily a water treatment component, for the benefit of and to be paid for by others.

**Terms of Armstrong Ranch Water Sale:**

1. MCWD would own the project and be responsible for the design, acquisition of water rights or contract rights to water, construction, and operation of the project. MPWMD would have a take-or-pay obligation for 50% of the feasibility, engineering and design, environmental, capital, capital replacement, and annual O&M costs for the right to take delivery of 40% of the annual water available from the project. The 10% balance of MPWMD's share would remain in the ground as recharge<sup>1</sup>.

2. Anticipated Project Yield and Delivery. Further study is needed to determine the availability of Salinas River storm flows (e.g., frequency, volume, and quality). EKI's estimated project yield is in the range of 1,500 AFY. Using that estimated project yield, the water allocation would be as follows:

MCWD's share for MCWD's direct use	40%	600 AFY
MCWD's share for recharge of 180/400 Foot Aquifer and Monterey Subbasins	10%	150 AFY
MPWMD's share for MPWMD's direct use	40%	600 AFY
MPWMD's share for recharge of 180/400 Foot Aquifer and Monterey Subbasins	10%	150 AFY
Total	100%	1,500 AFY

3. Term of Sale. 30-year term commencing with the date of commercial operation of the project.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Very truly yours,



Keith Van Der Maaten  
General Manager

Enclosure – EKI Technical Memorandum (Note: to review the enclosure, please contact the MPWMD office - 831-658-5610)

cc: Board of Directors, Marina Coast Water District

<sup>1</sup> The Kern Water Bank, which is probably the largest water bank in California, only allows a participant to withdraw 90% of the water put into the water bank. For a pilot water banking project in northeastern San Joaquin County, East Bay Municipal Utility District has agreed to only recover 50% of the EBMUD water used for in-lieu recharge on agricultural lands within the North San Joaquin Water Conservation District.



Monterey County Hospitality Association  
"The Voice of Your Hospitality Community"

RECEIVED

SEP 03 2017

MPWMD

September 19, 2017

Mr. Dave Stoldt  
Monterey Peninsula Water Mgmt. District  
5 Harris Court  
Monterey, CA 93940

Dear Mr. Stoldt: *Dave*

On behalf of the Monterey County Hospitality Association Board of Directors and Golf Committee, we want to thank you for your participation as a valued Sponsor for the 27<sup>th</sup> Annual Nick Lombardo Memorial Golf Tournament at Quail Lodge & Golf Club on August 28<sup>th</sup>.

The purpose of MCHA is to act as the advocate for its members and the Monterey County hospitality industry in general. We foster, protect and educate our members on matters affecting the viability of the industry. MCHA represents the hospitality industry throughout Monterey County which is the second largest industry generating more than \$2,000,000,000 in direct visitor spending while employing more than 25,000 people.

Because of your generous support, we are able to fund programs such as the valuable work of our government affairs committee that has been working diligently on your behalf on water issues, transportation, storm water issues and minimum wage, among many other concerns. We also offer quality educational seminars as well as recognition programs that are key to employee development.

The Nick Lombardo Memorial Golf Tournament is one of two fundraisers for MCHA. Support from industry leaders is a key element in the success of this event and the ongoing activities of our association. Thank you for helping us to surpass our goals.

We appreciate your support and look forward to a great year!

Best Regards,

*Gary Cursio*  
Gary Cursio  
Golf Co-Chair

Best Regards,

*John Turner*  
John Turner  
Golf Co-Chair

Best Regards,

*Bonnie Adams*  
Bonnie Adams  
Executive Director



1112 I Street, Suite 300  
 Sacramento, California 95814-2865  
 T 916.231.4141 or 800.537.7790 • F 916.231.4111

Maximizing Protection. Minimizing Risk. • [www.sdrma.org](http://www.sdrma.org)

September 19, 2017

RECEIVED

SEP 21 2017

MPWMD

Mr. Robert S. Brower Snr.  
 Board President  
 Monterey Peninsula Water Management District  
 Post Office Box 85  
 Monterey, California 93942

**Re: No Paid Property/Liability Claims in 2016-17**

Dear Mr. Brower Snr.:

This letter is to formally acknowledge the dedicated efforts of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District's Governing Body, management and staff towards proactive risk management and loss prevention training. Your agency's efforts have resulted in no "paid" property/liability claims for program year 2016-17. A "paid" claim for the purposes of this recognition represents the first **payment** on an open claim during the prior program year and excludes property claims. This is a great accomplishment!

It is through the efforts of members such as Monterey Peninsula Water Management District that SDRMA has been able to continue providing affordable property/liability coverage to over 500 public agencies throughout California. In fact, 408 members or 81% in the property/liability program had no "paid" claims in program year 2016-17.

In addition to this annual recognition, members with no "paid" claims during 2016-17 earned 2 credit incentive points (CIPs) thereby reducing their annual contribution amount. Also, members with no "paid" claims for at least 3 consecutive program years may receive a lower "risk factor" which also reduces their annual contribution amount.

As SDRMA is dedicated to serving its members and preventing claims, we would appreciate your agency taking a moment and sharing with us what made your District successful in preventing property/liability losses. Our goal is to incorporate your successful ideas and suggestions into our loss prevention programs to benefit all members of SDRMA. Please forward any comments or suggestions to Dennis Timoney, SDRMA Chief Risk Officer at [dtimoney@sdrma.org](mailto:dtimoney@sdrma.org).

On behalf of the SDRMA Board of Directors and staff, it is my honor to congratulate the Governing Body, management and staff of 2017-18 for their commitment to proactive risk management and loss prevention training.

Sincerely,  
 Special District Risk Management Authority

  
 Jean Bracy, President  
 Board of Directors





State of California – Natural Resources Agency  
 DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE  
 Central Region  
 1234 East Shaw Avenue  
 Fresno, CA 93710  
[www.wildlife.ca.gov](http://www.wildlife.ca.gov)

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Governor  
 CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



RECEIVED

SEP 22 2017

MPWMD

September 18, 2017

Ms. Felicia Marcus, Chair  
 State Water Resources Control Board  
 1001 I Street  
 Sacramento, CA 95814

**Subject:** California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) Response to August 26, 2017 Letter From Dr. Roy Thomas Re: Cal-Am Water Company Compliance with State Water Board (Board) Resolution 2016-0040

Dear Ms. Marcus,

On September 8, 2017 Mr. Dean Marston, Fishery Program Manager for the Department's Central Region, was contacted by Mr. Brian Coats (Board Engineer). Mr. Coats requested a response from the Department regarding a letter the Board had recently received from Dr. Roy Thomas. Dr. Roy Thomas' letter (dated August 28, 2017) i) expresses concern regarding the present status of Carmel River Steelhead Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), ii) questions whether or not a report filed by Cal-Am Water Company complies with Board Resolution No. 2016-0040 (Resolution), and iii) expresses concern regarding Monterey Peninsula Water Management District's (District) Steelhead mitigation efforts.

Mr. Coats asked the Department to answer three questions:

- i) Does the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Southwest Fisheries Science Center (Science Center) Report entitled "Status of the Carmel River Steelhead Population: Retrospective Analysis for Years 1996 to 2014", which was filed by Cal-Am Water Company (Cal-Am) on June 30, 2017, comply with Board Resolution 2016-0040 Stipulation No. 10 which requires Cal-Am to submit an annual report evaluating the status of Carmel River steelhead;
- ii) What is the quality of the Science Center's Report; and
- iii) What is the Department's opinion of the District's current fishery mitigation operations.

The Department respectfully provides the following answers to these questions.

Felicia Marcus, Chair  
State Water Resources Control Board  
September 18, 2017  
Page 2

By way of introduction the Department acknowledges that Carmel River Steelhead are not doing well by virtue of the fact that only seven adult steelhead were captured at Los Padres Dam (LPD) fish trap in the winter/spring of 2017. It is worth noting that two fishery improvement projects have recently occurred, removal of San Clemente Dam (SCD) and improvement of spawning habitat in the reach of the Carmel River downstream of LPD, which may have influenced the number of adult steelhead that would have otherwise migrated to LPD (i.e. steelhead chose to spawn in the reach of the Carmel River between SCD and LPD rather than continue to migrate upstream to the LPD etc.). This said, if the adult steelhead population in the Carmel were healthy (i.e. in good condition) then many more than seven steelhead would have migrated to LPD given the amount of suitable steelhead spawning and rearing habitat that exists upstream of LPD.

It is also worth noting the context of Cal-Am's reporting requirement to the State Board. Board Order 95-10 and/or subsequent cease and desist orders provided that:

- i) Cal-Am is responsible for approximately 85 percent of the total water diversions from the Carmel River and its associated subterranean flow;
- ii) Cal-Am's combined diversions from the Carmel River constitute the largest single impact to instream beneficial uses of the river;
- iii) Cal-Am was annually illegally diverting, on average, 7,602 afa of water without a basis of right;
- iv) Fish and wildlife were being adversely affected by Cal-Am's legal and illegal diversions;
- v) Based in part upon the aforementioned, the Board requires Cal-Am to take appropriate actions to terminate all unlawful diversions from the Carmel River by December 31, 2016;
- vi) The Board recognized that Cal-Am would not meet the Board's December 31, 2016 deadline to cease all illegal diversion and therefore met with Cal-Am, and other stakeholders, to work out the details for a time extension; and
- vii) Cal-Am, as a condition of being granted a time extension to cease and desist all illegal water diversions from the Carmel River, is required to prepare an annual report that evaluates the status of the threatened South-Central California Coast Steelhead Distinct Population Segment in the Carmel River.

Does NOAA's Science Center Meet the Board's Annual Reporting Requirement?

Per the Board's requirement stipulated in Resolution 2016-0040, Cal-Am is required to submit an annual report that evaluates the status of Carmel River steelhead. The report that Cal-Am provided (i.e. Science Center Report) does not meet this requirement due to i) the Science Center Report does not state that this is the purpose for the report nor

Felicia Marcus, Chair  
State Water Resources Control Board  
September 18, 2017  
Page 3

does it give acknowledgement to Cal-Am for having funded the work identified in the report, and ii) it is not an annual report regarding the current status of steelhead in the Carmel River but rather a retrospective analysis of the steelhead population in the Carmel River for the years 1996 to 2014.

What is the Quality of NOAA's Report?

NOAA's Science Center's report is well written and the Department has no objection to the data used, methods applied, analysis conducted, and recommendations identified given that the report consistently uses words that indicate there is a lot of uncertainty in any of the recommendations reached. The Department does provide, below, additional information for the Board to consider regarding juvenile fish rescues, and presence of striped bass, in the lower Carmel River.

What is the Department's opinion of the District's current fishery mitigation operations?

The Department has no objection to the District's current fishery mitigation efforts. It is worth noting that the District rescues fish during river dry back conditions and transfers them to Sleepy Hollow Fish Rearing Facility when conditions allow (i.e. such as when adjacent flow in the Carmel River is of sufficient volume to operate the facility). Carmel River flow in the lower river in the summer of 2017 has been greatly improved over recent years resulting in no river dry backs occurring and consequently no need to rescue fish in the mainstem Carmel River.

Juvenile Rainbow Trout Fish Rescues

Rescuing juvenile rainbow trout in the lower Carmel River is an effort that abounds with uncertainty even though the action appeals to human emotion when people see fish become stranded when river flow recedes. When juvenile fish are rescued, and transported to another area with sufficient river flow (i.e. either upstream or downstream) the rescue location), it is unknown what the eventual success of the fish rescue actually is. For example, when juvenile rainbow trout are rescued and transported upstream it is unknown if the carrying capacity of the habitat into which the rescued fish are placed is being exceeded resulting in the death of not only the rescued fish but also the juvenile trout that resided there prior to the rescued fish being translocated. Additionally, rescuing juvenile rainbow trout and rearing them in a juvenile rearing facility enables the rescued fish to be subject to fish handling impacts such as improved survival (i.e. greater than those of wild fish still in the river, etc.) which results in potential genetic advantage to a subset of fish that wind up being found in a specific reach of the lower Carmel River. Conducting tagging studies to evaluate the survival of rescued fish, as well as non-rescued fish, would be invaluable to inform efficacy of conducting future fish rescues. Additionally, conducting genetic studies to determine whether or not rescued fish genetics is swamping (i.e. bottlenecking) the Carmel River steelhead population would be prudent as well.

Felicia Marcus, Chair  
State Water Resources Control Board  
September 18, 2017  
Page 4

#### Striped Bass in the Carmel River

It is true that striped bass (*Marone saxatilis*) occur in both in the lower Carmel River and the lower Lagoon. What is not known is what the overall predation effect these non-native fish are having upon native fish such as steelhead. What we do know, from evaluation of stomach contents from over 500 striped bass of varying size collected from the lower river Lagoon for the last several years, is that striped bass are having near zero predation impact upon juvenile rainbow trout. For example, out of ~500 striped bass collected from the lagoon only three striped bass (i.e. less than 1%) had rainbow trout in their stomachs. Rather than eating juvenile steelhead, we found that striped bass are eating primarily ocean shrimp that are washing into the lagoon during flood tides. For striped bass residing in the lower Carmel River upstream of the lagoon, it is unknown what the primary food item(s) these striped bass are preying upon. It may be that juvenile rainbow trout comprise the primary food source for these fish or, it may be that a non-juvenile rainbow trout prey item (i.e. say sculpin) are the primary food source. Research, conducted over a variety of locations and environmental conditions, must occur before a definitive conclusion can be reached. Assumptions that striped bass are having a substantial impact upon rainbow trout in the lower Carmel River and/or lagoon must be documented and evidence based before management actions are undertaken to remove them. Also the Department views striped bass as a second order (i.e. lower) production factor and that lack of sufficient river flow caused by excessive diversion is having primary (i.e. first) order production impacts upon the Carmel River steelhead population (i.e. lack of flows reduces habitat quantity/quality as well as growth rates all of which impact juvenile, and eventual adult, production). Therefore, the Department believes it is a distraction to focus on striped bass when insufficient river flow is the primary factor controlling juvenile rainbow trout production. Getting Cal-Am to cease its illegal diversions should continue to draw the greatest level of restoration attention and subsequent effort.

#### Comments Regarding Additional Content of Dr. Roy Thomas' Letter to the Board

It should be noted there are mis-statements and mis-characterizations of conditions and events in Dr. Thomas's letter regarding the level of steelhead mitigation and the number of fish in the river over the last few years, among other contentions. For context of Carmel River conditions, since the Winter of 2011/12, the Central Coast experienced an 'Exceptional' drought which resulted in severe and significant impacts in all streams in the area. For example, in the Winter of 2013/14 the Carmel River lagoon sandbar remained closed all year due to lack of sufficient flow, thereby blocking all steelhead immigration and emigration that year. In subsequent winters (2014/15 and 2015/16), the sandbar only opened briefly a few times after some storm events, significantly limiting adult steelhead immigration and juvenile steelhead emigration. Overall the drought impacts resulted in reduced stream habitat, extremely low flows, no or limited immigration and emigration opportunities, longer than normal stream dryback conditions,

Felicia Marcus, Chair  
State Water Resources Control Board  
September 18, 2017  
Page 5

and much reduced environmental water releases from Los Padres Reservoir. Not only did this have a direct impact on the steelhead population, but it also limited the mitigation actions Monterey Peninsula Water Management typically conducts. As the most severe drought recorded in the last century, steelhead populations were impacted in all Central Coast streams, not only the Carmel River. Another circumstance which resulted in blocked or interrupted migration for steelhead occurred in the upper watershed in 2013-2015, the San Clemente Dam Removal which not only removed the fish ladder providing upstream passage, but reduced flows downstream of the project.

For additional information please contact Mr. Dean Marston by phone at 559-243-4005 ext. 122 and/or by email at [dean.marston@wildlife.ca.gov](mailto:dean.marston@wildlife.ca.gov).

Sincerely,



Julie Vance  
Regional Manager  
Central Region

Cc: See Page 6

Felicia Marcus, Chair  
State Water Resources Control Board  
September 18, 2017  
Page 6

Cc: Amanda Morrison  
Central Coast Branch Chief  
NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region  
U.S. Department of Commerce  
777 Sonoma Avenue, Room 325  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
[amanda.morrison@noaa.gov](mailto:amanda.morrison@noaa.gov)

Dr. Roy Thomas  
26535 Carmel Rancho Blvd Ste. 5  
Carmel, CA 93923  
[iiwinos@aol.com](mailto:iiwinos@aol.com)

Eric Sabolsice  
Director of Operations  
511 Forest Lodge Road #100  
Pacific Grove, CA 93950  
[Eric.Sabolsice@amwater.com](mailto:Eric.Sabolsice@amwater.com)

David Stoldt  
General Manager  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District  
P.O. Box 85  
Monterey, CA 93942-0085  
[dstoldt@mpwmd.net](mailto:dstoldt@mpwmd.net)

RECEIVED

17

SEP 19 2017

MPWMD

September 11, 2017

To Whom It May Concern,

I am a frequent visitor to Seaside and always appreciate the city's efforts to recycle and repurpose. A great example for other cities to follow!

My concern is in regards to the water meter covers on the sidewalks. Some are an accident waiting to happen. On my daily walks I see many children going to and from schools. Their little feet are just small enough to get caught in the holes from broken covers. The ones I pass frequently are at the following locations in Seaside:

In front of the store on the corner of Noche Buena and San Pablo.

In front of the address 1214 San Pablo.

Please have someone address these (and others) before someone gets injured.

Gratefully,



Dolly Trout  
2643 Finchwood Ave.  
Clovis CA 93611