

## FINAL MINUTES

### **Community Advisory Committee of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District**

*March 26, 2007*

#### **Members Present:**

Janet Brennan - League of Women Voters

Paul Bruno - Water For Us

Bob McKenzie – Monterey County Hospitality Association

Greg Pickens – Monterey Alliance of Neighborhoods

Tom Rowley – Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association

Roy Thomas – Carmel River Steelhead Association (arrived at 2:15 PM)

Dewey Baird; Bruce Crist; Peter Dausen; Manuel Fierro; Robert Greenwood; Sheryl McKenzie

#### **Members Absent:**

David Dilworth – Helping Our Peninsula's Environment (HOPE)

Ron Chesshire

#### **District Staff Present:**

David A. Berger – General Manager (and CAC Chair)

Andy Bell – Planning and Engineering Division Manager

Heidi Quinn – Associate Counsel

Arlene Tavani – Executive Assistant

#### **Presenters:**

Marc Lucca, General Manager, Marina Coast Water District

Keith Israel, General Manager, Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency

#### **1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 2 PM in the Conference Room of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District.

#### **2. Comments from Public**

No comments.

#### **3. Receive Action Minutes of February 6, 2007 Committee Meetings**

Staff was directed to: (A) note on the minutes that Sheryl and Bob McKenzie had provided advance notice of their absence; and (B) modify the comment made by Tom Rowley to state that the Cañada de la Segunda Dam and Reservoir proposal was a “variation” of ASR in that it relied on excess Carmel River winter flows.

- 4. Presentation on Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project by Marina Coast Water District and Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency**  
Marc Lucca, General Manager of the Marina Coast Water District gave the presentation. A summary of the presentation is on file at the District office and on the District's website. During the discussion, questions were raised by Brennan, Dausen and Thomas.
- 5. Presentation on Groundwater Replenishment Project by the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency**  
Keith Israel, General Manager of the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency gave the presentation. A summary of the presentation is on file at the District office and on the District's web site. During the discussion, questions were raised by Greenwood, Thomas, Rowley, Fierro, Bruno, Crist, Brennan, Dausen and Baird.
- 6. Public Comment on the Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project and the Groundwater Replenishment Project**  
There were no comments from the public.
- 7. Committee Comments on Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project and the Groundwater Replenishment Project**  
Comments from the committee members are recorded on Attachment 1. Bob McKenzie excused himself from the meeting prior to receipt of committee comments.
- 8. Approach to Development of Final Report and Report Format**  
This item was not discussed.
- 9. Adjourn**  
The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM.

*Note: An audio recording of the meeting is available for review and copies can be purchased. Contact Arlene Tavani at 658-5652 or [arlene@mpwmd.dst.ca.us](mailto:arlene@mpwmd.dst.ca.us). Written comments submitted by committee members are also available upon request.*

ATTACHMENT 1

<b>Community Advisory Committee Comments</b> Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project (RUWAP) by the MCWD and Groundwater Replenishment Project (GRP) by the MRWPCA <i>March 26, 2007</i>	
<b>Merits</b>	<b>Drawbacks</b>
<p>Robert Greenwood</p> <p>Peter Dausen</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Both projects useful in increasing water supply for area.</li><li>2. Great technology and great way to tap into a resource for increased portfolio of water</li></ol> <p>Janet Brennan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Both projects compatible. Both projects work together well.</li><li>2. <b>GRP</b> project is energy efficient.</li></ol> <p>Manuel Fierro</p> <p><b>RUWAP</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Recycled water used for non potable needs.</li><li>2. Helps some with 95-10 issue.</li><li>3. Can be part of a regional solution.</li><li>4. Redundancy in case of a breakdown of other projects.</li></ol>	<p><b>RUWAP</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Does not reduce our deficit, only 300 AF of supply to offset demand.</li><li>2. <b>RUWAP</b> can stand alone, but <b>GRP</b> cannot stand alone. Should be looked at as one consolidated project. Need regionalization.</li></ol> <p><b>RUWAP</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. May spend money when not needed. Redundant issue.</li><li>2. California Coastal Commission may not approve a new desalination plant.</li><li>3. Monterey County Health Department is promoting one large desalination plant.</li></ol>

**Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project**  
 Aquifer Storage and Recovery in Seaside Basin

*March 26, 2007*

Page 2 of 3

**Merits**

**GRP**

1. Provides water to Seaside Basin as required by Watermaster Management Team.
2. Could help solve 95-10 issue.

Roy Thomas

**RUWAP** – project is underway.

**GRP** – saves fresh water, expands groundwater storage, could provide surface water habitat.

Sheryl McKenzie

Both projects -- Commendable use of technology and conservation.

Bruce Crist

**GRP** –

1. Dynamite idea, support recycling of wastewater.
2. Relatively energy efficient.

Tom Rowley

Agrees with comments made by McKenzie and Dausen.

**Drawbacks**

**GRP**

1. Doesn't totally solve 95-10 by itself.
2. Costs 37.9 million and O&M is \$1,325,000 per year.
3. Further costs not known.

**RUWAP** – not keeping cost down – need to cooperate with other regional projects – share infrastructure.

**GRP** – should be expanded to utilize storm water and excess Salinas River water.

Both projects have limited potential for new supplies within MPWMD.

1. Agrees with comments made by McKenzie and Greenwood.

2. If we add up price and operating costs for all projects, we cannot afford them. These are all technically feasible projects, but can we afford all the individual projects?

**Regional Urban Water Augmentation Project**  
Aquifer Storage and Recovery in Seaside Basin

March 26, 2007

Page 3 of 3

**Merits**

Paul Bruno

1. Both projects technically feasible. Permits are obtainable on both.
2. Both projects will be built whether or not the MPWMD agrees.
3. Infrastructure can be used as part of a regional system.
4. Recharge of aquifers is an advantage.
5. Proposition 84 funds available for these types of projects.

Dewey Baird

1. Proponent of both projects.
2. Support Factory 21 Purified Recycled Water project.
3. Agrees with Bruno's comments.

**Drawbacks**

**RUWAP** -- Limited benefit to MPWMD as currently presented.

Both projects -- Issues of cost effectiveness. There may be less expensive options related to easing governmental regulations.

1. Concern regarding collective cost of all projects.
2. Need a matrix that outlines cost to ratepayers for one or more of the projects.