

FINAL MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District *April 23, 2007*

Members Present:

Janet Brennan - League of Women Voters

Paul Bruno - Water For Us

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; Manuel Fierro; Robert Greenwood; Sheryl McKenzie

Members Absent:

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

Bob McKenzie – Monterey County Hospitality Association (notified in advance of absence)

Ron Chesshire

Bruce Crist (notified in advance of absence)

Peter Dausen (notified in advance of absence)

District Staff Present:

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

Andy Bell – Planning and Engineering Division Manager

Joe Oliver – Senior Hydrogeologist

Heidi Quinn – Associate Counsel

Arlene Tavani – Executive Assistant

Presenters:

Andy Bell, Planning and Engineering Manager

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 March 26, 2007 Committee Meetings

The minutes were received. Staff was directed to note in past and future minutes the names of committee members who have provided, or will provide advance notice of their absence from a meeting.

- 4. Presentation on MPWMD Long-Term Water Supply Project/Desalination in Sand City from Monterey Peninsula Water Management District**
Andy Bell gave the presentation. A summary of the presentation is on file at the District office and on the District's website. Mr. Bell and Mr. Oliver responded to questions raised by Baird, Brennan, Bruno, Dausen, Fierro, Greenwood, Rowley and Thomas. Mr. Bell offered to provide to the committee members a memorandum by District Counsel, David Laredo, regarding legal requirements for authorizing votes on water supply projects. He will also submit to the committee members an estimate of the aggregate cost for an acre-foot of water charged by California American Water in the Monterey District.
- 5. Public Comment on the MPWMD Long-Term Water Supply Project/Desalination in Sand City from Monterey Peninsula Water Management District**
Steven Leonard, California American Water, expressed confidence in the CAC's project review process, and said that the committee members were asking good questions.
- 6. Committee Comments on MPWMD Long-Term Water Supply Project/Desalination in Sand City from Monterey Peninsula Water Management District**
Comments from the committee members are recorded on Attachment 1.
- 7. Approach to Development of Final Report and Report Format**
This item was not discussed.
- 8. Adjourn**
Prior to adjournment, Mr. Rowley announced that he could not participate in the May 29, 2007 meeting, and that Dick Donagon from the Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association will be in the audience. Sheryl McKenzie also noted that she will not be in attendance at the May 29 meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00 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. Written comments submitted by committee members are also available upon request.

Attachment 1

Community Advisory Committee Comments – Revised 5/29/07
MPWMD Long-Term Water Supply Project/Desalination in Sand City
April 23, 2007

Merits	Drawbacks
<p>Paul Bruno</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Technically feasible for desalination project, but not necessarily wells.2. Project size can be scaled.3. Does not rely upon rainfall. <p>Manuel Fierro</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Combined with ASR and RUWAP could comply with SWRCB Order 95-10 and get water to Seaside aquifer.2. Enough water to comply with SWRCB Order 95-10 but not for growth.3. California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) not involved.4. Would be a public/private entity. <p>Janet Brennan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Local control over project design and capacity.2. Possibility of voter approval for the project.3. Distribution costs would appear to be lower than for North coast desalination projects.4. There are environmental benefits in terms of the HDD wells.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Plant sites are theoretical at this time.2. Potential issues with erosion over time for anything west of Highway 1.3. Brine disposal by way of wells seems to be less favorable than by way of outfall.4. Coastal commission prefers a regional desalination facility system versus a series of small plants.5. Costs need to be updated because they reflect 2002 dollars. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Costs extremely high for amount of water produced.2. Enough water to comply with SWRCB Order 95-10 but not for growth.3. California American Water (CAW) may not own the desalination plant. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. High energy demand.

Community Advisory Committee Comments
Aquifer Storage and Recovery in Seaside Basin

April 23, 2007

Page 2 of 4

Merits

Drawbacks

Dewey Baird

1. Theoretically because water is potable, it has a potential for helping with SWRCB Order 95-10 and the Seaside Groundwater Basin problems.

Tom Rowley

1. Agree with Mr. Bruno about not relying on a water supply that is dependant upon rainfall.
2. Project is rainfall proof.
3. Coastal Commission is not expert.

Sheryl McKenzie

1. Doesn't depend on rainfall.

1. CIP costs as compared to the yield (ratio) are negative.
2. The technology is problematic, unproven.
3. Potential problems with permitting. Site belongs to California Department of Parks and Recreation.

1. HDD well technology is questionable.
2. Should check with Ed Thornton at Naval Postgraduate School before conducting an HDD well test.
3. Cost – building this piecemeal will not work. Result in high cost.
4. Storage vs. surge capacity. This is not addressed in the proposed project, the need for adequate storage during peak demand or when there is low rainfall. No reserve capacity.

1. Not enough water to meet SWRCB Order 95-10, unless combined with other projects.
2. Untested technology.
3. High energy costs.
4. Politicizing of voter approval – growth vs. no growth.

Community Advisory Committee Comments
 Aquifer Storage and Recovery in Seaside Basin
April 23, 2007
 Page 3 of 4

Merits

Drawbacks

Greg Pickens

1. Supports comments made by Bruno and Fierro.

1. Location still in question. No land leased or purchased at this time.
2. Technology feasible but not proven.
3. Radial Collector Well technology might be suitable for fresh water/river bed collection but questionable for onshore ocean water extraction.
4. HDD is limited with horizontal reach (100-200 ft offshore to start of screen filter) due to estimated pump setting calculations.
5. Possible retreat strategy required due to erosion (entry points/desal plant needing to be moved inland).
6. Potential multiple bring discharge solutions required. MRWPCA plus injector wells (or alternative methods).
7. Size of location may prohibit expansion beyond meeting minimal 95-10 water supply requirements. Number of offshore collection or discharge pipes limited by location.

Roy Thomas

1. Drought proof.
2. Less plumbing needed.
3. Within District boundaries.
4. Expandable.
5. Sites available.
6. Ocean is nearby.

1. Wells are too expensive and may not work as currently designed.
2. Need small test project to see where mistakes have been made.
3. More planning for storage and blending of the desalinated water needs to be done.

Community Advisory Committee Comments
Aquifer Storage and Recovery in Seaside Basin
April 23, 2007
Page 4 of 4

Merits

Drawbacks

Robert Greenwood

1. Supports comments made by Janet Brennan.

1. Supports comments made by Janet Brennan.