

FINAL MINUTES

Community Advisory Committee of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District May 29, 2007

Members Present:

Janet Brennan - League of Women Voters
Paul Bruno - Water For Us
David Dilworth – Helping Our Peninsula’s Environment (arrived at 2:35 PM)
Greg Pickens – Monterey Alliance of Neighborhoods
Dewey Baird
Ron Chesshire
Manuel Fierro
Robert Greenwood

Members Absent:

Bob McKenzie – Monterey County Hospitality Association (notified in advance of absence)
Tom Rowley – Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association (notified in advance of absence)
Roy Thomas – Carmel River Steelhead Association (notified in advance of absence)
Bruce Crist (notified in advance of absence)
Peter Dausen (notified in advance of absence)
Sheryl McKenzie (notified in advance of absence)

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:

Catherine Bowie – California American Water
Paul Findley, RBF Consulting

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:17 PM in the Conference Room of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District. There being no quorum, Chair Berger declared this to be an unofficial meeting. No formal action would be taken on any agenda item.

2. Comments from Public

No comments.

3. Receive Action Minutes of April 23, 2007 Committee Meetings

No action was taken due to lack of a quorum. The item was deferred to the June 25, 2007 committee meeting.

4. **Presentation on the Coastal Water Project Proposed by California American Water**
Ms. Bowie and Mr. Findley presented the report. A summary of the presentation is on file at the District office and available on the District's website. Questions were posed by Chesshire, Brennan, Crist, Dilworth, Greenwood, Bruno and Fierro. In response to a question from the Committee, Ms. Bowie stated she would submit to staff for distribution to the committee: (1) an estimate of the number of connections within the CAW system, and the number of persons that were served by those connections in 1988 and 1995; and (2) cost estimate for the 20,272 AFY regional alternative discussed in the PEA.

5. **Public Comment on the Coastal Water Project Proposed by California American Water**

Judi Lehman asked what amount of water the District was authorized to withdraw from the Carmel River to supply the Aquifer and Storage Recovery (ASR) project.

Committee Comments on Coastal Water Project Proposed by California American Water

Comments from the Committee members are summarized on [Attachment 1](#).

6. **Approach to Development of Final Report and Report Format**

This item was not discussed.

7. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 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. Written comments submitted by committee members are also available upon request.

Attachment 1

Community Advisory Committee Comments
 Coastal Water Project (CWP)
 May 29, 2007

Merits		Drawbacks
<p>Manual Fierro</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complies with Order 95-10 2. Provides 1,000 acre-feet per year (AFY) for Seaside Basin 3. Can be modified to provide 20,272 AFY as a regional project 4. California American Water (CAW) knows problems the system has had past and present 5. Can provide 11,738 AFY for a small project 6. CAW stated the possibility of joining with a public partner <p>Paul Bruno</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technically feasible 2. Progress is being made on the PEA and EIR 3. Project is a product of the Plan B community process which was Assembly Bill 1182 4. Does not rely on rainfall 5. Addresses Order 95-10 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. \$230 million for 11,738 AFY is too costly 2. CAW's Peninsula rate payers would pay the total cost at 9.9% profit for CAW 3. High cost per AF at \$1,725 4. No public vote required unless public funds are used 5. Does not conform with Monterey County Ordinance 10.72 6. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) controls rates customers must pay 7. Lead agency is the CPUC 8. No confirmed site for a desalination plant 9. Sale of CAW parent company on the stock exchange means no local control, you have a governance issue 10. 11,730 AFY does not meet with the desired requirements of Monterey County 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dependant upon electricity to operate 2. Entrainment is a significant issue when using once-through cooling 3. Its potential for success makes it a target for the no-growth community

Community Advisory Committee Comments

Coastal Water Project

May 29, 2007

Page 2 of 5

Merits

Drawbacks

6. Subsurface intake alternative addresses entrainment
7. Scaleable
8. Aquifer Storage/Recovery (ASR) component decreases the size and cost of the CWP
9. Extensive public outreach in the planning process
10. Project planning includes integration into the current water system
11. No public vote required unless public funds are used
12. CPUC controls rates
13. CPUC is the lead agency

Ron Cheshire

1. Agree with most of Mr. Bruno's statements on merits of the project
2. Facility like this has tremendous potential to get us out of problems we are facing which makes it a target
3. Moss Landing power plant is largest electrical producer in California and is unlikely to be closed down for any reasons

Dewey Baird

1. Potential mitigation of Order 95-10 and Seaside Groundwater Basin adjudication
2. Has an ASR component
3. Company has made a lot of progress so far
4. Mitigates saltwater intrusion
5. Partial restoration of the Carmel River summer flows

1. Agree with Paul Bruno's statements on drawbacks of the project
2. Concerns re operation and maintenance costs -- if left unchecked or not dealt with -- to provide a cheaper source of electricity with RO membranes, costs are ongoing and might tend to add up over the years.

1. Electricity dependant (Moss Landing power plant may not close soon, but electricity is fossil fuel dependant which is an issue now)
2. At least 4.5 years out with 40 permitting hurdles facing it

Community Advisory Committee Comments

Coastal Water Project

May 29, 2007

Page 3 of 5

Merits

Drawbacks

6. Not weather dependant
7. Agree with Mr. Bruno -- support CPUC as lead agency and approving rates
- Janet Brennan
1. Once-through cooling has least environmental impacts due to use of water that has been produced, and disposal of brine.
 2. Slant drilling alternative has benefits from an environmental perspective and may provide a net energy use reduction over the once-through cooling system.

3. The 70% ultimate rate increase is hard to swallow, although do not know of an alternative
1. We don't have a good example of a large, water producing desalination plant in the U.S. The one that does exist is in Florida and the cost of maintaining that facility is enormous, requiring continual membrane replacement. I question the technical feasibility of the larger facility.
2. The energy demand is significant and may face hurdles under State regulatory scheme to reduce CO² emissions.

- Greg Pickens
1. Agree with positive comments made by Manuel Fierro

1. No alternative water source intake discussed if the Moss Landing Power Plant cooling water discharge was not available
2. "Trough" used for saltwater prevention is questionable due to rising sea levels, inland waterway, storms and erosion
3. Potential multiple brine discharge solutions required. Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency plus?
4. Slant well intake system. The Dana Point pilot site is not sufficient to be considered proven technology.

Community Advisory Committee Comments

Coastal Water Project

May 29, 2007

Page 4 of 5

Merits

Drawbacks

David Dilworth

1. Agree with some of positive comments.
2. Agree with some of Manuel Fierro's comments on merits of project

What other locations use slant wells? The technical studies listed refer to HDD wells. Are there any studies for slant wells that can be provided?

5. Construction timeframe is too long, cost is too high, and location has not been secured
6. Rate recovery has begun. Does this imply that if an alternative to CWP is selected, rate payers will be credited the collected amount so that it can be applied to the other project?

1. Project is illegal as proposed, contrary to Monterey County ordinance
2. Disconnect between public sentiment and project design. CAW recognizes that no-growth is appropriate, but have proposed this large-growth project
3. Project is too big. Not a replacement, not a right-sized project, it is a large-growth project
4. Extremely expensive drought protection
5. Public outreach CAW has done has been meaningless because there is a disconnect between public sentiment and project design.
6. 2012 construction date is not soon.
7. 4 to 5 million gallons per day (mgd) for each slant well is more than double that of any operating well project configuration. The 4 to 5 mgd may not be achievable. It is untested.

Community Advisory Committee Comments

Coastal Water Project

May 29, 2007

Page 5 of 5

Merits

Drawbacks

8. Cones of depression and rate of infiltration -- may not be able to get enough water to the pipes
9. Maintenance is horribly expensive.
10. CPUC is an outrageous agency to authorize this project.
11. Once-through cooling is wasteful technology. Above ground radiators are current technology.
12. Tremendous amount of larvae are killed by the current once-through project. In order to stop that, must use other technology.
13. 20-mile pipeline is nontrivial project that is subject to breakage and leakage.

Robert Greenwood

1. Support 11,730 AF alternative
2. Support the idea of putting the desalination plant in Marina because it would greatly decrease the cost of transmission to the Monterey Peninsula.