



EXHIBIT 4-A

DRAFT MINUTES Technical Advisory Committee of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District July 23, 2013

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 pm in the MPWMD conference room.

Committee members present:

City of Carmel-by-Sea	Marc Wiener
City of Del Rey Oaks	Daniel Dawson
City of Monterey	Todd Bennett, Vice Chair
City of Pacific Grove	Sarah Hardgrave, Chair
City of Sand City	Steve Matarazzo
City of Seaside	Tim O'Halloran
County of Monterey	Rob Johnson
Monterey Peninsula Airport District	Desmond Johnston

Committee members absent: None

Staff members present:

David J. Stoldt, General Manager
Stephanie Pintar, Water Demand Division Manager
Arlene Tavani, Executive Assistant

District Counsel present: David C. Laredo

Presenters:

Eric Zigas, Environmental Science Associates
Chris Mueller, Environmental Science Associates

Comments from the Public: No comments.

Action Items

- 1. Consider Adoption of Minutes of the June 18, 2013 Committee Meeting**
On a motion of Matarazzo and second of Bennett, the minutes were approved unanimously on a vote of 8 - 0.

Discussion Items

- 2. Presentation from Eric Zigas, Environmental Science Associates, on Preparation of the EIR on the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project**
Mr. Zigas reviewed a document entitled MPWSP Water Demand and Supplies (on file at the District office and available for review on the Water Management District website) and responded to questions from the committee. A summary of his comments is provided here. (a) The Draft EIR is scheduled for release on February 28, 2014. (b) Assuming a project size of 15,296 acre-feet, there are 2,008 acre-feet set aside for future water uses such as Pebble Beach Water Entitlements, economic recovery bounce-back, and legal lots of record. (c) The State will not specify how the 2,008 acre-feet of water will be distributed. The local community must make

that determination. If the jurisdictions operate under the assumption that legal-lots-of –record have an entitlement to project water, the community must decide what projects will be constructed and the process to obtain water. For example, if a project were to come forward that was not included in the general plan, how would the jurisdiction respond? (d) If the 500 acre-feet for economic recovery bounce-back does not represent new growth, the community must decide how to utilize that increment of water. (e) Cumulative impacts of the 2,008 acre-feet of water use will not be assessed in the EIR. Instead, the EIR will reference growth impacts and mitigations outlined in the each jurisdiction’s general plan. (f) The EIR will study the cumulative impacts of the 9.6 MGD desal plant, and also the 6.4 MGD desal plant with groundwater replenishment. (g) Need to clarify that the jurisdictions’ estimates of water needed for general plans is for areas served by Cal-Am, not for areas on former Fort Ord that will be served from other water sources. (h) The alternatives study will evaluate a project sized to meet the community’s minimum water requirements. Persons that support a small project that could be increased in size when additional supply is needed must advocate for that option before the CPUC.

Public Comment: George Riley asked that the EIR define “growth” and the sources of water that will meet future water needs.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:13 pm.

U:\staff\Board_Committees\TAC\2013\20131017\01\item4_exh4a.docx