

**OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NOP FOR WATER PROJECT EIR
JULY 10, 2002**

Prepared by Henrietta Stern on 7/12/2002; not official transcript

2:00 PM SESSION

Clive Sanders, speaking as an individual (spoke twice)

- Notes his support for a dam
- Concern re diversion of 7,909 AF, impacts to river
- Asks re fate of SC Dam and how this info will be integrated into EIR
- Suggests dredging dams for more storage (better for fish due to summer flow)
- If only alternative is a big desal plant, build it large enough for future needs
- Notes NMFS desire to remove dams; Clive's desire is to dredge and gain benefit from storage; need to address the dredging concept

Dorothy Crivello, Water For Us

- Expresses support for dam and concern re lack of forward progress by MPWMD
- Show accurate cost of water alternatives, Plan A and B side by side, over many years

Edwin Lee

- Need project level evaluation for dam and all alternatives for fair comparison of all
- Emphasize cost comparison of alternatives when they are completed (if multiple, projects, at completion and operation of last project)
- Questions NMFS assertions re dams and fish in Carmel River; believes not necessarily based on scientific evidence; should independently assess veracity (e.g., migration through reservoir, conditions of river with various alternatives, viability of fish hatchery if passage is not successful)

Gary Whitman, World Water S.A.

- Submitted letter written by company president
- All costs of alternatives need to be considered
- Suggests evaluating water bags as source of supply
- Notes advantages of bags as a water supply source over alternatives currently in NOP

David Dilworth, HOPE (spoke twice)

- Suggests looking at combinations of alternatives broader than those listed in NOP; cites previous

evaluations

- Suggests obtaining 3500 AF of Salinas Basin water owned by Army currently slated for FORA
- Investigations of Carmel River should include flow, temp and chemistry, with graphs
- Had concerns with waterbags, including impact on source river and growth inducing here
- Requests life cycle graphs for each alternative to show timing and fate of water production over time
- Request complete EIR, not reference to older documents (full text in proposed EIR)
- Evaluate costs and performance over long-term defined as 100 years

Fran Farina, Save Our Carmel River

- Re: JSA slide 8-- questions project purpose in NOP, need apples-to-apples Plan A vs B; PUC never signed off on 15,285 as Cal-Am production
- Re: JSA slide 10- believes No Project should be legal supply only (7,376 AF); discuss what life would be like for community as well as river habitat if only 3376 diverted
- ASR- asks if injection source could be desal or other non-river source
- Re: JSA slide 12- PUC directive is 17,641 AF which should correspond to Plan A
- Re: JSA slide 16- need project level info on dam through year 2002, not 1998
- Asks re integration of Final Plan B into MPWMD EIR; what if it is major desal plant at Moss Landing

Tex Irwin, Monterey Peninsula Airport District

- Describe benefits to steelhead and riparian corridor due to dam or other alt that provides year-round flow
- Desal costs need to include electricity and replacement costs; what if rate increases?
- Compare effect to NMFS, Sanctuary concerns if desal vs dam
- What is environmental effect of generating electricity for the desal plant?
- Compare long-term operating expenses for dam vs others

Sean Flavin

- Submits series of written questions about baseline assumptions associated with production numbers in NOP
- Re: 15,285- what does it cover, what trends, what are sources
- Re: 4000 AF from Seaside, is that accurate
- Re:17,641- what is the basis for this number in Step 2;
- What kind of growth, when and where would production allow
- What does "local desal" mean; if not Moss Landing, how deal with final Plan B?
- How MPWMD and CPUC processes relate to each other
- Should add CPUC to list of agencies to be consulted in the JSA slides 16 and 17

Deborah Mickelson

- Cited a variety of information re MRWPCA/MCWD reclamation project
- Main point was that quantities of wastewater written in reports may not actually be available due to financing, high costs, land availability, cleanup/toxics, infrastructure needs, new uses rather than replacement and other factors
- This carefully assess realistic quantity that may be available as alternative for Peninsula

7:00 PM SESSION

Judy MacClelland, City of Pacific Grove

- Reads from letter which was submitted
- Poses series of questions about meaning and ramifications of short-term and long-term project goals
- Believes future needs are as equally important as existing needs
- Notes 3 production steps; believes there should be a 4th step for year 2020 needs solicited from the cities by MPWMD in 1999; reads from original MPWMD letter
- Requests broad as possible range of production

Marc Beique, Water for Us

- Concern about starting over again, lack of progress
- Refers to previous Ed Lee letter to Board
- ASR and the dam need to be evaluated at project level
- Need fair and accurate costs
- Concur with PG re include Step 4 for 2020 needs
- Notes concern about high water rates, impact to water bills (people won't or can't pay)
- If regional desal is Plan B project, MPWMD should not be lead agency

Helen Rucker

- Expresses concern about lack of progress, need water now for affordable housing
- Don't reinvent the wheel; refers to many years of older studies

Michael Waxer

- Echoes Farina comments on project yield goal higher than 15,285; Plan A vs B at apples to apples; notes Plan B goal is 10,730 not 7,909; what happened to A+ and B+ evaluations?
- Does project purpose in NOP conflict with state legislation embodied in AB 1182?
- What is rationale, basis for 15,285 rather than 17,641 as existing; feels people punished for conserving under duress and threat of fines; now yield goal is artificially low
- Questions why low end rationing standard was reduced on June 6 without public discussion; it means 1.5 years rather than 10 weeks of rationing in a 10-year period

Holly Keifer

- Include Army water (3500 AFA) as a possible source (transfer rights from Army to MPWMD rather than to FORA)
- Feels Board is doing a good job