

FINAL MINUTES
**Technical Advisory Committee of the
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District**
March 3, 2009

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 AM.

Committee Members Present

City of Carmel-by-the-Sea	Sean Conroy
City of Pacific Grove	Sarah Hardgrave
City of Seaside	Rick Riedl
City of Sand City	Steve Matarazzo

Committee Members Absent:

City of Del Rey Oaks	Laura Dadiw
City of Monterey	Todd Bennett
County of Monterey	Jennifer Bodensteiner
Monterey Peninsula Airport District	Bennie Stuth

District Staff Members Present:

Darby Fuerst, General Manager
Stephanie Pintar, Water Demand Manager
Arlene Tavani, Executive Assistant

Comments from the Public

No comments.

Action Items

1. Receive Presentation from Eric Zigas and Andrew Barnsdale of Environmental Science Associates and Discuss the Draft EIR on the Coastal Water Project

Eric Zigas, Environmental Science Associates, and Andrew Barnsdale, Energy Division of the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), provided an overview of the EIR and responded to questions from the committee.

Mr. Barnsdale described the schedule for certification of the EIR. He explained that the public is invited to submit comments on the environmental issues raised in the EIR by April 1, 2009. Topics not related to environmental issues will be addressed through a formal, legal process established by the court, whereby organizations or persons that have formally intervened to become parties to the case may comment. When the PUC issues a decision on certification of the EIR or approval or denial of a water supply project, only

official parties to the case can appeal or ask for a rehearing. Public hearings on the EIR will be held in May, June or July and a decision on the EIR is expected to be issued in December 2009.

Mr. Barnsdale also explained that since the PUC regulates CAW, the PUC has the authority to certify the EIR and approve construction of the Coastal Water Project. The PUC does not regulate Marina Coast Water District (MCWD). If CAW and MCWD were to propose a joint project, the PUC could decide to certify the EIR so it would be available to any other entity that would ultimately be responsible to approve or deny that project. Under that scenario, the PUC would also have the option to set a timeline for the project proponents to present the PUC with agreements between the participating agencies. If the agreements are completed and presented in the required timeline, the PUC could approve the project and authorize CAW to participate. If CAW could not complete the agreements in the required time period, the PUC could approve construction of a CAW-only 12,500 acre-feet replacement water only project.

Chair Hardgrave submitted for review a memo to the Pacific Grove City Council, dated March 4, 2009 (on file at the District office), outlining issues raised in the EIR that the Council could consider presenting in a comment letter to the PUC. She urged the committee members to review the four topics outlined in the memo, and encouraged each jurisdiction to submit comments on the EIR to the PUC. Chair Hardgrave, spoke to Topic #3 of the memo, which proposes that the water supply project selected by the PUC should include water to facilitate construction of the fair share housing allocation for each community that has been mandated by the State of California. She urged each jurisdiction to confirm the growth projections provided to the District in 2005. Chair Hardgrave requested that the District, as a formal party to the proceedings, speak for the jurisdictions and express to the PUC the need for water for growth within each jurisdiction. She also suggested that a joint meeting of the Technical and Policy Advisory committees be conducted in the future to identify the jurisdictions' concerns, so the District is prepared to bring those concerns to the PUC during the Phase 2 proceedings.

Public Comment: Catherine Bowie, California American Water, noted that the Phase 1 project includes 2,700 acre-feet of water for MCWD, but it is considered to have no growth impacts because the growth is included in the general plan of the service area. She asked if it would be possible to provide 4,500 acre-feet from the Phase 1 regional project and describe it as having no growth impacts because the 4,500 acre-feet of water is included in the jurisdictions' general plans. Mr. Zigas replied that the answer was no. It is not clear that 4,500 acre-feet matches the general plan requirements. The PUC could order that the 4,500 acre-feet project be constructed with the understanding that the social needs of the community outweigh the impacts of growth.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 AM.