



**FINAL MINUTES**  
**Water Supply Planning Committee of the**  
**Monterey Peninsula Water Management District**  
*May 22, 2014*

**Call to Order**           The meeting was called order at 9:00 am in the Water Management District conference room.

**Committee members present:**     Robert S. Brower, Sr. - Committee Chair  
David Pendergrass  
Jeanne Byrne

**Committee members absent:**     None

**Staff members present:**           David Stoldt, General Manager  
Larry Hampson, Planning & Engineering Division Manager  
Arlene Tavani, Executive Assistant

**District Counsel present:**       David C. Laredo

**Comments from the Public**       No comments presented.

**Action Items**

1.     Consider Adoption of March 4 and April 18, 2014 Committee Meeting Minutes  
      On a motion of Byrne and second by Pendergrass, the minutes were approved  
      unanimously on a vote of 3 – 0 by Byrne, Pendergrass and Brower.

**Discussion Items**

2.     **Next Steps on Los Padres Dam and Reservoir Long-Term Strategic and Short-Term Tactical Plan**

Following discussion of this item, the committee agreed to bring this issue up again at the next committee meeting.

A summary of the staff report and committee discussion follows. The consultant for the District, Shibatani and Associates, recommended a combination of new off-stream storage along with removal of the Los Padres Dam as the best alternative. The consultant proposed three off-stream alternatives: (a) Pine Creek dam with an estimated municipal yield of 7,600 acre-feet per year (AFY), (b) Boronda Creek dam, which would create no additional flow for municipal demand, and (c) an off-stream reservoir on San Clemente Creek (5,500 AFY for municipal demand). These alternatives presumed that current environmental instream flow requirements would need to be met before diversions to meet municipal demand would occur. District staff recommended that an Instream Flow Incremental Method analysis be completed to update instream

flow requirements and a new surface-groundwater computer model be developed so that the impacts of each alternative on steelhead and water supply to pumpers along the river can be analyzed. Staff noted that riverflow will need to increase in the winter of 2014-15 so that an IFIM study can be completed.

The Tactical Plan is one of several studies needed to evaluate alternative strategies, including removal of the dam and restoration of a natural river. Staff believes that a regulated river may be preferable to dam removal. The cost to recover the original capacity of Los Padres Reservoir could be up to \$200 million, including at least \$30 million for improved fish passage. However, the amount of increased supply for the community (about 850 AFY) would likely not be sufficient to justify such an expense solely for municipal supply. In order to construct a new lower Los Padres Dam (i.e., a dam downstream of the existing location with a height lower than the New Los Padres Dam proposed in 1995), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) would need to be convinced of the advantages, as one of the alternatives they support to solve steelhead passage issues and habitat degradation is removal of the dam. The Water Management District should determine under what conditions NMFS would support maintaining or enhancing the existing Los Padres Dam.

The Pine Creek alternative could require mitigation for inundation of five miles of steelhead habitat. A dam and reservoir on Boronda Creek may inundate land owned by one or more wineries, and would require work outside of the District boundary for installation of the reservoir and a tunnel between the river and Boronda Creek. Alternatively, a diversion point could be placed at the existing Los Padres Dam (instead of a diversion and tunnel above the existing reservoir), but this could be a more expensive solution. Creating surface storage in the Boronda Creek watershed could be advantageous to wineries because a one-mile portion of Cachagua Creek that currently dries up each year would flow in the summer.

Comments from the committee. (A) If an alternative in Cachagua Valley is pursued, it would be good to meet with winery representatives to explain the project's advantages and develop options. (B) Los Padres Dam should be retained and the reservoir dredged. (C) The community will not support off-stream storage, so an upgrade of Los Padres Dam must be considered. (D) Dredging Los Padres Reservoir to the original capacity would yield about 850 AFY of municipal water supply at a cost of approximately \$200 million. Dredging is not likely to be the least costly option for increasing water supply. (E) Leaving Los Padres Dam in place would require a long-term program to manage the sediment. (E) After the desalination project is built, the Water Management District should pursue options to use the remainder of MPWMD's water right on the Carmel River (Permit 20808B) for additional water supply so that the right is not revoked by the SWRCB.

### **3. Update on Progress to Obtain Source Water Agreements for Pure Water Monterey Project**

Following a report from Stoldt, the committee requested another update at the next committee meeting.

Stoldt reported that progress has been made towards development of source water

agreements. (A) It has been decided that the proposed water sources could be purified to water quality useable for the growers. (B) Discussions are ongoing regarding the amount of purified water to be allocated for use on the Monterey Peninsula and how much would be provided to the Salinas Valley. (C) It is possible that the County of Monterey will amend its water rights application to include water from the Tembladero Sough and reclamation ditch.

**4. Review Progress on DeepWater Desal Contingency Water Supply Project**

Stoldt reported that Kennedy Jenks will review the capital cost. The project cost analysis should be done within 4 to 5 weeks.

**Suggestions from the Public on Water Supply Project Alternatives**

No comments.

**Set Next Meeting Date**

The meeting was scheduled for June 10, 2014 at 10 am.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 am.

U:\Arlene\word\2014\Committees\WaterSupplyPlanning\Minutes\FINAL20140522.docx