

From: [John Moore](#)
To: DDWrecycledwater@waterboards.ca.gov; Randy.Barnard@waterboards.ca.gov; [Bob Jaques](#); [russell.mcglathlin](mailto:russell.mcglathlin@waterboards.ca.gov); [Arlene Tavani](#); Catherine.Stedman@amwater.com; [Royal Calkins](#); Jan.Sweigert@waterboards.ca.gov; [Jim Johnson](#); [john moore](#); editor@cedarstreettimes.com; paul@carmelpinecone.com; [Ron Weitzman](#)
Subject: Recycling Contaminated Agriculture Wastewater is Illegal
Date: Friday, March 15, 2019 2:23:11 PM
Attachments: [Scan_0221.pdf](#)
[Scan_0223.pdf](#)
[Scan_0226.pdf](#)

DDW: Please forward a copy of this to your current Director and Executive Director, and also to E.Joaquin Esquivel(Chair of State Water resources Bd.)

Attn. Randy Barnard, Wastewater Engineer:

Mr. Barnard: I have written you several times about the illegality of the Pure Water Monterey recycled wastewater project. This is a brief update proving beyond all doubt that your permit for the project is in violation of the law and of your own doctrines.

See Scan221, a copy of a document from the recent "Expert Panel Feasibility Report" that defines an "Indirect potable reuse" as follows: "Treated wastewater is introduced into an ENVIRONMENTAL BUFFER before the blended water is introduced into a water supply system(i.e. a groundwater system). The PWM project injects the treated water directly into the Seaside Basin, NOT before it has endured an environmental buffer, but DIRECTLY, and then tries to represent that the basin is a buffer.

See scan 222, it is a copy of section 5.1.2 of the feasibility report. it defines IPR in Ca.: "IPR is the planned augmentation of surface or groundwater supply with treated municipal wastewater. The last line of the page says "Engineered treatment, and the accompanying monitoring and controls, must be sufficient to consistently make safe drinking water out of municipal wastewater." Studies and reports at the state Dept. of Water Resources, and at DWW are devoid of any literature about recycling contaminated agriculture wastewater for potable purposes(In the case of PWM, two 303d sites, Reclamation Ditch and Blanco Drain). There are numerous other reports and studies related to IPR and DPR that make it clear that the contributors are only discussing the treatment of "Municipal Wastewater." Please prove me wrong: show us actual scientific inquiry into the feasibility of recycling contaminated agriculture wastewater for potable purposes(good luck!)

Scan 226 is the face page and pp1 and 2 Of the State Water Resources Control Board "Report to the Legislature December 2016." At the bottom of page 2 and the top of page 3, it said: "Recycled water is obtained from municipal wastewater (sewage) treatment plants and is treated prior to reuse." There is not a word in the report about even the "idea" of recycling contaminated agriculture wastewater for potable purposes. In fact, all of the studies by experts on file with the State Water Resources Control Board expressly state that commercial and industrial waste must be kept out of the treated source waters and the opinions of the experts condition there opinions upon the assumption that they are discussing only the recycling (whether IPRor

DPR) of municipal wastewater.

Mr. Barnard, it is time for you to man-up: Pull the trigger and expose how you were pressured into issuing a construction permit for the PWM project. John M. Moore

From: [John Moore](#)
To: [Tom Rowley](#)
Cc: [Rick Heuer](#); [Kevin DAYTON](#); [dbellem@att.net](#); [Richard Donnegan](#); [Richard RUCCELLO](#); [Paul BRUNO](#); [Norman GROOT](#); [GoBears1960@gmail.com](#); [Bob McKENZIE](#); [Joy Anderson](#); [Christine KEMP](#); [Douglas Roberts AIA](#)
Subject: Re: Fw: MPWMD Board Meeting - March 18, 2019
Date: Friday, March 15, 2019 9:26:12 AM

Thanks:

Recycling contaminated agriculture wastewater has never before been attempted anywhere in the world. There are tons of studies about direct potable reuse, but those studies relate only to the treatment of municipal wastewaters to the exclusion of industrial waste.

There are health related tests for toxins in recycled human waste projects. There are no additional tests for the poison agriculture wastewater. So it is a crap shoot. Without precedent, no one(Randy Barnhardt) could know and w/o tests toxins that get through will be free to infect us. John M. Moore



Virus-free. www.avast.com

On Thu, Mar 14, 2019 at 4:29 PM Tom Rowley <tomr2004@hotmail.com> wrote:

To: MPTA Directors -- Here attached below is the Agenda and packet of staff reports for next Monday's MPWMD meeting.

I note that many of the items listed in correspondence received do not include an indication of whether answers or responses to the originators of the letters will ever be forthcoming????

NOTE: I watched the re-broadcast of the Feb 21st WMD meeting on the AMP TV channel -- including the report given by M1W GM Paul Sciuto to update the status of the Pure Water Mtry project (GWR project). No mention or response to the letters of concern raised by John Moore were included in his presentation -- especially of interest were the questions about additional testing of injection water from the PWM project to detect possible concentrations of dangerous chemicals and contaminants.

"Aloha" V-P Tom

From: Sara Reyes <Sara@mpwmd.net>

Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2019 2:17 PM

Cc: alison4dro@gmail.com; alnan356@verizon.net; amacbell@redshift.com; ancr@me.com; anhelerosa@hotmail.com; arapa5@comcast.net; Arleen.hardenstein@sothebyshomes.com; bdmoore100@aol.com; billbuffalo@me.com; bjevansflamenca@sbcglobal.net; brian@brianleneve.com; burkedkj@aol.com; burlybob4@gmail.com; chardy824@gmail.com; communityenthusiastwes@gmail.com; daniels.kate@gmail.com; daroldandjudy@gmail.com; dave.cook@crumilitary.org; daverxmanatt.net@gmail.com; David Armanasco; dchardavoyne@ymail.com; ddl2012mry@gmail.com; dean@shanklerealestate.com; deannarossi2002@yahoo.com; dennisallion@sbcglobal.net; dhepburn@sbcglobal.net; dmurphy32@icloud.com; egoldencvalley@gmail.com; erik@mcweekly.com;

fran.foote@gmail.com; gelffmack@gmail.com; gravityfive@gmail.com;
hanshaselbach@comcast.net; hestrud59@gmail.com; holly1@gmail.com; ilwd50@gmail.com;
jablondau@msn.com; janehaines80@gmail.com; jannasch@mac.com; jayrbartow@gmail.com;
jeff.davi@mphtre.com; jettysystems@sbcglobal.net; jgaglioti@delreyoaks.org; jhparise@aol.com;
jim_bober@yahoo.com; jlehman@redshift.com; jmpamy@hotmail.com;
jmurphy992@yahoo.com; jntdahle@yahoo.com; jody@montereychamber.com;
john.tilley@pinnacle.bank; joseph.lucido@sbcglobal.net; jotojp@gmail.com; jswendse@sah.com;
jzs@caltech.edu; kathy.gombas@verizon.net; Kim Adamson; kingiek@att.net;
korper@sbcglobal.net; krislindstrom@gmail.com; lawsam1951@hotmail.com;
letendre@sbcglobal.net; lisa.ciani@gmail.com; lisa@carmelrealtycompany.com;
ljhans@hotmail.com; lonimccallum@gmail.com; lparrish@toast.net; marlimelton@gmail.com;
maryann@sandcityca.org; michaelfitzsimmons@gmail.com; michaelipson@yahoo.com;
mjelpiero@aol.com; mlwaxer@sbcglobal.net; mmbonetti@att.net; mnxb831@gmail.com;
mwchrislock@redshift.com; myrfisher@comcast.net; nancysoule@yahoo.com;
nickie117@sbcglobal.net; pbbmtry@aol.com; penn.shorks@yahoo.com; pjlmph65@gmail.com;
proverbs3-56@sbcglobal.net; rachelmcurry@gmail.com; rdelafuente@csumb.edu;
rene.boskoff@marriott.com; rick@hmamarketing.com; ritax95@yahoo.com; rlsgman@aol.com;
ronweitzman@redshift.com; rudyfischer@earthlink.net; s.schiavone@sbcglobal.net;
seacarmel@att.net; self48@icloud.com; shirmaine@shirmainejones.com;
shivani108@comcast.net; ssemschatz@aol.com; stansmith1@sbcglobal.net;
Suzanne.worcester@gmail.com; tom@rivelli.com; tomr2004@hotmail.com; vpearse@gmail.com;
wbdpad@sbcglobal.net; wiskoff@aol.com; wsabo@att.net; wshood37@gmail.com

Subject: MPWMD Board Meeting - March 18, 2019

The next regular meeting of the MPWMD Board is scheduled for Monday, March 18, 2019 at 7 pm in the District conference room. The agenda and staff reports are available for review at <https://www.mpwmd.net/who-we-are/board-of-directors/bod-meeting-agendas-calendar/>.

Please contact me if you wish to be removed from this distribution list.

Sara Reyes

Senior Office Specialist

Tel. 831-658-5610



Virus-free. www.avast.com

From: [John Moore](#)
To: DDWrecycledwater@waterboards.ca.gov; Randy.Barnard@waterboards.ca.gov; [Bob Jaques](#); [russell mcglothlin](#); [Arlene Tavani](#); Catherine.Stedman@amwater.com; [Royal Calkins](#); Jan.Sweigert@waterboards.ca.gov; [Jim Johnson](#); john.moore; editor@cedarstreettimes.com; paul@carmelpinecone.com; [Ron Weitzman](#)
Subject: Re: Recycling Contaminated Agriculture Wastewater is Illegal
Date: Saturday, March 16, 2019 9:54:41 AM
Attachments: [Scan_0227.pdf](#)

Mr. Barnard: I apologize for the additions, but I believe they are important. Scan 0227 is a copy of the DDW Staff Report-Recycled Water Policy Amendment 12/11/2018. First, the staff report cites Wat. Code sec. 13050(n) as the statutory basis for the Recycled Water Policy. It went on to say:

"Many different sources of water are used in California, such as graywater, oilfield produced water, AGRICULTURE RETURN Water, treated wastewater from non-domestic sources, and de facto or indirect reuse of treated wastewater; however, these types of water reuse are NOT covered by the Recycled Water Policy."

The PWM project prominently declares that "Agriculture Return Water" is a primary source for the project, specifically identifying Blanco Drain and Reclamation Ditch two 303d sites that are among the most highly contaminated agriculture waste sites in the world.

I am not a scientist, but as a highly trained lawyer, I dealt in the world of science experts. I can identify science based projects as opposed to ego-driven projects like PWM. I have repeatedly requested that PWM obtain an opinion from medically trained experts schooled in the science of recycled wastewater diseases. No such expert was hired to give an opinion in the permit process, only engineers like you. The engineers position and that of PWM is that it obtained a permit, so it must be safe. None of the permit process engineers ever claimed that the PWM project was health-safe, even you. And of course there is not even a research project inquiring into the health safety of recycling highly contaminated agriculture wastewater.

Please do not tell me that I am too uninformed to understand. The recycling of agriculture wastewater is illegal. Remove the agriculture wastewater from the project. John M. Moore

On Fri, Mar 15, 2019 at 3:14 PM John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Mr. Barnard:

> I can understand how two months in the Seaside Basin might help PWM
> discover contaminants, if the injected water was recycled domestic
> wastewater; but there are no tests for toxins et al that would be
> derived from recycled agriculture wastewater. So the two months in the
> basin is a sick joke for the PWM mix. JMM

>

> On Fri, Mar 15, 2019 at 2:22 PM John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>> DDW: Please forward a copy of this to your current Director and
>> Executive Director, and also to E.Joaquin Esquivel(Chair of State

>> Water resources Bd.)
>>
>> Attn. Randy Barndard, Wastewater Engineer:
>> Mr. Barndard: I have written you several times about the illegality of
>> the Pure Water Monterey recycled wastewater project. This is a brief
>> update proving beyond all doubt that your permit for the project is in
>> violation of the law and of your own doctrines.
>>
>> See Scan221, a copy of a document from the recent "Expert Panel
>> Feasibility Report" that defines an "Indirect potable reuse" as
>> follows: "Treated wastewater is introduced into an ENVIRONMENTAL
>> BUFFER before the blended water is introduced into a water supply
>> system(i.e. a groundwater system). The PWM project injects the treated
>> water directly into the Seaside Basin, NOT before it has endured an
>> environmental buffer, but DIRECTLY, and then tries to represent that
>> the basin is a buffer.
>>
>> See scan 222, it is a copy of section 5.1.2 of the feasibility report.
>> it defines IPR in Ca.: "IPR is the planned augmentation of surface or
>> groundwater supply with treated municipal wastewater. The last line of
>> the page says "Engineered treatment, and the accompanying monitoring
>> and controls, must be sufficient to consistently make safe drinking
>> water out of municipal wastewater." Studies and reports at the state
>> Dept. of Water Resources, and at DWW are devoid of any literature
>> about recycling contaminated agriculture wastewater for potable
>> purposes(In the case of PWM, two 303d sites, Reclamation Ditch and
>> Blanco Drain). There are numerous other reports and studies related
>> to IPR and DPR that make it clear that the contributors are only
>> discussing the treatment of "Municipal Wastewater." Please prove me
>> wrong: show us actual scientific inquiry into the feasibility of
>> recycling contaminated agriculture wastewater for potable
>> purposes(good luck!)
>>
>> Scan 226 is the face page and pp1 and 2 Of the State Water Resources
>> Control Board "Report to the Legislature December 2016." At the bottom
>> of page 2 and the top of page 3, it said: "Recycled water is obtained
>> from municipal wastewater (sewage) treatment plants and is treated
>> prior to reuse." There is not a word in the report about even the
>> "idea" of recycling contaminated agriculture wastewater for potable
>> purposes. In fact, all of the studies by experts on file with the
>> State Water Resources Control Board expressly state that commercial
>> and industrial waste must be kept out of the treated source waters and
>> the opinions of the experts condition there opinions upon the
>> assumption that they are discussing only the recycling (whether IPR or
>> DPR) of municipal wastewater.
>>
>> Mr. Barnard, it is time for you to man-up: Pull the trigger and expose
>> how you were pressured into issuing a construction permit for the PWM
>> project. John M. Moore

From: [John Moore](#)
To: DDWrecycledwater@waterboards.ca.gov; Randy.Barnard@waterboards.ca.gov; [Bob Jaques](#); [russell mcglothlin](#); [Arlene Tavani](#); Catherine.Stedman@amwater.com; [Royal Calkins](#); Jan.Sweigert@waterboards.ca.gov; [Jim Johnson](#); [john.moore](#); editor@cedarstreettimes.com; paul@carmelpinecone.com; [Ron Weitzman](#); [Paul Sciuto](#); [Dave Stoldt](#); [Kelly Nix](#); mheditor@montereyherald.com; [Mary Duan](#); [Lisa Bennett](#); [Greg Northcraft](#); [Luke Coletti](#); [Larry](#); landwatch@mclw.org; erica.burton@noaa.gov; erickson@stamplaw.us; [Rudy Fischer](#); anettadigi@hotmail.com; [Anthony Lombardo - LS Resort & Pasadera Country Club](#); [Georgia Booth](#); [Dan Miller](#); [Carmelita Garcia](#); [George Riley](#); [Jane Haines](#); info@jcbarchitects.com; [Israel Zubiarte](#); [Jenny McAdams](#); [Prescott J. Kendall](#); nkane@envirolaw.org; [Nicholas Smith](#); [Bruce Obbink](#); [Bill Peake](#); ramburke@yahoo.com; snilmeier@aol.com; [Vince Tuminello](#); [Saoulis, Violette](#); [Walt Classen](#); [fran&jd](#)
Subject: Re: Recycling Contaminated Agriculture Wastewater is Illegal
Date: Monday, March 18, 2019 1:43:43 PM
Attachments: [Scan_0227.pdf](#)

Just to clarify. A fair interpretation of the DDW "Recycled Water Policy"(0227 attached) is that the Pure Water Monterey project water did not even qualify and cannot qualify, to be recycled for any legal purpose, let alone potable purposes. The agriculture wastewater run off(and worse) cannot be recycled for industrial uses, irrigation of any kind(certainly not for crops, not for watering parks, not even car wash use. "These types of reuses are NOT covered by the Recycled Water Policy. " Any questions?

<https://www.avast.com/sig-email?utm_medium=email&utm_source=link&utm_campaign=sig-email&utm_content=webmail&utm_term=icon>

Virus-free. www.avast.com

<https://www.avast.com/sig-email?utm_medium=email&utm_source=link&utm_campaign=sig-email&utm_content=webmail&utm_term=link>

<#DAB4FAD8-2DD7-40BB-A1B8-4E2AA1F9FDF2>

On Sat, Mar 16, 2019 at 9:54 AM John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Mr. Barnard: I apologize for the additions, but I believe they are important.

> Scan 0227 is a copy of the DDW Staff Report-Recycled Water Policy

> Amendment 12/11/2018. First, the staff report cites Wat. Code sec.

> 13050(n) as the statutory basis for the Recycled Water Policy. It went

> on to say:

> "Many different sources of water are used in California, such as

> graywater, oilfield produced water, AGRICULTURE RETURN Water, treated

> wastewater from non-domestic sources, and de facto or indirect reuse

> of treated wastewater; however, these types of water reuse are NOT

> covered by the Recycled Water Policy."

>

> The PWM project prominently declares that "Agriculture Return Water"

> is a primary source for the project, specifically identifying Blanco

> Drain and Reclamation Ditch two 303d sites that are among the most

> highly contaminated agriculture waste sites in the world.

>

> I am not a scientist, but as a highly trained lawyer, I dealt in the

> world of science experts. I can identify science based projects as

> opposed to ego-driven projects like PWM. I have repeatedly requested

> that PWM obtain an opinion from medically trained experts schooled in

> the science of recycled wastewater diseases. No such expert was hired

> to give an opinion in the permit process, only engineers like you. The

> engineers position and that of PWM is that it obtained a permit, so it

> must be safe. None of the permit process engineers ever claimed that

> the PWM project was health-safe, even you. And of course there is not

> even a research project inquiring into the health safety of recycling
> highly contaminated agriculture wastewater.
>
> Please do not tell me that I am too uninformed to understand. The
> recycling of agriculture wastewater is illegal. Remove the agriculture
> wastewater from the project. John M. Moore
>
>
>
>
> On Fri, Mar 15, 2019 at 3:14 PM John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com> wrote:
>>
>> Mr. Barnard:
>> I can understand how two months in the Seaside Basin might help PWM
>> discover contaminants, if the injected water was recycled domestic
>> wastewater; but there are no tests for toxins et al that would be
>> derived from recycled agriculture wastewater. So the two months in the
>> basin is a sick joke for the PWM mix. JMM
>>
>> On Fri, Mar 15, 2019 at 2:22 PM John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com> wrote:
>>>
>>> DDW: Please forward a copy of this to your current Director and
>>> Executive Director, and also to E.Joaquin Esquivel(Chair of State
>>> Water resources Bd.)
>>>
>>> Attn. Randy Barndard, Wastewater Engineer:
>>> Mr. Barndard: I have written you several times about the illegality of
>>> the Pure Water Monterey recycled wastewater project. This is a brief
>>> update proving beyond all doubt that your permit for the project is in
>>> violation of the law and of your own doctrines.
>>>
>>> See Scan221, a copy of a document from the recent "Expert Panel
>>> Feasibility Report" that defines an "Indirect potable reuse" as
>>> follows: "Treated wastewater is introduced into an ENVIRONMENTAL
>>> BUFFER before the blended water is introduced into a water supply
>>> system(i.e. a groundwater system). The PWM project injects the treated
>>> water directly into the Seaside Basin, NOT before it has endured an
>>> environmental buffer, but DIRECTLY, and then tries to represent that
>>> the basin is a buffer.
>>>
>>> See scan 222, it is a copy of section 5.1.2 of the feasibility report.
>>> it defines IPR in Ca.: "IPR is the planned augmentation of surface or
>>> groundwater supply with treated municipal wastewater. The last line of
>>> the page says "Engineered treatment, and the accompanying monitoring
>>> and controls, must be sufficient to consistently make safe drinking
>>> water out of municipal wastewater." Studies and reports at the state
>>> Dept. of Water Resources, and at DWW are devoid of any literature
>>> about recycling contaminated agriculture wastewater for potable
>>> purposes(In the case of PWM, two 303d sites, Reclamation Ditch and
>>> Blanco Drain). There are numerous other reports and studies related
>>> to IPR and DPR that make it clear that the contributors are only
>>> discussing the treatment of "Municipal Wastewater." Please prove me
>>> wrong: show us actual scientific inquiry into the feasibility of
>>> recycling contaminated agriculture wastewater for potable
>>> purposes(good luck!)
>>>
>>> Scan 226 is the face page and pp1 and 2 Of the State Water Resources

>>> Control Board "Report to the Legislature December 2016." At the bottom
>>> of page 2 and the top of page 3, it said: "Recycled water is obtained
>>> from municipal wastewater (sewage) treatment plants and is treated
>>> prior to reuse." There is not a word in the report about even the
>>> "idea" of recycling contaminated agriculture wastewater for potable
>>> purposes. In fact, all of the studies by experts on file with the
>>> State Water Resources Control Board expressly state that commercial
>>> and industrial waste must be kept out of the treated source waters and
>>> the opinions of the experts condition there opinions upon the
>>> assumption that they are discussing only the recycling (whether IPR or
>>> DPR) of municipal wastewater.
>>>
>>> Mr. Barnard, it is time for you to man-up: Pull the trigger and expose
>>> how you were pressured into issuing a construction permit for the PWM
>>> project. John M. Moore