

California American Water Company's Coastal Water Project March 2009 Public Meeting Comment Summary

General Comments Regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report's (DEIR's) Structure, Scope, and Impact Assessment:

- One commenter offered a history of the League of Women Voters of Monterey Peninsula's (LWVMP) interest in water and the positions they had developed based on water studies spanning the last 25 years, while urging support for a balanced and comprehensive approach to efficient water use, conservation, and the protection of supplies and habitats.
- One commenter questioned whether the EIR had estimated the ongoing impact to water consumers until a solution could be found and expressed support for a solution that allows water for future growth.
- One commenter expressed concern that the EIR was limited in scope because it only made comparisons to Cal Am proposals and did not consider other options.
- One commenter expressed a general concern regarding the environmental impacts of these types of projects on marine mammals and the emission of greenhouse gases.
- One commenter questioned why an alternative for building a dam was not considered in the DEIR.
- One commenter suggested that the EIR consider the project within a social context and evaluate the effect of the project on different categories of people (i.e., seniors vs 30-year-olds, national corporations vs small businesses)
- One commenter expressed concern about impacts on residents due to glare from nighttime construction lighting, and suggested that one potential mitigation measure would be to include shields to minimize glare.
- One commenter requested that the sequencing of construction be defined (e.g., will Transmission Main North be completed before Transmission Main South is begun, or could construction take place concurrently in multiple areas?)
- One commenter requested aerial photographs of the Terminal Reservoir area (1:300 scale) that better identify the area.
- One commenter expressed concern with construction traffic as it relates to school traffic, and would like the EIR to consider the times of year that construction would occur to reduce traffic congestion around schools. The school year is from the second week of June until the first week of August. The peak traffic times are 7am and 7pm, so this should be considered. (Schools mentioned include King, Manzanita, and Highland)
- One commenter expressed concern about location of staging areas, and would like a map that identifies potential staging areas.

- One commenter requested clarification regarding the number of employees that would require employee parking. Specifically, the City of Seaside does not want additional employees parking in the area because of existing densities, and desire to maintain roadway LOS. The commenter notes that the north side of La Salle or Catholic Church parking lot could accommodate some employee parking.
- One commenter expressed concern regarding parking options for construction workers (where, how many, how long) given the limited availability of parking areas in Seaside, and recommended a motorpool area in Marina or use of CSUMB parking by the stadium as alternatives.
- One commenter expressed concern regarding siting for ASR wells because they could be located next to a working class community and noise could impact the sensitive receptors.

Comments and Questions Regarding the Regional Project:

- Six commenters expressed support for the regional project.
- One commenter stated that the priority for new water supplies should be to meet existing water needs first and urged the expansion of the Phase I projects to include the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency's (MRWPCA) groundwater replenishment program as a more certain water source than the 2.980 AFY that would come from the Salinas River.
- One commenter noted concerns regarding extractions of water from the Salinas Groundwater Basin. The commenter urged that these concerns be addressed in the evaluation of Phase I of the regional project, in addition to further evaluations for stormwater runoff programs as originally included in Phase I of the regional effort, and the desalination plant of Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD).
- One commenter questioned why the 300 AFY from the Sand City desalination plant is included in the baseline, since this water is only a temporary and uncertain source of water for the areas outside of Sand City. The commenter reiterated their belief that the full intent of the Regional Coalition effort is to design a comprehensive plan for new water supply options, including recycled and stormwater use.
- One commenter wrote about the reasons why they felt the regional plan was worthy of adoption; including city council endorsements, eligibility for federal and state grant and bond requests, transparency of governance, compliance with local ordinances and state mandates; and referred to additional objectives identified in the DEIR.
- One commenter stated that in fulfilling their mission to obtain the lowest possible rate for service consistent with reliable and safe service levels, the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) also advocates for consumer and environmental protections and that the Regional Project complies with this mission, in addition to solving present and future water needs for the Monterey Region.

- One commenter suggested the addition of the MRWPCA groundwater replenishment program, stormwater runoff programs, and the MPWMD desalination plant in the current evaluation.
- One commenter congratulated the CPUC on the development of a regional water project.
- One commenter asked if an eastern distribution pipeline to Prunedale would be built as part of Phase II of the Regional Project.
- One commenter stated that for Phase II of the Regional Project, the North County should not have to be constrained in receiving water by criteria related to growth (i.e., no water if project replacement only).

Comments and Questions Regarding the Moss Landing Project:

- One commenter requested information on current MLPP discharge rates.
- One commenter expressed support for the Moss Landing Site because it would provide for easier access to water and a cheaper source of power for northern Monterey County.
- One commenter expressed concerns about CalAm running the Moss Landing Desalination Plant because they felt the current water supply had not been properly managed and had led to the current overdraft of the Carmel River.

Comments and Questions Regarding the North Marina Project:

- One commenter expressed exclusive support for the Marina Coast Project.

Comments and Questions Regarding Miscellaneous Proposed Components and Construction:

- One commenter expressed support for David Avenue Reservoir instead of Forest Lake Reservoir.
- One commenter questioned how the intake south of the outfall would be monitored to make sure it was not taking in mixed outfall discharge.

Comments Regarding Types of Wells:

- One commenter expressed support for vertical wells to help mediate sea water intrusion.
- One commenter expressed disapproval for slant wells.
- One commenter expressed disapproval for inland brackish wells.
- One commenter expressed disapproval for any injection of recycled water into the Salinas Valley Aquifer.

Comments Regarding Water Supply:

- One commenter expressed the opinion that the current legal water amount of 3376 acre feet should only be taken from the Carmel River by CalAm during the wet winter months in order to protect summer flows for the steelhead.
- One commenter expressed concern that the Moss Landing and North Marina Projects do not supply water to North County
- One commenter stated that the highest priority was to ensure a drought resistant supply and making enough water available to current property owners to build additions with extra water for bathrooms.
- One commenter stated that the numbers in the existing water supply table on page 2-14 did not add up and they could not understand the break out.

Comments Regarding Coordination with Other Jurisdictions and Permitting for the Project:

- One commenter requested clarification of ownership of property (in particular Terminal Reservoir and the ASR injection/extraction wells) to determine what permits would be necessary and/or if there would possibly be an exemption from City of Seaside permits.
- One commenter expressed concern regarding potential permitting issues related to property located on the Former Fort Ord site, which is now annexed or in the process of being annexed to the City of Seaside.
- One commenter requested clarification regarding property ownership of the area for the ASR wells by Black Horse and Bayonet Golf Course. FORA currently owns the ROW, but who would own the facilities and would they be on easement land or land owned by CalAm?
- One commenter expressed concern regarding whether components of project would conflict with construction of the new General Jim Moore Boulevard and would like to see a discussion of construction access to the Terminal Reservoir site. The Fort Ord Reuse Authority is sponsoring the new roadway and increasing it from two lanes to four lanes.
- One commenter requested that there be coordination with the City of Seaside Fire Department (on Hilby) and correlating mitigation implemented. Yosemite and La Salle are arterial roads and primary access ways. The General Plan requires a five minute response time. Installation of the pipeline within roadways could affect the response time of the fire department.
- One commenter requested that there be coordination with the City of Seaside to provide advance notice of parking restrictions, including a defined timeframe for when notice would be given.

Comments Regarding Seaside Basin Groundwater Replenishment:

- One commenter expressed the opinion that because there is a great deal of public interest in the Seaside Basin Groundwater Replenishment Project (Section 5.3.6), it would be helpful to provide more details, including a site plan and process diagrams.
- One commenter expressed support for the construction of rainwater catch basins on Ft. Ord land and pumping of the water into the Seaside Groundwater Basin.

Comments Regarding Public versus Private Ownership:

- Four commenters expressed support for public ownership of water agencies and supplies.
- One commenter stated that the desalination plant should be a publicly owned entity that sells water to CalAm.
- One commenter requested an explanation of private vs public ownership and the effects of each on the proposed projects.
- Two commenters expressed their support for the public ownership of the regional project.

Comments Regarding Public Outreach:

- Four commenters expressed strong support for public comments to be shared on the project website, so local water consumers could view comments made by other water users.
- Four commenters expressed disappointment that there was no opportunity for oral public comment.
- Two commenters urged the CPUC to hold the public participation hearings scheduled for June 8-12, 2009 on the Monterey Peninsula so the community could continue to voice their opinions on the project before the final decision is made.
- One commenter expressed disappointment that more people did not come out to participate in the public meetings.
- One commenter expressed concern that the no-growth forces in the community would not support any new water project.

General Comments on the Process:

- Two commenters expressed support for the repeated airing of recorded video of the public meeting on the local public access television channel.
- Two commenters expressed congratulations to the PUC for facilitating the oversight process.

- One commenter offered extensive remarks on the opportunity presented to the communities of the Monterey Region by the California Public Utilities Commission's (CPUC's) DRA when they invited interested water supply and management agencies and municipal interests to participate in the development of a collaborative regional plan for reliable water supplies and water management programs.
- One commenter expressed disappointment that a community consensus was never reached following the negative vote in 1995 on a larger Los Padres Dam/Reservoir.
- One commenter questioned how Cal Am would be able to implement a solution when they are facing a state mandate and local water board restrictions.
- One commenter questioned what bonds or grants might be available to public entities and what effect County Ordinance 10.72 would have on all three projects.

Comments Regarding Project Cost:

- One commenter stated that while costs are not currently separated out in the CalAm Plans, a study should be made about the effect of the increased cost upon citizens' budgets for different economic groups and different types and sizes of businesses, using more expensive desalination water for each of the projects and that public comment should be requested on these studies.
- One commenter requested information regarding how much the project will cost to build and to operate, what the storage capacity is and how it will be recovered.
- One commenter expressed concerned about the potential for the project to have high costs.