

Section 14.6
No Affiliation (Individuals)

Samuel Adelson, 03/09/09

NA_Adels-1 See Master Response 13.7, (Alternative) Energy Sources and Energy Use.

Nadar Agha, 04/06/09

NA_Agha-1 The comment states that the North Marina Project and the Regional Project could cause saltwater intrusion under farmland in the Salinas Valley and reduce the water supply that would otherwise be available to them. Please refer to Master Response 13.6, Project Effects on Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin.

NA_Agha-2 The use of the National Refractories site for the desalination plant and conveyance facilities, as proposed by Poseidon Resources Corporation, and the Pajaro/Sunny Mesa CSD is discussed in Sections 7.5.1, 7.5.2 and 7.5.3. See, in particular, footnotes 5, 7, and 10 for more detail. It was concluded in the case of the desalination plant site, the intake facilities, and the outfall facilities that while there is no evidence that the National Refractories site/facilities would be superior to the East Parcel desalination plant site of the MLPP intake/outfall facilities, the National Refractories site/intake/outfall alternatives do fulfill the project objectives and are not being eliminated at this stage of analysis. Further environmental documentation will be needed, however, if this site is to be considered at the future stages in the development of this project.

Anonymous, March 04, 2009 REPOG Meeting

- NA_Anony-1 The comment asks for the ALJ's technical expertise on water issues. Unfortunately, this comment does not speak to the environmental issues of the EIR.
- NA_Anony-2 See Section 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for more detail regarding the process following the publication of the Final EIR.
- NA_Anony-3 See Section 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for more detail regarding the process following the publication of the Final EIR
- NA_Anony-4 The comment asks if the slant wells are tested. Various geological investigations of the subsurface materials underlying the dune and beach areas at Marina indicate that the depth, texture, and composition of the dune sand/upper 180-Aquifer materials are consistent with the materials that are conducive to such an extraction technology. Slant drilling and water extraction through slant wells has been used successfully in the oil industry for many years. Similar technology is currently employed at a desalination source water extraction project in Dana Point, California.
- NA_Anony-5 The comment asks if there will be a pipeline for deliveries to North County. No, there will not be a pipeline to North County in any of the Projects discussed in the EIR. MCWRA is the agency responsible for managing the North County water resources, not CalAm. Zone 2C receives benefits from the projects already implemented by the MCWRA, and those groundwater benefits are realized as raised groundwater levels resulting from a reduction in coastal pumping.
- NA_Anony-6 An EIR is only required to disclose potential environmental impacts. However, to the extent that incidental benefits are identified, they have been discussed in the EIR. Please refer to the impact summary tables in the Executive Summary for a full list of project impacts.
- NA_Anony-7 The comment makes a series of statements and poses a series of questions about growth accommodations of the projects, or how growth is defined, for where by whom, and how do they all relate (or not) to approved general plans or the potential for general plans to be revised based on the new availability of water supply. All of these issues are addressed in the EIR in either Chapter 2, Water Demand and Supplies, or Chapter 8, Growth Inducement Potential and Secondary Effects of Growth.
- NA_Anony-8 The Draft EIR contained a staff-recommended project designation as well as an environmentally-superior project designation. The Final EIR does not contain a staff-recommended project, but it does designate an environmentally-superior project. See Section 7.7, Comparison of Projects—Environmentally-Superior Project, for the full discussion of this topic.

Jay Bartow, First Presbyterian Church of Monterey

- NA_Barto-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.
- NA_Barto-2 This comment in support of a comprehensive project that plans for the future is acknowledged. Refer to Section 5.1.1, Project Overview and Background for discussion regarding the Regional Project as a comprehensive project alternative.
- NA_Barto-3 See Master Response 13.7, (Alternative) Energy Sources and Energy Use.

Raymond Bergara

NA_Berga-1 Comment noted. One of the objectives of the CWP is to satisfy CalAm's obligations to meet the requirements of SWRCB Order 95-10 (explained in Section 2.2.2). See Chapter 2, Water Demand and Supplies, for discussion of the issues regarding water supply and demand in Monterey County and, in particular, the anticipated future use of the Carmel River as a water supply.

Kay Cline, 04/05/09

NA_Cline-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

NA_Cline-2 Comment noted. The groundwater replenishment project needs to be developed further before it can be included in Phase 1. Please refer to the Master Response on the Seaside Groundwater Replenishment Project.

James M. Cullem, 03/04/09

NA_Culle-1 Please see Section 7.4, History of the Coastal Water Project, for a chronology of the various decisions, votes, and other incidents that led to the proposed CWP. In particular, the history presented under the headings New Los Padres Dam and Reservoir EIR, Carmel River Dam and Reservoir Project Supplemental EIR, and CPUC Water Supply Contingency Plan (“Plan B”) Evaluation and Coastal Water Project EIR relate the events leading up to the decision that the Carmel River Dam and Reservoir Project was infeasible.

Ramon da Pena, Jr., 03/03/09

NA_daPen-1 This comment in support of a desalination plant in Marina is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

NA_daPen-2 The comment expresses support for providing only the amount of water needed to correct the existing water deficit in the Carmel River system and Seaside Basin; support for focusing on present needs for existing housing and lots of record; and opposition to any alternative that would provide water for future growth due to the traffic impacts that would result; this comment is noted. Please refer to Chapter 8 for a discussion of the growth inducement potential and the secondary effects of growth of the CWP and the North Marina and Regional Project alternatives.

Davalos

NA_Daval-1 This comment is support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Beverly Davis

NA_Davi-1 This comment does not pertain to any environmental issue. The commenter should contact her current water provider for an answer to the question: “My family owns a parcel behind the Moss Landing PG&E plant. Will there be irrigation water available from the plant as a subscriber?”

Douglas Deitch

- NA_Deitc-1 This comment of concern regarding seawater intrusion and basin overdraft is acknowledged. Please refer to Chapter 4.2, Groundwater Resources and to Master Response 13.6, Project Effects on Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin, for discussion regarding seawater intrusion and other groundwater issues in the project area.
- NA_Deitc-2 This comment in support of sustainable use of local groundwater is acknowledged.
- NA_Deitc-3 This comment in support of regional coordination among agencies is acknowledged. Please refer to Section 5.1.1, Project Overview and Background, and Section 5.1.4, Regional Overview, for information regarding agency coordination with respect to the Regional Project.
- NA_Deitc-4 This comment of concern regarding agriculture's use of water in the project area is acknowledged.

Kathleen DeMaria, 04/15/09

NA_DeMar-1 See Master Response 13.16, Costs.

Bob Dibisch, 03/14/09

- NA_DibiB-1 Comment noted. The regulatory framework related to public versus private ownership of desalination facilities is discussed in detail in Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.
- NA_DibiB-2 This comment in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.
- NA_DibiB-3 This comment of concern regarding sewage disposal and water reclamation/recycled water is acknowledged. Neither the Moss Landing Project, the North Marina Project, nor Phase 1 of the Regional Project include a component that uses recycled water as a potable water supply.

Ralph Dibisch

- NA_DibiR-1 This comment in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process. The regulatory framework related to public versus private ownership of desalination facilities is discussed in detail in Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.
- NA_DibiR-2 This comment of concern regarding sewage disposal and water reclamation/recycled water is acknowledged. Neither the Moss Landing Project, the North Marina Project, nor Phase 1 of the Regional Project include a component that uses recycled water as a potable water supply.
- NA_DibiR-3 This comment in support of a project that involves Marina Coast Water District and that reduces the amount of water taken from the Carmel River is acknowledged.

Jean Donnelly, 03/02/09

- NA_Donne-1 Comment noted. Please see Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership, for more discussion.
- NA_Donne-2 For discussion of projects' impacts on marine biological resources, see Sections 4.3 and 6.3. For discussion of projects' impacts on air quality, see Sections 4.8 and 6.8, and for discussion of the projects' impacts on greenhouse gases in particular, see Impacts 4.8-5 and 6.8-5.

Nancy Downey, 03/04/09

NA_DownN-1 This comment is in favor of several small locally-owned and operated desalination plants as a project alternative is acknowledged. The CPUC and CalAm have reviewed many alternatives in the course of preparing this project. Section 7.4, History of the Coastal Water Project, and Appendix K discuss the history of the CWP and many of the alternatives that have been considered over time.

CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to a project which would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen significant project impacts. According to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6, an EIR need not consider an alternative whose impact cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. An alternative to the CWP that would involve several small desalination plants owned by various local bodies is considered outside the scope of a reasonable range of alternatives as defined by CEQA.

The CPUC has aimed throughout the lifetime of the CWP, to find a solution to the needed water supply that addresses the region as a whole. One of the objectives of the projects, as stated in the EIR, is to “explore...possibilities,” and CPUC worked with the group Water for Monterey County to present the Regional Project, an alternative that includes the additional objective to “maximize funding opportunities through regional cooperation.” Please refer to Section 5.1.1, Project Overview and Background, and Section 5.1.4, Regional Project Overview for discussion of the Regional Project and related stakeholder efforts to craft a regional solution to the CWP.

NA_DownN-2 Conservation strategies are included in all alternatives for the CWP including the Moss Landing, North Marina, and Regional Projects. Please see Master Response 13.14, Unaccounted-for Water and Conservation, for a discussion of CalAm’s conservation measures.

NA_DownN-3 This comment expressing concern about the format of the public participation meetings for the EIR is acknowledged. CEQA does not require the public meetings include group question-and-answer sessions, and the CPUC opted to provide many staff at the meetings to answer the public’s questions individually in a more personalized manner.

Wayne and Libby Downey, 03/04/09

NA_DownW-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

William Estes, Axiom Engineers

NA_Estes-1 This comment in support of a diversified, lower-cost alternative that uses less energy is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 5.11, Project Overview and Background, and 5.1.4, Regional Project Overview, for a discussion regarding the attempts made by the CPUC and other stakeholders to create a regional solution for the CWP. The proposed Regional Project is also described in Chapter 5.

Douglas Fay, 04/12/09

NA_Fay-1 This comment in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

NA_Fay-2 This comment expresses concern regarding the Salinas Valley Water Project, an existing project that has undergone its own CEQA review and is currently under construction. The comment is acknowledged.

NA_Fay-3 This comment in favor of the use of the National Refractories site in conjunction with aquaculture and “green” operations is acknowledged.

The analysis of the National Refractories sites and infrastructure as possible alternatives to portions of the project is based on the most recent information submitted by Poseidon Resources Corporation to the EIR’s preparers (see Section 7.5.1.2, National Refractories Site at Moss Landing, 7.5.2.2 Open Water Intake System at National Refractories, and 7.5.3.2, Existing Outfall at National Refractories).

The CPUC and CalAm have reviewed many alternatives in the course of preparing this project. Section 7.4, History of the Coastal Water Project and Appendix K in the EIR discuss the history of the CWP and many of the alternatives that have been considered over time.

CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to a project which would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen significant project impacts. According to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6, an EIR need not consider an alternative whose impact cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. An alternative to the CWP that would involve aquaculture is considered outside the scope of a reasonable range of alternatives as described by CEQA.

NA_Fay-4 Artificial reef construction and monitoring have previously been used to mitigate losses of organisms from areas with rocky reefs due to entrainment in cooling water intakes. As there is no rocky reef within 13 miles of Moss Landing Harbor, construction of an artificial reef is probably not an appropriate mitigation measure for this project.

NA_Fay-5 Mitigation measures must be reasonably connected to specific project impacts. As the prior loss of species cannot be attributed to the CWP, it is not possible to require mitigation measures that would restore species that were lost before the project began.

NA_Fay-6 As listed under Section 3.1.2, of Page 3-4 in Chapter 3, Project Description, the objectives of the CWP include satisfying CalAm's obligations to meet the requirements of SWRCB Order 95-10 and diversifying and creating a drought-proof water supply along with protecting listed species in the riparian and aquatic habitat below San Clemente Dam. Restoration of Salinas River as stated by the commentator would not serve the stated project objectives, therefore is not discussed in the EIR.

NA_Fay-7 This comment in favor of several attributes of any chosen project is acknowledged. The CPUC and CalAm have reviewed many alternatives in the course of preparing this project. Section 7.4, History of the Coastal Water Project and Appendix K in the EIR discuss the history of the CWP and many of the alternatives that have been considered over time.

CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to a project which would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen significant project impacts. According to the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6, an EIR need not consider an alternative whose impact cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

The CPUC has aimed throughout the lifetime of the CWP, to find a solution to the needed water supply that addresses the region as a whole. One of the objectives of the projects, as stated in the EIR, is to "explore...possibilities," and CPUC worked with the group Water for Monterey County to present the Regional Project, an alternative that includes the additional objective to "maximize funding opportunities through regional cooperation." Please refer to Section 5.1.1, Project Overview and Background, and Section 5.1.4, Regional Project Overview for discussion of the Regional Project and related stakeholder efforts to craft a regional solution to the CWP.

NA_Fay-8 The guidelines that the commentator lists for desalination of ocean waters relate to the regulatory roles of different agencies in the project area such as the California Coastal Commission, California Public Utilities Commission, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the California Department of Public Health that regulate the ocean water quality, discharges from facilities, water supply utilities, and water supply quality. It is not clear if the commentator indicates who should be implementing the "mandatory mitigation measures" such as educational programs or artificial reef development.

The EIR describes the proposed project and the environmental impacts resulting from the implementation of the project and where applicable, lists the mitigation measures that would reduce any significant impacts to less than significant levels. The mitigation measures (e.g., monitoring of the discharge from the outfall) would

be implemented by the project applicant as they relate to the project components discussed in the EIR.

NA_Fay-9 This comment expressing project preference is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Gwendolyn Field, 03/04/09

NA_Field-1 Comment noted. Please see Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership, for more discussion.

Manuel and Janine Fierro, 04/09/09

NA_Fierr-1 This comment in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Manuel G. Fierro, 03/04/09

NA_Fier2-1 Public participation hearings were held by the Administrative Law Judge Angela Minkin and Commissioner John Bohn, on July 13 and 14 (rather than June 8-12) in Monterey and Seaside. (See the following web page for more details:
<http://www.dra.ca.gov/DRA/h20/hot/coastalwaterproject.htm>.)

NA_Fier2-1 This comment expresses concern about the format of the public meetings on the DEIR; the comment is acknowledged. CEQA does not require public meetings on the DEIR, but holding public meetings is encouraged. The CPUC chose a format for the purpose of reviewing the DEIR and receiving public comment that included a staff presentation and the provision of staff to collect and individually answer the public's questions in a more personalized manner.

Manuel Fierro, 03/02/09

NA_Fier3-1 The comment asks about Monterey County Health Code Section 10.72 which requires a desalination plant to be owned and operated by a public entity. Please see Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership. Please also see Master Response 13.16, Costs, for discussion regarding project funding.

Manuel Fierro, 03/02/09

NA_Fier4-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Manuel Fierro, 03/02/09

NA_Fier5-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Stanley Nelson French, Jr., 03/27/09

NA_Frenc-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Denyse and Robert Frischmuth, 03/31/09

NA_Frisc-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Gerald T. Grady, Jr., 03/27/09

NA_Grady-1 This comment in support of Phase 1 and 2 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Robert Greenwood, 04/06/09

NA_Green-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

O. Hagar, 03/05/09

NA_Hagar-1 This comment, which appears to be in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Karen R. Harris, 03/03/09

NA_Harri-1 Please see response to comment L_MRWPCA-6c as well as Master Response 13.15, Seaside Basin Groundwater Replenishment Project.

J.E. Hicks

NA_Hicks-1 This comment in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process. The regulatory framework related to public versus private ownership of desalination facilities is discussed in detail in Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.

Christian W. Holster, 03/04/09

NA_Holst-1 This comment in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process. The regulatory framework related to public versus private ownership of desalination facilities is discussed in detail in Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.

Barbara Joachim, 04/15/09

NA_Joach-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Judy Karas, 03/29/09

NA_Karas-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

NA_Karas-2 See Master Response 13.12, Public Versus Private Ownership.

Judy Karas

NA_Karas2-1 This comment regarding litter is acknowledged.

Christopher Kretchmer

NA_Kretc-1 This comment in support of swift action is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Michelle Long

NA_Long-1 Comment noted. Please refer to the Master Response 13.15, Seaside Basin Groundwater Replenishment Project. The desalination project is primarily an urban water supply project. The project applicants (e.g., local agencies) are in the process of exploring opportunities to apply for federal funding, as applicable.

Jonathan Paul Lord, 03/19/2009

NA_Lord-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Rodger Maher, 02/01/2009

NA_Maher-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Thomas P. McCann, 03/27/2009

NA_McCan-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Mark McDonald

NA_McDon-1 This comment in support of the desalination plant is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Rex K. McIntosh, 04/02/09

- NA_McInt-1 We agree that the CWP project would be located within an area that is biologically very significant. It is for that reason that rigorous mitigation measures have been specified.
- NA_MacInt-2 We agree with the comment that larval stages may be more sensitive to altered ambient conditions than are adult stages of marine organisms. Some larval stages, such as for sea urchins and mussels, have been developed for toxicity testing and these are among the suite of toxicity tests routinely required by regulatory agencies for all discharges into marine waters.
- Regarding the potential build-up of salts in the Monterey Submarine Canyon, please see the response to the following comment (NA_McInt-03).
- NA_McInt-3 It is highly unlikely that the ambient salinity of Elkhorn Slough and Monterey Submarine Canyon will be altered. The combined discharge volume from coastal rivers is many orders of magnitude greater than that proposed for the CWP and, while there is evidence that the salinities of world oceans are changing in response to climate change, there has been no detectable change in open coastal salinities associated with river discharges.
- NA_McInt-4 As stated for the previous comment, it is highly unlikely that there will be any measurable effect of the brine discharges on regional salinities. Based upon an analysis of discharges of freshwater through the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (data available from <http://www.iep.ca.gov/dayflow/output/index.html> [IEP, 2009]), from the 1955 water year through the 2008 water year, the overall average has been 33,996 cubic feet per second, which converts to 21,971 MGD. Consequently, 20 additional desalination projects with discharges of 10 million gallons per day from each would equal <1% of the average daily discharge of freshwater from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta through the Golden Gate. As there has been no detectable freshening of coastal waters due to the river discharges, no detectable salting of coastal waters due to the brine discharges is anticipated.
- NA_McInt-5 This comment in support of long-term planning, extensive mitigation, and reclaiming wastewater is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

S. McStretta, 03/02/09

NA_McStr-1 Comment noted. Please also see Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.

Jane L. Miller, 03/18/09

NA_Mille-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

John H. Mitchell, Jr.

NA_Mitch-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Darly Moss Worth, 03/27/09

NA_MossW-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Hebard Olsen, 03/02/09

NA_Olsen-1 Please see Master Response 13.16, Costs.

Hebard Olsen, 03/02/09

NA_Olsen2-1 This comment expresses concern regarding the extent of public participation in the public meetings, and the comment is acknowledged. Please also see response to comment G_HOPE-1b.

Hebard Olsen, 03/02/09

NA_Olsen3-1 Comments submitted during the comment period are available online at <http://www.cwp-eir.com/docs.html>.

NA_Olsen3-2 This comment expresses concern about the format of the public participation meetings for the DEIR, and the comment is acknowledged. The commenter is first referred to CEQA Section 15087(i) which states that “Public hearings are encouraged, but are not required as an element of the CEQA process.” Please also see response to comment G_HOPE-1b.

Larry Parrish

- NA_Parri-1 This comment expressing concern about the format of the public participation meetings for the DEIR is acknowledged. The public meetings held during the review period for the DEIR provided a forum for public comment both in their solicitation of the written comments (via comment forms distributed and collected) and their solicitation of oral comments at the various resource area tables stationed around the room. CEQA does not require that public meetings include group question-and-answer sessions, and the CPUC opted to provide many staff at the meetings to answer the public's questions individually in a more personalized manner. Please also see response to comment G_HOPE-1b.
- NA_Parri-2 Please see Master Response 13.16, Costs.
- NA_Parri-3 This comment in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process. The regulatory framework related to public versus private ownership of desalination facilities is discussed in detail in Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.
- NA_Parri-4 This comment expressing concern regarding the cost of the CWP to ratepayers and ownership of the CWP by CalAm is acknowledged. Please see Master Responses 13.16, Costs, and 13.12, Public Versus Private Ownership.
- NA_Parri-5 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.
- NA_Parri-6 The commenter believes that the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWDM) seawater desalination project (95-10 Project) should be discussed in the CWP EIR as a potential water supply option. The commenter is referred to Master Response 13.13, Monterey Peninsula Water Management District 95-10 Project for an explanation of the 95-10 project, its current status, and why it was not considered as a viable project alternative. However, as discussed in response to comment L_MPWMD-32, the project has been added to the cumulative impacts chapter (see Table 9-1) and has been considered in the cumulative impacts analysis.

Nancy Parsons, 03/15/09

NA_Parso-1 This comment in support of the North Marina Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

V. Pedrusa, 03/04/09

NA_Pedru-1 Please see Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.

NA_Pedru-2 This comment in support of the “Marina Coast” “REPROG” [sic] project (presumably referring to the Regional Project) is acknowledged. Please refer to sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Dean Provence, 03/02/09

NA_Prove-1 Please see Master Response 13.3, The Use of this Environmental Impact Report.

NA_Prove-2 The discussion of the “No-Project” Alternative, in Section 7.6.2.1, addresses the implications of failing to implement the Coastal Water Project or another action alternative.

NA_Prove-3 This comment in support of a project that allows for future growth is acknowledged.

Carlos Quintana, 03/02/09

- NA_Quint-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.
- NA_Quint-2 This comment in support of a dam on the Carmel River is acknowledged. See Master Response 13.9, Alternatives.

George Riley, 03/03/09

NA_Riley-1 The commenter is correct that Table 2-5 (Section 2.4.1) contains errors, and they have been corrected; please refer to the response to comment G_LWV-4.

Paula Riso, 03/27/09

- NA_Riso-1 Comment noted. The regulatory framework related to public versus private ownership of desalination facilities is discussed in detail in Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.
- NA_Riso-2 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Timothy D. Sanders

NA_Sande-1 Subsequent to the release of the Draft EIR, additional feasible mitigation has been identified that would reduce the potentially significant impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions and the Moss Landing and North Marina Projects to less than significant levels. Please refer to the Master Response 13.8, Greenhouse Gases.

NA_Sande-2 Please see the Master Response 13.7, (Alternative) Energy Sources and Energy Use.

S. Saul

NA_Saul-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

George Schroeder, 03/31/09

NA_Schro-1 See Master Response 13.16, Costs.

NA_Schro-2 This comment in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process, which considers the impact to ratepayers. The regulatory framework related to public versus private ownership of desalination facilities is discussed in detail in Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.

Nancy Selfridge, 03/02/09

- NA_Selfr-1 Please see Master Response 13.12, Public versus private Ownership.
- NA_Selfr-2 This comment expresses concern about the format of the public participation meetings for the EIR, and the comment is acknowledged. The commenter is first referred to CEQA Section 15087(i) which states that “Public hearings are encouraged, but are not required as an element of the CEQA process.” See also response to comment G_HOPE-1b.
- NA_Selfr-3 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Ryan Shaw, 04/09/09

NA_Shaw-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

Doxey Sheldon, DMD, 02/01/09

NA_Sheld-1 This comment in support of the desalination and the CWP is acknowledged.

Eleanor Skinner, 03/02/09

NA_Skinn-1 This comment in support of Phase 2 of the Regional Project and a growth-accommodating project is acknowledged. For discussion of the CWP's potential impacts regarding growth, please see Chapter 8, Growth Inducement Potential and Secondary Effects of Growth.

NA_Skinn-2 This comment in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process. The regulatory framework related to public versus private ownership of desalination facilities is discussed in detail in Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.

Henry H. Smith, 04/14/09

NA_Smith-1 Comment noted

NA_Smith-2 This comment in support of the North Marina Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

NA_Smith-3 The commenter states that the new water supply must be required to replace illegal pumping from the Carmel River aquifer and that an overhaul of operations must be put in practice to ensure the promised benefit of a drought proof water supply.

The primary purpose of the proposed Project and alternatives evaluated in the EIR is to provide replacement supply in order to bring CalAm into compliance with Order 95-10 and the Seaside Basin Decision -- i.e., to enable CalAm to cease its unlawful diversions from both systems. This comment may refer to practice during the interim period since Order 95-10 was issued, as a replacement supply has been sought, where implementation of components of replacement supply (such as MPWMD's Phase 1 ASR project) has not translated into a reduction of CalAm's interim diversions in excess of 3,376 afy. (This situation is described in the SWRCB's July 27, 2009 Draft Cease and Desist Order.) However, as noted, the project objectives are to replace supplies currently provided through diversions of the Carmel River and the Seaside Groundwater Basin. The EIR analyzes the impacts of the Project and a reasonable range of alternatives. The commenter's support for a drought-proof replacement supply is noted.

NA_Smith-4 The commenter's recommendation that CalAm use desalinated water from the new plant during dry months and Carmel River water only during wet months as a way to provide the best year-round conditions for the river is noted. The purpose of the EIR is to analyze the environmental impacts of the CWP and its alternatives, which would replace the amount of water currently diverted in excess to CalAm's legal right to 3,376 afy of Carmel River system water. The purpose of the EIR is not to evaluate how or when CalAm uses the water to which it has a legal right pursuant to Order 95-10. Therefore, the topic addressed in this comment is outside the scope of the EIR. Please refer also to the response to F_NOAA-11.

Hank Smith, 03/04/09

NA_Smith2-1 Please see response to comment F_NOAA-11.

E.L. Tucker, 03/04/09

- NA_Tucke-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.
- NA_Tucke-2 Comment noted. The comment asserts that a new water district should be created. Case law discussed in Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership demonstrates the challenges associated with creating a separate service district to implement a desalination system.

James E. Tynan, 03/03/09

NA_Tynan-1 This comment in support of the Moss Landing site is acknowledged. Please refer to sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

NA_Tynan-2 This comment in support of vertical wells is acknowledged. Please refer to sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

NA_Tynan-3 This comment expressing discontent with the option of inland brackish wells is acknowledged. Please refer to sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

NA_Tynan-4 The comment expresses concern over the injection of recycled water into the Salinas Valley Groundwater basin. There is no component in any of the projects analyzed in the EIR that includes injecting recycled water into the Salinas basin.

Bill Weigle, 04/11/09

- NA_Weigl-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.
- NA_Weigl-2 Comment noted. The groundwater replenishment project needs to be developed further before it can be included in Phase 1. Please refer to Master Response 13.15, Seaside Basin Groundwater Replenishment Project.

Ron Weitzman, 02/02/09

NA_Weitz-1 This comment in favor of the use of the National Refractories site is acknowledged. The analysis in the EIR of the National Refractories sites and infrastructure as possible alternatives to the portions of the project is based on the most recent information submitted by Poseidon Resources Corporation to the EIR's preparers (see Section 7.5.1.2, National Refractories site at Moss Landing; Section 7.5.2.2, Open Water Intake System at National Refractories; and Section 7.5.3.2, Existing Outfall at National Refractories). The CPUC and CalAm have reviewed many alternatives in the course of preparing this project. Section 7.4, History of the Coastal Water Project, and Appendix K discuss the history of the CWP and many of the alternatives that have been considered over time. See Master Response 13.9, Alternatives, for more detail.

Roelof Wijbrandus, 03/02/09

- NA_Wijbr-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.
- NA_Wijbr-2 This comment suggesting the construction of rainwater catch basins, in order to catch rainwater to later be pumped into the Seaside Groundwater Basin, is acknowledged. Plan B, the predecessor to the CWP, explored the concept of stormwater collection and use, and the results of that process are described in EIR Appendix K.
- NA_Wijbr-3 Please see Master Response 13.16, Costs.
- NA_Wijbr-4 Public participation hearings were held by Administrative Law Judge Angela Minkin and Commissioner John Bohn, on July 13 and 14 (rather than June 8-12) in Monterey and Seaside. (See the following web page for more details: <http://www.dra.ca.gov/DRA/h20/hot/coastalwaterproject.htm>.)

Michael Wildgoose, 03/21/09

NA_Wildg-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

NA_Wildg-2 Comment noted. Concerns related to challenges associated with private ownership of desalination facilities are addressed in the regulatory framework described detail in Master Response 13.12, Public versus Private Ownership.

D.C. Willetts, 03/06/09

NA_WilleD-1 Comment noted. See Chapter 2, Water Demand and Supplies, for discussion of the many jurisdictions that were taken into account during the planning of the CWP.

Susan Willey, 09/03/09

NA_WilleS-1 This comment in support of Phases 1 and 2 of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process. For discussion of the CWP's potential impacts regarding growth, please see Chapter 8, Growth Inducement Potential and Secondary Effects of Growth.

Jason Williams

NA_Willi-1 Comment noted. See Chapter 2, Water Demand and Supply, for discussion of the anticipated future use of Carmel River as a water supply.

Norman Yassany, 03/28/09

NA_Yassa-1 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

NA_Yassa-2 Comment noted. The groundwater replenishment project was evaluated in the DEIR at a program level and needs to be developed further before it can be included in Phase 1. Please refer to the Master Response 13.15, Seaside Basin Groundwater Replenishment Project.

NA_Yassa-3 This comment in support of the Regional Project is acknowledged. Please refer to Sections 1.4.3, Alternative Selection and the Proposed Decision, and 1.4.4, A Final CPUC Decision, for a description of the CWP decision-making process.

References

Interagency Ecological Program (IEP), <http://www.iep.ca.gov/dayflow/output/index.html>,
accessed June 24, 2009.