

## Section 14.7 Public Meetings



## Public Meeting Comments, March 2009

- PubMtg-1 Comment noted.
- PubMtg-2 Chapter 7 includes a brief discussion of the potential impacts of the "No-Project Alternative", a scenario in which no water supply solution is implemented. See Chapter 8, Growth-Inducement Potential and Secondary Effects of Growth, for discussion of the CWP's potential impacts on growth.
- PubMtg-3 Please see Master Response 13.9, Alternatives.
- PubMtg-4 As marine mammals are very mobile, it is highly unlikely that the brine discharges would have any direct effects on them. Moreover, the best way to ensure that no food web-related impacts to marine mammals occur is to protect invertebrates by limiting the salinity and contaminant concentrations in brine discharges, for which the Draft EIR requires mitigation, where necessary.
- Please refer to Master Response 13.8, Greenhouse Gases, for information related to the Final EIR analysis of greenhouse gas emissions, including mitigation that has been identified that would reduce the potentially significant greenhouse gas impact to a level that would be less than significant.
- PubMtg-5 Section 7.4 in the alternatives chapter discusses past efforts to find a viable water supply project. See Appendix K for more detail on analysis of alternatives.
- PubMtg-6 This comment expressing an interest in socioeconomic analysis of the proposed project is acknowledged. CEQA does not require analysis of the socioeconomic impacts of a project unless they lead to an environmental effect. Effects analyzed under CEQA must be related to a physical change (CEQA Guidelines Section 15358(b)).
- PubMtg-7 The commenter is referred to Mitigation Measure 4.12-3a on page 4.12-30 of the Draft EIR, which requires that nighttime lighting be shielded or directed away from adjacent areas.
- PubMtg-8 The Executive Summary of both the DEIR and the FEIR includes a schedule that shows the expected timelines for all permitting, design, and implementation aspects of the project. The schedule included in the FEIR as Figure EW-1, does in fact show construction happening concurrently in multiple areas.
- PubMtg-9 Figure 3-15 shows the Terminal Reservoir in relation to local streets (including General Jim Moore Boulevard and Hilby Avenue), Figure 3-4e shows the Terminal Reservoir in relation to area municipalities. Terminal Reservoir is currently expected to be located northeast of the intersection of General Jim Moore Boulevard and Hilby Avenue, in the City of Seaside.

PubMtg-10 As stated in Mitigation Measure 4.7-5 of the EIR (as revised by response to Comment G-CalAm-242), project contractor(s) will provide flaggers in school areas at the start and end of the school day if and when pipeline installation would occur at designated school zones.

PubMtg-11 Construction staging areas for the pipeline installation would depend upon the contractor and subcontractors, and for the most part are not yet known. Staging areas for all other facilities are expected to be located immediately adjacent to the facility site or in a nearby unused or underused lot.

Homeowners and businesses located close to a proposed project location can expect to be notified of construction activities and staging areas as the construction phase of the CWP draws closer.

PubMtg-12 It is assumed the commenter is asking about parking demand for employees under long-term project operations and maintenance (comments about parking impacts during project construction are addressed in the response to Comment PubMtg-13, below). As described in Impact 4.7-8 of the Draft EIR, the number of workers at any one time would be limited (fewer than ten full-time workers at the desalination plant, and one or two workers performing maintenance activities). Increased parking demand generated by those workers is considered to be less than significant, as parking will be provided at the facilities, or within roadway shoulders or rights-of-way for maintenance purposes.

PubMtg-13 As described in Impact 4.7-3 of the Draft EIR, the project would create a temporary parking demand for construction workers and construction vehicles as crews move along the project corridor as pipes are installed, and during work on stationary facility locations. For the stationary facility locations, the worksites would generally have sufficient onsite space to accommodate a demand for up to about 88 parking spaces, and the impact would be less than significant. Each crew installing pipeline would require up to about 85 parking spaces. Given the proposed rate of construction during pipeline installation, impacts to parking at any one location would be relatively brief, but could reduce the parking capacity for people currently using the displaced spaces, creating a potentially significant impact tied to the extra driving required as the displaced parkers look for alternative parking spaces. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-3 would reduce the potential impact to a less-than-significant level by requiring that project contractor(s) identify locations that provide sufficient parking capacity to accommodate parking demand by construction workers (within the construction zone or, if needed, at a nearby location with transport [e.g. shuttle vans] provided between the parking location and the worksite).

PubMtg-14 For analysis of the potential noise impacts on existing sensitive receptors that would be associated with construction and operation of the proposed ASR wells, please refer to the Final EIR discussions under Impacts 4.9-1 and 4.9-2.

- PubMtg-15 These comments in support of the Regional Project are 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.
- PubMtg-16 This comment in support of the MRWPCA's groundwater replenishment program 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. Please also see Master Response 13.15, Seaside Basin Groundwater Replenishment Project, for a discussion of that potential water supply.
- PubMtg-17 The commenter expressed concern for the extraction of water from the Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. Please refer to Master Response 13.6, Project Effects on Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin.
- PubMtg-18 Please refer to the discussion of the Sand City desalination facility in the response to comment G\_LWV-04.
- PubMtg-19 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.
- PubMtg-20 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.
- PubMtg-21 This comment in support of the MRWPCA groundwater replenishment program, stormwater runoff programs, and the MPWMD desalination plant is acknowledged. The first and second of these projects are discussed in Chapter 5. The MRWPCA groundwater replenishment program is further discussed in Master Response 13.15, Seaside Basin Groundwater Replenishment Program. The MPWMD desalination plant is discussed in the Master Response 13.13, Regarding Monterey Peninsula Water Management District 95-10 Project.
- PubMtg-22 This comment of congratulations is acknowledged.
- PubMtg-23 An eastern distribution pipeline to Prunedale would not explicitly be part of the Phase 2 Regional project, and such a pipeline has not been evaluated in the Coastal Water Project DEIR. An expansion of the CSIP would result in reduced groundwater pumping by agriculture, which would in turn provide for a high quality low cost source of domestic groundwater supply for users overlying the Salinas Valley. A project that might include a distribution pipeline to the Prunedale area would likely be sponsored by MCWRA.

- PubMtg-24 The North Monterey County area is outside the CalAm service area. The water needs for North County have been provided to the EIR team by MCWRA, and are presented in the DEIR in Table 2-6. Phase 2 of the Regional project includes these demands for North County. As noted in Section 5.3 of the DEIR, “The second phase of the Regional Project would include some combination of the following components to provide 10,400 afy of anticipated water needs for northern Monterey County.”
- PubMtg-25 A discussion of the potential for growth-inducing impacts related to Phase 2 of the Regional Project is included in Chapter 8, Growth-Inducement Potential and Secondary Effects of Growth. Phase 2 of the Regional Project is expected to remove an impediment to growth and cause a significant and unavoidable impact, as acknowledged in Subsection 8.3.2.1.
- PubMtg-26 The NPDES permit held by Dynegy (owner and operator of the MLPP) allows for a maximum cooling water flow (discharge) of 1,226 million gallons per day (mgd) at the MLPP (RWQCB, 2000). The actual flow rate varies. Please see Appendix C of the EIR for detailed data regarding actual flow rates.
- PubMtg-27 This comment in support of the Moss Landing 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.
- PubMtg-28 Comment noted.
- PubMtg-29 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.
- PubMtg-30 The David Avenue Reservoir is in need of structural restoration prior to it being suitable for water storage. Also, the City of Pacific Grove completed a Stormwater Recycling Facility Feasibility Study and concluded that the David Avenue Reservoir is suitable and feasible for the storage of recycled water. See response to comment L\_CiPG2-1.
- PubMtg-31 The intake for the North Marina project will draw seawater through more than 200 feet of sand into slant-drilled wells below the sea floor. Consequently, the seawater will receive extensive filtration before it reaches the desalination plant. Any remaining impurities will be removed by the pretreatment filtration and reverse osmosis process.
- PubMtg-32 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

- PubMtg-33 This comment expressing disapproval of slant wells is acknowledged
- PubMtg-34 This comment expressing disapproval of inland brackish wells is acknowledged
- PubMtg-35 This comment expressing disapproval of injection of recycled water into the Salinas Valley Aquifer is acknowledged. The EIR does not include any such component.
- PubMtg-36 The comment suggests that CalAm's legal water right of 3,376 afy recognized in Order 95-10 should only be diverted from the Carmel River during the wet winter months in order to protect summer flows for the steelhead. Please refer to the response to comment F\_NOAA-11 for a discussion of existing water rights and associated diversion seasons.
- PubMtg-37 Comment noted. See Chapter 2 for discussion of water demand and supply in Monterey County.
- PubMtg-38 The Moss Landing and North Marina projects do not provide any water to North County. North County is not served by CalAm. Cal Am filed an application with the CPUC to build, own and operate the Coastal Water Project. The objectives of the CWP are presented in DEIR Section 3.1.2, and include the need to satisfy CalAm's obligations to meet the requirements of SWRCB order 95-10 and Seaside Basin Adjudication. If North County is to be served, the lead should be coming from MCWRA and the framework for providing North County is embodied in the Phase 2 Regional Project. See response to comment PubMtg-24.
- PubMtg-39 The commenter is correct that Table 2-5 (Chapter 2, Section 2.4.1, DEIR p. 2-14) contains errors; please refer to the response to Comment G\_LWV-4.
- PubMtg-40 As stated in DEIR Table 4.10-2, Project Site Locations and Land Use Planning Designations, the existing use and ownership of the land proposed for the Terminal Reservoir and the ASR wells are summarized. (Please refer also to Table 5-6 in the DEIR for a list of required permits).The site proposed for the Terminal Reservoir has been formally annexed by the City of Seaside from the former Fort Ord. Similarly, the ASR injection/ extraction well study area is located adjacent to existing MPWMD wells on land under City of Seaside jurisdiction. Per comment L\_CiSea-9, Table 4.10-2 has been edited to include a summary of the permits and entitlements that would be required for implementation of the project at the proposed sites. Please refer to response to comment L\_CiSea-9 for the text clarifications added to Table 4.10-2. Also, refer to the discussion of local agency jurisdiction and role in the permitting process is defined in the Master Response 13.10, Local Agencies' Authority and Roles. Development of both the Terminal Reservoir and ASR well sites, the following permits and entitlements would be required from the City of Seaside:

- Development permit, pursuant to City of Seaside Municipal Code Section 15.05;
- Right of entry/easement;
- Encroachment permit for all construction activities located within the public right-of-way and/or requiring access across a public right-of-way in the City of Seaside; and/or
- Review and approval by the City of Seaside's Board of Architectural Review for all above-ground permanent structures and facilities.

PubMtg-41 The comment is correct that portions of the proposed project would be located on former Fort Ord land that has been formally annexed by the City of Seaside. Permitting and approvals are within the authority and responsibility of the local jurisdiction, the City of Seaside. Issues associated with permitting would be addressed at a local level and require coordination between the project applicant and the City of Seaside. The project will comply with all applicable land use policies and conform to permit requirements. Please refer to responses to comments L\_CiSea-9, PubMtg-39, and the Master Response 13.10, Local Agencies' Authority and Roles.

PubMtg-42 Comment acknowledged. Please refer to responses to comments L\_CiSea-9, PubMtg-39, PubMtg-40, and Master Response 13.10, Local Agencies' Authority and Roles. The site proposed for the ASR wells was recently formally annexed by the City of Seaside from the former Fort Ord. The EIR identifies an ASR well "study area" which allows for flexibility in exact well placement. Portions of the study area are easements, privately owned, or City of Seaside land. CalAm would own the ASR facilities and would be responsible for land acquisition, if required, as well as application and acquisition of development, encroachment, and other permits required in City of Seaside jurisdiction.

PubMtg-43 As stated in subsection 9.4.1.7 of Chapter 9, Cumulative Impacts, of the Draft EIR, the project sponsor will coordinate the construction activities with local agencies to strategize and implement measures such as using flaggers during key construction periods, designating alternate haul routes, and providing outreach and community noticing to minimize any potential cumulative traffic impacts.

PubMtg-44 The commenter requests that there be coordination with the City of Seaside Fire Department on Hilby Avenue and that impacts on fire department response time be mitigated. Impact 4.7-5 in Draft EIR Section 4.7, Traffic and Circulation, addresses potential impacts of pipeline construction on emergency services, including fire departments. Mitigation Measure 4.7-5 requires coordination with police and fire stations, among others, as requested in this comment, and other measures to reduce impacts on emergency vehicles and general traffic. In conjunction with Mitigation Measure 4.7-1, which requires implementation of a Traffic Control and Safety

Assurance Plan, Mitigation Measure 4.7-5 would reduce project impacts on emergency vehicles to a less-than-significant level.

- PubMtg-45 See response to Comment L\_CiSea-2 regarding submittal of a Traffic Control and Safety Assurance Plan to the City of Seaside as part of the road encroachment permit process. The issue of notification about construction activities, including parking restrictions that could be needed, will be addressed as part of Traffic Control and Safety Assurance Plan.
- PubMtg-46 Comment noted. Please refer to the Master Response 13.15, Seaside Groundwater Replenishment Project.
- PubMtg-47 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.
- PubMtg-48 Comment noted. Please see the Master Response 13.15, Seaside Basin Groundwater Replenishment Program.
- PubMtg-49 Comments in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project are acknowledged. Please refer to EIR 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. Please refer also to Master Response 13.12, Public Versus Private Ownership.
- PubMtg-50 Comment noted. Please refer to Master Response 13.12, Public Versus Private Ownership. Please refer also to Master Response 13.10, Local Agencies' Authority and Roles, for an explanation of agreements that would be necessary between CalAm and local agencies if the Regional Project is approved.
- PubMtg-51 Comment noted. Please refer to Master Response 13.12, Public Versus Private Ownership.
- PubMtg-52 Comments in support of Phase 1 of the Regional Project are acknowledged. Please refer to EIR 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. Please refer also to Master Response 13.12, Public Versus Private Ownership.
- PubMtg-53 All comments received during the public comment period for the Draft EIR are posted on the project website and can be accessed at [www.cwp-eir.com/docs.html](http://www.cwp-eir.com/docs.html).
- PubMtg-54 See response to comment G\_HOPE-1b.

- PubMtg-55 Public participation hearings were held by the CPUC Administrative Law Judge Angela Minkin and Commissioner John Bohn on July 13 and 14, 2009 (rescheduled from June 8-12, 2009), in Monterey and Seaside. (See the following web page for more details:  
<http://www.dra.ca.gov/DRA/h20/hot/coastalwaterproject.htm>.)
- PubMtg-56 Comment noted.
- PubMtg-57 Comment noted.
- PubMtg-58 Comment noted.
- PubMtg-59 Comment noted.
- PubMtg-60 Comment noted. See Master Response 13.2, CPUC Authority, for discussion of the CPUC's role in the CWP.
- PubMtg-61 Comment noted.
- PubMtg-62 The CWP's stated objectives include:
- Satisfy CalAm's obligations to meet the requirements of SWRCB Order 95-10; and
  - Protect the Seaside Basin for long-term reliability.
- PubMtg-63 Project costs and financing strategies are not CEQA-relevant topics, but will be considered by the CPUC in their decision-making process. Ordinance 10.72 refers to the ownership of desalination facilities in Monterey County. See Master Response 13.12, Public Versus Private Ownership, for more detail.
- PubMtg-64 See Master Response 13.16, Costs.
- PubMtg-65 See Master Response 13.16, Costs, for discussion regarding project costs. The various types and quantities of water storage are described in Chapter 3, Project Description, and Chapter 5, Regional Project Description.
- PubMtg-66 See Master Response 13.16, Costs.
- PubMtg-67 The hotel in Seaside referenced in the comment is noted in Table 9-1 as Seaside Resort under the projects in the City of Seaside.
- PubMtg-68 The use of brine for sea salt has not been considered. Recovery of sea salt is not an objective of the proposed CWP. Additionally, the brine streams that would result from the proposed desalination plants would include some amount of treatment chemicals and source water quality-contaminants, as discussed under Impact 4.1-4, which would make the brine stream unattractive as sources of sea salt.

## References

Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast (RWQCB), *Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. 00-041 NPDES No. CA0006254 for Duke Energy North America Moss Landing Power Plant*, 2000.