

The Water for Monterey County Coalition

Dedicated to Identifying and Supporting an Affordable, Sustainable Water Supply Solution

Regional water supply program achieving sustainability
through multi-agency cooperation with responsible water development

Draft Meeting Notes, Sixteenth Meeting

August 6, 2008

Location: MBEST Center, 3180 Imjin Road, Marina, CA 93933
Phone at the center is: 831.582.1020

Table of Contents

Overview of Goals for Meeting #16 Steve Kasower, UCSC Center for Integrated Water Research	1
Review of the Notes from Meeting #15	1
Status Update on CPUC's EIR for the Coastal Water Project Eric Zigas, ESA Water representing the CPUC	1
Status Update: Strategic Implementation Plan Funding Steve Kasower, Center for Integrated Water Research, UCSC	4
Status Update: Public Information and Involvement Work Group Catherine Borrowman, Center for Integrated Water Research, UCSC	4
New Business/Old Business/Parking Lot Issues/Action Items	5
Discussion of Next Meeting Date, Agenda (Proposed for September 3, 2008)	5
Meeting Attendees	6

Overview of Goals for Meeting #16

Meeting #16 (August 6, 2008)

- Coastal Water Project EIR Status Update
- Funding the Strategic Implementation Plan
- Public Information and Involvement Work Group Update on Progress

Materials provided at the meeting included the following:

"Meeting #16 Agenda, 8-6-08"

"Draft Meeting #15 Notes v2"

"Coastal Water Project: Project Comparison" a matrix identifying the differences and similarities between the Moss Landing, North Marina, and Regional Projects.

Four maps showing an aerial view sketch of the three projects and other alternatives.

Review of Notes from Meeting #15

- Page 2, 7th bullet: “A question was raised about whether the State Water Resources Control Board members involved in the draft Cease and Desist Order hearing are being informed about the progress being made on the regional program. . .” A participant asked if there is any news about whether the draft Cease and Desist Order will be implemented, or made final. Some community members think it will be enforced and would therefore precipitate serious consequences for the area.
 - The Board members have kept themselves out of touch.
 - There are ongoing discussions but there has been no final decision about how things will be addressed. There are two days of hearings scheduled for August 7 & 8 in Sacramento. The MPWMD will hopefully be done testifying August 7th at some point, then the rebuttal phase of the hearing will begin. Then it is up to the SWRCB to issue a decision. There is no way of knowing the outcome until the decision has been made.
 - Is there a target for when the decision would be made, say in two months? The SWRCB will announce by the end of the year when they first issued the notice.
 - Is there a subpoena process when the SWRCB issues a decision? The SWRCB could be asked to reconsider its decision, and if a person is not satisfied with that then the issue would be appealed through the Superior Court System.
 - What has happened so far? The draft CDO was issued and evidentiary hearings were scheduled to either adopt it as drafted or modify it. In June, there were two days of hearings on the liability phase and then three days of hearings in July on the next phase, i.e. protecting the river and mitigations. In August, MPWMD is giving its testimony and will be cross-examined, then Cal Am takes the stand. Then it is likely there will be additional days scheduled in September for rebuttal testimony. Once the evidentiary hearings conclude, normally there would be a 30-day period for the attorneys to prepare their final briefs. Based on that a decision could be made or a settlement could be reached.
 - A member of the public asked for someone to seek legislative relief from the draft CDO from elected officials at the state level.

Status Update on CPUC's EIR for the Coastal Water Project

Eric Zigas, Environmental Science Associates, representing the CPUC Energy Division

Presentation:

- Mr. Zigas introduced four maps on the wall and four sets of those maps for table top. He referred to a matrix titled “Coastal Water Project: Project Comparison” which was circulated in the room with information about the proposals for Moss Landing, North Marina, the Regional Project, and a number of alternatives. Go to <http://ciwr.ucsc.edu/monterey/meetings/> to locate these materials under the August 6th date.
- Two projects are being presented at an equal level of detail in the EIR, the Moss Landing Desalination Plant and the North Marina Desalination Plant. The Regional Project is also presented and discussed. At the end of the EIR work there will be a choice to be made and a project to be defined for construction.

Description of the Proposed CWP Moss Landing Plant

- Cal-Am applied for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to build, own, and operate the Coastal Water Project, a 10 MGD desalination plant sited behind the existing Moss Landing Power Plant (MLPP).
- The MLPP cooling water return (Northern intake only) will be sourced for the desalination project from the Disengaging Basin. The source water pipeline would have a 54-inch diameter, and run 8,000 ft along Dolan Road.
- Brine flow pipeline concept is to blend about 12 MGD with the 1.2 billion gallons per day leaving the power plant as a result of its operations. The pipeline would be 24-inch diameter, 8,000 ft along Dolan Road and join the MLPP disengaging basin. The brine would be mixed with cooling plant water and exit via the MLPP outfall (existing).

- The MLPP outfall's 2 12ft pipes extend 1,000 ft off shore, rest at a total depth of 40 ft, and are upward looking, ending at 20' below the surface. About 12 MGD would be added to the stream of cooling plant water.
- The desalinated water would then run along roads and rights of way, aligned with railroad tracks through Castroville, with pick up on the TAMC right of way and continue down to cross Reservation Rd.
 - The EIR team has made a distinction between the otherwise continuous pipeline (i.e. transmission main) from the plant, breaking it into northern and southern sections for purposes of discussion and comparison with the CWP alternatives.
 - The northern section will be used for product water conveyance south, will have a 30-inch diameter and run 9.4 miles.
 - The southern section will be a new 30-inch pipeline from North Marina to Terminal Reservoir and run 8.09 miles to the Terminal Reservoir's new storage tanks.
- The two tanks would be 1.5 MG reservoirs above ground, 30 ft tall and 120 ft. in diameter each. The desalinated and conveyed water would be stored in the Terminal Reservoir. The Terminal Reservoir would also be at the receiving point for the Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) water.
- The Monterey Peninsula Water Management District in partnership with Cal-Am has already implemented a 920 AF on average of ASR, the CWP calls for 13,000 AF of ASR. Two new ASR wells are planned. In order to do this there will be upgrades to the Segunda Pipeline, and a new pipeline in parallel to existing pipeline from Segunda Reservoir to the existing Crest Tank, working its way up through Tapy Flats. The same pipeline will be used when the water is delivered to the Cal Am system for distribution around the service area.

Description of the Proposed CWP North Marina Plant

At the beginning of the project the EIR team consulted many water and regulatory agencies recommending the development of an alternative with subsurface intakes as a comparison against the open water intakes at Moss Landing. The project that took shape is a desalination plant, which would be located in North Marina.

- A 200-acre parcel outside the fence line of the MRWPCA has been identified for its location.
- The intake water would come from a series of slant wells under the beach at Reservation Road. There would be 6 wells (750' length, 170' below MSL, i.e. ground surface) drilled at a 20-degree angle off horizontal and 6 well pumps. The maximum intake flow would be about 3,000 gallons per minute, per well.
- The source water pipeline would be 36-inch diameter, and run approximately 16,000 ft from Reservation Road to Beach Road to the desalination plant location.
- Brine discharge would go into the MRWPCA outfall, about 11 MGD at 66 parts; it is about a 14,000 ft pipeline.
- A pipeline would require an easement to MRWPCA headworks to tie-in the brine to the MRWPCA outfall (existing). The outfall is 1,368 ft long, 95 – 109 ft below MSL, and there are diffuser ports every 8 ft on the pipe, 3.5 ft above sea floor.
- The desalinated water would follow the same corridor used for the source water, then it would join the desalinated water conveyance pipeline at Reservation Road. It would continue down over the Segunda Grade, come around the Peninsula, pick up the TAMC right of way, work its way through Pacific Grove and end up at the Forest Lake tank.
- One of the reasons for this routing of the desalinated water is a set of problems that have been identified with the southern part of the distribution system. Routing the water to the Forest Lake Tank solves a significant unavoidable impact with the Segunda Grade Pipeline.
 - Problem 1: In order to put that pipeline in Montara properties in a road with a steep grade that is loaded with utilities, that road would need to be closed for a period of time that is unacceptable for traffic flow. This impact must be avoided.

- Problem 2: There is also a hydraulic directional flow issue associated with the elevation of the Seaside area pipeline and the Pacific Grove pipeline that Cal Am is working out to obtain proper flow of the water through the areas in both directions.
- The Terminal Reservoir, Crest Tank, Segunda Reservoir, and ASR Facilities (new) would be the same facilities as described above for the CWP Moss Landing plant.

Discussion:

Q: Isn't there an issue with the dispersal of the brine from the North Marina desal plant outfall into the Monterey Bay compared with the Moss Landing outfall. . . i.e. is it as good, equal to, or better than the brine dispersal in the Sanctuary?

A: The EIR team is trying to understand this issue better. The indication from modeling at Moss Landing is that the brine dispersal would be good because of the volume of flow. At the North Marina site by the time the brine comes out of the ports and hits bottom it should be within 10 percent of ambient seawater salinity.

Q: Where will the two underground reservoirs be located?

A: Paul Findley responded stating that the North Marina desal plant clearwell tank(s) of 1MGD size will be located at the plant. There would be two 3 MGD tanks at the Terminal Reservoir. (Mr. Zigas suggested he and Mr. Findley validate the tank sizes since there is a difference in what each of them said.)

Q: How much water would the CWP produce per year?

A: When Cal-Am submitted the application, the amount that was to be produced was 10,430 AF per year from the desalination plant and a total of 13,000 AF from the desal plant plus the ASR. Since then MPWMD has taken a harder look at use, normalized over time, and the project is now trying to supply 12,500 AF.

Q: How much will the North Marina plant cost in comparison to the Moss Landing plant?

A: Mr. Findley responded that the two plants would have approximately the same capital costs: the assumption with the North Marina plant is there would be a significant amount saved from avoiding pretreatment, but the slant wells would use up that savings. There may be some savings from constructing the shorter conveyance pipeline, however this could amount to only 5% of the overall capital cost. This savings may not be realized because if the North Marina desal plant cannot use the MRWPCA outfall because a pipeline would need to be constructed northward to send the brine out the MLPP outfall. The decision has not been made yet nor have any agreements been drawn up between MRWPCA and Cal-Am about the use of the wastewater treatment plant outfall.

Presentation:

Description of the Water for Monterey County Regional Alternative Project

The Water for Monterey County Regional Project took a different approach to solving the water supply needs of customers in Cal-Am's service territory. In this project, Cal-Am is not coming forward to build, own, and operate a desal plant, rather the project has been designed to take advantage of the low hanging fruit, such as maximizing water recycling and saving water from increased conservation efforts. The components of the project are the result of studying water supply needs and opportunities through a regional lens. The project has been designed based on the numbers for each area provided by MPWMD documentation of water demands which are projected for cities within its jurisdiction, as well as water demand projected by entities in Marina, Moss Landing, Castroville, and in unincorporated areas of North Monterey County. RMC's engineering team carefully researched these projected water demands during the initial phase of the development of the regional alternative project.

The proposal's physical impacts reflect the maximization of existing water supply project facilities and the construction of new facilities that would compliment the resulting availability of water. Part of the basis of the regional project is the successful development of water supply projects for Northern Salinas Valley water users that have been affected by seawater intrusion into the Salinas Groundwater Basin. For 50 years Monterey County has been trying to stop seawater intrusion with incremental projects:

- the reservoirs at Nacimiento and San Antonio,

- 30 years of study of recycled water use dating back to the 1970s,
- the implementation of the recycled water project in 1998, and
- the current construction of the Salinas River Diversion Facility which will allow surface water blending with recycled water, instead of using groundwater for blending.

The Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project, together with the Salinas Valley Reclamation Project, made it possible to take some of the growers off groundwater to stop pumping within the coastal area (circled in purple on the map), leaving more groundwater in the ground. The regional project anticipates the expansion of the Castroville Seawater Intrusion Project to supply water to adjacent farms participating in the existing project.

A desalination plant located in North Marina would be supplied by water drawn in two different types of wells. One row of wells behind the dunes would be pumping seawater, the next row of wells, inland from the first, would be pumping brackish water. The desalting plant would be collocated with the surface water treatment plant.

The Salinas Valley Water Project would be delivering water to agriculture during the irrigation season and would (right now) be sitting idle during the rest of the year. That SVWP surface water diversion facility can be used in non-irrigation months for the regional project, with water that would be treated and delivered for water supply.

In order to expand the CSIP project, wastewater treatment flows during the wintertime would be treated and stored for use in the summer months. The proposal is to perch it on the 210 acres on top of the clay layer that separates the beach sand over the 180 ft aquifer. The water would be stored and then blended with river water for distribution in the CSIP system. One benefit from this would be the preservation of groundwater quality so that the needs of Castroville, Granite Ridge, and Prunedale can be met by groundwater over time in a balanced Salinas Basin. (These needs are currently in an unmet state.) The outcome of this project component, in addition to all the other efforts to reduce seawater intrusion, would be a positive outflow of fresh water in the Salinas Basin over time.

The proposal for storage of the potable water is in two 2.5 MG reservoirs below ground at the site of the desal plant. The treated potable water would be conveyed using the same distribution system proposed for the other two projects except for points where some of the water would be used in MCWD's service territory, including the former Fort Ord. (This distribution system would involve the construction of a 30-inch diameter pipeline consisting of a Transmission Main South, a Transmission Main in the former Fort Ord, and ASR pipeline segments.)

Other aspects of the program are ongoing conservation, stormwater reuse in the City of Pacific Grove, and a well providing water to the Prunedale area, (while it is not plumbed to the treatment facilities it is another piece of the total water supply program). The Seaside Replenishment Project concept is to take industrial effluent from Salinas, the Blanco Drain water, and bring it over to MRWPCA treatment facility where it would be treated in an advanced water treatment plant. That water would then be conveyed to the Seaside Basin where it would be injected in an inland area and in a coastal area. In essence it would put more water into the Seaside Basin for later extraction with the ASR system.

Discussion:

- The capacity of the desalination plant under the regional alternative is approximately 13,000 AF.
- With a total water supply of 25,600 AF the regional program takes care of the growth needs for the future build out of the cities already approved in general plans.
- The California Public Utilities Commission will receive information on the environmental impacts of the projects from the EIR team. It will also get an analysis of potential costs of the projects. Mr. Kasower and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates will be preparing information about the regional project with respect to costs and benefits for Cal-Am ratepayers, which will be done after the CEQA analysis is completed.

Q: What if the regional project is selected by the CPUC, what would be a realistic timeline for the realization of the benefits (lessened pumping off the Carmel River, water available for areas)?

A: If the certified EIR with CPUC direction/commitment on a choice is issued by the close of 2009, there would be a year or two for design and permitting work, then the start of construction. Some of the components can go faster than this and some would go slower, it would depend on when the water is really needed. The rollback schedule for pumping the Carmel River with the Draft Cease and Desist Order and the Seaside Basin adjudication mean that some of the water is needed as soon as possible. With respect to the water demands from general plan projections of need, there would be a slower time schedule. The design and permitting work could be performed by 2011 and if on an aggressive schedule it could take 2 years to build the facilities for the regional project components.

In comparison, 2015 is the date that Cal-Am continues to use at the moment with everything working, and no major delays for the construction of the Coastal Water Project.

Q: Will the EIR identify the permits needed for each project? Does the EIR team have a sense of how the permitting processes would vary among these alternatives?

A: The EIR will identify the permits required. The regional project will have an ownership issue of who builds, owns, and operates which pieces, which will be identified in the strategic implementation plan.

Q: Will the recycled water component in the regional project have anything to do with the Pebble Beach recycled water system?

A: No, the two wastewater systems are separate.

Q: Regarding the two different ways of treating the water, desalination and surface water treatment, wouldn't there be different costs associated with the two treatments?

A: Yes, surface water treatment would be less expensive.

Q: Would the water from both treatments go into a pool so the buyer would be charged the same regardless of the source?

A: The availability of the water would determine the amount of water that could be treated from surface water, the least expensive source, at any given point in time.

Q: Would the desalinated water go to the Peninsula and the surface water to agricultural users?

A: In the summer months the surface water would go to agricultural irrigation, in the winter months when there is no irrigation demand, the water would be treated to potable standards and be delivered to urban communities.

Q: What is happening in North County on the regional project map?

A: There would be a 400-500 ft deep well drilled to augment the North County Water Supply Project for the Granite Ridge/Prunedale area.

Q: How does the regional project, a larger effort, compete with the 2015 target date that Cal-Am has set?

A: Both facilities are similar in nature with respect to the types of facilities and the complexity of constructing them. They have similar schedules for implementation. It may take more than two years to acquire all the permits for these desalination projects. One aspect of the regional project is the necessity to cooperate to be successful. If the Water for Monterey County Coalition continues to meet and work toward the realization of the project then it can move forward. Participation/attendance at the meeting does not necessarily signal support for the regional project, those who support it now may change their minds in the future, and vice versa. While meeting attendees may not agree with one another about the regional project or its process, there are things that have been established as common ground during discussions over the past 17 months. Therefore, the progress the regional project makes toward a 2015 date is contingent on political and community processes over the coming years.

Q: The MPWMD has a smaller desal plant in the proposal stage. If that project looks viable and they proceed, will this 95-10 project be looked at in the EIR?

A: Yes. It would work its way into the regional project as an alternative. It will be analyzed as part of a cumulative discussion.

Q: What is the function of the Segunda Reservoir?

A: It serves a purpose of moving water to the customer from the source through the distribution system. Cal-Am currently moves water from the Carmel River wells up to customers in the Seaside area using the Segunda Reservoir. If there is a desalinated water conveyance system moving water South, the Segunda Reservoir would be used to move that water into and out of the Aquifer Storage and Recovery system.

Q: Would the industrial wastewater from Salinas be extremely costly to treat?

A: The strategic choice to use this wastewater comes from the assumption that water that seems costly to treat today may not, by tomorrow's standards, be a bad deal. Salinas industrial wastewater is produce wash water. However, it belongs to the City of Salinas so it may not be there for the taking.

Q: Would the City of Salinas' need for water be part of the regional project?

A: The City of Salinas has identified groundwater for its needs that would not be provided by the regional project. However the amount of water that would be drafted from the ground has been taken into the regional project's hydrologic modeling over time. The regional projects would solidify the groundwater resource (with its emphasis on maintaining a balanced groundwater basin and pushing back the line of intruded seawater toward the ocean).

Q: If water is coming from one area, when will it be decided what amount of water will be treated and sent back to the area providing the source water?

A: This is a front and center piece of the strategic implementation plan: ownership, contractual obligations, and conditions upon issue. The EIR is a physical analysis that allows the Commission to select an environmentally preferred alternative. The Commission will direct Cal-Am's activities. If an agency agrees to build the brackish desal plant, then Cal-Am can come to the Commission requesting permission to operate it and build the pipelines to convey the water to its customers.

Water Rights Discussion

- A participant raised the issue of water rights, stating that the amount of water produced from a source is contingent upon obtaining those rights and the conditions of use. For the EIR, it would be useful to know the amount of water that can be legally obtained from each source. It would be useful to know the overall water amount that can be produced at a certain time of year, from which source. Otherwise, water planners could assume an inflated production value and make decisions based upon those assumptions.
- How much will the EIR discuss ownership and water rights issues? The EIR will deal with the regulatory side of things, looking at information provided about ownership and rights issues, however these issues will not be crystal clear.
- With respect to mitigation measures and the feasibility of those measures and the agencies responsible for adopting it, it seems that you can't do the environmental document without the strategic implementation plan information. To some extent, the EIR team needs to know who will own and operate which pieces and who is going to commit to which mitigation measure. For example, if Cal-Am intends to mitigate the Carmel River overdraft with water from diversion facilities on the Salinas River, the MCWRA would need to indicate it has agreed to that arrangement.

Q: Is the only difference between the Cal-Am plant proposed for North Marina and the regional project desal plant in North Marina the intakes? Aren't the plants going to be approximately the same size and in the same place?

A: The regional project's desal plant would be sized for 13,000 AF of production, whereas the Cal-Am North Marina desal plant would be sized for 12,500 AF of production. Both plants would

operate at a percentage of production in any given year depending on the amount of river water that is available for use from the wet weather flows. The source water for the North Marina plant would be strictly seawater, whereas the regional project's desal plant would use seawater and brackish water.

Presentation:

Alternatives Map

- There could be different ways of plumbing in North Marina. One route could come in from the beach, follow along Beach Road. There could be any number of routes for the brine.
- Regarding plant location, there is a National Refractories site alternative proposed by Pajaro Sunny Mesa. With this alternative, other than location, the facilities would be the same as the proposed Coastal Water Project at Moss Landing.
- Another alternative is the Water Standard Company's ship based desal.
- The EIR team may create another series of alternatives that mix and match pieces from Project A and Project B. This would be done to evaluate them together in the EIR to develop a suggestion for the environmentally preferred project.
- If the regional project owners don't reach a decision in time for the Commission's decision, the Commission may not want to choose something that precludes the possibility that the regional project may be built in the future. Could we start a project for Cal-Am only that allows a regional project to happen in the future?

Status Update: Strategic Implementation Plan Funding

Steve Kasower, Center for Integrated Water Research

- The strategic implementation plan's "hopeful participants" for funding are the Marina Coast Water District, California American Water, and the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency. These entities are considering sharing the costs involved in keeping the process going. The hope is that Monterey County Water Resources Agency will agree to manage the contract.
- One of the concepts in the strategic implementation plan is to develop a "fast track" strategy to supply water that mitigates 95-10's requirements and the Seaside Basin requirements. Some pieces may be pushed forward if we keep focused on them. This is important because the Cease and Desist Order process is not directly tied to anything discussed in the regional project, except that if we can offer a "fast track" solution, it may be the only way the Monterey region can save itself from economic pain.
- In the plan all the pieces of the regional project and how they "play out together" will be analyzed. Topics covered would be how the pieces look, the most economically advantageous course, the legal basis for the contracts, how to integrate the pieces over time, etc.
- How did the regional project reach the point where it is now being evaluated in the Coastal Water Project's EIR? It happened as a result of water agencies coalescing their interests to move project planning forward.
- A participant expressed interest in how to pay for the regional project. In the strategic implementation plan the options will be explained, including major grant money, bond money, and low interest loans.
- There are four IRWMP planning groups in the Monterey Bay area that are now meeting together, coordinated by the MCWRA. The approach that is currently being taken is to present requests to the State from this "umbrella" group to put the region in a good position to receive money when it becomes available.
- There could be limitations on the amount of money made available from public funds if a public agency goes into partnership with a private company. Therefore it would be important to make sure the partnership is designed to offset any limitations that would be placed on the public agency in the strategic implementation plan.
- The important issue with respect to funding the REPOG meetings is for an independent entity to be in the "drivers seat", however Cal-Am will continue to offer financial resources

to keep the process going. The work ahead with this is to figure out the mechanics of the contracting arrangements.

Status Update: Public Information and Involvement Work Group

Catherine Borrowman, Center for Integrated Water Research

In the past few months the Public Information and Involvement Work Group (PIIWG) has acted as an advisory group for the nascent public participation program. The outcomes of this program's planning phase are the subject of this presentation. For the past 5 months the program has been focused on providing information about the Water for Monterey County project and the WFMC Coalition to interested groups and individuals.

The groups with an interest in water issues in Monterey County are:

- Water purveyors
- Government agencies
- Non-profit organizations
- The media
- Agricultural community
- Business community
- Educational institutions
- Clubs

The groups that have heard presentations about Water for Monterey County include the following:

- REPOG participants
- City Councils
- CSUMB
- Monterey County Hospitality Association
- Monterey Green Party
- Agricultural growers and shippers
- State Water Resources Control Board
- Public access channel TV viewers of "Our Town"

Groups who may want to hear about the Water for Monterey County project include:

- Monterey County Farm Bureau
- Monterey Alliance of Neighborhoods
- Carmel Valley Association
- Leadership Monterey Peninsula
- Rotary Clubs
- Monterey County Business Council
- Chambers of Commerce
- Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula
- Educational Institutions
- Political Clubs
- Sierra Club
- LandWatch Monterey County

Water for Monterey County Website Tour

The Marina Coast Water District funded the production of the Water for Monterey County website. CIWR has worked with MCWD, the PIIWG, RMC Water & Environment, and Communication Planners to develop the content for the site. The website provides information, acting as an introduction to the Water for Monterey County project and the public process of regional water supply planning.

- The home page leads a viewer toward the buttons that link to pages with introductory text about the reasons for the development of the regional program, the area and proposed water supply components, the EIR timeline and the involvement of the public.

- The Challenge page describes three important drivers behind the development of Water for Monterey County: SWRCB Order 95-10, management of the Seaside Groundwater Basin, and seawater intrusion in the Salinas Groundwater Basin.
- The Proposed Solution page has been simplified from its previous format. It no longer has text and images relating to each slide outlining the concepts of the program presented in the spring of 2008. Currently it contains a brief description of the project area's communities and the program component's contribution to future water supply. In the future, this section should contain more information about the program as it evolves.
- The Public Involvement page describes the approach used to increase public participation in the regional water supply planning effort.
- The Water for Monterey County community dialogues described on the Meetings page are characterized as an open and transparent process with broad representation from the region's agencies and publics.
- The Timeline page discusses the Water for Monterey County project in terms of how it will be considered within the CPUC EIR process as an alternative to the Coastal Water Project.
- The News page is for press releases about the regional project. It also has a list of the articles that offer editorials, opinions, or news about regional water supply planning and the Monterey Regional Water Supply Project.
- Quotes are scattered throughout the right sidebar of the website which give a viewer different opinions of participants or observers. This gives a viewer a sense of different perspectives on the project's significance or the merits of the planning process with respect to a kind of outcome.
- There is a Contact Us/Request a Speaker page, a website viewer can request a person to give a presentation before a group in the region.
- The About Us page describes the Water for Monterey County Coalition's mission, goals, objectives, methods to accomplish goals, and history.
- The FAQ section provides answers to basic questions a viewer may have about the regional project. This section should be dynamic and change with time as the information people are requesting is met with answers developed by the Coalition's water agencies.
- The Links section guides visitors to sites of organizations that may have resources of value to the viewing audience.

Q: Has the agricultural community been briefed/informed of the Water for Monterey County project?

A: It is an ongoing process of engaging in delicate and sensitive discussions with key players in the agricultural community. The community is not monolithic in views, some growers are pretty optimistic, whereas some have reasonable questions such as "what does this mean for me and the water needed for the viability of agricultural economic activity?"

Discussion of the Next Steps for the REPOG

The REPOG will hear a status report on the strategic implementation plan at the next meeting. The REPOG will meet on October 1st, and thereafter on the first Wednesday of each month.

New Business/Old Business/Parking Lot Issues/Action Items

A participant suggested that the topic of the next REPOG meeting is to discuss if the project is viable with or without the support of the Salinas Valley agricultural community.

Discussion of Next Meeting Date/Agenda

- **Meeting #17 (October 1, 2008)**

Meeting Attendees

Craig Anthony, Cal-Am
Todd Bennett, City of Monterey

Dave Berger, Cal-Am
Catherine Borrowman, Center for Integrated Water Research, UCSC
Janet Brennan, Public
Al Budris, Del Monte Forest Property Owners Association
Tom Bunosky, Cal-Am
Bill Carrothers, Public
Jim Crook, MRWPCA
Mark Dias, Public
Steve Endsley, FORA
Manuel Fierro, CPW
Paul Findley, RBF
John Fischer, Public
David Foote, Schaaf & Wheeler
Darby Fuerst, MPWMD
Max Gomberg, DRA
Howard Gustafson, MCWD
Lidia Gutierrez, Gutierrez Consultants on behalf of the PVWMA
Jim Heitzman, MCWD
Scott Hilk, MCP
Michael Houlemard, FORA
Monica Hunter, Planning and Conservation League Foundation
Bob Jaques, Seaside Basin Watermaster
Dana Jacobson, Cal Water
Marti Johnson, PCLS
Steve Kasower, Center for Integrated Water Research, UCSC
Margie Kay, Public
Judi Lehman, MPWMD
Roger Masuda, Griffith & Masuda
Lyndel Melton, RMC Water and Environment
Julie Moore, ESA Water
Ken Nishi, MCWD
Kelly Nix, Carmel Pine Cone
Carl Nizawa, City of Salinas
Andrea Nocito, CirclePoint consultant for ESA/CPUC
Tim O'Halloran, City of Seaside
Jane Parker, Supervisor-elect
Debby Platt, City of Marina
George Riley, CPW
Tom Rowley, Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association
Clive Sanders, Carmel Watershed Conservancy
Jonathan Sapp, Sapp Devco
Bob Schaffer, Marina Community Partners
Gary Shallcross, Watershed Institute of CSUMB, member of Central Coast Regional Water
Quality Control Board
Ron Stefani, CCSD & MRWPCA
Kevin Stone, Monterey County Association of Realtors
Eric Tynan, Castroville Community Services District
Curtis Weeks, MCWRA
Eric Zigas, ESA representing the CPUC
Heidi Burch, City of Carmel
Vicki Nakamura, Monterey Peninsula College
Henry Gowin + colleague, 2nd District of Monterey County