

**Monterey Regional Water Supply Reliability Collaboration  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates**

**Draft Meeting Notes, Third Meeting**

**March 28, 2007**

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

**Table of Contents**

Discussion of "Action Items," "Parking Lot Issues," Individual and Sub-group agendas	1
Overview of Goals for Meeting # 3 Steve Kasower, University of California, Santa Cruz Urban and Regional Water Research team	2
Review of the Notes from Meeting # 2 & Re-draft of the Articles of Collaboration	2
Review of the Status of the Regional Analytical Work	2
Presentation & Discussion of DRA/UCSC analysis Catherine Borrowman, University of California, Santa Cruz	4
Overview & Discussion of CPUC's EIR (CEQA) analysis Andrew Barnsdale CPUC and Eric Zigas, ESA Water, CPUC Consultants	4
New Business/Old Business/Parking Lot Issues	5
Discussion of Next Meeting Date, Agenda (Proposed for April 25, 2007)	5
Meeting Attendees	5

**Discussion of "Action Items," "Parking Lot Issues," Individual  
and Sub-group Agendas**

During the meeting, individuals bring up topics that they feel are important to address. If those topics are off-agenda, they are noted for discussion later as a "Parking Lot" issue. If an individual refers to a topic as an "Action Item," then other members of the plenary group need to agree that this topic needs to be addressed. The process of who assigns which person a task needs to be clear. All items noted during the meeting are taken as suggestions for the Study Team to consider, however some items, if they are clearly discussed as action items, will be addressed by Steve Kasower, who assumed responsibility for assigning the task and setting the due date.

Parking Lot issues are issues that are brought up in the meeting but are determined to be off-agenda. These issues are noted and can be discussed at the end of the meeting or they may not be addressed until a subsequent meeting. Parking Lot issues differ from Action Items. Action Items are pieces of work that the plenary group wants to make sure that a member of the group performs.

## **Overview of Goals for Meeting # 3**

### **Meeting #3 (March 28, 2007) Proposed Milestones**

- Review the status of the regional analytical work by the Study Team with discussion and suggestions by the Regional Plenary Oversight Group (REPOG).
  - Progress report and discussion of the demographic evaluation.
  - Discussion and presentation of analytical modeling tools being used by the Study Team to evaluate regional project components.
- Presentation by the team that is conducting the environmental analysis for the CPUC.
  - Presentation of their ongoing work.
  - Discussion of the confluence between the ongoing environmental analysis and the Study Team's preparation of the "Regional Plan."

### **Materials provided at the meeting included the following:**

"Monterey Regional Water Supply Reliability Collaboration, Draft Third Meeting Agenda, March 28, 2007"

"Draft Monterey Regional Water Supply Reliability Dialogue Group Conflict Resolution Process"  
"Monterey Regional Water Supply Reliability Collaboration, First Draft Meeting Notes, February 28, 2007"

"Draft Articles of Collaboration" Memo from Diana Brooks, Division of Ratepayer Advocates and Steve Kasower, University of California, Santa Cruz to Monterey Area Regional Water Supply Reliability Collaborators. January 18, 2007, revised for March 28, 2007.

## **Review of Notes from Meeting # 2 & Re-draft of the Articles of Collaboration**

### *Correction to notes:*

1. Persons who signed in will now be recognized in the notes and the section for Introductions will be changed to Meeting Attendees.
2. The comment about the purpose of PBS&J at the meetings has been changed to "PBS&J, representing the Water Standard Company's ship-based desalination plant, is concentrating on wanting to be a part of any regional solution."
3. The note starting with "A MPWMD Manager stated. . ." has been changed per an email sent by Darby Fuerst. It now reads "MPWMD has factors for residential and multi-residential households; for example, it is assumed that each single-family household uses an average of 0.28 AF per year. This use is equivalent to an average of 10 hundred cubic feet (Ccf) per month or approximately 100 gallons per resident per day. In the 2006 projections of future water needs, land-use data was provided by the jurisdictions to MPWMD staff (Stephanie Pintar), who converted the data to water-use projections, based on agreed-upon average annual water-use factors."

## **Review of the Status of Regional Analytical Work**

- The webpage has been planned and is now under construction.
- While the notes from Meeting #1 and #2 captured diverse viewpoints about political, environmental, social, and economic issues, the notes from subsequent meetings should contain comments from participants about the reports from technical working groups and their contributions to the formation of a regional plan.
- The monthly meeting participants are invited to now break up into technical working groups. Potable Water and Distribution Systems Work Group; Non-Potable, Recycled Water and Distribution systems Work Group; Conservation and Water Management Programs Work Group, Public Involvement and Information Assurance Work Group.
- These four topics require agency participation. The Study Team is interested in the dynamics of a smaller group comprised of entities with the responsibility to carry out the regional alternative programs.

- Several spots are reserved for non-agency members in each technical working group. Non-agency participants should caucus after the meeting and select two representatives for each of the potable, non-potable, and conservation work groups and four representatives for the public information work group.
- The monthly plenary session's agenda will contain a report of these four groups and ample time for discussion.
- Who would chair these work group meetings? How would they be conducted?
  - Steve Kasower will chair each of these technical work groups. Each work group will discuss technical detail, identify potential projects and project components for analysis, prioritize analytical work, and prepare status presentations for review and discussion at the Regional Plenary Oversight Group (REPOG) meetings. The technical work group meetings will take place at the UC MBEST Center and may take place around the time of the monthly REPOG meeting. Issues that are raised in these technical meetings may eventually need to be brought before the governing boards of the participating entities.
- By agency, we mean either public or private entity that has legal responsibility to make investments in water and related infrastructure and programs.
- What is meant by "information assurance" in the Public Involvement and Information Assurance Work Group?
  - In meetings to date the group has witnessed some level of frustration from public representatives. This technical working group can focus on the opportunity to communicate more effectively with the public. The "assurance" mechanism is an effort to make sure the information presented to the public is credible and of high quality.
- The REPOG will be expected to listen to status reporting on a timely basis and discuss it. The members of the REPOG are expected to give feedback about how the technical groups are doing. The REPOG should identify missing elements of a discussion in a technical group.
- Will the technical working groups present information and analysis that includes costs, benefits, feasibility, and timelines? Will participants in the plenary oversight group be presented with information that aligns benefits with the proposed amounts of money that will be spent?
- Technical working groups should report only information, not policy arguments.
- Where do the regulatory agencies fit into the working groups? Will the technical information debated in these groups be placed in a correct context of regulatory limitations?
  - Regulations are a part of the political and legal operating environment. The planning elements may be debated as feasible or infeasible based on the constraints or opportunities that exist regarding each issue. Regulations can be seen as a necessary condition in the political system to achieve a goal such as enhancing the quality of the environment with water supply operations.
- Where do these groups get regulatory information?
  - The technical working groups do not require that regulators participate in the work group meetings. If there is some question about an issue, members of the work group can inform regulators about specific elements of the plan under consideration and discuss the regulatory perspectives with them.
- The role of the potable group would be to gather factual information and distinguish it from non-factual information.
- A question was raised about the methodology of assigning risk to courses of action for analytical purposes. The group will make an effort to determine the degree of risk with different courses of action.
- What distinguishes "potable" from "non-potable"?
  - Basically, it depends on the degree of treatment required.
  - For purposes of the technical working groups, the group names help determine which is which.
  - There is overlap, but it's all working toward the same end, so it's alright.

- Decisions must begin with options, and the focus should be on those most likely to succeed.
- Work on anything that is possible, and then, if feasible, develop it and try to sell it to the public and regulatory agencies. Think outside the envelope.

### **Presentation & Discussion of DRA/UCSC analysis**

- Catherine Borrowman, UCSC member of the Study Team presented a conceptual overview of the economic/demographic analysis that she is undertaking. The analysis will examine the regional value of water, how reliable water supplies support the regional incomes and jobs, and how Cal Am ratepayers may be impacted by more reliable water supplies.
- This analysis is in addition to financial/rate impact evaluation that the UCSC Study Team will also undertake.

### **Presentation & Discussion of CPUC's EIR (CEQA) analysis of the Coastal Water Project**

- Andrew Barnsdale from CPUC, noted the EIR process is moving ahead with an analysis of the data. He presented an overview of where the EIR process is going, including a variety of project footprints. He noted that the EIR is not focused on volumes except as they impact the project footprint.
- Mr. Barnsdale also described how the regional project process could impact the EIR. To the extent that the REPOG and its work groups can provide a defined regional plan, the EIR may be able to include it.
- Question about whether the Study Team's work on regional economic/demographic characteristics will show up in EIR? The economic/demographic work is not designed as part of the EIR. Its intention is to inform decision makers about other values that water supply reliability will exhibit in the region.
- Eric Zigas from ESA|Water, working on the EIR presented some maps that depict the alternatives to the CWP and its distribution facilities. He reiterated that the application is to solve Cal Am's regulatory problem, the proposal is the CWP.
- The California Coastal Commission staff is maintaining a need to demonstrate that subsurface intakes are not feasible prior to accepting once-through-cooling (OTC) intakes for review and evaluation. The EIR team has asked Cal Am to undertake an evaluation of subsurface intakes.
- There is a possibility that Cal Am will also examine abandoned agricultural wells for a source of brackish groundwater.
- Regional infrastructure partnerships are also depicted on the map that don't preclude other alternatives and leave the options open for the future. The analytical goal is to examine potentially feasible distribution alternatives that are needed to get water to the service area but minimize facility environmental impacts by shortening pipeline lengths and effecting economies of scale through creative facility sharing.
- The EIR process will conclude in a matter of months.
- The Public Utilities Commission can only consider the CWP as submitted. They can only act on the application before them. If there are regional or alternative projects described in the EIR, they must be defined and supported. Time is of the essence for getting alternatives on the board, since the CWP is on a fixed schedule at the CPUC, and the EIR process is nearing the point that it will be unable to evaluate new projects.
- Why aren't we looking at legalizing rights on the Carmel River? Since 2002 the MPWMD has petitioned the State Water Resources Control Board, for about 8K AF that is within a right the district already has under the old Carmel River dam proposal, that is a change petition that would grant the district the right to pursue additional Carmel River water.
- What influence could this regional group have on the EIR? The regional group will have influence only if it comes to some conclusion by August.

**New Business/Old Business/Parking Lot Items  
Third Meeting To-Do List**

Task	Person Assigned	Due Date	Deliver To:	Accomplished?
Produce an addendum to demand numbers worksheet "Compliance with 95-10 Plus Additional Regional Demands" for Salinas	Jim Smith			

**Parking Lot Items**

Discuss SWRCB Decision 95-10 and Cal Am project as proposed. (Referred to work groups.)  
Discuss Marina Coast pass-through concept. (Referred to work groups.)

**Discussion of Next Meeting Date/Agenda**

**Meeting #4 (April 25, 2007) Proposed Milestones**

- Status report of the regional analytical work by the Study Team with discussion and suggestions by the group. ***This item will evolve into Status reports to the Plenary Oversight Group from each working group.***
- Discussion concerning the potential agreements that would need to be reached by project component partners. Individual roles that each agency could take in the regional project. Ultimately each agency will need to take the lead for their regional project components. ***This item will be subsumed into the working group presentations.***

---

**Meeting Attendees**

Dewey Baird, Presidio of Monterey  
Andrew Barnsdale, CPUC  
Andy Bell, MPWMD  
Dave Berger, MPWMD  
Catherine Borrowman, UCSC  
Diana Brooks, DRA  
Al Budris, Central Coast Rain Harvesters  
Amy Campbell, AMBAG  
Madeleine Clark, Elkhorn Slough Coalition  
Jerry Cole, CDM  
Sarah Corbin, Surfrider  
Mark Del Piero, PSMCSD  
Manuel Fierro, Citizens for Public Water  
Paul Findley, RBF Consulting  
John Fischer  
Skip Griffin, PBS&J  
Rito Guerra, Abel Maldonado  
Howard Gustafson, MCWD  
Maryann Hulsman, ESA  
Keith Israel, MRWPCA  
Margie Kay  
Bruce Laclergue, PVWMA  
Steven Leonard, Cal Am  
David Lewis, Castroville  
Marc Lucca, Marina Coast Water District  
Lynn Maack, DRA  
Peter MacLaggan, Poseidon, PSMCSD  
Roger Masuda, Griffith & Masuda

Jonas Minton, PCL  
David Pendergrass, MPWMD  
Holly Price, MBNMS  
Jason Reiger, CPUC  
George Riley, CPW  
Joe Rosa, PCMSCD  
Danilo Sanchez, DRA  
Bob Schaffer, Marina Community Partners  
James Smith, California Water Service Company  
Curtis Weeks, MCWRA  
Ron Weitzman, MFOW  
Eric Zigas, ESA  
Doug Yount, City of Marina