

EXHIBIT 13-A
MPWMD Comparative Matrix, Part I-A, Desalination Projects

	A	B	C	D	E
1	FINAL for 10/16/06 Meeting		MPWMD Comparative Matrix -- Part I-A, Desalination	Projects	
2					
3					
4	DECISION ELEMENT	COASTAL WATER PROJECT	NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY DESALINATION PROJECT	LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (Sand City Desal)	
5	PROPONENT/SPONSOR	California American Water	Pajaro/Sunny Mesa CSD	MPWMD	
6	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Moss Landing desal plant assumes use of Duke Energy site and intake/outfall. Includes desal conveyance system comprised of transmission main, terminal reservoir, and pump stations; and ASR facilities to store CR (or desalinated) water in Seaside Basin. PEA analyzes Proposed Project and five alternatives (see Line 60). Proposed Project yield is 11,730 AFY.	Desal plant at National Refractories site; prefer use of Duke Energy wastewater as source (existing intake as backup) with existing outfall. Includes energy recovery; possible 30-ac solar energy. Current focus on regional plant, including P/SM service area; willing to expand to serve other areas. No ASR is planned, but could be combined with MPWMD ASR project.	Desal plant at Sand City with potential intake and outfall locations from Seaside State Beach to coastal Fort Ord. HDD well technology needed to achieve 8,409 AF yield goal; brine disposal via MRWPCA outfall likely needed. Could be combined with MPWMD ASR project.	
7	Pilot Project	Approvals expected by end of 2006; install early 2007; operate for one year via agreement with LS Power.	Approvals expected by end of 2006 based on approved Encina plant design; plan to operate 4 yrs.; managed by Kennedy/Jenks expert	None planned currently, but will be required by DHS	
8	PROJECT YIELD	Actual yield based on commitments of purveyor customers	Actual yield based on commitments of purveyor customers	8,409 AFY yield goal; possibly 11,000 AFY (uncertain)	
9	Comply with Order 95-10? Water for Seaside Basin?	Yes, 10,730 AFY assumed for Project and alternatives. 1,000 AFY slated to replace Cal-Am use in Seaside Basin.	Yes, 10,730 AFY assumed. Up to 2,700 AF to address gap between current production and sustainable yield estimate in Seaside Basin.	Yield falls short of 10,730 AFY unless expanded or combined with another project. No yield to address Seaside Basin.	
10	Future Mont. Penin. Needs?	Regional Alt includes 3,572 AFY for jurisdictions within CAW service area as previously identified by MPWMD and jurisdictions.	Water for growth not currently contemplated.	Current project goal is legalizing existing use (11,285 AFY from CR and 3,500 AFY from Seaside assumed). Water for growth not contemplated.	
11	Future Non-MP Needs	Regional Alternative lists 4,970 AFY for MCWD/NorCo as amended by participants. North Marina Alt could also be sized to meet regional needs.	Up to 11,230 AF to address known overdraft in areas now within P/SM service area	None	
12	TOTAL YIELD	11,730 AFY for Proposed Project; 20,272 AFY for Regional Alternative (or North Marina Alt).	20,000-22,400 AFY (20 MGD project, capable of producing up to 22,400 AFY - 20,930 AFY demand identified)	8,409 AFY. Project could potentially be expanded to 11,000 AFY - permitting and feasibility are uncertain.	
13	Yield Phasing to Mont Penin	11,730 AFY is Proposed Project amount. Oversized Pipeline Alt or Regional Alt could facilitate incremental future supply above 11,730 AFY.	Phasing based on demand; assume 10,730 AF plus amount needed for Seaside first	No phasing	
14					
15	PROJECT COST	2005 Costs for Proposed Project (11,730 AFY) Indexed to 2004 through 2008	Costs in 2005 dollars for 20 MGD project provided to B-E/GEI Consultants by Poseidon Resources	Varies with site; see Dec 2003 Board Review Draft EIR	
16	Capital - see lines 77-106	\$191,090,000 for proposed project (11,730 AFY) Based on 10% contingencies - B-E/GEI Consultants recommend 25% contingencies. B-E/GEI evaluated only the desalination component of the project, and not the ASR component.	\$132,000,000 for 20 MGD project \$169,030,000 (B-E/GEI Consultants, based on increasing contingencies by 10-15% to 25%)	\$176,200,000 - \$193,000,000	
17	Amortized Cap. Cost (\$/yr)	\$15,000,000/yr	Information not provided	\$14,200,000 - \$15,600,000/yr	
18	O&M - see lines 108-112	\$6,372,000 (net amount; see basis of cost info) B-E/GEI evaluated only the desalination component of the project, and not the ASR component.	\$16,900,000/yr	\$8,740,000 - \$ 9,090,000/yr \$6,740,000 - \$7,090,000/yr (B-E/GEI Consultants)	
19	Assumed energy cost (\$/kwh)	\$0.07/kwh	Information not provided	\$0.12/kwh	
20	Total Annual Cost	\$21,372,000/yr	Information not provided	\$22,99,000 - \$24,690,000/yr \$20,990,000 - \$22,690,000/yr (B-E/GEI Consultants)	

EXHIBIT 13-A
MPWMD Comparative Matrix, Part I-A, Desalination Projects

	A	B	C	D	E
4	DECISION ELEMENT	COASTAL WATER PROJECT	NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY DESALINATION PROJECT	LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (Sand City Desal)	
21	Time frame for estimates	Capital cost escalated through end of construction in 2008 with 4% inflation	2005	December 2002	

EXHIBIT 13-A
MPWMD Comparative Matrix, Part I-A, Desalination Projects

	A	B	C	D	E
4	DECISION ELEMENT	COASTAL WATER PROJECT	NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY DESALINATION PROJECT	LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (Sand City Desal)	
22	COST TO PENINSULA				
23	Share of total project cost	100% of Proposed Project costs are for CAW Peninsula customers; Regional Alt would rely on prorata share of participation.	Cost of water based on contract volume (capacity+annual usage charges); separate charge for pipelines and pumping facilities.	Entire cost to be paid by Peninsula consumers.	
24	How share determined	See line 23	See line 23	N/A	
25	Cost sharing of existing vs. future Cal-Am ratepayers	See CPCN application; David Stephenson testimony	Future capacity cost based on construction and transmission	New users pay connection fee similar to current system	
26	Cost of Water (\$/AF)	Proposed Project is \$1,725/AF delivered to Peninsula customers (\$1,000/AF for desal plant, pumps, pipes and storage; \$150/AF for ASR; \$550/AF for O&M). Includes lease of desal site. Regional Alternative would be \$1,600/AF for CAW customers. Based on 10% contingencies - B-E/GEI Consultants recommend 25% contingencies. B-E/GEI evaluated only the desalination component of the project, and not the ASR component.	Information not provided by project proponent \$1,434/AF (B-E/GEI Consultants)	\$2,737 - \$2,939/AF based on 7.5 MGD (8,409 AFY) project. Includes site acquisition and other R)W costs. \$2,491-\$2,693/AF if energy costs reduced by 33% as recommended by B-E/GEI Consultants. Need to add conveyance and related costs to obtain cost of delivered water.	
27	Impact to Cal-Am Bill	Increase of \$2.20/ccf in 2007 to \$5.73/ccf in 2011	No information provided	No information provided	
28					
29	FINANCING ASSUMPTIONS	See CPCN application amended 7/14/05	Revenue bonds or COPs; possible Poseidon funding	pursuant to District Law	
30	Interest rate (%)	7%	Information not provided	7%	
31	Term (yrs)	30	Information not provided	30 years	
32	Public vote required?	No public vote required; possible if public financing. CPUC makes CPCN decision.	Not required of P/SM unless Prop 218	Depends on type of funding or if part of JPA etc.	
33	Grants (describe)	None anticipated at this time.	On DWR eligible list, but no grant to date. Will pursue funds for pilot and envtl studies with MLML.	None currently	
34					
35	TIMELINE	See CWP charts		N/A -- Board tabled action in Oct 04	
36	Draft EIR (and/or EIS)	PEA submitted 7/14/05 forms basis of DEIR, anticipated to be published by CPUC Spring 2007. NEPA requirement uncertain.	See Line 37	unknown; minimum 7 mos to evaluate onshore HDD, and DEIR; assume NEPA tiers on EIR.	
37	Certify FEIR (EIS ROD)	FEIR anticipated Summer 2007; NEPA depends on timing of ARMY/FORA land transfer	June 2008 ("Environmental Review and Permitting")	unknown; assume 6 mos to FEIR	
38	Obtain key permits	Pilot plant permits: Monterey County - Aug 2006, but appealed to CCC; RWQCB - Sep 2006; CCC - to be considered late 2006. Full-Scale Project: CPUC issuance of CPCN - Sep 2007; CCC Coastal Development Permit anticipated March 2008	Pilot plant permits: Monterey County - Mar 2006, but appealed to CCC; RWQCB - Sep 2006; CCC - anticipated to be considered late 2006. See Line 37 for full-scale project permits	Assume 6-12 mos from FEIR	
39	Secure financing	Upon CPUC approval of CPCN (Sep 2007)	Information not provided	Assume 6 months after approval/vote	
40	Secure ROW/property access	After FEIR certified by CPUC	Information not provided	Assume 3-6 months after financing	
41	Start construction	Winter/Spring 2008 to 2010	Information not provided	Assume 3-6 mo after ROW/access	
42	Commence water delivery	2010	July 2010	assume 24-month construction	
43	Total time to water delivery	3 1/2 - 4 years from Sep 06	4 years from Sep 06	unknown; 4-5 years from Day 1	

EXHIBIT 13-A
MPWMD Comparative Matrix, Part I-A, Desalination Projects

	A	B	C	D	E
4	DECISION ELEMENT	COASTAL WATER PROJECT	NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY DESALINATION PROJECT	LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (Sand City Desal)	
44					
45	PERMITS/REGS				
46	Federal Agencies	USEPA, MBNMS, USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, USACOE, USCG	Same as CWP except no ASR permits needed; fewer stream crossings/avoidance lessen federal permits	Similar to CWP; no pipeline under sloughs and streams lessens some federal permits	
47	EIS needed?	NEPA review required; EIS possible based on pipeline alignment through federal lands if not already transferred to local jurisdictions	NEPA review may be needed by Army for pipes; EIS unlikely if demonstrate avoidance, reduced impact	NEPA review assumed; EIS is possible	
48	Fed lead agency?	Army Corps likely	to be determined, if needed	TBD (US Army?)	
49	Sanctuary approval?	Permit to construct; review NPDES application	Yes, related to NPDES/outfall; need to confirm outfall capacity	Yes, related to intake and discharge	
50	State Agencies	CPUC, SWRCB, RWQCB, SLC, CDFG, CCC, CEC, CDPR, CDHS, SHPO (CDTS?)	Same as CWP, except no CPUC or CEC; no SWRCB for ASR	Same as CWP except no CPUC, CEC	
51	CPUC approval?	Needed for Cal-Am rates; CPCN submitted for CWP Sept 20, 2004 and amended July 14, 2005.	N/A	N/A	
52	EIR lead agency	CPUC	Pajaro/Sunny Mesa CSD	MPWMD	
53	SWRCB/Water Rights	Needed for ASR or any other new Carmel River diversions	N/A, no ASR planned	N/A	
54	Regional Agencies	MBUAPCD, MPWMD, TAMC, FORA	Same as CWP	Same as CWP	
55	Monterey County	MCWRA, MCPBI, MCEH, MCPW	MCEH, construction and use permits	MCEH, MCPBI (?)	
56	Local Agencies	All affected cities and jurisdictions for encroachment and construction permits; includes MLHD	Similar to CWP; jurisdictions may vary; MLHD (?)	Construction and use permits within affected jurisdictions	
57					
58	SITE CONTROL				
59	Confirmed site?	Moss Landing Power Plant planned for pilot plant. "Duke East" site evaluated in PEA as preferred site.	Confirmed site for pilot project. Lease agreement signed with owner of Natl Refractory site. Potential use of LS Power discharge rather than own intake; will use own outfall.	Sites and alternatives identified; agreements with owners are needed, including MRWPCA for use of regional outfall.	
60	Alternative sites and projects?	Moss Landing scenario in PEA evaluates Granite Rock and Natl Refractories sites. Five project alternatives in PEA include: (1) Regional Alt with 20,272 AFY yield; (2) Over-sized Pipeline Alt with larger source and transmission pipelines to enable future supply increases; (3) HDD Intake Alt using HDD intake wells near MLPP as feedwater supply rather than Duke intake; (4) North Marina Alt, which locates plant in Armstrong Ranch area with HDD intake and MLPP outfall for brine; and (5) No Project Alt, comprised of existing conservation efforts.	No alternative to National Refractories site needed. EIR will identify project alternatives.	Several locations for desalination plant, seawater collectors and brine disposal via HDD and MRWPCA outfall evaluated in BRDEIR, along with other project alternatives.	

EXHIBIT 13-A
MPWMD Comparative Matrix, Part I-A, Desalination Projects

	A	B	C	D	E
4	DECISION ELEMENT	COASTAL WATER PROJECT	NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY DESALINATION PROJECT	LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (Sand City Desal)	
61					
62	OPERATIONS/OTHER				
63	Technical, Managerial and Financial Capabilities (TMF) to meet DHS standards	Cal-Am has extensive TMF capabilities and current certifications to own/operate water systems. Over 39,000 customers in Monterey County	P/S/M has current TMF certification by DHS. Planned enhancement for desal project includes expanded board and staff; plan to outsource engineering (K/J), legal, development, contract, admin, construction, management; Poseidon is "Exclusive Management Agent" in current agreement.	Assume certified entity would operate plant in coordination with Cal-Am system, with MPWMD oversight.	
64	Back-up; water production interruptions (e.g., power or intake water)	CWP design is consistent w/ Duke operations; forebay, storage tanks and ASR as backup; also other Cal-Am sources in Seaside and CR.	Own intake is backup supply if MLPP discharge water not available; refurbishing seawater tanks with 11-day supply; generators and onsite solar, if feasible. Notes County Ordinance requires back-up supply.	Redundant plant design; back-up generators; ASR source	
65					
66	PROJECT PARTICIPANTS				
67	Overview	CAW willing to participate in public/private partnerships and regional governance formation. Proposed project is geared toward existing CAW customers. Regional Alternative includes cities and areas within MPWMD, MoCo, MCWD, Castroville WD and Moss Landing; pending further study and action by entities.	Focus on regional plant, including P/S/M needs; willing to expand plant to meet needs of others such as FORA, MCWD and Monterey Peninsula.	Funded by MPWMD via methods allowed by MPWMD Law; possible public-private partnership or JPA.	
68	MPWMD participation	MPWMD and CAW executed April 2006 Management and Operations Agreement regarding ASR component. No approvals to date.	P/S/M Board authorized JPA with MPWMD in 2004; MPWMD declined offer at that time.	MPWMD currently envisioned as sole sponsor.	
69	Other entities participation	Other water purveyors are wholesale water customers.	Ongoing discussions with FORA and MCWD. Met met with Cal-Am in Nov 2004; sent letter in Feb 05.	None specified; partnerships possible.	
70					
71	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT				
72	Outreach programs	Formal outreach program with 52 town hall meetings; presentations to jurisdictions. Website. Direct mail communication to CAW customers and stakeholders. CPUC staff to facilitate DEIR public involvement.	Presentations to MPWMD, City of Monterey, MCWD, FORA, DHS, Monterey County, MoCo Planning; Castroville WD as requested	Monthly written updates and quarterly public workshops 2002-early 2004.	
73					
74	INFORMATION SOURCES	Year 2005 and 2006: PEA and Amended Application to CPUC on CWP dated July 14, 2005, including technical memoranda on engineering and cost estimates; amended CPCN application for CWP July 2005. Handout materials from CAW consultant (RBF); matrix input data from RBF July-August 2005, including detailed basis of cost documents. August 25, 2005 Town Hall Meeting presentation by Steve Leonard of CAW and responses to questions. Seawater Desalination Projects Evaluation, B-E/GEI Consultants, June 26, 2006	Year 2006: Application by P/S/M to California Department of Water Resources for Proposition 50 Grant for Pilot Demonstration Project, March 24, 2006. Monterey Bay Regional Desalination Project Conceptual Design Report, P/S/M in cooperation with Poseidon Resources Corp., April 2006. Information provided in 2006 by Poseidon Resources to B-E/GEI Consultants for preparation of desalination projects evaluation. Seawater Desalination Projects Evaluation, B-E/GEI Consultants, June 26, 2006	Board Review Draft EIR, MPWMD Water Supply Project, December 2003. Regulatory agency worksheets prepared by Jones & Stokes Sept 2004. See line 115 for technical reports with cost information. MPWMD consultant estimates (CDM). Seawater Desalination Projects Evaluation, B-E/GEI Consultants, June 26, 2006	
75					

EXHIBIT 13-A
MPWMD Comparative Matrix, Part I-A, Desalination Projects

	A	B	C	D	E
4	DECISION ELEMENT	COASTAL WATER PROJECT	NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY DESALINATION PROJECT	LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (Sand City Desal)	
76					
77	CAPITAL COST DETAIL	Year 2005 costs indexed to 2004 through 2008	Year 2005 costs	Year 2004 information - December 2002 costs	
78	DESALINATION				
79	Intake	included in plant cost	Information not provided	\$21,600,000	
80	Pre-treatment	included in plant cost	Information not provided	included in plant cost	
81	Desal Plant	\$93,531,000	Information not provided	\$28,250,000	
82	Post-treatment	included in plant cost	Information not provided	included in plant cost	
83	Brine discharge	included in intake cost	Information not provided	\$18,560,000 - \$27,130,000	
84	Storage	\$5,981,000 includes term reser, pump station	Information not provided	included in transmission pipeline	
85	Transmission Pipelines	\$25,024,000	Information not provided	\$12,692,000	
86	Pump stations	included in storage costs	Information not provided	included in transmission pipeline	
87	Energy facilities	none identified	Information not provided	\$1,000,000	
88	DESAL SUBTOTAL	\$124,536,000	Information not provided	\$82,100,000 - \$90,670,000	
89					
90	ASR COSTS	\$15,578,000	N/A	N/A	
91	RECYCLED WATER COSTS	N/A	N/A	N/A	
92	OTHER WATER SOURCES	N/A	N/A	N/A	
93					
94	ADDL CAPITAL COSTS				
95	Pilot Plant	\$2,585,000	\$2,970,000	none identified	
96	Distribution system improvements	included in desal and ASR costs	none identified	none identified	
97	Right-of-way	\$2,000,000 (desal plant site to be leased)	none identified (desal plant site to be leased)	\$5,900,000 - \$9,100,000 (includes site acquisition)	
98	Envtl review, permits, etc.	\$30,456,000	Information not provided	\$61,700,000 - \$67,850,000	
99	Engineering	included in envt/permits	Information not provided	included in envt/permits	
100	Construction Management	included in envt/permits	Information not provided	included in envt/permits	
101	Admin/legal	included in envt/permits	Information not provided	included in envt/permits	
102	Mitigation measures	to be determined	None identified	to be determined	
103	Contingencies	\$15,935,000	Information not provided	\$25,800,000	
104	SUBTOTAL	\$50,976,000	Information not provided	\$94,002,000	
105					
106	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	\$191,090,000 for proposed project (11,730 AFY) Based on 10% contingencies - B-E/GEI recommends 25% contingencies. B-E/GEI evaluated only the desalination component of the project, and not the ASR component.	\$132,000,000 for 20 MGD project \$169,030,000 (B-E/GEI Consultants, based on increasing contingencies by 10-15% to 25%)	\$176,200,000 - \$193,000,000	
107					
108	ANNUAL O&M COST DETAIL				
109	Energy	included in total O&M	Information not provided	\$7,200,000 - \$7,550,000	
110	Facilities O&M	included in total O&M	Information not provided	\$5,200,000 - \$5,550,000 (B-E/GEI Consultants)	
111	Mitigation O&M	to be determined	None identified	\$1,540,000	
112	TOTAL O&M (\$/yr)	\$6,372,000	\$13,360,000	\$8,740,000 - \$ 9,090,000/yr	
113				\$6,740,000 - \$7,090,000/yr (B-E/GEI Consultants)	
114					

EXHIBIT 13-A
MPWMD Comparative Matrix, Part I-A, Desalination Projects

	A	B	C	D	E
4	DECISION ELEMENT	COASTAL WATER PROJECT	NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY DESALINATION PROJECT	LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (Sand City Desal)	
115	SOURCES FOR COSTS	Costs presented in Amended CPCN Application, July 14, 2005, including detailed Basis of Cost documents and tables. Seawater Desalination Projects Evaluation, B-E/GEI Consultants, June 26, 2006	Total capital and O&M costs were provided by Poseidon Resources. Cost breakdowns were provided to B-E/GEI Consultants under condition of confidentiality. Pilot plant capital costs are provided in application by P/SM to California Department of Water Resources for Proposition 50 grant, March 24, 2006. Seawater Desalination Projects Evaluation, B-E/GEI Consultants, June 26, 2006	Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project, Phase 2 Technical Memorandum, Project Facilities Alternatives for the Sand City Desalination Project, June 23, 2004, CDM, p 6-2. Seawater Desalination Projects Evaluation, B-E/GEI Consultants, June 26, 2006	

EXHIBIT 13-A
MPWMD Comparative Matrix, Part I-A, Desalination Projects

	A	B	C	D	E
4	DECISION ELEMENT	COASTAL WATER PROJECT	NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY DESALINATION PROJECT	LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (Sand City Desal)	
116					
117	ACRONYMS				
118	\$/AF	cost per acre-foot			
119	\$/kwh-	cost per kilowatt-hour			
120	ac	acre			
121	AFY	acre-feet per year			
122	ARB	Air Resources Board			
123	ASR	aquifer storage and recovery			
124	B-E/GEI	Bookman-Edmonston/GEI Consultants			
125	BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure Office (US Army)			
126	BRDEIR	Board Review Draft EIR on MPWMD Water Supply Project (interim draft, Dec 2003)			
127	Cal-Am	California American Water			
128	CalTrans	Cal. Dept. of Transportation			
129	CAW	California American Water			
130	CCC	California Coastal Commission			
131	CDFG	Cal. Dept. Fish & Game			
132	CDM	Camp Dresser & McKee, Inc			
133	CDTS	Cal. Dept. of Toxic Substances			
134	CEC	California Energy Commission			
135	CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act			
136	COP	Certificate of Participation			
137	CPCN	Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity			
138	CPUC	Cal. Public Utilities Commission			
139	CR	Carmel River			
140	CSD	Community Services District			
141	CWP	Coastal Water Project			
142	DBO	design-build-operate			
143	DEIR	Draft EIR			
144	DHS	Cal. Dept. of Health Services			
145	DPR	Cal. Dept. of Parks & Recreation			
146	Duke	Duke Energy Corporation			
147	DWR	Cal. Dept. of Water Resources			
148	EIR	Environmental Impact Report			
149	EIS	Environmental Impact Statement			
150	FEIR	Final EIR			
151	FORA	Fort Ord Reuse Authority			
152	HDD	horizontal directional drilling			
153	IS	Initial Study			
154	JPA	Joint Powers Authority			
155	K/J	Kennedy Jenks Engineers, Inc.			

EXHIBIT 13-A
MPWMD Comparative Matrix, Part I-A, Desalination Projects

	A	B	C	D	E
4	DECISION ELEMENT	COASTAL WATER PROJECT	NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY DESALINATION PROJECT	LONG-TERM WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (Sand City Desal)	
156	MBNMS	Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary			
157	MBUAPCD	Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District			
158	MCEH	Monterey County Environmental Health			
159	MCPBI	Monterey County Dept. Planning & Building Inspection			
160	MCPW	Monterey County Public Works			
161	MCWD	Marina Coast Water District			
162	MCWRA	Monterey County Water Resources Agency			
163	MLHD	Moss Landing Harbor District			
164	MLML	Moss Landing Marine Laboratory			
165	MLPP	Moss Landing Power Plant			
166	MoCo	Monterey County			
167	MP	Monterey Peninsula			
168	MPWMD	Monterey Peninsula Water Management District			
169	MRWPCA	Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency			
170	N/A	not applicable			
171	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act			
172	NMCDP	North Monterey County Desalination Project			
173	NOAA Fish	National Marine Fisheries Service (part of Natl Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration)			
174	NOP	Notice of Preparation			
175	NorCo	North Monterey County			
176	O&M	operations and maintenance			
177	PEA	Proponent's Environmental Assessment			
178	P/SM	Pajaro/Sunny Mesa Community Services District			
179	RBF	RBF Consulting, Inc			
180	ROD	Record of Decision			
181	ROW	right-of-way			
182	RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board			
183	SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office			
184	SLC	State Lands Commission			
185	SRF	State Revolving Fund, a loan administered by SWRCB			
186	SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board			
187	TAMC	Transportation Agency of Monterey County			
188	TBD	to be determined			
189	USACOE	US Army Corps of Engineers			
190	USBLM	US Bureau of Land Management			
191	USBR	US Bureau of Reclamation			
192	USCG	US Coast Guard			
193	ESEPA	US Environmental Protection Agency			
194	USFWS	US Fish & Wildlife Service			
195					