

COMMENT FORM

**California American Water Company (Cal Am)
Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report**

Date: 30 June 2015
Name: Ron Weitzman
Affiliation: Water Plus (dba Water Ratepayers Association of the
Monterey Peninsula), president
Address: 23910 Fairfield Place
Carmel, CA 93923
Email address: ronweitzman@redshift.com

I wish to be added to the CEQA mailing list.

To:

Attn: Andrew Barnsdale
California Public Utilities Commission
c/o Environmental Science Associates
MPWSP-EIR@esassoc.com

COMMENTS (due on or before 13 July 2015)

Comments begin on next page.

Two Alternatives to the Monterey Pipeline

One of the more disruptive adverse impacts of the Cal Am project is the construction of the Monterey Pipeline (long solid thin red line in attached map, DEIR Figure 7.3), identified as the superior, though non-mitigatable, alternative for moving potable water from north to south to enable district-wide distribution. Members of the Water Ratepayers Association of the Monterey Peninsula object to that choice and evaluation. We believe the EIR needs to consider at least two other options, providing partial or total mitigation of the adverse impacts of the Monterey Pipeline.

The first is to use the Aquifer Storage and Recovery route as a replacement for the Monterey Pipeline. Shown as a long black dashed line in the attached map, it would serve the same purpose without the considerable disruption that construction of the Monterey Pipeline would occasion. ASR pipelines are already in place. Plans are even now to include two pipelines along the route, one carrying water in the opposite direction of the other. Ratepayers have paid many millions of dollars to construct the ASR pipelines while receiving almost no benefit from them, partially because of the drought but more ominously because of the persistent precipitation drop in California due to global warming. Using the ASR route for the north-to-south pipeline would constitute a redemption of this otherwise misspent money while providing remediation of serious adverse impacts, including unnecessary costs.

The second option for remediation is to build the desalination plant at near the mouth of the Carmel River. That would completely avoid the need for a Monterey Pipeline, together with its disruptive and costly impacts. WRAMP will consider this option in greater detail in a separate comment on possibly superior project alternatives not considered in the DEIR.

REMEDICATION. The EIR should consider an ASR route or location of the desalination plant near the mouth of the Carmel River as potentially superior alternatives to the Monterey Pipeline. Cal Am is already taking steps to build the Monterey Pipeline on the assumption that any water supply developed would need this pipeline. That assumption is not defensible without consideration of alternatives like the two proposed here. In the meantime, Cal Am should not be permitted to go forward with the construction of the Monterey Pipeline before approval of the FEIR and certification of total project public convenience and necessity.

If you do not take these remediation measures, please explain, Why not?

