

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



COMMENT FORM

California American Water Company (CalAm) Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project Draft Environmental Impact Report

Date: June 23, 2015
Name: Dick Rotter
Affiliation: WaterPlus
Address: 14500 Mountain Quail Rd.
Corral de Tierra, CA
Email address: dickrotter@gmail.com

Check here if you do NOT want to be added to the CEQA mailing list.

Privacy Notice: All information provided on this form will become part of the public record. Unless indicated by you otherwise, you will automatically be added to the CEQA mailing list.

Your input on the proposed project is greatly appreciated. If you have comments on the accuracy and adequacy of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project (MPWSP) you can submit your comments by turning in this completed comment form tonight in the comment box located at the sign-in table; faxing your comments to (415) 896-0332; emailing your comments to MPWSP-EIR@esassoc.com, or mailing them to the following address:

Attn: Andrew Barnsdale
California Public Utilities Commission
c/o Environmental Science Associates
550 Kearny Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108

Comments should pertain to the accuracy and adequacy of the Draft EIR prepared for the MPWSP. All comments must be received by the CPUC no later than July 1, 2015. PLEASE PRINT LEGIBLY.

Comment:

PAGE 4-4-74-5 various mentions of impacts.
There is no mention of the 18 to 24 month of test well data
collection period. Cal AM puts it in all schedules and updates.
What would be challenged or modified from the extended data
collection period? There is no mention of its relevance, why?
Is this DEIR intending to seek approval without this data? How
can this extended test data be ignored? Will this affect the pro-
ject if new data proves relevant? Where has this been accounted
for in the DRIR? Will it be included in the FEIR? Would mitiga-

Comment Form for the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project Environmental Review Process

Comment continued:

Would mitigations change for example if relevant data comes forward?

Page 7-10,11 7.4.6 Other desalination proposals at Moss Landing

the word feasible is used but not defined. Why are cost and risk overlooked in this analysis? The word "feasible" should be defined in the final FEIR. Will the FEIR include the concepts of cost and risk?

Page 7-14 RE Peoples: "This desalination proposal has not been carried forward as an alternative to the MPWSP because the COUC has no jurisdiction...."

Why is this reference to "no CPUC jurisdiction" be relevant? Regardless of CPUC, all alternatives should be considered.

Page 7-18-19 Open Ocean Intakes

Peoples and DWD are proposing to use this method. There is no mention of the rapidly improving technology that reduces entrainment and impingement. The DEIR is remiss in using little discussion on its widespread use and usefulness. Why do you shortchange Open Ocean Intake feasibility?