

**From:** John Moore <[jmoore052@gmail.com](mailto:jmoore052@gmail.com)>

**Date:** August 24, 2018 at 9:42:24 AM PDT

**To:** Jim Johnson <[jjohnson@montereyherald.com](mailto:jjohnson@montereyherald.com)>, [paul@carmelpinecone.com](mailto:paul@carmelpinecone.com), "[editor@cedarstreettimes.com](mailto:editor@cedarstreettimes.com)" <[editor@cedarstreettimes.com](mailto:editor@cedarstreettimes.com)>, "[mheditor@montereyherald.com](mailto:mheditor@montereyherald.com)" <[mheditor@montereyherald.com](mailto:mheditor@montereyherald.com)>, [DDWrecycledwater@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:DDWrecycledwater@waterboards.ca.gov), [Randy.Barnard@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:Randy.Barnard@waterboards.ca.gov), "[kera@mcweekly.com](mailto:kera@mcweekly.com)" <[kera@mcweekly.com](mailto:kera@mcweekly.com)>, russell mcglathlin <[RMcGlothlin@bhfs.com](mailto:RMcGlothlin@bhfs.com)>, Felicia Marcus <[felicia.marcus@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:felicia.marcus@waterboards.ca.gov)>, Mary Adams <[district5@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:district5@co.monterey.ca.us)>, Arlene Tavani <[arlene@mpwmd.net](mailto:arlene@mpwmd.net)>, Moe Ammar <[moeammar@pacificgrove.org](mailto:moeammar@pacificgrove.org)>, Bob Jaques <[bobj83@comcast.net](mailto:bobj83@comcast.net)>, Jane Parker <[district4@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:district4@co.monterey.ca.us)>, George Riley <[GeorgeTRiley@gmail.com](mailto:GeorgeTRiley@gmail.com)>, john moore <[jmerton99@yahoo.com](mailto:jmerton99@yahoo.com)>, Joe Livernois <[joe@vomb.org](mailto:joe@vomb.org)>, [landwatch@mclw.org](mailto:landwatch@mclw.org), Carly Mayberry <[cmayberry@montereyherald.com](mailto:cmayberry@montereyherald.com)>, Royal Calkins <[calkinsroyal@gmail.com](mailto:calkinsroyal@gmail.com)>, [chayito@my1water.org](mailto:chayito@my1water.org), Mark Stone <[Assemblymember.Stone@outreach.assembly.ca.gov](mailto:Assemblymember.Stone@outreach.assembly.ca.gov)>

**Subject: Re: Important Water Article in Friday's Herald**

And of course, the Commission is unaware that Agriculture Waste Waters are defined as an "Extremely Impaired Source" by the Department of Drinking Water. That means that if any other source of less contaminated source water is available, the DDW should have denied the permit (in favor of desalination, a much safer source). There was never any opposition to the whole permit process, so many risks were not reported in the EIR for the project

In today's Pine Cone, Paul Miller, in referring to PWM stated that "water is water." So why are there so many cases of contaminated drinking water throughout the U.S.? One of the three basins used by the Orange County Water District has become contaminated, but they have no choice but to go on using it. Imagine PWM with only one basin. Water is not water, if drinking water is contaminated.

The State Water Bd. has just issued "Notification Level Issuances" for both perflourooctansulfonic acid (PFOS) and perfluorooxyanoic acid (PFOA), two of the deadly new contaminant classes found in drinking water and affecting the public health of users throughout the U.S. Closed military bases are a particular problem. The Seaside Basin sits under Area 39 of old Ft. Ord, a very contaminated cite with a great potential for the two classes of contaminants..

The notices were issued on July 18, 2018, signed by the Director Of the Division of Drinking Water. According to paragraph 5 of each notice: "5. The establishment of a notification level does not require public water systems to monitor for the contaminant, 'except when water systems are subject to the recycled water regulations' (emphasis mine' )." So the PWM project requires monitoring and the only safe monitoring is full time.

Paragraph 6 of each notice describes the sources of the two contaminants, mainly consumer products but also from fire fighting foam and other industrial sources(Ft Ord area 39 is a classic source that may seep into the Seaside Basin, my comment, not the Notice) To my knowledge, the Seaside Basin has never been tested for these two classes of contaminants. It must be!

The reason there is not more public opposition to the PWM project is because the details of the risks inherent in the project have never been revealed to the public. We were never allowed to vote for or against the project, a process that would have exposed the health risks to the public.

For my part, all that I have ever requested is that the judge in charge of supervising the Seaside Basin, appoint experts in the toxicology of the treated mix, to determine that it is safe, or not, for potable uses. There is only one reason that the PWM object to that request, and that is another cause for concern.

John M. Moore(licensed, but retired lawyer(JD Stanford School of Law))  
836 2d st. Pacific Grove, Ca. 93950 831-655-4540

On Thu, Aug 23, 2018 at 9:47 PM Ron Weitzman <[ronweitzman@redshift.com](mailto:ronweitzman@redshift.com)> wrote:

Jim, too bad The Herald did not send you there. It was civilized and serious. There was a good feeling in the room. The opposing parties filled in a lot of the blanks in the proposed decision and the EIR/EIS and also strongly argued for the alternatives to immediate approval of project denial or short-term delay. The purpose of the delay, possibly not to go beyond the 31 December proceeding deadline, is to consider expansion of Pure Water Monterey as a substitute for Cal Am's proposed desal plant, which Water Plus argued would raise rates and thereby lower demand so much as to make the desal plant unnecessary, a white elephant. –Ron

Full commission 'engaged' in CPUC hearing on Cal Am desal project

By Jim Johnson, Monterey Herald

POSTED: 08/23/18, 3:21 PM PDT | UPDATED: 2 HRS AGO

0 COMMENTS

Monterey >> In a sign of how seriously the state Public Utilities Commission is taking the debate over the future of water supply on the Monterey Peninsula, all five commissioners attended a CPUC oral

argument hearing on California American Water's proposed desalination project in San Francisco on Wednesday.

Several of those who attended the hearing said three of the five commissioners asked a number of questions of the parties to the desal project proceeding, and all five appeared "engaged and interested" in the issue. Only a majority of the commission was required to attend.

Commissioners Carla Peterman, Martha Guzman Aceves and Clifford Rechtschaffen each asked questions related to the Peninsula's water demand, the sizing of Cal Am's desal project and the overall water supply. They also asked whether a proposed Pure Water Monterey expansion could meet the water system's demand without the desal project, according to sources who attended the meeting.

Only commission president Michael Picker and assigned commissioner Liane Randolph did not ask questions, attendees said.

The hearing, requested by the Marina Coast Water District and the city of Marina, offered an opportunity for supporters and critics to make their arguments directly to commissioners between last week's release of a proposed decision for the desal project and the Sept. 13 CPUC meeting when the commission is expected to consider issuing a permit for the project. To this point, only one commissioner at a time - presently, Randolph - has been directly engaged in the commission's review of the project.

In answer to Cal Am's proposal, some parties to the proceeding have criticized the desal project for a number of legal and technical issues. They called for postponing or ditching desal entirely in favor of an expanded Pure Water Monterey project and other supplemental supplies. They argued that would allow the Peninsula to meet the state-ordered cutback in pumping from the Carmel River by the end of 2021, and meet critical milestones along the way.

Monterey One Water General Manager Paul Sciuto, whose agency is building the Pure Water Monterey project, said the hearing was an important opportunity for back-and-forth between commissioners and parties to the proceeding as part of the review process.

"I thought it was great all five commissioners were engaged and interested in the proceeding and the process," Sciuto said. "The opportunity for the parties to clarify points and highlight evidence in the record but not in the proposed decision was important to get a well-vetted, comprehensive decision."

Other attendees said Sciuto was eloquent in his defense of the Pure Water Monterey expansion proposal, which he argued was further along than three CPUC judges found in the proposed decision. He also praised Planning and Conservation League Executive Director Jonas Minton for urging the commissioners not to rush into a decision on Cal Am's desal project while a viable alternative with less environmental impact was available.

Public Water Now Managing Director George Riley, whose organization is backing a fall ballot measure aimed at a public buyout of Cal Am's local water system, said he thought the commissioners paid close attention to the Pure Water Monterey expansion proposal. Marina mayor Bruce Delgado said he believed the commission gained a better understanding of the city's "community values" including the risk to its groundwater from the proposed desal project as a result of the proposal to feed the desal plant through nearby slant wells.

Delgado said it was “good to have everyone in the room,” and speculated about the potential benefit of having such a hearing earlier in the process.

Cal Am spokeswoman Catherine Stedman also said the hearing was a “good opportunity for the commissioners to learn the positions of the various parties” and be able to ask “direct, clarifying questions.” She said Cal Am officials appreciated the opportunity to make their case for the “importance of moving ahead with a water supply solution as quickly as possible.” She argued that opponents’ issues were addressed in the project’s environmental review.

“We believe that now is absolutely the time to focus on completion of our project rather than contemplate last-minute, unvetted alternatives and interim projects that aren’t capable of meeting the (river cutback order),” Stedman said.

Jim Johnson can be reached at 831-726-4348.