

## 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 ReportDate: June 23, 2015Name: Dick RotterAffiliation: WaterPlusAddress: 14500 Mountain Quail Rd.Corral de Tierra, CAEmail 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:

Pages 4.4-67 "Over the life of the proposed project, thus  
would be an average..." (re amount of inland water extracted)

This reference to "the life of the proposed project" is used  
quiet often, but the DEIR fails to designate this life, and the  
years are not designated. The years are not even mentioned.

The DEIR does not even mention the life of the replacement  
components that apply to the "life of the project". Where does  
"the life of the project" get addressed? How does the "life"  
even relate to an EIR for a project approval?

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

Comment continued:

Page 4.4-80 "With the implementation of the proposed project, a portion of the intruding seawater would be removed from the coast through pumping at the seawater intake system. Once removed, the pressure on the seawater flowing landward at the coast would be reduced within the localized area affected by the proposed project pumping. The pressure reduction would interrupt the inland flow of seawater instead of allowing the seawater to continue to migrate inland. This would cause the seawater/freshwater interface to migrate back towards the ocean, thus reducing the extent of the area currently affected by seawater intrusion."

Figure 4.4-9 (pg 4.4-28) shows an 11-mile front of seawater intrusion. Figures 4.4-13, -14 and -15 show about 4 miles of ocean front for potential impacts on groundwater levels. Figure 4.4-16 shows particle tracking data, also over a 4-mile front. The particle tracking shows a trend of close-in water flows that circle toward the cone of depression, but does not show the circular loop of other water particles that follow in the larger 11-mile front of seawater intrusion. Common sense says the larger circle of particle tracking would fill in behind the flow toward the cone of depression, and stabilize 4-miles inland. Where is data that shows seawater intrusion will be affected at the more inland areas? Where is proof that circular pattern of particle tracking actually extends farther than 4-miles inland? How far inland does it stabilize? The DEIR cannot say there is an inland reduction of seawater intrusion without more definitive data to support it. Will these be explained and corrected in the FEIR?