

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Sections

- 1.1 Introduction
 - 1.2 Project Setting and Background
 - 1.3 Use of This Document
 - 1.4 CEQA Process
-

1.1 Introduction

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC or Commission) as the Lead Agency¹, has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the California American Water Company's (CalAm) proposed Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project (MPWSP or proposed project) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. The EIR is a public document for use by the CPUC, other governmental agencies, and the public in identifying and evaluating the potential environmental consequences of a project, identifying mitigation measures to lessen or eliminate adverse impacts, and examining feasible alternatives to the project. The impact analyses in this report are based on a variety of sources; references for these sources are listed at the end of each technical section. The information contained in this EIR will be reviewed and considered by the CPUC Commissioners prior to the ultimate decision to approve, deny, or modify the proposed project.

CalAm is proposing the MPWSP for the purpose of developing replacement water supplies for CalAm's Monterey District service area (Monterey District). The MPWSP is needed to replace existing water supplies that have been constrained by legal decisions affecting the Carmel River and Seaside Groundwater Basin water resources. California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Order 95-10 requires CalAm to reduce and terminate surface water diversions from the Carmel River in excess of its legal entitlement of 3,376 acre-feet per year (afy), and SWRCB Order 2009-0060 ("Cease and Desist Order") requires CalAm to terminate diversions in excess of its legal entitlement by December 2016. In 2006, the Monterey County Superior Court adjudicated the Seaside Groundwater Basin, effectively reducing CalAm's yield from the Seaside Groundwater Basin from approximately 4,000 afy to 1,474 afy.

¹ Under CEQA, the Lead Agency is the public agency that has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project; the Lead Agency decides whether an EIR or negative declaration will be required for the project and causes the document to be prepared (CEQA Guidelines Section 15367).

The proposed project is comprised of various facilities and improvements, including: a seawater intake system; a 9.6-million-gallons-per-day (mgd) desalination plant; desalinated water storage and conveyance facilities; and expanded Aquifer Storage and Recovery (ASR) facilities. This EIR also evaluates a variation of the project (MPWSP Variant or project variant) that would be capable of meeting the project objectives by combining a reduced-capacity (6.4-mgd) desalination plant and all other facilities included in the proposed project with a water purchase agreement from the Monterey Regional Water Pollution Control Agency's (MRWPCA) proposed Pure Water Monterey Groundwater Replenishment (GWR) project.

This chapter contains the following sections:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Project Setting and Background
- 1.3 Use of This Document
- 1.4 CEQA Process

1.2 Project Setting and Background

The California American Water Company (CalAm), the project applicant, is a privately owned public utility that has served the Monterey Peninsula since acquiring properties from California Water and Telephone Company in 1966. CalAm's Monterey District water service area (Monterey District) encompasses most of the Monterey Peninsula, including the cities of Carmel-by-the-Sea, Del Rey Oaks, Monterey, Pacific Grove, Sand City, and Seaside, and the unincorporated areas of Carmel Highlands, Carmel Valley, Pebble Beach, and the Del Monte Forest. The water supply challenges facing CalAm and the Monterey Peninsula are substantial and have been well-documented in a number of venues including the SWRCB, the Monterey County Superior Court, the CPUC, and the California Legislature. Water sources consist primarily of surface water from the Carmel River and groundwater from the Seaside Basin Groundwater Basin. By reason of its geography and rainfall patterns, the area is prone to severe droughts. Rainfall is the primary source of water and groundwater recharge within coastal Monterey County.

1.2.1 SWRCB Order 95-10 and Seaside Groundwater Basin Adjudication

In 1995 SWRCB Order 95-10 (SWRCB, 1995) substantially reduced supplies available to CalAm from the Carmel River. The order stated that CalAm was diverting water in excess of its legal right and directed CalAm to diligently undertake actions to obtain appropriate rights to the water that was being unlawfully diverted or obtain water from other sources. In the meantime the order directed CalAm to implement conservation measures to offset demand, among other requirements. (See Section 2.2.2 in Chapter 2 for more information on Order 95-10 and the subsequent SWRCB Order 2009-0060). One of Order 95-10's provisions directed CalAm to maximize its use of the Seaside Groundwater Basin for the purpose of serving existing customers – while honoring existing allocations – to reduce diversions from the Carmel River to the greatest practicable extent.

However, in 2006 the Seaside Groundwater Basin was adjudicated. In its decision adjudicating the basin, the Monterey County Superior Court established the adjudicated water rights of all the

users of the Seaside Groundwater Basin, for the purpose of avoiding long-term damage to the basin. The adjudication substantially reduced the amount of groundwater available to CalAm (from approximately 4,000 afy to 1,474, as noted above). (See Section 2.2.3 in Chapter 2, Water Demand, Supplies, and Water Rights for more information on the Seaside Groundwater Basin Adjudication.)

1.2.2 Relationship between the Coastal Water Project and the MPWSP

In 2004, CalAm filed Application A.04-09-019 seeking a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) from the CPUC for the Coastal Water Project. The Coastal Water Project (CWP) was intended to replace existing Carmel River water supplies for the CalAm Monterey District service area that are constrained by legal decisions described above. In general, the previously proposed CWP involved the production of desalinated water supplies, increased yield from the Seaside Groundwater Basin ASR system, and additional storage and conveyance systems to move the replacement supplies to the existing CalAm distribution system. The CWP (also referred to as the Moss Landing Project) was sized to meet existing water demand and did not include supplemental supplies to accommodate growth. The CWP proposed to use the existing intakes at the Moss Landing Power Plant to draw source water for a new 10-mgd desalination plant at Moss Landing, construct conveyance and storage facilities, and facility improvements to the existing Seaside Groundwater Basin ASR system. (Refer to Section 3.2.2.3 in Chapter 3, Project Description for more information on the exiting ASR system.) On January 30, 2009, the CPUC published a Draft EIR analyzing the environmental impacts of the previous CWP, as well as the environmental impacts of two project alternatives—the North Marina Project² and the Regional Project.³ The CPUC published the Coastal Water Project Final EIR (SCH No. 2006101004) in October 2009 and certified the EIR in December 2009 (Decision D.09-12-017). A year later, in Decision D.10-12-016, the CPUC approved implementation of the Regional Project alternative.

Subsequent to approval of the Regional Project, CalAm withdrew its support for the Regional Project in January 2012.⁴ As a result, in April 2012, CalAm submitted Application A.12-04-019 (CalAm, 2012) seeking a CPCN from the CPUC for the MPWSP to construct, own, and operate a desalination facility for water supply.

The MPWSP includes many of the same elements previously analyzed in the CWP EIR; however, key components, including the seawater intake system and desalination plant, have been relocated and/or modified under the current proposal.

² The North Marina Project alternative included most of the same facilities as the previously proposed CWP and, like the previously proposed CWP, would only provide replacement supplies to meet existing demand. The key differences between this alternative and the previously proposed CWP were that the slant wells and desalination plant would be constructed at different locations (Marina State Beach and North Marina, respectively), and the desalination plant would have a slightly greater production capacity (11 mgd versus 10 mgd).

³ The Regional Project would have been implemented jointly by CalAm, Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) and Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA). The Regional Project was to be implemented in two phases and included vertical seawater intake wells on coastal dunes located south of the Salinas River and north of Reservation Road; a 10-mgd desalination plant in North Marina (Armstrong Ranch); product water storage and conveyance facilities; and expansions to the existing Seaside Groundwater Basin ASR system. The second phase of the Regional Project, which was evaluated at a programmatic level of detail, included water to meet demand under buildout of the service-area cities' general plans and water for areas of North Monterey County.

⁴ The CPUC subsequently closed the CWP proceeding in Decision D.12-07-008 (July 12, 2012).

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, the CPUC determined that preparation of a Subsequent EIR is the appropriate level of CEQA review for the MPWSP.⁵ Although the MPWSP EIR qualifies as a “Subsequent EIR” under CEQA, there are no special procedural requirements that apply to a Subsequent EIR; therefore, for simplicity “Subsequent” is not used in the title and this document is referred to as an EIR. This EIR provides a comprehensive description and evaluation of all proposed components (including the new proposed elements and previously analyzed components) as the “whole of the action.” This EIR evaluates alternatives not previously considered in the CWP EIR. The CWP EIR is not in itself incorporated by reference into this EIR. However, this EIR utilizes relevant data that was developed for the CWP EIR, and updates the data and prior analyses as appropriate to address the effects of the current proposal.

1.2.3 Endangered Species

In addition to the constraints on water supply discussed above, CalAm’s diversions from the Carmel River are also constrained by an annual Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between CalAm, the Monterey Peninsula Water Management (MPWMD, which regulates water resources on the Monterey Peninsula), and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and agreements with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and NOAA Fisheries. Two federally-listed endangered species, the California Red-Legged Frog and steelhead trout, are present in the Carmel Valley area. The agreements between CalAm and USFWS and NOAA Fisheries, which restrict pumping and withdrawals from the river in order to protect these species, are described below. Refer to Section 4.6, Terrestrial Biological Resources in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, for more information on biological resources in the project area.

1.2.3.1 California Red Legged Frog

In 1996, the California Red-Legged Frog was listed as threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). In 1997, the USFWS issued an ESA-4(d) ruling that allowed it to prosecute for a “take” of the frog. The California Red-Legged Frog inhabits the Carmel River. In 1997, CalAm entered into an agreement with USFWS to further regulate its well production activities in an attempt to avoid and/or mitigate impacts on the California Red-Legged Frog and has renewed that agreement several times.

⁵ Per CEQA Section 21166 a Subsequent EIR would be required if: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR, was certified as complete was adopted, shows any of the following: (a) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration; (b) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR; (c) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or (d) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

1.2.3.2 Steelhead Trout

In 1997 the South Central California Coast Steelhead Trout (steelhead) was listed as threatened under the ESA, and in 2000 NOAA Fisheries issued an ESA-4(d) rule allowing it to prosecute for take of steelhead. The steelhead inhabits the Carmel River. The USFWS and NOAA Fisheries have taken the position that any entity that pumps water from the Carmel Valley Aquifer may be liable for a “take” because the pumping may alter the habitat, affect the steelhead’s ability to migrate in the river, and affect the CRLF’s ability to grow to maturity. In 2001, CalAm negotiated a Conservation Agreement with NOAA Fisheries that included various changes in operations, with the long-term goal of procuring an alternative water supply source to reduce withdrawals from the Carmel River Aquifer. Failure of CalAm to satisfy USFWS and NOAA Fisheries’ concerns regarding ESA compliance could subject CalAm and its customers to enforcement actions for take, including further reduction of the water supply obtained from the Carmel Valley Aquifer and fines that could be in the millions of dollars.

1.3 Use of this Document

Section 15124(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain a statement briefly describing the intended uses of the EIR.

This EIR will be used primarily by the CPUC, as the Lead Agency, and responsible agencies, including but not limited to, local municipalities (e.g. Monterey County and project area cities), SWRCB and the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), California Coastal Commission (CCC) and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), to evaluate environmental impacts of the proposed project as well as project alternatives, and make a decision of approval for the proposed project. It is expected that, as required by CEQA, the CPUC and other relevant agencies will use this EIR in deciding whether to approve the MPWSP or any alternative to, or of, the MPWSP. The analyses contained within this EIR would be used to support the acquisition of the regulatory permits or approvals, as needed.

1.3.1 The California Public Utilities Commission

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC or Commission) is a constitutionally-established state⁶ agency charged with providing regulatory oversight of investor-owned utilities in the transportation, energy, communications and water industries. The Commission consists of five commissioners who are appointed for six-year terms by the Governor. The commissioners are served by an Executive Director and a staff of professional engineers, economists, policy and industry analysts, attorneys and administrative law judges (ALJ). The CPUC provides regulatory oversight in the areas of purpose and need; economic cost; ratemaking; safety and reliability; and customer service; among others. The Commission is located in San Francisco and makes decisions by vote of its commissioners at regularly scheduled public business meetings. More information on the CPUC may be found at: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov>.

⁶ State of California Constitution, Article XII, Section 1.

The CPUC is the Lead Agency for CEQA compliance in evaluation of CalAm’s proposed MPWSP, and has directed the preparation of this EIR. This EIR will be used by the Commission, in conjunction with other information developed in the Commission’s formal record, to act on CalAm’s application for a CPCN for construction and operation of the proposed project. Under CEQA requirements, the CPUC will determine the adequacy of the Final EIR and, if adequate, will certify the document as complying with CEQA. If the Commission approves a project with significant and unmitigable environmental impacts, it must state why in a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which would be included in the Commission’s decision on the application.

Consistent with this broad scope of its authority, the CPUC regulates the construction and expansion of water lines, plants and systems by such private water service providers pursuant to Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity (each a “CPCN”) (Pub. Util. Code Section 1001) and authorizes “just and reasonable” rates that such water service providers may charge their customers for the provision of water services (Pub. Util. Code Sections 451, 454). More specifically concerning CPCNs, “No. . . water corporation . . . shall begin the construction of . . . a line, plant, or system, or of any extension thereof, without having first obtained from the commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require such construction.” Pub. Util. Code Section 1001. The CPUC may issue a CPCN as requested, refuse to issue it or issue it for only part of a proposed project, and may attach terms and conditions to the exercise of the rights granted by the CPCN to the extent that, in the CPUC’s judgment, the public convenience and necessity so require. Pub. Util. Code Section 1005.

The Project proponent, CalAm, is a “public utility” under the CPUC’s jurisdiction, and has applied to the CPUC for a CPCN under Public Utilities Code section 1001 to build, own and operate all elements of the MPWSP, and also for permission to recover present and future costs for the Project by short-term rate increases. The Final EIR will be reviewed by a CPUC ALJ, who will submit a proposed decision to the Commission concerning certification of the EIR and approval of the MPWSP. In addition to environmental impacts addressed during the CEQA process, the CPCN process will consider any other issues that have been established in the formal proceeding record, including but not limited to economic issues, social impacts, specific routing and alignments, and the need for the project. During this process the CPUC will also take into account testimony and briefs from parties who have formally intervened in A.12-04-019, as well as the formal record of any hearings held by the ALJ in this case. The five appointed CPUC Commissioners will ultimately cast a vote on whether to approve the proposed decision prepared by the CPUC ALJ. One or more Commissioners may also prepare one or more alternate proposed decisions that differ from the proposed decision of the CPUC ALJ, and may vote at a Commission meeting whether to adopt an alternate proposed decision. Whichever proposed decision garners at least a majority vote of the CPUC Commissioners will become the decision of the Commission. This decision is subject to review within the CPUC and in court.

Although the CPUC’s authority is broad, it is not all-inclusive. Significantly, the CPUC does not have jurisdiction over municipally-owned utilities unless expressly provided by statute. *Orange County Air Pollution Control Dist. v. Public Util. Com.* 4 Cal.3d 945, 953 at FN7 (1971). For example, the MRWPCA is a municipally-owned utility. The CPUC has no jurisdiction over the MRWPCA. Thus, as discussed below, the CPUC would not have authority over any element of

the MPWSP that ultimately is undertaken by the MRWPCA (as could be the case for the Pure Water Monterey Groundwater Replenishment Project (GWR Project), discussed in detail in Chapter 6, MPWSP Variant).

1.3.2 State Water Resources Control Board

To implement the MPWSP, CalAm will be applying for a loan under the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF, or SRF) Program, partially funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and administered by the SWRCB. To comply with applicable federal statutes and authorities, USEPA has established specific guidelines in the Operating Agreement with SWRCB for administering the SRF Loan Program and requires “CEQA-Plus” environmental documentation and review⁷. As a funding agency overseeing the SRF program and as a state agency with jurisdiction by law to preserve, enhance, and restore the quality of California’s water resources, the SWRCB will serve as a Responsible Agency under CEQA for the proposed project. As provided for in Section 15096(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, a responsible agency must consider the environmental effects of the project as shown in the EIR.

1.3.3 Other Agencies

Several other agencies will rely on information in this EIR to inform them in their decision over issuance of specific permits related to project construction or operation. In addition to the CPUC, State agencies such as the Department of Transportation, CDFW, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Office of Historic Preservation would be involved in reviewing and/or approving the project. On the federal level, agencies with potential reviewing and/or permitting authority include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). A complete list of agencies is included in Chapter 3, Project Description, Table 3-8.

1.4 CEQA Process

This EIR has been prepared in compliance with the CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines. This EIR is a public document for use by CPUC, other governmental agencies, and the public in identifying and evaluating the potential environmental consequences of a project, identifying mitigation measures to lessen or eliminate adverse impacts, and examining feasible alternatives to the project. The impact analyses in this report are based on a variety of sources; references for these sources are listed at the end of each technical section. The information contained in this EIR will be reviewed and considered by the CPUC Commissioners prior to the ultimate decision to approve, deny, or modify the proposed project.

⁷ The CWSRF Program is partially funded through a capitalization grant from the USEPA on an annual basis. Due to the federal nexus with USEPA, federal laws and regulations (e.g. federal cross-cutters) apply to all projects pursuing CWSRF financing. Under the CWSRF Program, the Division under the State Water Board uses the CEQA document plus the federal cross-cutting documentation in place of a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document in what is termed “CEQA-Plus” documentation. The State Water Board does not complete a NEPA review process, but rather completes the “NEPA-like” process of CEQA-Plus.

1.4.1 Notice of Preparation and Scoping

In accordance with CEQA Section 15162(d), a subsequent EIR must be given the same notice and public review as given to a Draft EIR under Section 15087 or Section 15072 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) was circulated to local, state, and federal agencies, Native American tribal organizations, as well as other interested parties, on October 5, 2012. The NOP solicited both written and verbal comments on the EIR's scope during a 30-day comment period and provided information on the forthcoming public scoping meetings. Comments were requested by November 5, 2012. The NOP provided a description of the MPWSP, a discussion of possible alternative projects being considered, a map of the project location and the area, and a summary of the probable environmental effects of the project to be addressed in the EIR.

In addition to the NOP, the CPUC published legal and display advertisements in the *Monterey Herald* on October 10, October 21 and October 24, 2012; in the *Carmel Pine Cone* on October 12, 2012; in the *Salinas Californian* on October 10 and October 25, 2012; and in Spanish in the *El Sol* on October 12, 2012.

During the scoping period, the CPUC held a series of three scoping meetings in Monterey County to discuss the proposed project and to solicit public input as to the scope and content of this EIR. Scoping meetings were held:

October 24, 2012
6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Rancho Canada Golf Club
4860 Carmel Valley Road
Carmel, CA 93923

October 25, 2012
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Oldemeyer Center
Blackhorse Room
968 Hilby Avenue
Seaside, CA 93955

October 25, 2012
6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Oldemeyer Center
Laguna Grande Hall
968 Hilby Avenue
Seaside, CA 93955

Appendix A of this Draft EIR contains a copy of the NOP, the NOP mailing list, and the Scoping Report which presents a description of public outreach efforts and comments received during the scoping process.

1.4.2 Draft EIR and Public Review

This document constitutes the Draft EIR, as provided for in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. This document is being circulated to local, state, and federal agencies as well as interested organizations and individuals who wish to review and comment on the report. Notice of this Draft EIR was also sent directly to every agency, person, or organization that commented on the NOP. The publication of the Draft EIR marks the beginning of a 60-day public review period, ending July 1, 2015. During the 60-day review period, written comments may be mailed, hand delivered, emailed or faxed to:

Andrew Barnsdale
California Public Utilities Commission
c/o Environmental Science Associates
550 Kearny Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94108
mpwsp-eir@esassoc.com

Commenters are requested to include their name, address, and telephone number with the comments. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a), the focus of review should be on the sufficiency of this Draft EIR in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated.

1.4.3 Final EIR

Following circulation of this Draft EIR and incorporation of public comments and responses to comments, a Final EIR will be published by the CPUC and submitted into the formal record of the Commission's CPCN proceeding for CalAm (A.12-04-019). The Final EIR will then be reviewed by a CPUC ALJ, who will submit a proposed decision to the Commission concerning certification of the EIR and approval of the MPWSP. In addition to environmental impacts, the ALJ will consider any other issues that have been established in the formal proceeding record, including but not limited to economic issues, social impacts, specific routing and alignments, and the need for the proposed project. During this process the ALJ will also take into account testimony and briefs from parties who have formally intervened in A.12-04-019, as well as the formal record of any hearings held by the ALJ in this case.

1.4.4 CPUC Approval

Following certification of the Final EIR, the CPUC may proceed with project approval actions. Should the CPUC decide in favor of the MPWSP, as proposed or as modified, the CPUC must make findings on each significant environmental impact. As to each such impact, the lead agency must find that either (1) the environmental effect has been reduced through mitigation measures to a less-than-significant level, essentially "eliminating, avoiding, or substantially lessening" the expected impacts, or (2) the residual significant adverse impact that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant level is outweighed by project benefits. This latter finding is called a Statement of Overriding Considerations and if the CPUC makes a Statement of Overriding Considerations, it would be included in the record of the project approval and would be mentioned in the notice of determination.

The ALJ may also deny the proposed project, but decide in favor of an alternative that may require further action on the part of other parties and public agencies. The Commission's final decision may therefore include an order for CalAm to return to the Commission at a later time for approval of either a specific project or some form of water purchase agreement, either of which would resolve at a minimum the water supply issues raised by SWRCB Order 95-10 and the Seaside Basin adjudication. In either event, if the proposed decision (or an alternate) finds the Final EIR adequate for the Commission's decision making purposes, the Commission as the Lead Agency for CEQA may certify the Final EIR by formal vote and direct that CalAm take the necessary steps to implement the Commission's final decision.

In addition, State law requires lead agencies to adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program for those changes to the project that it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. CEQA does not require that the specific reporting or monitoring program be included in the EIR. Throughout this

EIR, however, proposed mitigation measures have been clearly identified and presented in language that will facilitate establishment of a monitoring program. All adopted measures will be included in a mitigation monitoring and reporting program to verify compliance.

References – Introduction

California American Water (CalAm), 2012. Before the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, A.12-04-019, Application of California-American Water Company (U210W) for Approval of the Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project and Authorization to Recover All Present and Future Costs in Rates, Filed April 23, 2012.

Monterey County Superior Court, 2006. California American Water, Plaintiff, vs. City of Seaside, City of Monterey, et al., Case No. M66343, Decision. Filed March 27, 2006.

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), 1995. Order No. WR 95-10: Order on Four Compalints Files Against The California-American Water Company, Carmel River, Monterey County. July 6, 1995.