



Supplement to 3/18/2019 MPWMD Board Packet

Attached are copies of letters received between February 13, 2019 and March 11, 2019. These letters are listed in the March 18, 2019 Board packet under Letters Received.

Author	Addressee	Date	Topic
John Moore	MPWMD Board	3/11/2019	Seaside Basin
John Moore	David J. Stoldt	3/5/2019	Your last editorial, "Hooray for wastewater"
Christopher Cook	David J. Stoldt	3/5/2019	Water Distribution System Permit #M 15-03-L3
Marli S. Melton	David J. Stoldt	2/20/2019	Rule 19.8 – Feasibility Study
Melodie Chrislock	MPWMD Board	2/22/2019	Pure Water Monterey Project Expansion
Melodie Chrislock	MPWMD Board	2/21/2019	Rule 19.8 – Feasibility Study
Melodie Chrislock	MPWMD Board	2/21/2019	Pure Water Monterey Project Expansion
Mary Ann Carbone	MPWMD Board	2/20/2019	Going Forward with Implementation of Measure J
John Narigi/Jeff Davi/Bob McKenzie	MPWMD Board	2/29/2019	Agenda Items 7, 11, 14 at February 21, 2019 meeting
John Moore	David Stoldt	2/27/2019	Notice of SWRCB Public Medting – Perflouroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Information Item

U:\staff\Boardpacket\2019\20190318\LettersRecd\SuplPkt.docx

Arlene Tavani

From: jmoore052@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2019 5:25 PM
To: Arlene Tavani
Subject: Re: Seaside Basin

Intended for your board. John

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 11, 2019, at 4:53 PM, Arlene Tavani <Arlene@mpwmd.net> wrote:

>
> John: This communication was sent to me, but it looks like it was intended for Margaret Thum.

>
> Arlene Tavani

>
> Executive Assistant

>
> Monterey Peninsula Water

>
> Management District

>
> Phone: 831-658-5652

>
>

>
>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com>

> Sent: Monday, March 4, 2019 11:31 AM

> To: Margaret Thum <margaret.thum@gmail.com>

> Subject: Seaside Basin

>

> Thanks for the info. They have a site related to my issue about toxins

> into the basin. I attach a copy of my comment to them which should fill in some spaces. They allege that aquifers under Ord meet all water quality tests. As pointed out by me, such tests are totally inadequate as a test for PFASs and recycled potable water. John <Scan_0219.pdf>



Fort Ord Cleanup

the environmental cleanup of the Former Fort Ord

ABOUT

NEWS

COMMUNITY

CLEANUP PROGRAMS

DOCUMENTS

PROPERTY

CONTACT US

Contact Us

If you have general questions or would like additional information about the environmental cleanup at the former Fort Ord, please fill out the form below.

Or feel free to contact us at:

Fort Ord Environmental Cleanup Program

Community Relations Office

P.O. Box 5008, Monterey, CA 93944-5008

Call the Community Relations Office: 831-393-1284

Fax: 831-393-9188

Get In Touch

Fields marked with an * are required

Name

John M. Moore

Address 1

836 2d st.

City

Pacific Grove

State

Ca.

Zip / Post Code

93950

Email

jmerton99@yahoo.com

Phone

831-655-4540

Your Comments *

I am particularly concerned about contamination of the Seaside Basin which sits under Fort Ord. Site 39 had DoD tests of the soil that exceeded standards for certain toxic chemicals (PSAs and PSOS?), evidently from firefighting foam, but while a well was capped no other remediation took place. Do you have tests of the Seaside basin soils and/or water. Did the tests test for Poly-and per- fluorinated alkyl substances(PFASs)? Site 39 is above the Seaside basin and rain water enters the basin from that Site. The Seaside basin is a repository for Cal Am drinking water from ASR and soon from potable recycle. I note scandals from other military sites related to PFASs and hope that it can be avoided in this case.

- Questions/Comments on Army cleanup in the northern portion of the Fort Ord National Monument, also called BLM Area B**
- Questions/Comments Regarding Prescribed Burns**
- I've included my email. I'd like regular cleanup updates.**
- Other**

Submit

Other Links You Might Be Interested In

- [Visit the Fort Ord BRAC field office](#)
- [Click here to view other points of contact regarding the Fort Ord Cleanup program](#)
- [Find links to other websites](#)

[How to Reach Us](#)

Search

Custom

Arlene Tavani

From: John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 2:54 PM
To: Arlene Tavani; DDWrecycledwater@waterboards.ca.gov; Bob Jaques; russell mcglothlin; George Riley; Jim Johnson; john moore; snyders2@email.arizona.edu; Dave Stoldt; Bill Peake; Mark Stone; Randy.Barnard@waterboards.ca.gov; erickson@stamlaw.us; erica.burton@noaa.gov; Elinora Mantovani
Subject: Fwd: Your last editorial "Hooray for wastewater"

----- Forwarded message -----

From: John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Mar 5, 2019 at 2:41 PM
Subject: Your last editorial "Hooray for wastewater"
To: <paul@carmelpinecone.com>

Editor: In last weeks editorial, you raved about the safety and economic benefit that will result when the Pure Water Monterey(PWM) recycled wastewater project comes on line later this year. You said:
 "With the right kind of purification, it(drinking it) becomes perfectly safe."

There is precedent for recycling human sewage for potable uses. The gold standard is the Orange County Water District(PCWD) project which recycles human sewage for potable use by over 300,000 people. The PWM project has used the history of that project to its advantage and that is good.

So far so good. But you omitted that the PWM project will mix human waste with highly contaminated agriculture wastewater and provide treatment to the mix.

Here's the rub. Contaminated agriculture waste is the highest form of poison created by man. No other project has ever attempted to treat it for potable purposes. So no learning curve. OCWD rejected it as a recycle source(OCWD web site).

There are no health tests for recycled agriculture wastewater and there is no agency or entity attempting to develop such tests for that water source. How do I know that? I asked the Ca. Dept. of Drinking Water. If you doubt me, contact them.

So how did the PWM project get a permit? A sewage treatment firm gave it an opinion that the Ph of the two water sources were similar so the two sources must be similar(EIR). The tests are the tests designed to test recycled sewage.

No expert with medical training about the health safety of the PWM project was engaged to give an opinion about the health safety of the project(EIR). A sewage engineer gave an opinion that if you consider sewage and agriculture waste as both allowed by state regulations then the mix is a permitted use(EIR). The rules had only been applied in a few instances for the recycling of sewage, never for Ag. poisons(Dept. of Drinking Water).

So without any scientific evidence about the health safety of treating agriculture wastewater for drinking purposes, a permit was granted.

I have request that the Superior court judge that oversees the Seaside Watermaster, which is the basin into which the treated PWM mix will be injected, should obtain the opinions of one or more medically trained in the health safety of

recycled waste water, to approve the safety of the project before permitting it into the basin, and if not, to advise about the corrective steps necessary to make the process safe(including the elimination of the Agriculture wastewater component) . PWM has been able to avoid that procedure. Why? Is it an unfair request?

John M. Moore, 836 2d st Pacific Grove, Ca. 93950 831-655-4540



RECEIVED
MARCH 07 2019
MPWMD

511 Forest Lodge Road
Suite 100
Pacific Grove, CA 93950
californiaamwater.com

March 5, 2019

David J. Stoldt
General Manager
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
5 Harris Court, Building G
Monterey, CA 93940

Re: Water Distribution System Permit #M15-03-L3

Dear Mr. Stoldt:

California American Water was surprised to receive your letter dated February 26, 2019 regarding Water Distribution System Permit #M15-03-L3. In summary, we have been working cooperatively with you to determine whether it would make sense to amend our permit to establish a permanent interconnect between Bishop and Ryan Ranch. Based on previous discussions, including those held during meetings held in January and February of this year, we believed that there was further investigation to be accomplished on both sides to determine whether such an amendment was required and prudent.

As part its investigation, California American Water retained a consultant to assess the feasibility of rehabilitating the Ryan Ranch wells. Our consultant visited the site on February 21, 2019, and believes that well rehabilitation will likely result in the Ryan Ranch wells being able to meet full system demand. Based on this assessment, we are proceeding with an expedited project delivery schedule to enable us to place the wells back in service within the next several months. Upon completion we will close the emergency interconnection.

Consequently, California American Water believes that a public hearing is unnecessary and would not be beneficial to either party. Please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss further.

Sincerely,

Christopher Cook
Director of Operations

cc Richard Svindland, President, California American Water
Lori Girard, Corporate Counsel, California American Water
David Laredo, Esq.

9
RECEIVED

FEB 25 2019

MPWMD

Marli S. Melton
7 White Oak Way
Carmel Valley, CA 93924
831.659.2306 marlimelton@gmail.com

February 20, 2019

Dear Mr. Stoldt,

Thank you for sharing results from questionnaires completed by at the recent public hearings on feasibility. One of the comments that I found most helpful at the Carmel meeting highlighted the **difference between expenses and investment**. Both of them involve payments, but they are quite different.

At the moment, ratepayer payments to Cal Am can be considered **expenses** -- we give them money and get water in return, which we use. All of that payment counts as an expense to us, even though Cal Am charges us for more than the actual cost of water and directly related maintenance and services to deliver it. We are also paying Cal Am money to cover their profits, taxes, out-of-area offices and employees, and miscellaneous other items. Nearly all that money leaves our community.

If we are able to purchase Cal-Am, our water bills will still pay for the cost of the water, services needed to deliver it, and plant maintenance, but the remaining will become an **investment** -- that is, the money will buy us durable assets -- plant and equipment that will continue to provide water for the long term. Owning these assets will benefit the community for many years to come, as the **funds we would otherwise have paid Cal Am for profits, taxes, etc. can be used to make our water more affordable**. In addition, as the **loan to buy Cal Am is paid off, each year, more money that would have left our community will stay here locally to help our community thrive**.

Therefore, **defining "feasible" as "cheaper water in the short term" overlooks the many long-term many benefits of owning water company assets for generations to come**. It also overlooks the long-term benefits of retaining money locally to circulate here and the long-term **benefits of a change in the form of ownership, from out-of-area for-profit to more responsive, local, nonprofit ownership**. We will also be receiving water from an entity that can cooperate with other local water districts and water suppliers to further local and regional interests affordably.

Please help the consultants you hire, as well as all of your board members recognize the difference between expenses and investments and also, the importance of thinking long-term. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Marli Melton

Arlene Tavani

From: MWChrislock <mwchrislock@redshift.com>
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 10:53 AM
To: Molly Evans; Alvin Edwards; George Riley; Jeanne Byrne; Gary Hoffmann; Dave Potter; Mary Adams; Dave Stoldt; Davelaredo; Arlene Tavani
Cc: Paul Sciuto
Subject: Pure Water Monterey Expansion

Importance: High



February 22, 2019

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Board of Directors and Staff,

On behalf of the 3500 local members of Public Water Now I want to say thank you to the Water Management District for its contribution to the Pure Water Monterey Project. While Cal Am made promises and charged us for failed projects, the District took action. Now we ask you to move forward with the Pure Water Monterey Expansion.

Cal Am has given us the most expensive water in the country, with many residents paying hundreds of dollars a month for water. If Cal Am's proposed desal plant can ever be built, its huge expense and the cost of the water it would produce, added to what we now pay, could double the cost of our water. That should worry everyone.

Cal Am's desal plant would draw its source water from Marina's groundwater, harming Marina's water supply.

The inconvenient truth is that Cal Am has no legal rights to this water. Contrary to Cal Am's claims, it cannot get appropriative water rights in the over drafted Salinas basin. Neither the CPUC nor the State Water Board can determine water rights. This must be settled in court. As you know on January 16, 2019, Marina & Marina Coast filed their case challenging this project in the California Supreme Court.

Cal Am would like us all to believe that its desal plant is the only answer to our water supply problems. They would like us to believe they can get around the law and steal Marina's water. But water rights law appears to be on Marina's side. At this point, blind faith in Cal Am is a risky bet.

This is a terrible gamble with our community's water supply. If Cal Am loses there is no back up plan to supply water or meet the CDO deadline.

Cal Am and its supporters claim that there is no alternative to this desal plant. They claim we need 14,000 acre-feet to meet our long-term demand. Where is Cal Am's proof of this future demand? What does long-term mean, 50 years, 100 years? From 1997 to 2006, in the entire ten years before the moratorium, only 125 acre-feet of new water were needed. This figure is from your own records.

From the current MPWMD numbers it looks like we need much less than Cal Am claims. Another 660 acre-feet would meet the Peninsula's 5-year average use of 9,924 acre-feet. Clearly, the 2250 acre-feet from the expansion of Pure Water Monterey would meet our needs for decades to come.

It's true, the Pure Water Expansion does not produce as much water as Cal Am's desal. But the question you need to address is how much do we actually need.

The only plan that can guarantee us any water is the Pure Water Monterey expansion. Please for the good of our community, we ask you to move the expansion forward. It will take 27 months to complete. To meet the CDO deadline Monterey One Water must begin by September. There's no time to lose.

Melodie Chrislock
Managing Director
mwchrislock@redshift.com
831 624-2282
PUBLIC WATER NOW



February 21, 2019

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Board of Directors and Staff:

I am submitting this letter on behalf of the 3500 local members of Public Water Now who put Measure J on the ballot.

We have the most expensive water in the country. Our costs on the Peninsula are more than three times the average of publicly owned water in California.

Public Water Now wants to see reduced water costs. While we think savings of any amount over time makes a public buyout of Cal Am feasible, our research from CPUC financial filings tells us that Cal Am's annual profit and corporate taxes of approximately \$19 million should cover the purchase price, and also lower the cost to customers.

Publicly owned water systems are more affordable because there are no profits, no taxes, and overhead is reduced. These factors plus the ability to finance new water supply projects and debt at significantly reduced interest rates all contribute to the financial feasibility of a buyout. In addition, more cost effective water supply solutions are possible without the profit motive.

The feasibility analysis should look at savings over time compared to the cost of staying with Cal Am. Staying with Cal Am is NOT financially feasible. But most importantly the feasibility study should focus on what a court will see as feasible and in the public interest.

Cal Am has taken financial risks resulting in \$34 million in unnecessary costs from failed projects. And now they face legal challenges over water rights on their proposed desal project. We expect a more financially responsible approach from a public agency that avoids costly environmental damage and litigation.

A buyout of Cal Am is in the public interest for many reasons.

Local control of a community's water system and resources is fundamental. Local control and lower costs are the main reasons that 87% of the water in the U.S. is provided by publicly owned agencies.

With local control, decisions are made here, not in San Francisco or New Jersey. We would also be free of CPUC oversight. Rates and projects would be approved locally. The CPUC is supposed to "protect the public interest", but in practice they consistently protect Cal Am's interests and profits.

When profit is NOT the driving motivation, both the community and the ratepayers benefit. The lack of profit motive allows problem solving that is more cost effective, and makes regional solutions possible. It drives policy and projects that are truly in the public interest.

Public Water Now certainly understands that we need a new water supply to replace water being illegally drawn by Cal Am. We expect MPWMD to pursue options that are less expensive than Cal Am's proposed profit-driven solutions, and to make sure that they are both legally sound and environmentally responsible.

It remains a mystery to us that a few still propose sticking with Cal Am, the company who has given us the most expensive water in the country, produced no new water supply in their 50 plus years of ownership and now presents us with a \$320 million desal plant to solve the need for 700af of water. Why would anyone want to leave control of our water future to Cal Am?

In response to the letters the MPWMD Board received from the G16 group, Sand City and the Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association, we want to set the record straight.

Of course these three letters represent only a small minority of a few hundred people versus the 23,757 voters who passed Measure J.

PWN never claimed that we would see immediate savings under public ownership, although we certainly think that may be the case. Our claim that public ownership would produce lower costs or "more affordable water" was based on data from the Food & Water Watch study of the 500 largest water systems in the country, which clearly shows public ownership leads to lower costs. We have previously provided that study for the record.

PWN never claimed that Measure J was just a feasibility study. During the campaign, it was actually Cal Am that claimed that "Measure J was not just a feasibility study," but PWN never said it was. PWN presented the feasibility study as a safe guard. We said that there was no risk in voting yes on Measure J because if the study showed it was not feasible it would all stop there.

MPWMD's public feasibility sessions have given you a wide range of public expectations with which to move forward. The public voted for more affordable water period. It did not specify a date or a certain amount of savings. But more important to the success of a public buyout, we understand that a court will only be convinced by a strong argument in regard to savings. We ask you to make that strong case with the feasibility study.

Melodie Chrislock
Managing Director
Public Water Now



February 21, 2019

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Board of Directors and Staff:

On behalf of the 3500 local members of Public Water Now I want to say thank you to the Water Management District for its contribution to the Pure Water Monterey Project. While Cal Am made promises and charged us for failed projects, the District took action.

For decades, Cal Am has been over drafting our water resources, creating the water shortage we now face. It has given us the most expensive water in the country, with many residents paying hundreds of dollars a month for water.

The huge expense of Cal Am's proposed desal plant and the cost of the water it would produce, added to what we now pay, could double the cost of our water.

Cal Am's desal plant would draw its source water from Marina's groundwater, harming Marina's water supply.

The inconvenient truth is that Cal Am has no legal rights to this water. Contrary to Cal Am's claims, it cannot get appropriative water rights in the over drafted Salinas basin. Neither the CPUC nor the State Water Board can determine water rights. This must be settled in court. As you know, on January 16, 2019, Marina & Marina Coast filed their case challenging this project in the California Supreme Court.

Cal Am would like us all to believe that its desal plant is the only answer to our water supply problems. They would like us to believe they can get around the law and steal Marina's water. But water rights law appears to be on Marina's side. At this point, blind faith in Cal Am is a risky bet.

This is a terrible gamble with our community's water supply. If Cal Am loses there is no back up plan to supply water or meet the CDO deadline.

Cal Am and its supporters claim that there is no alternative to this desal plant. They claim we need 14,000 acre-feet to meet our long-term demand. Where is their proof of this future demand? In the ten years before the moratorium from 1997 to 2006, only 125 acre-feet of new water were needed.

From the current MPWMD numbers it looks like we need much less than Cal Am claims. Another 660 acre-feet would meet our 5-year average use of 9,924 acre-feet.

Clearly, the 2250 acre-feet from the expansion of Pure Water Monterey would meet our needs for decades to come.

The only plan that can guarantee us water is the Pure Water Monterey expansion. Please, for the good of our community, we ask you to move the expansion forward. It will take 27 months to complete. To meet the CDO deadline Monterey One Water must begin by September. There's no time to lose.

Melodie Chrislock
Managing Director
Public Water Now



February 20, 2019

Board Members
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
5 Harris Court, Building G
Monterey, CA 93940

RE: Going Forward with the Implementation of Measure J

Dear Madam Chair and Board Members,

On January 24, I sent a letter that listed five issues of concern regarding your implementation of Measure J. These items were identified by the Sand City City Council and I was asked to communicate these concerns to you. To date, I have had no reply to my letter. I specifically requested that you put my five questions on a public agenda for discussion and input from the public.

As a reminder my requests were generally as follows:

City Hall
1 Pendergrass Way
Sand City, CA
93955

Administration
(831) 394-3054

Planning
(831) 394-6700

FAX
(831) 394-2472

Police
(831) 394-1451

FAX
(831) 394-1038

- Number one Provide a listing of all the factual data that you plan to use in undertaking the feasibility study
- Number two Publicly discuss and articulate the Board's definition of feasibility and publicly state which assets of California American Water are actually being considered for condemnation
- Number three Provide for a public discussion of the scopes of work of consultants in determining the feasibility analysis required by Measure J
- Number four Provide a clear articulation of the costs associated with each phase of the feasibility analysis and condemnation process and what risks are associated with each stage of that process. This listing should include the costs associated with losing the condemnation process as well as the costs associated with winning the condemnation process.

Incorporated
May 31, 1960



Number five

Clearly state what mechanism you would use for financing the purchasing of the California American Water assets. Clearly state whether the public will be given an opportunity to vote on whether to move forward with the purchase once the true cost is ascertained by the jury

I believe the answers to these questions will be important to all of your constituents regardless of which side they were on during the Measure J campaign. We can only expect to maintain the public trust if we are honest and open with them. If the public feels that we are trying to hide something from them or that we are moving forward on major issues of importance to them without their ability to vote on those directions, I am fearful they will feel betrayed. This will cause additional corrosion of trust in our local government processes. We should all remember that in 2004 two thirds of the voters in that election voted to eliminate the Water Management District because they had lost trust in its abilities. Recent staff and board leadership had been able to regain that trust- please do not squander it.

I would appreciate a timely response in order to relay the results of the answers to my Council and community.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Carbone
Mayor, City of Sand City

City Hall
1 Pendergrass Way
Sand City, CA
93955

Administration
(831) 394-3054

Planning
(831) 394-6700

FAX
(831) 394-2472

Police
(831) 394-1451

FAX
(831) 394-1038

Incorporated
May 31, 1960

MAC:sg

Coalition of Peninsula Businesses
 A coalition to resolve the Peninsula water challenge to
 comply with the CDO at a reasonable cost

*Members Include: Monterey County Hospitality Association, Monterey Commercial Property Owners' Association,
 Monterey Peninsula Chamber of Commerce, Carmel Chamber of Commerce, Pacific Grove Chamber of Commerce,
 Monterey County Association of Realtors, Associated General Contractors-Monterey Division,
 Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula*

RECEIVED

FEB 19 2019

MPWMD

February 19, 2019

Molly Evans, Chair, and Members
 Board of Directors, Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
 Dave Stoldt, MPWMD General Manager
 P.O. Box 85
 Monterey, California 93942

Transmitted by fax to: Fax: (831) 644-9560

Re: Agenda items 7., 11., 14 at February 21, 2019 meeting

Dear Chair Evans, Board Members and General Manager Stoldt:

The Coalition of Peninsula Businesses (CPB) is concerned about three items on the February 21st agenda.

Items 7 and 14, when read together, indicate that you have already solicited statements of qualifications from firms to provide services in connection with the water system potential public ownership feasibility study required by Measure J. Item 14 indicates you want authorization to proceed with hiring three firms without any public review of the firms, their qualifications, or of the range of alternatives to these firms available.

Why is this process hastily being pursued without any public review or input? This is anything but a transparent process. The Coalition expects better of your public agency.

Item 14 indicates you have already had a review performed by an as-yet not hired consultant of potential criteria for the feasibility study required by Measure J. Again, this was done without public input or review and without your Board formally discussing and adopting feasibility criteria to guide the study.

Why is this process hastily being pursued without any public review or input? This is anything but a transparent process. The Coalition expects better of your public agency.

The Coalition urges you to stop this “black box” approach to the important task of determining the feasibility of pursuing public ownership of our water system and let a little ‘daylight’ in!

Sincerely,



John Narigi, Chair



Jeff Davi, Co-chair



Bob McKenzie, Consultant

Cc: Monterey Peninsula Regional Water Authority

Arlene Tavani

From: John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 8:14 AM
To: Tom Rowley; Bob Jaques; DDWrecycledwater@waterboards.ca.gov; Jim Johnson; Dan Miller; Felicia Marcus; mheditor@montereyherald.com; Dave Stoldt; David Sweigert; Swrcb Clerk; Dan Davis; Luke Coletti; Anthony Lombardo - LS Resort & Pasadera Country Club; Bill Peake; Ron Weitzman; AKEMAN, TOM; Buill Monning; david8@1hope.org; Saoulis, Violette; Catherine.Stedman@amwater.com; Walt Classen; George Riley; Marge Jameson; Margaret Thum; Arlene Tavani; Brian Brooks; russell mcglathlin; Esther Trosow; Jenny McAdams; Carmelita Garcia; Cynthia Garfield; davidhenderson1950@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Fw: FW: NOTICE OF SWRCB PUBLIC MEETING - PERFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES (PFAS) INFORMATIONAL ITEM
Attachments: Scan_0213.pdf

Here is the notice attached to Mr. Rowley's letter. BTW, the Army superfund unit actually found PFAS in Site 39, but in its final report indicated that it was not going to spend the millions to clean it up(as it had at many other bases) because the water did not flow off base(not true). It did not consider that about 1/3 of the water in the underlying Seaside basin leeches from site 39 into the basin. That water is not ever treated before we will drink it and it mixes with Carmel river water that we now drink. PFAS are particularly dangerous to pregnant women, fetuses, and growing children because it is a lot of toxicity into a small infant.

I have filed about 140 pages of scientific reports about the dangers of the PWM recycling project(PWM0 in the case of Cal Am v City of Seaside M66343, a Superior court case wherein an appointed judge controls the final say in matters affecting the Seaside Basin(if he or she is informed). If you are interested, obtain the documents thru the court or go to the Seaside Basin web site.JMM

 Virus-free. www.avast.com

On Tue, Feb 26, 2019 at 8:48 PM John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com> wrote:

The answer to your question is that most, but not all of the PFOS and PFAS get removed in a high tech reverse osmosis(RO)_ project like Pure Water Monterey. But that project does not require such tests even at the 70 parts per trillion, let alone the new tougher tests that are to be discussed.

The Pure Water Monterey project will recycle human waste and highly contaminated agriculture waste water(including RO as part of the treatment and then inject it into the Seaside Basin as drinking water. The Seaside Basin is located in part under site 39 of old Fort Ord which contains PFOS and PFAS from fire fighting foam which logically drains into the basin after heavy rains.

Hopefully this PFA discussion will lead to the addition of tests for water from the Pure Water Monterey project. Otherwise, that project is simply a crap shoot, and should have a very short period of operation before it is shut down as a health nuisance. JMM

 Virus-free. www.avast.com

On Tue, Feb 26, 2019 at 5:07 PM Tom Rowley <tomr2004@hotmail.com> wrote:

Hi Folks -- Here is the email I mentioned yesterday at the MPCC GAC...

MY Q: Does this chemical pollutant get removed with the typical reverse osmosis desalination process?
"Aloha" TR

From: Nichole Rodriguez - NOAA Affiliate <nichole.rodriguez@noaa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:33 AM

To: Al Budris; Alayne Chappell - NOAA Affiliate; Amity Wood - NOAA Federal; Andrew DeVogelaere Ph. D.; Barton Selby; Brand, Jason P LCDR; Brent Marshall; Brian Christy - NOAA Federal; Brian Johnson - NOAA Federal; Brian Nelson; Carol Maehr; Carpio-Obeso, MarielaPaz@Waterboards; Chris Mobley - NOAA Federal; Christina E. x7384 McGinnis; Cynthia Mathews; Dan Brumbaugh; Dan Falat; Dan Haifley; Dan Howard - NOAA Federal; Dan@Coastal Carl; Dave Feliz; Dawn Hayes - NOAA Federal; Deb@Wildlife Wilson-Vandenberg; Deborah Halberstadt; Ed Smith; Eric Abma; Gary Hoffmann; Gary Pezzi; Jacob Winnikoff; Jim Moser; Jimmy Dutra; John Haynes; John Hunt; John Moren; Jon Hill; Jose R Montes; Karen Grimmer; Katherine O'Dea; Kathy Fosmark; Keith Rootsart; Kevin Miller; Kristen Petersen; Lilli Ferguson - NOAA Federal; Linda McIntyre; Lisa Uttal; Lisa Wooninck - NOAA Federal; LT Darrina Willis; Maria Brown - NOAA Federal; Max Delaney - NOAA Federal; Michael Bekker; Michael Carver - NOAA Federal; Michael Murray - NOAA Federal; Mindy Maschmeyer; Nichole Rodriguez; Nicole Capps - NOAA Federal; Paul Michel - NOAA Federal; Paul Reilly; PJ Webb; Richard Hughett; Sarah Lopez; Steve Lindley - NOAA Federal; Steven Bograd - NOAA Federal; Steven Haddock; Tami Grove; Tom Rowley; William Douros - NOAA Federal

Subject: Fwd: FW: NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING - PERFLOUROALKYL SUBSTANCES (PFAS) INFORMATIONAL ITEM

Good morning MBNMS Advisory Council members,

Please see attached notice from the State Water Resources Control Board regarding a public meeting on Perflouroalkyl Substances (PFAS).

Nichole

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Carpio-Obeso, MarielaPaz@Waterboards <MarielaPaz.Carpio-Obeso@waterboards.ca.gov>

Date: Fri, Feb 15, 2019 at 6:40 PM

Subject: FW: NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING - PERFLOUROALKYL SUBSTANCES (PFAS) INFORMATIONAL ITEM

To: Nichole Rodriguez - NOAA Affiliate <nichole.rodriguez@noaa.gov>

Hello Nichole

Could you please distribute to the SAC members

Thanks

MarielaPaz

From: lyris@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov <lyris@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, February 15, 2019 6:11 PM
To: Carpio-Obeso, MarielaPaz@Waterboards <MarielaPaz.Carpio-Obeso@waterboards.ca.gov>
Subject: NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING - PERFLUROALKYL SUBSTANCES (PFAS)
INFORMATIONAL ITEM



This is a message from the State Water Resources Control Board

Attached is a Notice of Public Meeting on Perflouroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Informational Item.

The Public Meeting is scheduled for March 6, 2019.

You are currently subscribed to board_workshops as: mcarpio-obeso@waterboards.ca.gov.

To unsubscribe click here: leave-7161340-1752251.45a6582a1dbb5e14740fa7c6efe31aa7@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov

Nichole Rodriguez
Advisory Council Coordinator
Contractor to NOAA, Lynker Technologies LLC
Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary
99 Pacific Street Bldg. 455A
Monterey, CA 93940
Desk: [\(831\) 647-4206](tel:8316474206)
Fax: [\(831\) 647-4250](tel:8316474250)
E-Mail: nichole.rodriguez@noaa.gov
Website: <http://montereybay.noaa.gov>
Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/MBNMS>
Twitter: <https://twitter.com/MBNMS>





Virus-free. www.avast.com



GAVIN NEWSOM
GOVERNOR

JARED BLUMENFELD
SECRETARY FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

State Water Resources Control Board

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

PERFLUOROALKYL SUBSTANCES (PFAS) INFORMATIONAL ITEM

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) present an informational item on March 6, 2019 consisting of an invited panel of Federal and State Agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations. The goal of this informational item is to inform the Water Board and public of Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS), potential sources, and potential risks to drinking water. Panelists will provide updates on existing state & federal actions, as well as the Water Board's Action Plan.

Wednesday, March 6, 2019, 9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Joe Serna Jr. - CalEPA Headquarters Building
Coastal Hearing Room
1001 I Street, Second Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Additional information on the public meeting is located on the State Water Board web site at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_info/calendar/.

BACKGROUND

PFAS are a group of man-made chemicals resistant to heat, water, and oil. Not naturally found. Manufacturing of PFAS started in the 1940s and are still used today. PFAS are used in industrial and consumer products. Common occurrences of PFAS chemicals are found in: carpets, rugs, water-proof clothing, upholstery, food paper wrappings, non-stick products, cleaning products, fire-fighting foams, and metal plating (e.g., cookware). Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS) are fluorinated organic chemicals that are part of the PFASs group of chemicals. No longer manufactured the United States, PFOA and PFOS are still manufactured globally and imported into the US. Since these chemicals have been used in an array of consumer products, scientists have found PFOA and PFOS in the blood of nearly all people tested. According to the Center for Disease Control (CDC), blood levels of both PFOS and PFOA have steadily decreased in U.S. residents since 1999-2000. However, manufacturers are developing replacement technologies in the PFAS family, including reformulating/substituting longer-chain substances with shorter-chain substances.

In May 2016, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) issued a lifetime health advisory for PFOS and PFOA for drinking water, advising municipalities that they should notify their customers of the presence of levels over 70 parts per trillion in community water supplies. U. S. EPA recommended that the notification of customers include information on the increased risk to health, especially for susceptible populations.

E. JOAQUIN ESQUIVEL, CHAIR | EILEEN SOBECK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

1001 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 | Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100, Sacramento, CA 95812-0100 | www.waterboards.ca.gov

In June 2018, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) recommends interim notification levels for PFOA (based on liver toxicity, as well as cancer risks) and for PFOS (based on immunotoxicity). OEHHA made these recommendations following its review of currently available health-based advisories and standards and supporting documentation. After independent review of the available information on the risks, the Water Board Division of Drinking Water established notification levels at concentrations 13 parts per trillion for PFOS and 14 parts per trillion for PFOA. These levels are consistent with OEHHA's recommendations.

Water Board staff will present the phased investigation Action Plan requiring testing of drinking water systems, and site investigations at high risk locations.

DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY

Meeting materials and additional details will be posted with the Board Agenda prior to the March 6, 2019 Informational Item at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_info/calendar/

WEBCAST INFORMATION

Video and audio broadcasts of the public meeting will be available via the internet and can be accessed at: <https://video.calepa.ca.gov/>.

PARKING AND ACCESSIBILITY

For directions to the Joe Serna, Jr. (CalEPA) Building and public parking information, please refer to the map on the State Water Board website: <http://www.calepa.ca.gov/headquarters-sacramento/location/>.

The CalEPA Building is accessible to persons with disabilities. Individuals requiring special accommodations are requested to call (916) 341-5261 at least 5 working days prior to the meeting. TDD users may contact the California Relay Service at (800) 735-2929 or voice line at (800) 735-2922. Video and audio broadcasts of the meeting will be available via the internet and can be accessed at: <https://video.calepa.ca.gov/>.

All visitors to the CalEPA Building are required to sign in and obtain a badge at the Visitor Services Center located just inside the main entrance (10th Street entrance). Valid picture identification may be required. Please allow up to 15 minutes for receiving security clearance.

FUTURE NOTICES


The State Water Board public meeting will be at the time and place noted above. Any change in the date, time, and place of the public meeting will be noticed on the Lyris e-mail list.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Please direct questions about this notice to Annalisa Kihara at (916) 324-6786 (Annalisa.Kihara@waterboards.ca.gov), or Daniel Newton at (916) 449-5596 (Daniel.Newton@waterboards.ca.gov)

February 15, 2019

Date


 Jeanine Townsend
 Clerk to the Board