



Supplement to 8/19/2019 MPWMD Board Packet

Attached are copies of letters received between July 19, 2019 and August 9, 2019. These letters are listed in the August 19, 2019 Board packet under Letters Received.

Author	Addressee	Date	Topic
John Moore	MPWMD	8/3/2019	Pure Water Monterey Project
M. W. Chrislock	MPWMD	7/26/19	Pure Water Monterey Project
Ron Weitzman	MPWMD	7/20/19	Pure Water Monterey Project
John Moore	MPWMD	7/18/19	Pure Water Monterey Project
David Dilworth	MPWMD	7/17/19	Pure Water Monterey Project
John Moore	MPWMD	7/17/19	Pure Water Monterey Project
Ron Weitzman	MPWMD	7/15/19	Pure Water Monterey Project
John Moore	MPWMD	7/15/19	Pure Water Monterey Project

U:\staff\Boardpacket\2019\20190819\LettersRecd\LettersReceived.docx

Arlene Tavani

From: John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 3, 2019 9:12 AM
To: WB-DDW-RecycledWater
Cc: Dave Stoldt; Barnard, Randy@Waterboards; Paul Sciuto; Marge Jameson; Jim Johnson; Joe Livernois; Monterey County Weekly; megrismer@ucdavis.edu; Rudy Fischer; Ron Weitzman; Royal Calkins; Anthony Lombardo - LS Resort & Pasadera Country Club; Mary Adams; Arlene Tavani; Jane Parker; John Phillips; Luis Alejo; public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov; George Riley; john.robertson@waterboards.ca.gov; Kelly Nix; Carmel Pine Cone; richard.rauschmeier@cpuc.ca.gov; robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov
Subject: Fwd: Rudy Fischer/John Moore re Pure Water Monterey(PWM)

My letter to the cedar street times sets forth a state of emergency created by the PWM GWR project. Because state law places the permitting authority in local boards, no health safety opinion about a project like PWM is required. Such boards are totally reliant on staff, which in the PWM project was dishonest in a political attempt to foist the costs of cleaning up toxic agriculture waste sites to the Cal Am customers. I note that the 2010 expert panel re investigating Direct Potable Reuse noted the risk of allowing non-expert regional board members to be the final permit authority. My plea is based on the authority of DDW to prevent water events that are a danger to public health. The PWM is a potential mass poisoning, Do something. I incorporate herein all of my prior correspondence to DDW about the dangers of the PWM project. John M. Moore

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

From: John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.ge>
Date: Fri, Aug 2, 2019 at 2:27 PM
Subject: Rudy Fischer/John Moore re Pure Water Monterey(PWM)
To: Marge Jameson <cedarstreettimes@gmail.com>

Thank you for publishing the recent letters by ex-Monterey One Water(MOW)board member Rudy Fischer and me. I continue to question the health safety of the drinking water from PWM, while Mr. Fischer references his high regard for the PWM staff, the water quality tests for water from the project and references the success of the Orange County Water District project that recycles sewage to drinking water as permitted by state law. He was the chair person of MOW at the time it agreed to join with the Monterey Bay Water Management District to form PWM. The State Water Board has jurisdiction over water quality matters. The Dept. of Drinking Water(DDW) is the technical agency that provides the research and regulations for drinking water. But here is the catch: the final permit for a project like PWM was by the vote of the five board members of the Central Valley Water Control Board, all of whom were lay people with no technical training.
(Editor-connect this dead space-Thanks)

The permit for the PWM project and the consent of the WOW board were obtained by fraud and corruption. Mr Fischer was and is a victim of the fraud. DDW has a full set of regulations that apply to the treatment and recycling of municipal waste(human sewage) into drinking water. The 77 pages of Ground Water Replenishment regulations were a result of about 17 years of research and observation of the Orange county municipal waste recycling project and are expressly applicable to human sewage, excluding applicability for all other source waters, like industrial and Ag. waste.

The DDW does not have any policy or regulations that permit the treatment and recycling of Toxic agriculture waste like Blanco Drain and Reclamation Ditch, the two huge areas of decades of agriculture waste that are source waters (mixed with municipal waste) for the PWM project. DDW is not even in the process of researching the treatment and recycling of agriculture waste for drinking water. No project in the world has even made such an attempt. The fraud: MOW and the Central Valley Resources Board were never informed that the attempt to treat and recycle agriculture waste waters was unprecedented and void of any support by health safety experts. In fact there were representations that the technology was common. Similar fraud was committed in the EIR for the project and before the Public Utilities Commission.

To date, no health safety expert with medical disease expertise has been retained to provide an opinion about the health safety of the PWM project. I have requested that PWM provide such an opinion, but it wouldn't dare. There is no body of data and research for an expert to draw from and like the regulations for the treatment of municipal waste, it would take years of research to create a data bank from which experts could generate health safety opinions. The safety tests for the PWM project are those that apply to municipal waste projects and are

(Editor-connect this dead space, Thanks)

based upon at least two decades of experience. There is no such history and research that provides a clue about the toxins that will remain after the PWM treatment process. Therefore, there are no safety tests for the treatment of toxic agriculture waste. As humans, we are entitled to know. The burden is not on the captive purchasers of the PWM water to prove that the water will be unsafe, but on PWM to prove that the water will be safe. At a minimum, the treatment and recycling of the Salinas Valley agriculture waste should be removed from the PWM project. John M. Moore

Arlene Tavani

From: MWChrislock <mwchrislock@redshift.com>
Sent: Friday, July 26, 2019 12:43 PM
To: Paul Sciuto; Dave Stoldt; 'Bob Jaques'; 'russell mcglothlin'; 'Sweigert, Jan@Waterboards'; 'Dorene D'Adamo'; 'WB-DDW-RecycledWater'; 'Rudy Fischer'; Arlene Tavani; 'Jeanne Byrne'; Jean Getchell; Mary Adams; 'Carmelita Garcia'; 'Carly Mayberry'; 'Cynthia Garfield'; 'Bill Peake'; 'David Sweigert'; 'Nicholas Smith'; 'Susan Goldbeck'; 'Bill Monnet'; Katherine Biala; 'Barnard, Randy@Waterboards'; Mike McCullough
Cc: 'Mary Duan'; 'Marge Jameson'; Royal Calkins; 'Joe Livernois'; Jim Johnson; 'Jenny McAdams'; pam@mcweekly.com; 'Luke Coletti'; 'Dan Davis'; erickson@stamplaw.us; 'Israel Zubiata'; 'Larry'; 'William Moore'; 'Prescott J. Kendall'; 'david8@1hope.org'; Steven.mover77@gmail.com; unobaj@yahoo.com; 'Vince Tuminello'; 'Walt Classen'; 'fran&jd'; 'Roberta Lindsey'; 'Dan Miller'; ramburke@yahoo.com; George Riley; 'Pgac-Susan Nilmier'; robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov; 'Michael Canan'; 'Robert Huit'; 'Robert Pacelli'; 'Jane Haines'; 'Jane Parker'; Chris Lopez; John Phillips; Luis Alejo; Bill Lee; Herbart Cortez; Howard Gustafson; Jan Shriner; Keith Van Der Maaten; Matt Zefferman; Peter Le; Tom Moore; Claude Hoover; DSullivan@mpc.edu; Glen Dupree; Hart22584@comcast.net; KenEkelund@redshift.com; Mike LeBarre; Mke Scattini; Richard Ortiz; Asaf Shalev; Marge Jameson; Sara Rubin; Bill Monning; Mark Stone; Alison Kerr; Bill Peake; 'Clyde Roberson'; David Potter; Don Freeman; Ian Oglesby; maryann@sandcityca.org; Adam Urrutia; Bruce Delgado; 'David Brown'; 'Frank O'Connell'; 'Gail Morton'; 'Layne Long'; Lisa Berkley; 'Nancy Amadeo'; SSMyers@att.net; SSPaulding@fbm.com
Subject: Re: Pure Water Monterey-Ground Water Replenishment Project

Public Water Now has backed Pure Water Monterey because we have asked the questions that John Moore raises and we've gotten answers put those issues to rest. Moore has not asked the questions, he's just made assertions. He has never spoken with Monterey One Water on these issues. PWN is confident that this project is safe and fully permitted.

Melodie Chrislock

Public Water Now's response to John Moore's claims.

Is Pure Water Monterey Safe and Legal?

John Moore keeps arguing against the Pure Water Monterey Project, but his argument has NO basis in fact. His opinion is misinformed.

Pure Water Monterey (PWM) is a project of Monterey One Water to treat wastewater and inject it into the Seaside Basin to be drawn out as drinking water. It stays in the basin for ten to twelve months. This is called Indirect Potable Reuse and it is clearly legal. At this time Direct Potable Reuse is not legal, but is being studied. Moore confuses the two to make his argument.

Pure Water Monterey will begin supplying us with 3,500 acre-feet of advanced purified water in the next few months. This water supply project has been developed over the last five years. It is already fully permitted, legal and near completion.

Moore claims this water has not been tested for safety.

He is mistaken. This water has been tested for 435 constituents of emerging concern, plus 24 pesticides that are used locally. Over 7,000 samples of the source waters have been tested, plus 11,576 samples of the purified water after it has been treated. This water is thoroughly tested. There is no question that it is safe.

As an example, the Blanco Drain and Reclamation Ditch agricultural wastewater was tested for DDT. Testing showed it was 50 times lower than the World Health Organization standard. And remember that's before it goes through the purification process.

The safety standards for this water were developed by the CA Department of Health Services and Division of Drinking Water with input from various experts from around the country. The regulations require that indirect potable water must be in the ground for at least two months. PWM water will be in the ground for 10 to 12 months.

The Water Reuse Association and the SWRCB have been looking at water safety and have not documented a single case where someone got sick from recycled water.

This water is so pure it is actually expected to improve the quality of the groundwater in the Seaside Basin over time.

Moore claims that filtering this water through the groundwater basin does not make it safe. He completely ignores the initial purification process.

It's not just the duration of time this water resides in the basin that makes it safe. Before it goes into the Seaside Basin this water goes through an advanced purification process using ozone, membrane filtration, reverse osmosis and oxidation with ultra violet light and hydrogen peroxide. This recycled water exceeds drinking water standards BEFORE it is injected into the Seaside Basin. More on the process here: <http://purewatermonterey.org/wp/about-us/project-technology/>

Public Water Now supports the Pure Water Monterey project. It is an environmentally superior and cost effective solution to the Peninsula's water supply needs.

If you have concerns, get the facts from Monterey One Water. Public Water Now is sponsoring a tour of the Pure Water Monterey demo plant on Saturday, August 10 at 10am. Call 831 778-4885 to RSVP for the tour.

Melodie Chrislock
Managing Director
Public Water Now

From: john moore [<mailto:jmerton99@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, July 19, 2019 8:21 PM

This is my final comment on this Thread: In 2014, the state adopted a 77 page regulation setting forth the conditions for granting a GWR permit for recycled "municipal waste." In 2018, the state water Resources Bd. adopted that regulation in full, again for municipal sewage.

Randy Barnhard, engineer authorized the permit for the PWM project. PWM and R, Fischer cite the two month duration that the PWM water must repose in the Seaside Basin. They assume that somehow makes the project legal, if not safe.

Big Big problem: there are NO regulations in fact, or in progress for the permitting of a GWR project that uses advanced treatment for agriculture waste water. PWM relies on a heavily researched 77 page regulation that applies only to municipal waste. Without benefit of the health safety benefits of the Regulation adoption procedure, the PWM permit was based on the whim of the chief sewage engineer, at the request of PWM, certain Supervisors from the Ag districts, and the Big Ag companies that should be paying the tens of millions to clean up Blanco Drain and Resurrection Ditch. Based on Mr. Fischers comment about the two months in the Basin, it appears that he believes it is relevant to an Ag waste treatment process. Hardly, there are years of research necessary before such an important set of rules can be adopted, including determining the existence of toxic dissolved particles that get through the treatment process and the, if possible designing tests to alert the project managers that dangerous toxins are in the water. JMM

On Monday, July 15, 2019, 10:31:15 AM MDT, John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com> wrote:

CEDAR STREET TIMES • July 19, 2019

To All:

This comment is based upon sources that include the Ca. Water Code and regulations based thereon and the studies set forth on the web site for the Ca. State Water Resources Board(State Water Board) and its division, the Department of Drinking Water(DDW).

The purpose of this comment is to prove beyond all doubt that Pure

Water Monterey(PWM) a Ground Water Replenishment project(GWR) is a public health risk that cannot be implemented.

Like the Orange County Water District(OCWD) GWR project, which treats and recycles human waste and then uses a five year GWR process to produce water for potable purposes, PWM will treat and recycle human waste, but also will attempt to treat and recycle toxic agriculture waste from Blanco Drain and Resurrection Ditch, Salinas Valley agriculture waste repositories with toxic waste from WWII forward based on a "Gimmick" instead of a true GWR process. Blanco Drain And Resurrection Ditch are both 303d sites per the federal govt.: that means the waters are so severely contaminated that it cannot sustain aquatic life.

Currently, state law does not permit municipal wastewater to be treated with advanced processes, then recycled via reverse osmosis and sold directly for potable use (Direct Potable Reuse). Subsequent to treatment and recycle, the water must utilize a GWR process that reasonably removes toxic and undesirable dissolved solids that get through treatment and recycle. The Orange project treats and recycles human waste; thereafter, the water traverses cracks, spaces, sands and rivers for about five years . After the five years, water districts drop wells into the aquifer and removes and sell the water for potable purposes. The project has mixed health safety results.

The reason that Direct Potable Reuse is illegal is because the

identification and toxicity of the millions of dissolved solids that get through recycle are unknown. The state is currently pursuing a scientific inquiry into that identification. The identification of toxic particles uses bio-assay evaluations where particle cells are analyzed for toxicity. Once identified, the scientists attempt to create tests that will identify toxic particles. The goal is to be sure that Direct Potable Reuse water is safe before it is authorized. The scientists are scheduled to report their progress back to the State water Board in late 2023. It is critical to understand that the state inquiry relates only to treated and recycled municipal waste water and specifically excludes all industrial waste, including agriculture waste waters.

How does this relate to the PWM GWR project? PWM will mix municipal waste with agriculture waste, treat it and recycle it and then will follow the "gimmick" to claim that it is a bona fide GWR project authorized under state law.

Here is the Gimmick. The Seaside Basin currently serves as a drinking water repository for excess waters from the Carmel river, seepage from above and a couple of minor sources. PWM will inject the treated and recycled water directly into the basin, an illegal Direct Potable Reuse that is a process currently subject to research to identify toxic dissolved particles that make it through the process as I have explained above.

PWM would argue that the illegality is neutralized by its GWR process and that it is a legal GWR process, in spite of the illegal Direct Potable Reuse. The PWM permit requires that the treated water injected into the basin must remain in the basin for two months so that it can qualify as a GWR. Put another way, we are to accept that the illegal direct injection into the basin and all of the health risks under investigation, will be cleansed by association with the other drinking water in the basin and that two months scientifically eliminates the concerns about DPR currently under scientific study at the state level (and that only for human wastewater, not agriculture waste.).

The recent proposal to expand the PWM project would add dangers: it would result in over 2/3 of the water in the Seaside basin derived from illegal DPR water. Without benefit of the current DPR research, it would contaminate all of the basin.

Currently, there is no water treatment recycle project in the world that attempts to treat and recycle agriculture waste for potable uses. On its web site, PWM admits that.

Pure Water Now advocates and the Salinas agriculture interests assert that the PWM project is preferable to the slant well desalinization project foisted on Cal Am by the State Water Board. In fact, a deep water desalinization is the only alternative(at about \$200 per sq. ft.).

If PWM or PWN responds to this comment, they will assert that the PWM project must pass the safety tests. True, but as a GWR project the tests do not and cannot include tests for a DWR project, because those there are no such tests at this time(see 2023 remark above).

The reason that I have inserted myself into this water disgrace is based on simple survival instincts and concern for my fellow humans. Nothing else. But it is time for someone other than me to get involved. A local petition requesting PWM to obtain a health safety opinion from a recognized water treatment safety expert about the health safety feasibility of the project would be a good start(expert appointed by the Seaside Basin case judge).

Arlene Tavani

From: Ron Weitzman <ronweitzman@redshift.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 20, 2019 2:43 PM
To: 'Margaret Thum'; 'MWChrislock'
Cc: 'john moore'; 'Barnard, Randy@Waterboards'; 'Paul Sciuto'; Dave Stoldt; 'Bob Jaques'; 'russell mcglathlin'; 'Sweigert, Jan@Waterboards'; 'Dorene D'Adamo'; 'WB-DDW-RecycledWater'; 'Rudy Fischer'; Arlene Tavani; 'Jeanne Byrne'; 'Jean Getchell'; 'Mary Adams'; public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov; 'Carmelita Garcia'; 'Carly Mayberry'; 'Cynthia Garfield'; 'Bill Peake'; 'David Sweigert'; 'Nicholas Smith'; 'Susan Goldbeck'; 'Bill Monnet'; 'John Moore'; 'Mike McCullough'; mheditor@montereyherald.com; 'Mary Duan'; 'Carmel Pine Cone'; 'Marge Jameson'; 'Royal Calkins'; 'Joe Livernois'; 'Jim Johnson'; 'Jenny McAdams'; pam@mcweekly.com; 'Luke Coletti'; 'Dan Davis'; erickson@stamplaw.us; 'Israel Zubiata'; 'Larry'; 'Kelly Nix'; 'William Moore'; 'Prescott J. Kendall'; 'david8@1hope.org'; Steven.mover77@gmail.com; unobaj@yahoo.com; 'Vince Tuminello'; 'Walt Classen'; 'fran&jd'; 'Roberta Lindsey'; 'Dan Miller'; ramburke@yahoo.com; 'George Riley'; 'Pgac- Susan Nilmier'; robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov; 'Michael Canan'; 'Robert Huit'; 'Robert Pacelli'; 'Jane Haines'; 'Jane Parker'; 'Chris Lopez'; 'John Phillips'; 'Luis Alejo'; 'Bill Lee'; 'Herbart Cortez'; 'Howard Gustafson'; 'Jan Shriner'; 'Keith Van Der Maaten'; 'Matt Zefferman'; 'Peter Le'; 'Tom Moore'; 'Claude Hoover'; DSullivan@mpc.edu; 'Glen Dupree'; Hart22584@comcast.net; KenEkelund@redshift.com; 'Mike LeBarre'; 'Mke Scattini'; 'Richard Ortiz'; 'Asaf Shalev'; 'Marge Jameson'; 'Channel 11'; 'Herald City Editor'; 'KION TV'; 'KSBW'; 'Sara Rubin'; 'Buill Monning'; 'Mark Stone'; 'Alison Kerr'; 'Bill Peake'; 'Clyde Roberson'; 'David Potter'; 'Don Freeman'; 'Ian Oglesby'; maryann@sandcityca.org; 'Adam Urrutia'; 'Bruce Delgado'; 'David Brown'; 'Frank O'Connell'; 'Gail Morton'; 'Layne Long'; 'Lisa Berkley'; 'Nancy Amadeo'; SSMyers@att.net; SSpaulding@fbm.com
Subject: RE: Pure Water Monterey-Ground Water Replenishment Project

Melodie, I agree with Margaret Thum. It would be helpful if you could provide the list of tested pesticides, as well as how and where they are tested. What is the source of the list? This is a critical question: Does the tertiary treatment the mix of sewer and agricultural runoff and wash water undergoes for irrigation use filter out the pesticides? How do we know? That is part of the project. Questions are not misinformation. Thanks. --Ron

From: Margaret Thum [mailto:margaret.thum@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 20, 2019 2:07 PM
To: MWChrislock
Cc: Ron Weitzman; john moore; Barnard, Randy@Waterboards; Paul Sciuto; Dave Stoldt; Bob Jaques; russell mcglathlin; Sweigert, Jan@Waterboards; Dorene D'Adamo; WB-DDW-RecycledWater; Rudy Fischer; Arlene Tavani; Jeanne Byrne; Jean Getchell; Mary Adams; public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov; Carmelita Garcia; Carly Mayberry; Cynthia Garfield; Bill Peake; David Sweigert; Nicholas Smith; Susan Goldbeck; Bill Monnet; John Moore; Mike McCullough; mheditor@montereyherald.com; Mary Duan; Carmel Pine Cone; Marge Jameson; Royal Calkins; Joe Livernois; Jim Johnson; Jenny McAdams; pam@mcweekly.com; Luke Coletti; Dan Davis; erickson@stamplaw.us; Israel Zubiata; Larry; Kelly Nix; William Moore; Prescott J. Kendall; david8@1hope.org; Steven.mover77@gmail.com; unobaj@yahoo.com; Vince Tuminello; Walt Classen; fran&jd; Roberta Lindsey; Dan Miller; ramburke@yahoo.com; George Riley; Pgac- Susan Nilmier; robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov; Michael Canan; Robert Huit; Robert Pacelli; Jane Haines; Jane Parker; Chris Lopez; John Phillips; Luis Alejo; Bill Lee; Herbart Cortez; Howard Gustafson; Jan Shriner; Keith Van Der Maaten; Matt Zefferman; Peter Le; Tom Moore; Claude Hoover; DSullivan@mpc.edu; Glen Dupree; Hart22584@comcast.net; KenEkelund@redshift.com; Mike LeBarre; Mke Scattini; Richard Ortiz; Asaf Shalev; Marge Jameson; Channel 11; Herald City Editor; KION TV; KSBW; Sara Rubin; Buill Monning; Mark Stone; Alison Kerr; Bill Peake; Clyde Roberson; David Potter; Don Freeman; Ian Oglesby; maryann@sandcityca.org; Adam Urrutia; Bruce Delgado; David Brown; Frank

Can you please provide a list of what is tested and when? This info was not included in the link you provided.

On Sat, Jul 20, 2019, 1:59 PM MWChrislock <mwchrislock@redshift.com> wrote:

Moore's argument has NO basis in fact. He has never contacted Monterey One Water (MOW) to allow them address his questions. He does not want answers, he just wants to broadcast his misinformed opinion. I'm sorry Ron Weitzman chooses to spread this misinformation.

FYI It's not the duration of time the water resides in the basin that makes this water safe, it the the process <http://purewatermonterey.org/wp/about-us/project-technology/> it undergoes. This water is tested thousands of times for 435 constituents of concern and 24 local pesticides. First the samples are tested to see what's in the water, then the finished water is again tested. The finished water is clean to drinking water standards (the same standards that apply to the water that comes out of your tap now), before it is injected into the Seaside Basin.

By the way Moore acknowledges that municipal wastewater is being recycled safely to drinking water in many cities and he sees no problem with that. If he thinks municipal wastewater is not contaminated with pesticides and everything else from the food and drugs we eat and excrete, then he isn't thinking this through very carefully.

Do you really think MOW would spend \$124 million on a project that was not was not safe, legal and fully permitted? This is not politics, this is science.

If you have concerns, get the facts from MOW.

Melodie Chrislock
Managing Director, Public Water Now

PWN has been sponsoring tours of the Pure Water Monterey project to help educate the public. Join us!



This fall the Pure Water Monterey Project will begin supplying 3500 acre-feet of highly purified recycled water to the Peninsula. That is more than a third of the water the Peninsula currently uses. And this state of the art recycled water project can be expanded to meet our water supply needs for decades to come, making Cal Aim's costly desalt unnecessary. This is a joint project of Monterey One Water and the

Water Management District.

Pure Water Monterey Tour

Saturday, August 10 at 10am

Monterey One Water

Take the tour with us and..... DRINK THE WATER!

Public Water Now can have up to 30 guests on the tour.

Please **RSVP to 831 778-4885 to hold your place.**

On 7/20/19, 10:00 AM, "Ron Weitzman" <ronweitzman@redshift.com> wrote:

All: John's is a voice in the wilderness that I hope keeps echoing after he ends his participation in this email thread. The three-legged stool of Cal Am's water-supply project is the result of bargaining among state and local agencies that each had something of value to trade. It is a political, not a scientific, project.

Not only nowhere in the world has toxic agricultural runoff water been recycled for human consumption or for agricultural irrigation, but also nowhere in the world have slant wells been used for desalination. So much for two legs of the stool. The third leg is aquifer storage and recovery, which has fallen far short of what it was supposed to have delivered over the years since it began.

If completed, will the project work? Who knows? Proponents want to try it in the hope that it will work. Maybe it will. After all, today we celebrate the anniversary of the first walk on the moon by human beings. Cal Am's water-supply project may be our local moonshot.

Even if pesticide particles are too big to get through the Pure Water Monterey reverse-osmosis screens to contaminate our drinking water, are they also too big to get by the far less stringent recycling process for the irrigation water? Again, who knows? It is important to know because if the pesticides contaminate the irrigation water the result could be deformed and poisonous produce that could doom the Salinas Valley agricultural industry.

So, why are we taking these chances? As noted in the first paragraph, the answer is politics. Citizens do need to be involved. Thank you, John. --Ron

From: john moore [<mailto:jmerton99@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Friday, July 19, 2019 8:21 PM

To: Barnard, Randy@Waterboards; Paul Sciuto; David J. Stoldt; Bob Jaques; russell mcglothlin; Catherine.Stedman@amwater.com; Sweigert, Jan@Waterboards; Dorene D'Adamo; WB-DDW-RecycledWater; Rudy Fischer; Arlene Tavani; Jeanne Byrne; Jean Getchell; Mary Adams; public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov; Carmelita Garcia; Carly Mayberry; Cynthia Garfield; Bill Peake; David Sweigert; Nicholas Smith; Susan Goldbeck; Bill Monnet; John Moore

Cc: mheditor@montereyherald.com; Mary Duan; Carmel Pine Cone; Marge Jameson; Royal Calkins; Ron Weitzman; Joe Livernois; Jim Johnson; Jenny McAdams; pam@mcweekly.com; Luke Coletti; Dan Davis; erickson@stamlaw.us; Israel Zubiata; Larry; Margaret Thum; Kelly Nix; William Moore; Prescott J. Kendall; david8@1hope.org; Steven.mover77@gmail.com; unobaj@yahoo.com; Vince Tuminello; Walt Classen; fran&jd; Roberta Lindsey; Dan Miller; ramburke@yahoo.com; George Riley; Pgac- Susan Nilmier; robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov; Michael Canan; Robert Huit (rhuitt@hgfb.net); Robert Pacelli; Jane Haines; Jane Parker

Subject: Re: Pure Water Monterey-Ground Water Replenishment Project

This is my final comment on this Thread: In 2014, the state adopted a 77 page regulation setting forth the conditions for granting a GWR permit for recycled "municipal waste." In 2018, the state water Resources Bd. adopted that regulation in full, again for municipal sewage.

Randy Barnhard, engineer authorized the permit for the PWM project. PWM and R, Fischer cite the two month duration that the PWM water must repose in the Seaside Basin. They assume that somehow makes the project legal, if not safe.

Big Big problem: there are NO regulations in fact, or in progress for the permitting of a GWR project that uses advanced treatment for agriculture waste water. PWM relies on a heavily researched 77 page regulation that applies only to municipal waste. Without benefit of the health safety benefits of the Regulation adoption procedure, the PWM permit was based on the whim of the chief sewage engineer, at the request of PWM, certain Supervisors from the Ag districts, and the Big Ag companies that should be paying the tens of millions to clean up Blanco Drain and Resurrection Ditch. Based on Mr. Fischers comment about the two months in the Basin, it appears that he believes it is relevant to an Ag waste treatment process. Hardly, there are years of research necessary before such an important set of rules can be adopted, including determining the existence of toxic dissolved particles that get through the treatment process and the, if possible designing tests to alert the project managers that dangerous toxins are in the water. JMM

On Monday, July 15, 2019, 10:31:15 AM MDT, John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com> wrote:

To All:

This comment is based upon sources that include the Ca. Water Code and regulations based thereon and the studies set forth on the web site for the Ca. State Water Resources Board(State Water Board) and its division, the Department of Drinking Water(DDW).

The purpose of this comment is to prove beyond all doubt that Pure Water Monterey(PWM) a Ground Water Replenishment project(GWR) is a public health risk that cannot be implemented.

Like the Orange County Water District(OCWD) GWR project, which treats and recycles human waste and then uses a five year GWR process to produce water for potable purposes, PWM will treat and recycle human waste, but also will attempt to treat and recycle toxic agriculture waste from Blanco Drain and Resurrection Ditch, Salinas Valley agriculture waste repositories with toxic waste from WWII forward based on a "Gimmick" instead of a true GWR process. Blanco Drain And Resurrection Ditch are both 303d sites per the federal govt.: that means the waters are so severely contaminated that it cannot sustain aquatic life.

Currently, state law does not permit municipal wastewater to be treated with advanced processes, then recycled via reverse osmosis

and sold directly for potable use (Direct Potable Reuse). Subsequent to treatment and recycle, the water must utilize a GWR process that reasonably removes toxic and undesirable dissolved solids that get through treatment and recycle. The Orange project treats and recycles human waste; thereafter, the water traverses cracks, spaces, sands and rivers for about five years . After the five years, water districts drop wells into the aquifer and removes and sell the water for potable purposes. The project has mixed health safety results.

The reason that Direct Potable Reuse is illegal is because the identification and toxicity of the millions of dissolved solids that get through recycle are unknown. The state is currently pursuing a scientific inquiry into that identification. The identification of toxic particles uses bio-assay evaluations where particle cells are analyzed for toxicity. Once identified, the scientists attempt to create tests that will identify toxic particles The goal is to be sure that Direct Potable Reuse water is safe before it is authorized. The scientists are scheduled to report their progress back to the State water Board in late 2023. It is critical to understand that the state inquiry relates only to treated and recycled municipal waste water and specifically excludes all industrial waste, including agriculture waste waters.

How does this relate to the PWM GWR project? PWM will mix municipal waste with agriculture waste, treat it and recycle it and then will

follow the "gimmick" to claim that it is a bona fide GWR project authorized under state law.

Here is the Gimmick. The Seaside Basin currently serves as a drinking water repository for excess waters from the Carmel river, seepage from above and a couple of minor sources. PWM will inject the treated and recycled water directly into the basin, an illegal Direct Potable Reuse that is a process currently subject to research to identify toxic dissolved particles that make it through the process as I have explained above.

PWM would argue that the illegality is neutralized by its GWR process and that it is a legal GWR process, in spite of the illegal Direct Potable Reuse. The PWM permit requires that the treated water injected into the basin must remain in the basin for two months so that it can qualify as a GWR. Put another way, we are to accept that the illegal direct injection into the basin and all of the health risks under investigation, will be cleansed by association with the other drinking water in the basin and that two months scientifically eliminates the concerns about DPR currently under scientific study at the state level (and that only for human wastewater, not agriculture waste.).

The recent proposal to expand the PWM project would add dangers: it would result in over 2/3 of the water in the Seaside basin derived from illegal DPR water. Without benefit of the current DPR research, it would contaminate all of the basin.

Currently, there is no water treatment recycle project in the world that attempts to treat and recycle agriculture waste for potable uses.

On its web site, PWM admits that.

Pure Water Now advocates and the Salinas agriculture interests assert that the PWM project is preferable to the slant well desalinization project foisted on Cal Am by the State Water Board. In fact, a deep water desalinization is the only alternative(at about \$200 per sq. ft.).

If PWM or PWN responds to this comment, they will assert that the PWM project must pass the safety tests. True, but as a GWR project the tests do not and cannot include tests for a DWR project, because those there are no such tests at this time(see 2023 remark above).

The reason that I have inserted myself into this water disgrace is based on simple survival instincts and concern for my fellow humans. Nothing else. But it is time for someone other than me to get involved. A local petition requesting PWM to obtain a health safety opinion from a recognized water treatment safety expert about the health safety feasibility of the project would be a good start(expert appointed by the Seaside Basin case judge).

Arlene Tavani

From: John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2019 7:12 AM
To: Rudy Fischer
Cc: Jean Getchell; V T; Barnard,Randy@Waterboards; Paul Sciuto; Dave Stoldt; Bob Jaques; russell mcglathlin; Sweigert,Jan@Waterboards; Dorene D'Adamo; WB-DDW-RecycledWater; Arlene Tavani; Jeanne Byrne; Mary Adams; public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov; Carmelita Garcia; Carly Mayberry; Cynthia Garfield; Bill Peake; David Sweigert; Nicholas Smith; Susan Goldbeck; Bill Monnet; mheditor@montereyherald.com; Mary Duan; Carmel Pine Cone; Marge Jameson; Royal Calkins; Ron Weitzman; Joe Livernois; Jim Johnson; Jenny McAdams; pam@mcweekly.com; Luke Coletti; Dan Davis; erickson@stampplaw.us; Israel Zubiate; Larry; Margaret Thum; Kelly Nix; William Moore; Prescott J. Kendall; david8@1hope.org; Steven.mover77@gmail.com; unobaj@yahoo.com; Walt Classen; fran&jd; Roberta Lindsey; Dan Miller; ramburke@yahoo.com; George Riley; Pgac- Susan Nilmier; robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov; Michael Canan; Robert Huit (rhuit@hghb.net); Robert Pacelli; Jane Haines; Jane Parker
Subject: Re: Pure Water Monterey-Ground Water Replenishment Project
FlwUp: -1

Rudy:

Instead of blindly following the conflicted PWM administrators, please answer a few simple questions: 1. Is the Seaside Basin a Cal Am repository of drinking water as stated by its technical expert? 2. Is the treated PWM treated product injected into the Seaside Basin(the drinking water) w/o benefit of GWR(like OCWD)? 3. If the answer to 1 and 2 are Yes, isn't it then a Direct Potable Reuse(DPR)? 4. Isn't it true that DPR has not been approved by statute, or, the State water resources Board(see its web site re DPR to be re-evaluated in 2023)because of health safety concerns? Is it true that there is No recycle or GWR project in the world that attempts to produce potable water from toxic agriculture waste water like Blanco Drain and Resurrection Ditch?

If you desire clarification, please say so? But stop spreading stupid stuff, when this factual stuff is there for all to understand. Your "rely on the creators of this water scam", is old, very old: stick to the facts.

And if you desire to qualify as a caring human, explain why PWM and the Dept. of Drinking Water refuse to provide Cal Am customers with an opinion by qualified health safety scientists(toxicologists, medical scientists, endocrinologists, cell Phd's etc.)about the health safety of PWM's final product? JMM

<https://www.avast.com/sig-email?utm_medium=email&utm_source=link&utm_campaign=sig-email&utm_content=webmail&utm_term=icon>

Virus-free. www.avast.com

<https://www.avast.com/sig-email?utm_medium=email&utm_source=link&utm_campaign=sig-email&utm_content=webmail&utm_term=link>

<#DAB4FAD8-2DD7-40BB-A1B8-4E2AA1F9FDF2>

On Wed, Jul 17, 2019 at 10:45 AM Rudy Fischer <rudyfischer@earthlink.net> wrote:

>

> Please people; I would hope you would have some faith in those who have worked with water delivery and safety as a career. I think they know something about what they are doing and do not go about risking the public's health. Having travelled in many countries - and gotten sick from the water in some - I am confident that we have the cleanest water available; monitored and treated to protect our health and well being.

>
> Mr. Moore is a long retired lawyer who keeps bringing up the same lame arguments over and over - even after they have been discredited over and over. I believe that Mr. Moore dealt with bankruptcy (not water) law, and I prefer to get my information from - and believe - those who have expertise in the appropriate field. This like telling the pilot of your airplane that you don't think the plane will work because you heard some bad things about the tire company's finances.

>
> As a former Board Chair of Monterey One Water (which is building Pure Water Monterey) I can assure you that this project has been well thought out and passes regulatory muster. The Monterey Regional Water Management District, Cal Am, the California State Water Resources Control Board - including its Division of Drinking Water, which regulates drinking water systems - and countless others WITH decades of experience in providing clean, potable water without endangering health are involved in this project. These are the professionals - not John (as nice a guy as he is). Have some faith in the experts, please.

>
> Rudy Fischer

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

>>From: Jean Getchell

>>Sent: Jul 15, 2019 8:30 PM

>>To: V T

>>Cc: John Moore , "Barnard, Randy@Waterboards" , Paul Sciuto , "David
>>J. Stoldt" , Bob Jaques , russell mcglathlin , "Sweigert,
>>Jan@Waterboards" , Dorene D'Adamo , WB-DDW-RecycledWater , Rudy
>>Fischer , Arlene Tavani , Jeanne Byrne , Mary Adams ,
>>"public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov" , Carmelita Garcia , Carly Mayberry ,
>>Cynthia Garfield , Bill Peake , David Sweigert , Nicholas Smith ,
>>Susan Goldbeck , Bill Monnet , "mheditor@montereyherald.com" , Mary
>>Duan , Carmel Pine Cone , Marge Jameson , Royal Calkins , Ron
>>Weitzman , Joe Livernois , Jim Johnson , Jenny McAdams ,
>>"pam@mcweekly.com" , Luke Coletti , Dan Davis ,
>>"erickson@stamlaw.us" , Israel Zubiato , john moore , Larry ,
>>Margaret Thum , Kelly Nix , William Moore , "Prescott J. Kendall" ,
>>"david8@1hope.org" , "Steven.mover77@gmail.com" , "unobaj@yahoo.com"
>>, Walt Classen , fran&jd , Roberta Lindsey , Dan Miller ,
>>"ramburke@yahoo.com" , George Riley , Pgac- Susan Nilmier ,
>>"robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov" , Michael Canan , "Robert Huit
>>(rhuit@hghb.net)" , Robert Pacelli , Jane Haines , Jane Parker
>>Subject: Re: Pure Water Monterey-Ground Water Replenishment Project

>>
>>If memory serves, these same issues were raised before the Regional Water Quality Control Board before it issued the required permit to M1W.

>>Jean Getchell

>>
>>Law Office of Jean Getchell
>>1743 Santa Ynez Street
>>Ventura, CA 93001
>>(831) 392-6596

>>
>>Sent from my iPhone

>>
>>> On Jul 15, 2019, at 8:23 PM, V T wrote:
>>>

>>> Thank you John:

>>>

>>> I hope those with authority do something to prevent this travesty and hazardous situation from arising, we cannot allow agricultural waste water to be recycled and tried to be purified to make it drinkable when the chances of it being toxic are so strong!

>>>

>>> To all who receive this, I am shocked and against this program and the whole façade of calling the company "Pure Water" is ridiculous!

>>>

>>> Vince Tuminello in Pacific Grove California

>>>

>>> Sent from my iPhone

>>>

>>>> On Jul 15, 2019, at 9:31 AM, John Moore wrote:

>>>>

>>>> To All:

>>>> This comment is based upon sources that include the Ca. Water Code

>>>> and regulations based thereon and the studies set forth on the web

>>>> site for the Ca. State Water Resources Board(State Water Board)

>>>> and its division, the Department of Drinking Water(DDW).

>>>>

>>>> The purpose of this comment is to prove beyond all doubt that Pure

>>>> Water Monterey(PWM) a Ground Water Replenishment project(GWR) is a

>>>> public health risk that cannot be implemented.

>>>>

>>>> Like the Orange County Water District(OCWD) GWR project, which

>>>> treats and recycles human waste and then uses a five year GWR

>>>> process to produce water for potable purposes, PWM will treat and

>>>> recycle human waste, but also will attempt to treat and recycle

>>>> toxic agriculture waste from Blanco Drain and Resurrection Ditch,

>>>> Salinas Valley agriculture waste repositories with toxic waste

>>>> from WWII forward based on a "Gimmick" instead of a true GWR

>>>> process. Blanco Drain And Resurrection Ditch are both 303d sites

>>>> per the federal govt.: that means the waters are so severely

>>>> contaminated that it cannot sustain aquatic life.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Currently, state law does not permit municipal wastewater to be

>>>> treated with advanced processes, then recycled via reverse osmosis

>>>> and sold directly for potable use (Direct Potable Reuse).

>>>> Subsequent to treatment and recycle, the water must utilize a GWR

>>>> process that reasonably removes toxic and undesirable dissolved

>>>> solids that get through treatment and recycle. The Orange project

>>>> treats and recycles human waste; thereafter, the water traverses

>>>> cracks, spaces, sands and rivers for about five years . After the

>>>> five years, water districts drop wells into the aquifer and

>>>> removes and sell the water for potable purposes. The project has mixed health safety results.

>>>>

>>>> The reason that Direct Potable Reuse is illegal is because the

>>>> identification and toxicity of the millions of dissolved solids

>>>> that get through recycle are unknown. The state is currently

> >>> pursuing a scientific inquiry into that identification. The
> >>> identification of toxic particles uses bio-assay evaluations where
> >>> particle cells are analyzed for toxicity. Once identified, the
> >>> scientists attempt to create tests that will identify toxic
> >>> particles The goal is to be sure that Direct Potable Reuse water
> >>> is safe before it is authorized. The scientists are scheduled to
> >>> report their progress back to the State water Board in late 2023.
> >>> It is critical to understand that the state inquiry relates only
> >>> to treated and recycled municipal waste water and specifically
> >>> excludes all industrial waste, including agriculture waste waters.
> >>>
> >>> How does this relate to the PWM GWR project? PWM will mix
> >>> municipal waste with agriculture waste, treat it and recycle it
> >>> and then will follow the "gimmick" to claim that it is a bona fide
> >>> GWR project authorized under state law.
> >>>
> >>> Here is the Gimmick. The Seaside Basin currently serves as a
> >>> drinking water repository for excess waters from the Carmel river,
> >>> seepage from above and a couple of minor sources. PWM will inject
> >>> the treated and recycled water directly into the basin, an illegal
> >>> Direct Potable Reuse that is a process currently subject to
> >>> research to identify toxic dissolved particles that make it
> >>> through the process as I have explained above.
> >>>
> >>> PWM would argue that the illegality is neutralized by its GWR
> >>> process and that it is a legal GWR process, in spite of the
> >>> illegal Direct Potable Reuse. The PWM permit requires that the
> >>> treated water injected into the basin must remain in the basin for
> >>> two months so that it can qualify as a GWR. Put another way, we
> >>> are to accept that the illegal direct injection into the basin and
> >>> all of the health risks under investigation, will be cleansed by
> >>> association with the other drinking water in the basin and that
> >>> two months scientifically eliminates the concerns about DPR
> >>> currently under scientific study at the state level (and that only for human wastewater, not agriculture waste.).
> >>>
> >>> The recent proposal to expand the PWM project would add dangers:
> >>> it would result in over 2/3 of the water in the Seaside basin
> >>> derived from illegal DPR water. Without benefit of the current DPR
> >>> research, it would contaminate all of the basin.
> >>>
> >>> Currently, there is no water treatment recycle project in the
> >>> world that attempts to treat and recycle agriculture waste for potable uses.
> >>> On its web site, PWM admits that.
> >>>
> >>> Pure Water Now advocates and the Salinas agriculture interests
> >>> assert that the PWM project is preferable to the slant well
> >>> desalinization project foisted on Cal Am by the State Water Board.
> >>> In fact, a deep water desalinization is the only alternative(at about \$200 per sq.
> >>> ft.).
> >>>
> >>> If PWM or PWN responds to this comment, they will assert that the
> >>> PWM project must pass the safety tests. True, but as a GWR project

> >>> the tests do not and cannot include tests for a DWR project,
> >>> because those there are no such tests at this time(see 2023 remark above).
> >>>
> >>> The reason that I have inserted myself into this water disgrace is
> >>> based on simple survival instincts and concern for my fellow humans.
> >>> Nothing else. But it is time for someone other than me to get
> >>> involved. A local petition requesting PWM to obtain a health
> >>> safety opinion from a recognized water treatment safety expert
> >>> about the health safety feasibility of the project would be a good
> >>> start(expert appointed by the Seaside Basin case judge).

Arlene Tavani

From: David Dilworth <David@1hope.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2019 11:02 AM
To: Rudy Fischer; Jean Getchell; V T
Cc: John Moore
Subject: Drinking Ag Waste Water is like Boeing telling us the 737MAXX safety systems - were well thought out.

Hey Rudy,

Wow. I didn't know you were a comedian as well !

Love your missive -- especially "I can assure you that this project has been well thought out "

along with "have some faith in those who have worked with water delivery and safety as a career."

That's just like Boeing telling us the 737-MAX safety systems - "were well thought out."

And that we should "have some faith in Boeing's experts and all the FAA Regulators who have worked in human delivery and safety as a career."

That's hilarious Rudy. You're a hoot.

Thanks,
-David

At 10:45 AM 17,7/17/2019, Rudy Fischer wrote:

>Please people; I would hope you would have some faith in those who have
>worked with water delivery and safety as a career. I think they know
>something about what they are doing and do not go about risking the
>public's health. Having travelled in many countries - and gotten sick
>from the water in some - I am confident that we have the cleanest water
>available; monitored and treated to protect our health and well being.

>
>Mr. Moore is a long retired lawyer who keeps bringing up the same lame
>arguments over and over - even after they have been discredited over
>and over. I believe that Mr. Moore dealt with bankruptcy (not water)
>law, and I prefer to get my information from - and believe - those who
>have expertise in the appropriate field. This like telling the pilot
>of your airplane that you don't think the plane will work because you
>heard some bad things about the tire company's finances.

>
>As a former Board Chair of Monterey One Water (which is building Pure
>Water Monterey) I can assure you that this project has been well
>thought out and passes regulatory muster. The Monterey Regional Water
>Management District, Cal Am, the California State Water Resources
>Control Board - including its Division of Drinking Water, which
>regulates drinking water systems - and countless others WITH decades of

>experience in providing clean, potable water without endangering health
>are involved in this project. These are the professionals – not John
>(as nice a guy as he is). Have some faith in the experts, please.

>
>Rudy Fischer

>
>
>>
>>Sent from my iPhone

>>
>>> On Jul 15, 2019, at 8:23 PM, V T wrote:

>>>
>>> Thank you John:

>>>
>>> I hope those with authority do something to
> prevent this travesty and hazardous situation from arising, we cannot
> allow agricultural waste water to be recycled and tried to be purified
> to make it drinkable when the chances of it being toxic are so strong!

>>>
>>> To all who receive this, I am shocked and
> against this program and the whole façade of calling the company
> "Pure Water" is ridiculous!

>>>
>>> Vince Tuminello in Pacific Grove California

>>>
>>> Sent from my iPhone

>>>
>>>> On Jul 15, 2019, at 9:31 AM, John Moore wrote:

>>>>
>>>> To All:
>>>> This comment is based upon sources that include the Ca. Water Code
>>>> and regulations based thereon and the studies set forth on the web
>>>> site for the Ca. State Water Resources Board(State Water Board)
>>>> and its division, the Department of Drinking Water(DDW).

>>>>
>>>> The purpose of this comment is to prove beyond all doubt that Pure
>>>> Water Monterey(PWM) a Ground Water Replenishment project(GWR) is a
>>>> public health risk that cannot be implemented.

>>>>
>>>> Like the Orange County Water District(OCWD) GWR project, which
>>>> treats and recycles human waste and then uses a five year GWR
>>>> process to produce water for potable purposes, PWM will treat and
>>>> recycle human waste, but also will attempt to treat and recycle
>>>> toxic agriculture waste from Blanco Drain and Resurrection Ditch,
>>>> Salinas Valley agriculture waste repositories with toxic waste
>>>> from WWII forward based on a "Gimmick" instead of a true GWR
>>>> process. Blanco Drain And Resurrection Dith are both 303d sites
>>>> per the federal govt.: that means the waters are so severely
>>>> contaminated that it cannot sustain aquatic life.

>>>>
>>>>
>>>>

> >>> Currently, state law does not permit municipal wastewater to be
> >>> treated with advanced processes, then recycled via reverse osmosis
> >>> and sold directly for potable use (Direct Potable Reuse).
> >>> Subsequent to treatment and recycle, the water must utilize a GWR
> >>> process that reasonably removes toxic and undesirable dissolved
> >>> solids that get through treatment and recycle. The Orange project
> >>> treats and recycles human waste; thereafter, the water traverses
> >>> cracks, spaces, sands and rivers for about five years . After the
> >>> five years, water districts drop wells into the aquifer and
> >>> removes and sell the water for potable purposes. The project has mixed health safety results.
> >>>
> >>> The reason that Direct Potable Reuse is illegal is because the
> >>> identification and toxicity of the millions of dissolved solids
> >>> that get through recycle are unknown. The state is currently
> >>> pursuing a scientific inquiry into that identification. The
> >>> identification of toxic particles uses bio-assay evaluations where
> >>> particle cells are analyzed for toxicity. Once identified, the
> >>> scientists attempt to create tests that will identify toxic
> >>> particles The goal is to be sure that Direct Potable Reuse water
> >>> is safe before it is authorized. The scientists are scheduled to
> >>> report their progress back to the State water Board in late 2023.
> >>> It is critical to understand that the state inquiry relates only
> >>> to treated and recycled municipal waste water and specifically
> >>> excludes all industrial waste, including agriculture waste waters.
> >>>
> >>> How does this relate to the PWM GWR project? PWM will mix
> >>> municipal waste with agriculture waste, treat it and recycle it
> >>> and then will follow the "gimmick" to claim that it is a bona fide
> >>> GWR project authorized under state law.
> >>>
> >>> Here is the Gimmick. The Seaside Basin currently serves as a
> >>> drinking water repository for excess waters from the Carmel river,
> >>> seepage from above and a couple of minor sources. PWM will inject
> >>> the treated and recycled water directly into the basin, an illegal
> >>> Direct Potable Reuse that is a process currently subject to
> >>> research to identify toxic dissolved particles that make it
> >>> through the process as I have explained above.
> >>>
> >>> PWM would argue that the illegality is neutralized by its GWR
> >>> process and that it is a legal GWR process, in spite of the
> >>> illegal Direct Potable Reuse. The PWM permit requires that the
> >>> treated water injected into the basin must remain in the basin for
> >>> two months so that it can qualify as a GWR. Put another way, we
> >>> are to accept that the illegal direct injection into the basin and
> >>> all of the health risks under investigation, will be cleansed by
> >>> association with the other drinking water in the basin and that
> >>> two months scientifically eliminates the concerns about DPR
> >>> currently under scientific study at the state level (and that only for human wastewater, not agriculture waste.).
> >>>
> >>> The recent proposal to expand the PWM project would add dangers:
> >>> it would result in over 2/3 of the water in the Seaside basin
> >>> derived from illegal DPR water. Without benefit of the current DPR

> >>> research, it would contaminate all of the basin.
> >>>
> >>> Currently, there is no water treatment recycle project in the
> >>> world that attempts to treat and recycle agriculture waste for potable uses.
> >>> On its web site, PWM admits that.
> >>>
> >>> Pure Water Now advocates and the Salinas agriculture interests
> >>> assert that the PWM project is preferable to the slant well
> >>> desalinization project foisted on Cal Am by the State Water Board.
> >>> In fact, a deep water desalinization is the only alternative(at about \$200 per sq.
> >>> ft.).
> >>>
> >>> If PWM or PWN responds to this comment, they will assert that the
> >>> PWM project must pass the safety tests. True, but as a GWR project
> >>> the tests do not and cannot include tests for a DWR project,
> >>> because those there are no such tests at this time(see 2023 remark above).
> >>>
> >>> The reason that I have inserted myself into this water disgrace is
> >>> based on simple survival instincts and concern for my fellow humans.
> >>> Nothing else. But it is time for someone other than me to get
> >>> involved. A local petition requesting PWM to obtain a health
> >>> safety opinion from a recognized water treatment safety expert
> >>> about the health safety feasibility of the project would be a good
> >>> start(expert appointed by the Seaside Basin case judge).

Arlene Tavani

From: John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2019 2:01 PM
To: Rudy Fischer; WB-DDW-RecycledWater; Dave Stoldt; Paul Sciuto; Jim Johnson; Joe Livernois; Marge Jameson; Royal Calkins; Barnard, Randy@Waterboards
Cc: David Dilworth; Jean Getchell; V T
Subject: Re: Peninsula Water Disaster

I was a trial lawyer, including micro-electronic trade secret cases.

From 1993-98, I processed and defended all claims related to five new prisons built by the Ca. Dept of corrections (five billion in projects). Every technology, including water and wastewater was involved. Numerous attorneys were subject to my supervision. I have a "Preeminent" Martindale rating (top 1% nationally). BTW, bankruptcy lawyers include some of the best minds in the world.

But you are missing the point Rudy. Treating and recycling toxic agriculture waste, like Blanco Drain and Resurrection Ditch has never been researched, recommended or attempted. The current research by the state has postponed further proposals for Direct Potable reuse until 2023, but the PWM project will inject treated wastewaters directly into the Seaside basin, Cal-Am's repository of drinking water. In short, it is an illegal Direct potable reuse project. There is no data OR TESTS for the safety of such a unique try.

GWR is a process to clean water that has been recycled and treated, BEFORE the water is injected into a basin or aquifer for potable use (like the five years of GWR in Orange). PWM injects its product into a drinking water basin, after, not before and asserts that two months in cleansing in that basin qualifies it as a legal GWR. By definition, if that water becomes cleaner in the basin, it will be contaminating the water in the basin. Unlike Orange, there is no true GWR process that operates to create a GWR cleansing effect. It is a hoax, and you were/are a big part of it.

But Rudy, here's my deal: I have never claimed that voters should rely on my research as a basis to assure that the PWM project is safe. For about two years, I have requested (in writing to agency after agency) that PWM obtain the opinion of one or more qualified waste water GWR health safety experts to provide an opinion and the basis for it, that the PWM final product will be safe for potable uses. How can PWM refuse such a reasonable request? How can you not join in my request?

Remember that not a single such medical opinion was ever part of the permit process (or the EIR). The PWM sewage engineer asserted there were numerous similar projects, but she intentionally failed to inform that in the history of man, no such project had ever attempted to treat, recycle and AWR toxic agriculture wastewater to create potable water. Never. So no data, no experience, no tests Rudy, you tell people that the PWM project is like Orange. That is not true as set forth above. But in your writings you never reveal this revolutionary attempt to treat and recycle toxic agriculture waste water. Evidently you do not believe that feature of the PWM project to be important.

You claim that those in charge of the PWM project should be trusted.

But none of them has any health safety training and experience for such projects. Add to that, no one in the history of the world has any health safety experience related to a treatment, recycle, AWR of an agriculture waste project. No one!

The failed vote on the reservoir was before the water board cease and desist order. Also, it was the Monterey Bay water Management District that allowed the dam to become contaminated, another example of its history of water failures. Water One Monterey, under your watch, dumped 5 Million gallons of untreated human sewage into the Monterey Bay. Nice going Rudy. John M. Moore (licensed, but retired Stanford trained lawyer)

<https://www.avast.com/sig-email?utm_medium=email&utm_source=link&utm_campaign=sig-email&utm_content=webmail&utm_term=icon>

Virus-free. www.avast.com

<https://www.avast.com/sig-email?utm_medium=email&utm_source=link&utm_campaign=sig-email&utm_content=webmail&utm_term=link>
<#DAB4FAD8-2DD7-40BB-A1B8-4E2AA1F9FDF2>

On Wed, Jul 17, 2019 at 11:26 AM Rudy Fischer <rudyfischer@earthlink.net> wrote:

>
> David;
>
> I'm not saying there is no problem. There is; and I agree it is human caused. But the solution is not to disallow reasonable water projects which will reduce the local reliance on the overdrafted aquifer and river. Getting the water that is needed from recycled water or a small desal plant will allow us to leave more water in the aquifer AND take less than we currently do from the Carmel River.

>
> My goal is to be smart about it, though, and that means actually doing something. I know that some people don't want to do anything; but that is no longer an option. Because of those who fought against a reservoir years ago, for instance, this (wet) year alone 13 years worth of water went out of the mouth of the Carmel River unusable and unsavable. THAT is a tragedy!

>
> Rudy

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

> >From: David Dilworth <David@1hope.org>
> >Sent: Jul 17, 2019 11:10 AM
> >To: Rudy Fischer <rudyfischer@earthlink.net>, Jean Getchell
> ><jeanagetshell@gmail.com>, V T <vtpg@hotmail.com>
> >Cc: John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com>
> >Subject: Peninsula Water Disaster

> >
> >PS Just in case you were not FULLY aware of our Peninsula Water
> >Disaster situation -- here's a review article covering more than most
> >local experts do --

> >
> >https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=http%3a%2f%2f1hope.org%2fwaters%2fit.htm&c=E,1,v8OPd9tkgjHa4aSDU2gyCsbXKi9OQJLSbH9VmQbe0FI5Bh4tRxITNDO-0HkkGWKQ_AypYrfc_rTjuPewCobfB4b13RrWhPn4cTcpsr6jbF_bZnxEIA8BUUVH&typo
> >=1

> >
> >Yes, it is almost a year since it was updated, but very little of our
> >physical, legal and political water situation has changed in the past
> >decade.

> >
> >Cheers,
> >-David

> >
> >At 10:45 AM 17,7/17/2019, Rudy Fischer wrote:

> >>Please people; I would hope you would have some faith in those who
> >>have worked with water delivery and safety as a career. I think they
> >>know something about what they are doing and do not go about risking
> >>the public's health. Having travelled in many countries - and gotten

>>>sick from the water in some - I am confident that we have the
>>>cleanest water available; monitored and treated to protect our
>>>health and well being.

>>>

>>>Mr. Moore is a long retired lawyer who keeps bringing up the same
>>>lame arguments over and over - even after they have been discredited
>>>over and over. I believe that Mr. Moore dealt with bankruptcy (not
>>>water) law, and I prefer to get my information from - and believe -
>>>those who have expertise in the appropriate field. This like
>>>telling the pilot of your airplane that you don't think the plane
>>>will work because you heard some bad things about the tire company's
>>>finances.

>>>

>>>As a former Board Chair of Monterey One Water (which is building
>>>Pure Water Monterey) I can assure you that this project has been
>>>well thought out and passes regulatory muster. The Monterey Regional
>>>Water Management District, Cal Am, the California State Water
>>>Resources Control Board - including its Division of Drinking Water,
>>>which regulates drinking water systems - and countless others WITH
>>>decades of experience in providing clean, potable water without
>>>endangering health are involved in this project. These are the
>>>professionals – not John (as nice a guy as he is). Have some faith
>>>in the experts, please.

>>>

>>>Rudy Fischer

>>>

>>>

>>>>

>>>>Sent from my iPhone

>>>>

>>>>> On Jul 15, 2019, at 8:23 PM, V T wrote:

>>>>>

>>>>> Thank you John:

>>>>>

>>>>> I hope those with authority do something to
>>> prevent this travesty and hazardous situation from arising, we
>>> cannot allow agricultural waste water to be recycled and tried to
>>> be purified to make it drinkable when the chances of it being toxic
>>> are so strong!

>>>>>

>>>>> To all who receive this, I am shocked and
>>> against this program and the whole façade of calling the company
>>> "Pure Water" is ridiculous!

>>>>>

>>>>> Vince Tuminello in Pacific Grove California

>>>>>

>>>>> Sent from my iPhone

>>>>>

>>>>>> On Jul 15, 2019, at 9:31 AM, John Moore wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>> To All:

>>>>>> This comment is based upon sources that include the Ca. Water

> > >> Code and regulations based thereon and the studies set forth on
> > >> the web site for the Ca. State Water Resources Board(State
> > >> Water Board) and its division, the Department of Drinking Water(DDW).
> > >>

> > >> The purpose of this comment is to prove beyond all doubt that
> > >> Pure Water Monterey(PWM) a Ground Water Replenishment
> > >> project(GWR) is a public health risk that cannot be implemented.
> > >>

> > >> Like the Orange County Water District(OCWD) GWR project, which
> > >> treats and recycles human waste and then uses a five year GWR
> > >> process to produce water for potable purposes, PWM will treat
> > >> and recycle human waste, but also will attempt to treat and
> > >> recycle toxic agriculture waste from Blanco Drain and
> > >> Resurrection Ditch, Salinas Valley agriculture waste
> > >> repositories with toxic waste from WWII forward based on a
> > >> "Gimmick" instead of a true GWR process. Blanco Drain And
> > >> Resurrection Ditch are both 303d sites per the federal govt.:
> > >> that means the waters are so severely contaminated that it cannot sustain aquatic life.
> > >>

> > >>
> > >>
> > >>

> > >> Currently, state law does not permit municipal wastewater to be
> > >> treated with advanced processes, then recycled via reverse
> > >> osmosis and sold directly for potable use (Direct Potable
> > >> Reuse). Subsequent to treatment and recycle, the water must
> > >> utilize a GWR process that reasonably removes toxic and
> > >> undesirable dissolved solids that get through treatment and
> > >> recycle. The Orange project treats and recycles human waste;
> > >> thereafter, the water traverses cracks, spaces, sands and
> > >> rivers for about five years . After the five years, water
> > >> districts drop wells into the aquifer and removes and sell the water for potable purposes. The project has mixed
health safety results.

> > >>

> > >> The reason that Direct Potable Reuse is illegal is because the
> > >> identification and toxicity of the millions of dissolved solids
> > >> that get through recycle are unknown. The state is currently
> > >> pursuing a scientific inquiry into that identification. The
> > >> identification of toxic particles uses bio-assay evaluations
> > >> where particle cells are analyzed for toxicity. Once
> > >> identified, the scientists attempt to create tests that will
> > >> identify toxic particles The goal is to be sure that Direct
> > >> Potable Reuse water is safe before it is authorized. The
> > >> scientists are scheduled to report their progress back to the
> > >> State water Board in late 2023. It is critical to understand
> > >> that the state inquiry relates only to treated and recycled
> > >> municipal waste water and specifically excludes all industrial waste, including agriculture waste waters.

> > >>

> > >> How does this relate to the PWM GWR project? PWM will mix
> > >> municipal waste with agriculture waste, treat it and recycle it
> > >> and then will follow the "gimmick" to claim that it is a bona
> > >> fide GWR project authorized under state law.

> > >>

>>>> Here is the Gimmick. The Seaside Basin currently serves as a
>>>> drinking water repository for excess waters from the Carmel
>>>> river, seepage from above and a couple of minor sources. PWM
>>>> will inject the treated and recycled water directly into the
>>>> basin, an illegal Direct Potable Reuse that is a process
>>>> currently subject to research to identify toxic dissolved
>>>> particles that make it through the process as I have explained above.

>>>>

>>>> PWM would argue that the illegality is neutralized by its GWR
>>>> process and that it is a legal GWR process, in spite of the
>>>> illegal Direct Potable Reuse. The PWM permit requires that the
>>>> treated water injected into the basin must remain in the basin
>>>> for two months so that it can qualify as a GWR. Put another
>>>> way, we are to accept that the illegal direct injection into
>>>> the basin and all of the health risks under investigation, will
>>>> be cleansed by association with the other drinking water in the
>>>> basin and that two months scientifically eliminates the
>>>> concerns about DPR currently under scientific study at the state level (and that only for human wastewater, not
agriculture waste.).

>>>>

>>>> The recent proposal to expand the PWM project would add
>>>> dangers: it would result in over 2/3 of the water in the
>>>> Seaside basin derived from illegal DPR water. Without benefit
>>>> of the current DPR research, it would contaminate all of the basin.

>>>>

>>>> Currently, there is no water treatment recycle project in the
>>>> world that attempts to treat and recycle agriculture waste for potable uses.
>>>> On its web site, PWM admits that.

>>>>

>>>> Pure Water Now advocates and the Salinas agriculture interests
>>>> assert that the PWM project is preferable to the slant well
>>>> desalinization project foisted on Cal Am by the State Water
>>>> Board. In fact, a deep water desalinization is the only alternative(at about \$200 per sq.
>>>> ft.).

>>>>

>>>> If PWM or PWN responds to this comment, they will assert that
>>>> the PWM project must pass the safety tests. True, but as a GWR
>>>> project the tests do not and cannot include tests for a DWR
>>>> project, because those there are no such tests at this time(see 2023 remark above).

>>>>

>>>> The reason that I have inserted myself into this water disgrace
>>>> is based on simple survival instincts and concern for my fellow humans.
>>>> Nothing else. But it is time for someone other than me to get
>>>> involved. A local petition requesting PWM to obtain a health
>>>> safety opinion from a recognized water treatment safety expert
>>>> about the health safety feasibility of the project would be a
>>>> good start(expert appointed by the Seaside Basin case judge).

>>

Arlene Tavani

From: Ron Weitzman <ronweitzman@redshift.com>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 8:58 PM
To: 'Jean Getchell'; 'V T'
Cc: 'John Moore'; 'Barnard, Randy@Waterboards'; 'Paul Sciuto'; 'Dave Stoldt'; 'Bob Jaques'; 'russell mcglathlin'; 'Sweigert, Jan@Waterboards'; 'Dorene D'Adamo'; 'WB-DDW-RecycledWater'; 'Rudy Fischer'; Arlene Tavani; 'Jeanne Byrne'; 'Mary Adams'; public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov; 'Carmelita Garcia'; 'Carly Mayberry'; 'Cynthia Garfield'; 'Bill Peake'; 'David Sweigert'; 'Nicholas Smith'; 'Susan Goldbeck'; 'Bill Monnet'; mheditor@montereyherald.com; 'Mary Duan'; 'Carmel Pine Cone'; 'Marge Jameson'; 'Royal Calkins'; 'Joe Livernois'; 'Jim Johnson'; 'Jenny McAdams'; pam@mcweekly.com; 'Luke Coletti'; 'Dan Davis'; erickson@stamplaw.us; 'Israel Zubiata'; 'john moore'; 'Larry'; 'Margaret Thum'; 'Kelly Nix'; 'William Moore'; 'Prescott J. Kendall'; 'david8@1hope.org'; Steven.mover77@gmail.com; unobaj@yahoo.com; 'Walt Classen'; 'fran&jd'; 'Roberta Lindsey'; 'Dan Miller'; ramburke@yahoo.com; 'George Riley'; 'Pgac- Susan Nilmier'; robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov; 'Michael Canan'; 'Robert Huit'; 'Robert Pacelli'; 'Jane Haines'; 'Jane Parker'
Subject: RE: Pure Water Monterey-Ground Water Replenishment Project

Thank you, John, and thank you, Jean. I was the one who presented the argument to the regional board, but to no avail. We are in a political, not a scientific, battle, and science unfortunately is not a very effective weapon in politics. --Ron

-----Original Message-----

From: Jean Getchell [<mailto:jeanagetchell@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 8:30 PM
To: V T
Cc: John Moore; Barnard, Randy@Waterboards; Paul Sciuto; David J. Stoldt; Bob Jaques; russell mcglathlin; Sweigert, Jan@Waterboards; Dorene D'Adamo; WB-DDW-RecycledWater; Rudy Fischer; Arlene Tavani; Jeanne Byrne; Mary Adams; public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov; Carmelita Garcia; Carly Mayberry; Cynthia Garfield; Bill Peake; David Sweigert; Nicholas Smith; Susan Goldbeck; Bill Monnet; mheditor@montereyherald.com; Mary Duan; Carmel Pine Cone; Marge Jameson; Royal Calkins; Ron Weitzman; Joe Livernois; Jim Johnson; Jenny McAdams; pam@mcweekly.com; Luke Coletti; Dan Davis; erickson@stamplaw.us; Israel Zubiata; john moore; Larry; Margaret Thum; Kelly Nix; William Moore; Prescott J. Kendall; david8@1hope.org; Steven.mover77@gmail.com; unobaj@yahoo.com; Walt Classen; fran&jd; Roberta Lindsey; Dan Miller; ramburke@yahoo.com; George Riley; Pgac- Susan Nilmier; robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov; Michael Canan; Robert Huit (rhuit@hghb.net); Robert Pacelli; Jane Haines; Jane Parker
Subject: Re: Pure Water Monterey-Ground Water Replenishment Project

If memory serves, these same issues were raised before the Regional Water Quality Control Board before it issued the required permit to M1W.

Jean Getchell

Law Office of Jean Getchell

1743 Santa Ynez Street

Ventura, CA 93001

(831) 392-6596

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jul 15, 2019, at 8:23 PM, V T <vtpg@hotmail.com> wrote:

>

> Thank you John:

>

> I hope those with authority do something to prevent this travesty and hazardous situation from arising, we cannot allow agricultural waste water to be recycled and tried to be purified to make it drinkable when the chances of it being toxic are so strong!

>

> To all who receive this, I am shocked and against this program and the whole façade of calling the company "Pure Water" is ridiculous!

>

> Vince Tuminello in Pacific Grove California

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>> On Jul 15, 2019, at 9:31 AM, John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com> wrote:

>>

>> To All:

>> This comment is based upon sources that include the Ca. Water Code and

>> regulations based thereon and the studies set forth on the web site

>> for the Ca. State Water Resources Board(State Water Board) and its

>> division, the Department of Drinking Water(DDW).

>>

>> The purpose of this comment is to prove beyond all doubt that Pure
>> Water Monterey(PWM) a Ground Water Replenishment project(GWR) is a
>> public health risk that cannot be implemented.

>>

>> Like the Orange County Water District(OCWD) GWR project, which treats
>> and recycles human waste and then uses a five year GWR process to
>> produce water for potable purposes, PWM will treat and recycle human
>> waste, but also will attempt to treat and recycle toxic agriculture
>> waste from Blanco Drain and Resurrection Ditch, Salinas Valley
>> agriculture waste repositories with toxic waste from WWII forward
>> based on a "Gimmick" instead of a true GWR process. Blanco Drain And
>> Resurrection Ditch are both 303d sites per the federal govt.: that
>> means the waters are so severely contaminated that it cannot sustain
>> aquatic life.

>>

>>

>>

>> Currently, state law does not permit municipal wastewater to be
>> treated with advanced processes, then recycled via reverse osmosis
>> and sold directly for potable use (Direct Potable Reuse). Subsequent
>> to treatment and recycle, the water must utilize a GWR process that
>> reasonably removes toxic and undesirable dissolved solids that get
>> through treatment and recycle. The Orange project treats and recycles
>> human waste; thereafter, the water traverses cracks, spaces, sands and
>> rivers for about five years . After the five years, water districts

>> drop wells into the aquifer and removes and sell the water for potable
>> purposes. The project has mixed health safety results.

>>

>> The reason that Direct Potable Reuse is illegal is because the
>> identification and toxicity of the millions of dissolved solids that
>> get through recycle are unknown. The state is currently pursuing a
>> scientific inquiry into that identification. The identification of
>> toxic particles uses bio-assay evaluations where particle cells are
>> analyzed for toxicity. Once identified, the scientists attempt to
>> create tests that will identify toxic particles The goal is to be sure
>> that Direct Potable Reuse water is safe before it is authorized. The
>> scientists are scheduled to report their progress back to the State
>> water Board in late 2023. It is critical to understand that the state
>> inquiry relates only to treated and recycled municipal waste water and
>> specifically excludes all industrial waste, including agriculture
>> waste waters.

>>

>> How does this relate to the PWM GWR project? PWM will mix municipal
>> waste with agriculture waste, treat it and recycle it and then will
>> follow the "gimmick" to claim that it is a bona fide GWR project
>> authorized under state law.

>>

>> Here is the Gimmick. The Seaside Basin currently serves as a drinking
>> water repository for excess waters from the Carmel river, seepage from
>> above and a couple of minor sources. PWM will inject the treated and

>> recycled water directly into the basin, an illegal Direct Potable
>> Reuse that is a process currently subject to research to identify
>> toxic dissolved particles that make it through the process as I have
>> explained above.

>>

>> PWM would argue that the illegality is neutralized by its GWR process
>> and that it is a legal GWR process, in spite of the illegal Direct
>> Potable Reuse. The PWM permit requires that the treated water injected
>> into the basin must remain in the basin for two months so that it can
>> qualify as a GWR. Put another way, we are to accept that the illegal
>> direct injection into the basin and all of the health risks under
>> investigation, will be cleansed by association with the other drinking
>> water in the basin and that two months scientifically eliminates the
>> concerns about DPR currently under scientific study at the state level
>> (and that only for human wastewater, not agriculture waste.).

>>

>> The recent proposal to expand the PWM project would add dangers: it
>> would result in over 2/3 of the water in the Seaside basin derived
>> from illegal DPR water. Without benefit of the current DPR research,
>> it would contaminate all of the basin.

>>

>> Currently, there is no water treatment recycle project in the world
>> that attempts to treat and recycle agriculture waste for potable uses.
>> On its web site, PWM admits that.

>>

>> Pure Water Now advocates and the Salinas agriculture interests assert
>> that the PWM project is preferable to the slant well desalinization
>> project foisted on Cal Am by the State Water Board. In fact, a deep
>> water desalinization is the only alternative(at about \$200 per sq.
>> ft.).

>>

>> If PWM or PWN responds to this comment, they will assert that the PWM
>> project must pass the safety tests. True, but as a GWR project the
>> tests do not and cannot include tests for a DWR project, because those
>> there are no such tests at this time(see 2023 remark above).

>>

>> The reason that I have inserted myself into this water disgrace is
>> based on simple survival instincts and concern for my fellow humans.
>> Nothing else. But it is time for someone other than me to get
>> involved. A local petition requesting PWM to obtain a health safety
>> opinion from a recognized water treatment safety expert about the
>> health safety feasibility of the project would be a good start(expert
>> appointed by the Seaside Basin case judge).

Arlene Tavani

From: john moore <jmerton99@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 3:02 PM
To: Barnard, Randy@Waterboards; Paul Sciuto; Dave Stoldt; Bob Jaques; russell mcglothlin; Catherine.Stedman@amwater.com; Sweigert, Jan@Waterboards; Dorene D'Adamo; WB-DDW-RecycledWater; Rudy Fischer; Arlene Tavani; Jeanne Byrne; Jean Getchell; Mary Adams; public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov; Carmelita Garcia; Carly Mayberry; Cynthia Garfield; Bill Peake; David Sweigert; Nicholas Smith; Susan Goldbeck; Bill Monnet; John Moore
Cc: mheditor@montereyherald.com; Mary Duan; Carmel Pine Cone; Marge Jameson; Royal Calkins; Ron Weitzman; Joe Livernois; Jim Johnson; Jenny McAdams; pam@mcweekly.com; Luke Coletti; Dan Davis; erickson@stamlaw.us; Israel Zubiato; Larry; Margaret Thum; Kelly Nix; William Moore; Prescott J. Kendall; david8@1hope.org; Steven.mover77@gmail.com; unobaj@yahoo.com; Vince Tuminello; Walt Classen; fran&jd; Roberta Lindsey; Dan Miller; ramburke@yahoo.com; George Riley; Pgac-Susan Nilmier; robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov; Michael Canan; Robert Huit (rhuitt@hghb.net); Robert Pacelli; Jane Haines; Jane Parker
Subject: Re: Pure Water Monterey-Ground Water Replenishment Project

Typo: I cited the cost of "deep water" desalinization at \$220 per sq. ft. It should have said \$2200 per acre ft. JMM

On Monday, July 15, 2019, 10:31:15 AM MDT, John Moore <jmoore052@gmail.com> wrote:

To All:

This comment is based upon sources that include the Ca. Water Code and regulations based thereon and the studies set forth on the web site for the Ca. State Water Resources Board(State Water Board) and its division, the Department of Drinking Water(DDW).

The purpose of this comment is to prove beyond all doubt that Pure Water Monterey(PWM) a Ground Water Replenishment project(GWR) is a public health risk that cannot be implemented.

Like the Orange County Water District(OCWD) GWR project, which treats and recycles human waste and then uses a five year GWR process to produce water for potable purposes, PWM will treat and recycle human waste, but also will attempt to treat and recycle toxic agriculture waste from Blanco Drain and Resurrection Ditch, Salinas Valley agriculture waste repositories with toxic waste from WWII forward based on a "Gimmick" instead of a true GWR process. Blanco Drain And Resurrection Ditch are both 303d sites per the federal govt.: that means the waters are so severely contaminated that it cannot sustain aquatic life.

Currently, state law does not permit municipal wastewater to be treated with advanced processes, then recycled via reverse osmosis and sold directly for potable use (Direct Potable Reuse). Subsequent to treatment and recycle, the water must utilize a GWR process that reasonably removes toxic and undesirable dissolved solids that get through treatment and recycle. The Orange project treats and recycles human waste; thereafter, the water traverses cracks, spaces, sands and rivers for about five years . After the five years, water districts

drop wells into the aquifer and removes and sell the water for potable purposes. The project has mixed health safety results.

The reason that Direct Potable Reuse is illegal is because the identification and toxicity of the millions of dissolved solids that get through recycle are unknown. The state is currently pursuing a scientific inquiry into that identification. The identification of toxic particles uses bio-assay evaluations where particle cells are analyzed for toxicity. Once identified, the scientists attempt to create tests that will identify toxic particles. The goal is to be sure that Direct Potable Reuse water is safe before it is authorized. The scientists are scheduled to report their progress back to the State water Board in late 2023. It is critical to understand that the state inquiry relates only to treated and recycled municipal waste water and specifically excludes all industrial waste, including agriculture waste waters.

How does this relate to the PWM GWR project? PWM will mix municipal waste with agriculture waste, treat it and recycle it and then will follow the "gimmick" to claim that it is a bona fide GWR project authorized under state law.

Here is the Gimmick. The Seaside Basin currently serves as a drinking water repository for excess waters from the Carmel river, seepage from above and a couple of minor sources. PWM will inject the treated and recycled water directly into the basin, an illegal Direct Potable Reuse that is a process currently subject to research to identify toxic dissolved particles that make it through the process as I have explained above.

PWM would argue that the illegality is neutralized by its GWR process and that it is a legal GWR process, in spite of the illegal Direct Potable Reuse. The PWM permit requires that the treated water injected into the basin must remain in the basin for two months so that it can qualify as a GWR. Put another way, we are to accept that the illegal direct injection into the basin and all of the health risks under investigation, will be cleansed by association with the other drinking water in the basin and that two months scientifically eliminates the concerns about DPR currently under scientific study at the state level (and that only for human wastewater, not agriculture waste.).

The recent proposal to expand the PWM project would add dangers: it would result in over 2/3 of the water in the Seaside basin derived from illegal DPR water. Without benefit of the current DPR research, it would contaminate all of the basin.

Currently, there is no water treatment recycle project in the world that attempts to treat and recycle agriculture waste for potable uses. On its web site, PWM admits that.

Pure Water Now advocates and the Salinas agriculture interests assert that the PWM project is preferable to the slant well desalinization project foisted on Cal Am by the State Water Board. In fact, a deep water desalinization is the only alternative(at about \$200 per sq. ft.).

If PWM or PWN responds to this comment, they will assert that the PWM project must pass the safety tests. True, but as a GWR project the tests do not and cannot include tests for a DWR project, because those there are no such tests at this time(see 2023 remark above).

The reason that I have inserted myself into this water disgrace is based on simple survival instincts and concern for my fellow humans. Nothing else. But it is time for someone other than me to get involved. A local petition requesting PWM to obtain a health safety opinion from a recognized water treatment safety expert about the health safety feasibility of the project would be a good start (expert appointed by the Seaside Basin case judge).