

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

**Date:** September 8, 2018 at 1:24:28 PM PDT

**To:** russell mcglothlin <[RMcGlothlin@bhfs.com](mailto:RMcGlothlin@bhfs.com)>, Ron Weitzman <[ronweitzman@redshift.com](mailto:ronweitzman@redshift.com)>, Jim Johnson <[jjohnson@montereyherald.com](mailto:jjohnson@montereyherald.com)>, [DDWrecycledwater@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:DDWrecycledwater@waterboards.ca.gov), Felicia Marcus <[felicia.marcus@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:felicia.marcus@waterboards.ca.gov)>, [robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov](mailto:robert.brownwood@waterboards.ca.gov)

**Subject:** Fwd: Response to LandWatch opinion that Recycled effluent and toxic Ag waste is environmentally safer than the desalination project

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

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

Date: Sat, Sep 8, 2018 at 12:44 PM

Subject: Fwd: Response to LandWatch opinion that Recycled effluent and toxic Ag waste is environmentally safer than the desalination project

To: john moore <[jmerton99@yahoo.com](mailto:jmerton99@yahoo.com)>

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

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

Date: Sat, Sep 8, 2018 at 12:42 PM

Subject: Response to LandWatch opinion that Recycled effluent and toxic Ag waste is environmentally safer than the desalination project

To: [mheditor@montereyherald.com](mailto:mheditor@montereyherald.com) <[mheditor@montereyherald.com](mailto:mheditor@montereyherald.com)>

Editor:

In Saturday's edition you published an article by LandWatch in which it said: "The recycled water water would also have fewer environmental impacts; use much less energy; and run on energy generated by methane waste gas." It was comparing it to desalinated potable water.

I contend that the project presents an intolerable environmental risk to human health, because the Pure Water Monterey (PWM) project is a revolutionary first of its kind and the safety of the water it will produce has never been affirmed by recycled wastewater toxicologists.

During the last year, I have compiled and presented substantial research to all of the relevant state and local agencies about the safety, or not, of the PWM project. Based on that evidence, I have demanded that "As families we are entitled to an opinion by a panel of experts in the toxicology of the recycled wastewater to be produced by PWM affirming that it will be safe for potable(drinking, cooking etc.)purposes." I have substantial support for that demand.

The approval of the PWM project by the Regional Water Resources Board, was by five "mom and pops" like you and me, based on a non-adversary EIR presentation by Water One Monterey. The safety part was by an Environmental engineer(Nellor, a two person firm of Margaret Nellor, an engineer, and her mother). Her evidence was that several existing

projects affirmed the safety of the PWM project. There are none. Even the Orange Water District Project has recently learned that one of its three storage basins is contaminated. And the district has one of the highest cancer rates in the nation, particularly among children.

In fact, there are NO existing or planned wastewater recycling projects that mixes toxic agriculture waste with human affluent in an attempt to produce potable water. The PWM project is experimental.

In a Policy Directive, David E. Spath Ph.D then director of the Department of Health Services(In 2014, it was removed from Health Services in favor of engineers at the State Water Board)said:  
"Extremely impaired sources that contain or are likely to contain high concentrations of contaminants, contain multiple contaminants, 'or unknown contaminants'(emphasis mine)(such as groundwater subject to contamination from a hazardous waste disposal site) should not be considered for human consumption where alternatives are available."  
The PWM project intends to inject its water into the Seaside Basin which sits under Area 39 of old Ft. Ord, a hazardous waste disposal site that has not been purified. Ag wastewater is specifically labeled as an "impaired source" regardless of location, in the Directive, but was not discussed as such in the EIR.

Australia performed a comprehensive three year study about the human health safety of recycling human sewage for potable purpose(Report 2015). In conclusion, Professor Peter Collignon, AM, Infectious Disease Physician and Microbiologist, Professor of Clinical Medicine . Australian Natl. University said; "We should only adopt recycling water from sewage as a Last Resort" He went on to say that in an emergency, if a community needed to resort to recycled human sewage as a potable use, it would require 24/7 real time testing for pathogens(which is not currently available). No expert has ever studied the risks in recycling Ag wastewater or the risks from mixing it with effluent. There are dozens of contemporary reports that agree with Australia and Doctor Collignon.

The key health risks from recycling human effluent is that hundreds of microscopic molecules get thru the system, some of them are pathogenic, But we have no tests to identify them. Real toxicologists work and write about this conundrum every day. Currently, the state hopes to have adequate tests by 2023. PWM will argue "we meet all tests now required and if we meet the tests it must be safe." Ok, Let's see if expert toxicologists agree!

If PWM objects to the expert tests that I have requested, we should all be even more scared.

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