



# Supplement to 9/19/11 MPWMD Board Packet

Attached are copies of letters received between August 8, 2011 and September 13, 2011. These letters are also listed in the September 19, 2011 Board packet under item 22, Letters Received.

Author	Addressee	Date	Topic
John Narigi and Mike Zimmerman,	MPWMD Board	8/15/11	Agenda Items 15 & 16 of 8/15/11 Board Meeting – Proposal by WaterPlus for Public Ownership of California-American Water
Mark Beique	MPWMD Board	8/15/11	Commentary to MPWMD Concerning SWRCB CDO Order 2009-06 and Proposal to Purchase California American Water Co
Janine M. Chicourrat	MPWMD Board	8/15/11	Agenda Items 15 & 16 of 8/15/11 Board Meeting – Proposal by WaterPlus for Public Ownership of California-American Water
Carlos Ramos	MPWMD Board	8/15/11	The Latino Water Coalition of the Monterey Peninsula
Curtis V. Weeks	Stephanie Pintar	9/2/11	4 E. Carmel Valley Rd., Carmel Valley (APN 187-441-024-000; BP 051442)

U:\staff\word\boardpacket\2011\20110919\ltr\Pkt\ltr\Pkt.docx

Received at 1  
8/15/2011  
Board Meeting  
Item 16

**MCHA's Coalition of Peninsula Businesses**  
P.O. Box 223542  
Carmel, California 93922  
831-626-8636 fax 831-626-4269

August 15, 2011

The Honorable Bob Brower, Chair  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District  
5 Harris Court  
Monterey, California 93940

Re: Agenda Items 15 and 16

Dear Bob and Members, Board of Directors:

We recently formed a Coalition to support the expeditious completion of the Regional Water Project before the drastic and devastating cutbacks on water availability ordered by the SWRCB Cease and Desist Order take effect. We are the Monterey County Hospitality Association, Monterey Commercial Property Owners' Association, Community Hospital of the Monterey Peninsula, Monterey County Association of Realtors, and the Chambers of Commerce of Carmel, Pacific Grove and the Monterey Peninsula. We represent thousands of businesses employing tens of thousands of workers and thousands of residents on the Monterey Peninsula.


We oppose the District spending time and money on forming a 'citizen's advisory committee' to investigate buying out Cal Am. The WaterPlus presentation to you was replete with misrepresentations and erroneous information about which Cal Am informs you tonight. It strikes us as wasteful and unnecessary to spend time and money on this when you have five important water supply augmentation projects underway that can benefit from all the time and money you can spare.

Cal Am has stated, repeatedly, it is not for sale. The only way to buy Cal Am against its will is to initiate extremely expensive and time-consuming condemnation proceedings; this will take millions of dollars and take a dozen or so years, neither of which the District has to spare. Not one drop of new water would result from buying out Cal Am.


The issue of buying out Cal Am should have been settled with the 2 to 1 defeat of Measure W in 2005.

Please put aside this silly distraction from the important work of helping the community avoid the devastation the Cease and Desist Order deadline will impose on our businesses, our local governments and our residents.

Sincerely,



John Narigi, Coalition Co-chair  
General Manager  
Monterey Plaza Hotel and Spa



Mike Zimmerman, Coalition Co-chair  
Executive Vice-president and COO  
Cannery Row Company

Submitted on 8/16/2011  
Comments made under  
item 16.

**Marc Beique**

1209 Harrison St., Monterey, CA 93940 Tel (831) 373-0922 E-mail: marc@beique.com

August 15, 2011

**COMMENTARY TO MPWMD  
CONCERNING SWRCB COD Order 2009-06  
AND  
PROPOSAL TO PURCHASE CALIFORNIA AMERICAN WATER CO.**

1. **BENEFICIAL HUMAN USE OF WATER:** It is clear with respect to the SWRCB, Cal-Am, and the Carmel River that our government has clearly discounted the needs of the human population in favor of the fish. It is well within the rights of the SWRCB to award the "public trust resources" of the Carmel River water rights to us (MPWMD), instead of to the fish. Article X, section 2 of California's 1928 Constitution provides, in part:

"The right to water or to the use of flow of water in or from a natural stream or water course in this state is and shall be limited to such water as shall be reasonably required for the beneficial use to be served, and such right does not and shall not extend to the waste or unreasonable method of use or unreasonable method of diversion of water."

- a. Incredibly, SWRCB essentially dismisses all but the absolute minimum water required for public health and safety with the following statement:

"The quantity of water required to protect public health and safety will vary from system to system and will vary, over time, within a particular system depending upon how the water supply system is built, modified and operated, and upon measures taken by the end users of water to conserve the use of water. Fourteen years have passed since Order 95-10 was adopted, making it appropriate to consider requiring Cal-Am to further reduce its illegal diversions from the river, even without a substitute supply."

Is this minimum survival quantity of water the United Nations recognizes to sustain life? 50 liters per day? This is about 2,500 AF for the 44,000 Cal-Am customers, about the same amount as Cal-Am's legal water rights. Why, exactly, has SWRCB taken this position with us? Will we allow ourselves to be pushed back to the status of a third-world country by our own government? Why does MPWMD allow this position to go unchallenged?

2. **GROWTH:** This is the area of greatest double-speak by SWRCB (and MPWMD, with a long history of involvement in population planning-and not water supply development.) For example:
- "Accordingly, we conclude that water should not be diverted from the river for growth and that the quantity of water that is illegally diverted by Cal-Am should be reduced over a period of years until illegal diversion from the river is ended."
- AND
- "Further, we conclude that Cal-Am should be prohibited from increasing diversions from the river and should be required to reduce the quantity of water diverted from the river for existing service connections."

The State is essentially saying in these paragraphs that Carmel River water is not OK for beneficial uses, and that all beneficial human uses related to existing service connections shall be subordinated to the higher purpose of the "public trust". This is patently unfair, and flies in the face of civilized behavior... This two-faced representation comes at the request of non-governmental and quasi-governmental organizations and special-interest groups listed as "Interested Parties" on the face of the Cease and Desist Order:

Public Trust Alliance.  
 Carmel River Steelhead Association.  
 Ventana Chapter of the Sierra Club.  
 California Sportfishing Protection Alliance.  
 Planning and Conservation League  
 California Salmon and Steelhead Association  
 National Marine Fisheries Service

Remember, "growth" is the wedge that was used to sway the misinformed populace to vote "no" to a bond measure for a new dam. This bond measure never required an election by law; this was merely a convenient way for the nay-sayers to have their way.

3. **FISH:** SWRCB recognizes that Cal-Am supports the New Los Padres Project proposed by the District as one means for providing a reliable and legal supply of water for its customers. Finally, Cal-Am has cooperated with the District, Department of Fish and Game, and others to develop and implement measures to mitigate the effect of its diversions on the instream resources of the river. Nonetheless, the SWRCB has the audacity to state:

"We find that Cal-Am's illegal diversions continue to have an adverse impact on fish, wildlife and the riparian habitat of the Carmel River, centered on the argument that several miles of the threatened steelhead's critical habitat, the river, is dry five to six months of the year."

- a. Not stated clearly by the SWRCB in this statement is they have determined that well water is actually pumped from a subterranean stream. This portion of the Carmel River is the first and only river in CA to have this distinction. Why?
- b. Not stated in the SWRCB argument is that the dry river miles are generally downstream from both existing dams, in the area of highest underground pumping. Not stated by SWRCB is the fact that the fish generally do not swim around either of the two dams, the lower of which is scheduled for removal. No fish swim around the upper Los Padres dam, as there is no fish ladder.
- c. Also not stated by SWRCB is that there are other remedies to this situation in addition to a "cease-and-desist order". The most obvious of these is the construction of the New Los Padres Reservoir, ¼ mile downstream of the existing dam (which the fish cannot swim over). This new dam would provide consistent year-round stream flows for the fish and the rest of the riparian environment, especially during critical spawning times. Together with the planned removal of the San Clemente Dam, another quarter of the entire Carmel River watershed would be naturally re-opened to the fish, along with a much better

August 15, 2011

Comments on SWRCB COD Order 2009-06 and Cal-Am Purchase Proposal  
Page 3 of 5

guarantee of stream flows required by them. This is something that no desal project, no ASR project, not any other project, except for a dam, can do.

- i. Why don't we (MPWMD) do this?
- ii. Where is the State's continued support of the New Los Padres Reservoir? The SWRCB is as fickle as the arguments proposed by the special interest groups.
- iii. Why doesn't the environmental community support this option, since it is in the best interests of the fish?
- iv. Why are we going to spend \$400 million dollars on a solution that will be a perpetual drain on our economic resources, and hugely increase our carbon footprint, when we can accomplish the same legal water, with better ecological results, at half the cost? Can you say GROWTH?

4. **STANDING UP FOR WHAT IS RIGHTFULLY OURS:** There are three course of action we can take, highlighted in yellow:

- a. The SWRCB COD states that all conditions of SWRCB Order 95-10 remain in effect, except as modified by COD. This includes the following enforcement options:
  - i. Trespass: \$500/day.
  - ii. Failure to comply with COD: \$1,000/day.
  - iii. Injunctive relief.
- b. Maximum Penalty per COD: \$1,500/day=\$550,000 year=\$13 year per each of Cal-Am's 44,000 customers. Compare this to the minimum \$23 month increase in proposed desal water bills (per CPUC Ratepayer Advocate) for the minimum 4 ccf (400 cubic feet) month customer. **LET'S PAY SWRCB AND BE DONE WITH IT.**
- c. Additional Penalties, EPA: Threatened species, up to \$50,000, with one year in prison, and civil penalties of up to \$25,000 per taking. Given 20,000 hatchlings in the river each year, this could be a large number (\$500,000,000 per year).
  - i. **HOWEVER**, the EPA cannot impose fines for **ACTIONS TAKEN IN SELF DEFENSE**. Cal-Am and we, the customers of Cal-Am, need to state immediately that all of our future actions in this community involving end-use of Cal-Am produced water, including drinking, bathing, eating, sanitation, sewerage, irrigation, gardening, industrial processes, recreation, cooling and dust control, are done in **SELF DEFENSE** of those certain unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It is long overdue that our government begins to service the majority of the people in this matter, not the privileged, wealthy few of the special-interest groups directing the directors of the MPWMD.

Since the public trust resources of the Carmel River cannot be awarded to Cal-Am (a private company), why not assign those rights to the MPWMD, and give that step-child a purpose? We should no longer tolerate this nonsensical situation. It is time that we take back our government. This is a call to civil disobedience. Go home and turn your taps on and let the water run. Let's see if OUR government will turn it into blood.

5. **MPWMD AND THE PURCHASE OF CAL-AM:**

1. MPWMD has not done their job in over 30 years. Why and when was the District chartered? The answer to that question has been turned on its head by the many special interests groups controlling the Board. Any answer to this question that suggests anything

August 15, 2011

Comments on SWRCB COD Order 2009-06 and Cal-Am Purchase Proposal

Page 4 of 5

other than the creation of an adequate water supply is simply false rhetoric—lies repeated over and over to the point that you think it the truth. MPWMD has spent \$150 million dollars, but have not created any new water. Only Cal-Am has functioned as a true utility in these 30 years—only they have provided us with water.

2. The MPWMD house is not in order; what assurances do we have that MPWMD's actions with respect to Cal-Am actions are going to be helpful? We have no assurances.
3. Where is MPWMD's sworn behavior to act in the public best interests? Why are you picking this \$750 million??? fight with Cal-Am, when the problem and its solutions are clear?
4. Not clear you say? Why isn't, MPWMD fighting for the people that pay your bills? All we ever get back from MPWMD is study this and study that and, oh, by the way, Fish!
5. Let's talk fish. Do the fish currently swim over the existing Los Padres Dam? NO. Will they ever? NO. Can they swim over a new larger dam ¼ mile downstream? NO? What exactly, then, is NOAA's point? Why hasn't this water district gone to bat for us? Removal of the San Clemente Dam will open 1/4 or more of the Carmel river watersheds to the fish. A new dam could provide supplemental water for the habitat, especially in dry years. Why aren't you fighting NOAA and the SWRCB instead of yet another hare-brained tactic "Let's buy Cal-Am?????" Why are the special interests, including the environmentalist nay-sayers and the fish, more important than us? Is it their money and the power they give you?
6. Why aren't the other 15% of the Carmel river users being hounded for their fair share of the river's maintenance? Why is it only us Cal-Am customers that are forced to pay for work that benefits not just us, but all of Carmel Valley and all of California?
7. Speaking of protection of the public interest, California's 1928 Constitution provides, in part:  
 "The right to water or to the use of flow of water in or from a natural stream or water course in this state is and shall be limited to such water as shall be reasonably required for the beneficial use to be served, and such right does not and shall not extend to the waste or unreasonable method of use or unreasonable method of diversion of water."  
 Why isn't this district working in our interest to extend our Constitutional right to the use of the Carmel River?
8. Why isn't MPWMD demanding that the desal project be put to the public vote, just as the dam was? It's not your project? Why isn't it your project? How is it that water can be imported into the District? What about your rules and regulations? Where is your backbone?
9. MPWMD knows that the public was "convinced" not to pay \$100 million for a "GROWTH-INDUCING" dam. Why should we pay \$450 million for a white elephant of a desal plant (ask Santa Barbara) that will not allow growth, or development of lots of record, or children, or grandchildren? This desal plant will be run by electricity generated at Moss Landing, using Canadian natural gas imported through 2 huge 36" high pressure gas pipelines (go look). Talk about a carbon footprint-and forever. Where is the smug environmentalism in this? Where are the no-growthers now? Where is the sustainability? Where is the responsible action on the part of MPWMD? (Oh, that's right, you already have effectively stopped growth—re latest census—and that was your true goal all along.)

August 15, 2011  
Comments on SWRCB COD Order 2009-06 and Cal-Am Purchase Proposal  
Page 5 of 5

- 10. So—the MPWMD is not paying to help remove the San Clement Dam. But we Cal-Am rate payers are. We are also paying for the upkeep of the Carmel River. We are also being asked to spend another \$400 million for desal. That's at least one-half billion dollars. And now MPWMD is entertaining the thought of purchasing Cal-Am for \$750 million? We can't allow this to happen: we simply cannot afford these exorbitant costs.
- 11. We need some 20,000 AF annually for our community. This year 100,000 AF have poured through the Carmel River. Average years, maybe a third of that. And we have to allocate all to the fish? This is not at all responsible. The MPWMD is not working for we the people. I will not support your unreasonable special interests efforts to waste more of our money. Get off the let's buy Cal-Am wagon.
- 12. Government that does not work for the people is not government. Get us some water—and more than the 50 liters per day that the UN says is enough. Enough studies have been done. Decide and do—but make it reasonable.

Marc



Received at 8/15/2011  
Board meeting  
Item 16

August 15, 2011

Mr. Bob Brower, Chair  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District  
5 Harris Court  
Monterey, California 93940

Re: Agenda Items 15 and 16

Chair Brower and Members of the Board:

The Monterey County Hospitality Association represents the hospitality industry throughout Monterey County. The Hospitality industry is the second largest industry in the Monterey County generating more than \$2,000,000,000 in direct visitor spending and \$50,000,000 in local tax revenue while employing more than 23,000 people. Water is the lifeblood not only of our industry but also of every resident and business on the Monterey Peninsula. Decisions that affect the future of the Peninsula's water supplies and water providers is of great to concern to our Association and its members.

MCHA does not believe the District's limited time or money should be spent on a 'citizen's advisory committee' to investigate buying Cal Am as advocated by WaterPlus. The recent WaterPlus presentation to you was a compilation of misrepresentations and erroneous information. We believe Cal Am will correct those tonight. The District's five water supply augmentation projects that are underway are far more critical to the Peninsula and would benefit greatly from the resources that would otherwise be spent on a committee.

The issue of buying Cal Am was settled with the 2 to 1 defeat of Measure W in 2005. Cal Am has clearly and publicly stated it is not for sale. The only way to buy Cal Am against its will is to through eminent domain and condemnation. That will take many years and millions of dollars. Neither the District nor those it serves has the money or time to spare. Most importantly the effort will not result in one new gallon of water.

MCHA strongly urges the District to not be distracted from the urgent work needed to avoid the devastation the Cease and Desist Order will bring to Peninsula residents, businesses and local governments. The "committee" should not move forward.

Sincerely,

Janine M. Chicourrat, President  
Monterey County Hospitality Association

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

OCEAN & MISSION • SUITE 201 • P.O. BOX 223542 • CARMEL, CA • 93922  
PHONE: 831-626-8636 • FAX: 831-626-4269 • EMAIL: badams@adcomm4.com



**Latino Water Coalition**

1048 Broadway Avenue - Obama Way | Seaside, CA 93955

Received at 8/15/2011  
Board Meeting<sup>11</sup>  
Item 0  
Oral Communications

August 15, 2011

To: Board of Directors of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District  
Fr: Carlos Ramos, Member - *Latino Water Coalition* Steering Committee  
Re: The *Latino Water Coalition* of the Monterey Peninsula

On behalf of the *Latino Water Coalition*, I am pleased to introduce the coalition to you by way of our recent formation. The *Latino Water Coalition* consists of the following community groups serving the Monterey Peninsula:

- *comite comunidad en accion de Seaside* (Community In Action)
- Latino Seaside Merchants Association
- Latino Voting Rights Coalition
- LEJA | Latino Environmental Justice Advocates, District II (Monterey Peninsula)

As you know, the mission statement of this water agency reads:

**THE MISSION OF THE MONTEREY PENINSULA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT IS TO MANAGE, AUGMENT AND PROTECT WATER RESOURCES FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE COMMUNITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT.**

## *Latino Water Coalition*

1048 Broadway Avenue - Obama Way | Seaside, CA 93955

As such, we look forward to providing the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District with constructive and productive input in order to assist you in meeting your commitment to the management, augmentation and protection of water resources for the community and the environment.

However, we will positively and proactively provide said input within the critical context of social justice issues that directly impact the community, and thus, your successful accomplishment of your mission for the benefit of all of your constituents.

The *Latino Water Coalition* strongly believes that any decision without the complete input of the entire community within your jurisdiction is incomplete because of an ineffective outreach into the Latino community and communities of color within your jurisdiction.

As such, we look forward to engaging this agency, and its staff, in finding more effective ways of reaching out to the communities of color – especially the growing Latino community on the Monterey Peninsula.

In closing, the *Latino Water Coalition* strongly believes that in addition to technological solutions to our water issues on the Monterey Peninsula, *common sense*, coupled with effective input by all segments in the community, will enhance your effectiveness as an agency and as individual board members. After all, we believe that water means jobs; water means affordable housing; and, water means the effective utilization of economic opportunities in the community in an environmental and socially responsible manner.

# MONTEREY COUNTY

## WATER RESOURCES AGENCY

PO BOX 930  
SALINAS, CA 93902  
(831)755-4860  
FAX (831) 424-7935

CURTIS V. WEEKS  
GENERAL MANAGER



STREET ADDRESS  
893 BLANCO CIRCLE  
SALINAS, CA 93901-4455

RECEIVED

SEP - 6 2011

MPWMD

September 2, 2011

Stephanie Pintar  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District  
P. O. Box 85  
Monterey, CA 93942

Re: 4 E. Carmel Valley Rd., Carmel Valley (APN 187-441-024-000; BP 051442)

Dear Stephanie:

This letter is in response to your August 15, 2011, letter to Anthony Lombardo, Esq., regarding the above-referenced property.

The issue at hand is the 1996 legal construction of a 3,420 square foot basement without the benefit of a water permit issued by the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (District). As you document in your letter, the Monterey County Building Department failed at the time to notify the applicant of the requirement to obtain a water permit prior to the issuance of a building permit. Additionally, a District non-residential Water Release Form and Water Permit Application (WRF) was never submitted to the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (Agency) for review and approval.

On page 2 of your letter, you inform Mr. Lombardo that "to resolve the Water Permit issue and allow the District to issue a passing inspection report for the property . . . your client must permanently make the basement level inaccessible for any use other than [sic] as a crawl space." You continue, "The violation must be corrected by **September 15, 2011**, or the District will debit [the] Monterey County Water Resources Agency allocation by 0.240 Acre-Feet of water."

The District does not have the authority to debit Monterey County's allocation budget without first receiving Agency authorization to do so in the form of an approved WRF. As of the date of your August 15, 2011, letter, the Agency had not received a WRF for review and approval. A WRF was subsequently submitted to the Agency on August 18, 2011. Please note that in all future interaction, water allocations from the Agency's budget must be processed appropriately and approved by the Agency.

Monterey County has 10.356 acre feet of water remaining in its allocation budget (12.78 acre feet minus "public credits"). This water, with the exception of a strategic public safety reserve, has been allocated to permit applicants, and the Agency maintains a waiting list for future allocations of California-American water should they become available.

Of this 10.356 acre feet, the Agency's strategic reserve is approximately 1.0 acre foot. In an effort to resolve errors made in processing this application by organizations other than the Agency, the Agency will allocate 0.24 acre feet of its strategic reserve to validate the subject building permit.

Sincerely,



Curtis V. Weeks, General Manager  
Monterey County Water Resources Agency

Enclosure: Copy, Water Release Form and Water Permit Application, dated 09/02/2011

Cc: Darby Fuerst, General Manager  
Bob Brower, Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Chair  
Carl Holm, Monterey County Resource Management Agency  
Tom Moss, Monterey County Water Resources Agency

MONTEREY PENINSULA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT  
NON-RESIDENTIAL WATER RELEASE FORM AND WATER PERMIT APPLICATION

NOTE: When approved and signed by the Jurisdictions this form must be submitted with final and complete construction plans to:

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District Permit Office  
5 Harris Court, Bldg. G ~ Monterey, CA 93940 ~ (831) 658-5601 ~ www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us

Completing the Water Release Form & Water Permit Application does not guarantee issuance of a water permit.

ALL SPACES BELOW MUST BE COMPLETED OR THE APPLICATION MAY NOT BE PROCESSED. (Please print firmly)

1. OWNERSHIP INFORMATION:

Name: Hofman

Daytime telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

2. AGENT/REPRESENTATIVE INFORMATION:

Name: Lombardo + Gilies / ATN: GASL

Daytime telephone: (831) 754-2444

Mailing Address: 318 Cayuga St, Salinas

3. PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Year building was constructed? 1995 Existing Square-footage see notes Proposed Square-footage 3420

Address: 4 E. Carmel Valley Rd, C.V. Assessor Parcel Number 187-441-024

Is a water meter needed? (Circle one) YES  NO  If yes, how many meters are requested? \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: Separate water meters are required for each use.  
Water company serving parcel: Cal-Am

4. Type of Non-Residential Use: Storage Square footage (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Project Description (Be thorough and detailed):  
Existing Basement Storage Space permitted in 1996

Non-Residential users that increase square-footage or change uses as illustrated below are required to obtain a water permit. Low water use plumbing fixtures will be required as a condition of most water permits.

<b>GROUP I - Low to Moderate Use</b>		Square feet x 0.00007 = <u>0.240</u> Acre Feet (AF)
Auto Uses	Retail	Warehouse
Church	Nail/Salon	Family Grocery
<b>GROUP II - High Use</b>		Square feet x 0.0002 = _____ Acre Feet (AF)
Bakery	Pizza	Coffee House
Dry Cleaner	Deli	Sandwich Shop
<b>GROUP III - Miscellaneous Uses</b>		No _____ x _____ (factor) = _____ Acre Feet (AF)
Assisted Living (more than 6 beds)	0.085 per bed	Public Toilets
Beauty Shop/Dog Grooming	0.0567 AF/station	Public Urinals
Child Care	0.0072 AF/child	Waterless Urinals
Dormitory	0.040 AF/room	Restaurant (24-Hour & Fast Food):
Gas Station	0.0913 AF/pump	Restaurant (General/Bar):
Irrigated areas -- not adjacent to building:	MAWA <sup>1</sup>	Self-Storage
Laundromat	0.200 AF/machine	Skilled Nursing
Meeting Hall	0.00053 AF/sf	Spa
Motel/Hotel/Bed and Breakfast:	0.100 AF/room	Swimming Pool (surface area)
Motel Large Bath tub (add to room factor)	0.030 AF/tub	Theater
Plant Nursery (total land)	0.00009 AF/sf	

Use Calculations Above

(1) Proposed Use: 0.240  
(2) Previous Use: by Mo. Co. permit w/o MPWMD permit, so 0  
Subtract (2) from (1) 0.240  
(Jurisdiction must authorize water for positive result)

In completing this Water Release Form, the undersigned (as owner or as agent for the property owner) acknowledges that any discrepancy or mistake may cause rejection or delay in processing of the application. Additionally, the applicant is responsible for accurately accounting for the type of non-residential use. In addition, changes in use or expansions completed without a water permit may result in additional fees and penalties, the imposition of a lien on the property, and the deduction of water from the local jurisdiction's allocation.

I certify, under penalty of perjury, that the information provided on this Water Release Form & Permit Application is to my knowledge correct, and the information accurately reflects the changes presently planned for this property.

Signature of Owner/Agent: [Signature]

Date: 8/18/11

AUTHORIZATION FOR WATER PERMIT - JURISDICTION USE ONLY

0.164 AF Paralta \_\_\_\_\_ AF Public 0.076 AF Pre-Paralta \_\_\_\_\_ Private Well \_\_\_\_\_ No water needed

NOTES: \_\_\_\_\_ Authorized by: [Signature] Date: 8/18/11

This form expires on the same date as any discretionary or building permits issued for this project by the city or county.

BP 051442

WHITE - MPWMD YELLOW - APPLICANT PINK - LOCAL JURISDICTION

1 Maximum Applied Water Allowance: Contact MPWMD for assistance if needed.