



# Supplement to 9/17/2012 MPWMD Board Packet

Attached are copies of letters received between August 10, 2012 and August 30, 2012. These letters are also listed in the September 17, 2012 Board packet under item 17, Letters Received.

Author	Addressee	Date	Topic
Roy Thomas	MPWMD Board	8/10/12	Monterey Peninsula Water Resource System
Maxwell Chaplin	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	Crucial Role of MPWMD for Breakthrough in Water Management
Tamara & Reuben Harris	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	8/20/2012 Board Meeting Item 16 -- District Position on Cal-Am Application to CPUC re Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project
Kim Williams	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Anne Helms	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Barbara Howard	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Terri Beatty	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Karin Locke	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Tom Macdonald	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Jay Zwagerman	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Safwat Malek	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Robert & Veronica Valenti	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Sandra Schachter	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Larry Weingarten	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Henry Azama	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Mishka Chudilowsky	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Sylvia Shih	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Barbara Baldock	MPWMD Board	8/19/12	" "
Thomas A. Gardiner	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "
Fila Evanson	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "
Heidi Zamzow	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "
Helen Rucker	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "
Marli Melton	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "
Donna Kneeland	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "
Wade Einkauf	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "
Hebard Olsen	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "
Janice Archuleta	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "
David Beech	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	8/20/12 Board Meeting, Item 14 – Appeal of Staff Determination re Flores Well #1
David Beech	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "
Molly Erickson	MPWMD Board	8/20/12	" "

Joni Hoffman	MPWMD Board	8/26/12	8/20/2012 Board Meeting Item 16 -- District Position on Cal-Am Application to CPUC re Monterey Peninsula Water Supply Project
Linda Tulett	MPWMD Board	8/30/12	Statement of Findings to the Referendum Against Ordinance 152 Section Four, of the MPWMD

U:\staff\Boardpacket\2012\20120917\LtrPkt\Ltrpkt.docx

# Monterey Peninsula Water Resource System

## Status of Water on September 30, 2011 in Acre Feet (AF)

RECEIVED

AUG 10 2012


MPWMD

\*\*29,882

\*26,166

^20.5

*from Ray Thomas  
"This is how the  
District has been  
seducing the  
community"*



^Cal Am Production

\* Usable Storage in Carmel Valley Basin Aquifers

\*\*Usable Storage Total System

Source: Monterey Peninsula Water Management District & California American Water Company

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Maxwell Chaplin <maxcha21@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 9:34 PM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Crucial Role of MPWMD for Breakthrough in Water Mgmt

Secretary Tavani: Since it looks like I won't be able to attend the August 20 Board meeting, I request my views on item # 16 be made available to the Board.

Time has run out for resolving the issues of adequacy of the Carmel River as a water source. The mpwmd is the only public agency with the mandate to deal effectively with these issues. The district must step up and take responsibility for proposing a sensible and responsible structure for dealing with our water supply problems. It is ridiculous that a public project such as this should not benefit from public financing. The public is paying for these remedies, it should govern the project, or at least have oversight. I can see no justification for turning over solution of these problems to a for-profit company with no responsibility to the rate-payers. Maxwell Chaplin, 26250 Rinconada Drive, Carmel Valley

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Tbharris146@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 6:00 PM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Agenda item #16

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,

Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

We have been following the water issues on the Monterey Peninsula and urge the WMD to take leadership in owning, financing and governing a new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers. The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

Tamara and Reuben Harris  
Sunstar Rd. Monterey, CA

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Kim Williams <kiwipapa8@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 2:50 PM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Subj: August 20 Meeting Agenda #16

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,

Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I support the District taking leadership to **own**, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.

The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

Kim Williams  
Carmel Valley

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Anne Helms <anneh2@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 2:13 PM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Augut 20 meeting

**Subj: August 20 Meeting Agenda #16**

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,  
Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers. The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

Anne Adams Helms  
25350 Camino de Chamisal  
Corral de Tierra, CA 93908  
(831) 484-6534  
Fax (831) 484-5106

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Barbara Howard <writermarketer@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 1:09 PM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Subj: August 20 Meeting Agenda #16

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,

Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I support the District only in joining Pacific Grove Water Project. Please make this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.

The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment by supporting The Pacific Grove Water Project which will provide the most affordable, quick and sustainable water solution. I do not support you, or anyone else, making the ratepayers pay to build something that already exists. It is a waste of money and those who support that, no doubt, have an agenda - because it makes no sense and IS NOT in the best interest of the ratepayers. Join Pacific Grove NOW. Time is running out.

Barbara Howard

Monterey, CA



**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** terribeatty@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 12:23 PM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Subj: August 20 Meeting Agenda #16

**To the MPWMD Chair and Board,  
Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:**

**I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers. The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.**

**Terri Beatty  
Carmel Valley**

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Karin Locke <wisteriagma@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 12:17 PM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** 8 20 2012 Agenda # 16 Comment

**To the MPWMD Chair and Board,  
Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:**

**I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers. The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.**

Karin Locke

Pacific Grove CA

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** tom macdonald <ijmacdonald@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 11:39 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** AGENDA ITEM 16: MPWMD SHOULD OWN AND MANAGE DESALINATION PROJECT

IT IS TIME FOR MPWMD TO ASSERT ITSELF AND START MANAGING OUR WATER, INSTEAD OF SERVING AS AN APPENDAGE TO CAL AM.

CAL AM IS THUMBING ITS NOSE AT MPWMD AND THE ENTIRE COMMUNITY BY IGNORING THE EXPLICIT COUNTY REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF ANY DESALINATION PLANT.

CAL AM'S ESTIMATES OF THE PER ACRE-FOOT COST OF DESAL IS SEVERAL TIMES HIGHER THAN OTHER POSSIBLE DESAL WATER PROVIDERS.

WE NEED TO HAVE PUBLIC OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT TO AVOID A DOUBLING OR TRIPLING OF OUR WATER BILLS.

ONLY MPWMD CAN ASSURE THAT WE GET LOWER INTEREST COSTS AND KEEP THE INTEREST COSTS DOWN

PLEASE VOTE TO TAKE CHARGE OF THIS VITAL PROJECT AND LIVE UP TO YOUR NAME: WATER

**MANAGEMENT DISTRICT.**

Tom Macdonald  
34 Miramonte Road  
Carmel Valley, CA 93924  
(831) 298-7380

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Jay Zwagerman <jazwag@me.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 11:37 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** August 20 Meeting Agenda #16

**Importance:** High

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,

Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.

The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out. Please act now!

Regards,  
Jay Zwagerman

-----  
Jay A Zwagerman  
42 El Caminito del Norte  
Monterey CA 93940-2511  
831-236-2682  
[jazwag@mac.com](mailto:jazwag@mac.com)  
-----

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Safwat Malek <safwat@enviro-international.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 11:18 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** MPWMD August 20 Meeting. Regarding Agenda #16

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,

Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

**I STRONGLY URGE & support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility.**

Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.

The Mayors Water Authority (JPA) has designated the District to take the lead.

We highly recommend that the District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is of the essence!!

Thank you.

Safwat Malek  
<http://www.Enviro-International.com>  
[www.hermosahillscr.com](http://www.hermosahillscr.com)  
[www.solarhomecarmel.com](http://www.solarhomecarmel.com)  
[safwatmalek@enviro-international.com](mailto:safwatmalek@enviro-international.com)  
Architects Builders  
P.O.Box 1734, Pebble Beach, CA 93953  
Ph 831/626-3490  
Fax 831/626-5401  
Cell 650/619-8760.

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Valenti Robert <valentir@mac.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 11:11 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** August 20 Meeting Agenda #16

Please provide this message to the MPWMD Chair and Board, regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.

The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead.

The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

Thank you.

Robert & Veronica Valenti  
4145 Segunda Drive  
Carmel, CA 93923

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** schachtersj@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 11:05 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** August 20 meeting AGenda #16

[Arlene@mpwmd.net](mailto:Arlene@mpwmd.net)

**Subj: August 20 Meeting Agenda #16**

**To the MPWMD Chair and Board,  
Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:**

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers. The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

Sandra Schachter  
74 Poppy Road  
Carmel Valley, CA 93924

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Larry Weingarten <eleent@mbay.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 10:49 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** control of water

**Subject:** August 20 Meeting Agenda #16

**To the MPWMD Chair and Board,**

**Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:**

**I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.**

**The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act now, with clarity and commitment so that local control is put firmly into our hands.**

**Larry Weingarten  
Salinas, CA**



**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** henry azama <mrmoonsdad@redshift.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 10:48 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Meeting Agenda #16

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,

Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.

The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

Henry Azama

220 1st St.

PG

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** mishka chudilowsky <mrmoonsmom@redshift.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 10:47 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Desal plant

**Subj: August 20 Meeting Agenda #16**

**To the MPWMD Chair and Board,**

**Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:**

**I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.**

**The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.**

**Mishka Chudilowsky**

**Pacific Grove**

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Sylvia Shih <58eugenia58@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 10:34 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Agenda item #16

**Subj: August 20 Meeting Agenda #16**

**To the MPWMD Chair and Board,**

**Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:**

**I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers. The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.**

**Sylvia Shih, Seaside, CA**

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Barbara Baldock <bjbaldock@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 19, 2012 10:30 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** August 20 meeting Agenda #16

**Subj: August 20 Meeting Agenda #16**

**To the MPWMD Chair and Board,**

Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers. The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

**BARBARA BALDOCK**  
Monterey

**TO:** MPWMD Chair and MPWMD Board of Directors

**FROM:** Thomas A. Gardiner, Founder, John Gardiner's Tennis Ranch Foundation  
P. O. Box 143, Aptos, CA 95003 ... Telephone: 831-688-6603

**CC:** David Armanasco, Deep Water Desal, LLC  
**CC:** Mibs McCarthy, President, Carmel Valley Association  
**CC:** George Riley, Citizens for Public Water  
**CC:** Ron Weitzman, WATERplus

**RECEIVED**

AUG 20 2012

**MPWMD**

**DATE:** August 20, 2012

**CONCERNING:** MPWMD August 20, 2012 Meeting Agenda Item #16

John Gardiner's Tennis Ranch Foundation supports the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (MPWMD) taking leadership for partnering to own, finance and govern a Desal Facility in conjunction with a Public-Private Partnership with Deep Water Desal, LLC. or some other Water Desal Project that may evolve.

MPWMD was created by vote of the constituents with the **FIDUCIARY MANDATE** and responsibility for Monterey Peninsula Water Delivery and Management of Water Sources, specifically the Carmel River Aquifer, as the **MPWMD MISSION**.

The Cal-Am ratepayers and the Monterey Peninsula Community water demands for mitigation of the CA State Water Resources Board Cal-Am Cease & Desist 2015 Order to stop the 'illegal over drafting' of 10,000 acre feet from the Carmel River Aquifer prescribes the MPWMD make the **FIDUCIARY DECISION** to protect the ratepayers.

**ACT** with your social conscience, reward the citizens with the **LEADERSHIP** envisioned and move in a positive 'flow' towards the objective for augmenting a reliable, cost efficient and environmentally responsive Desal Plant, coupled with alternative water storage, storm water reclamation, conservation technologies, restoring the Carmel River corridor, recharging the Aquifer and regain the **PUBLIC CONFIDENCE**.

**MPWMD LEADERSHIP** begins with **VOTERS TRUST** for having created the MPWMD.

Respectfully submitted,

**TAG**

**Thomas A. Gardiner**

**Carmel Valley Association 2012 Member  
Carmel Born 1951 & Monterey Bay LIFE Resident**

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** filaevanson@gmail.com on behalf of Fila Evanson <fila.evanson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2012 1:01 PM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** August 20 Meeting Agenda #16

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,

Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers. The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

Fila Evanson, Carmel

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Zamzow Heidi <hzamzow@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2012 11:58 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** August 20 meeting and Agenda Item 16

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.

The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

Heidi Zamzow

2010 Civil Grand Jury Foreperson Pro Tem

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Helen Rucker <hrucker@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2012 11:40 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** August 20th meeting agenda item #16

To the MPWMD board:

As a long time citizen of the Monterey Peninsula, I support the MPWMD in taking the leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please use your authority to meet community demands and protect us, the rate payers. The District must act soon. Time is running out.

Helen B. Rucker, Seaside



**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Marli Melton <marlimelton@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2012 9:11 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Public control for de-sal

Dear MPWMD Chair and Board,  
Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

Local ratepayers need to have the District take leadership on desal. I agree with local mayors that the outcomes for desal are likely to be much better if a public entity owns, finances and governs the new desal facility. The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. Please act now to show to fulfill your mission, meet community needs, and protect ratepayers.

Thank you.  
Marli Melton  
Carmel Valley

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** CrmiDonna@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2012 8:57 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Tonight's meeting of the MPWMD

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.

The Mayors Water Authority has desitnated the District to take the lead. The District must act - now - with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

Donna Kneeland  
Carmel

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Wade Einkauf <wade\_einkauf@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2012 6:52 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

**To the MPWMD Chair and Board,**  
Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I reside in the old Toro water district (highway 68) but ultimately the cost and benefit of water produced by any local desal plant will affect all ratepayers in the area. There is absolutely no incentive for a wholly owned CAL AM project to aggressively target the long term costs to ratepayers. They are incentivized to target long term profits for their share holders. If it is not clear to all MPWMD board members that now is the time for you to take decisive control of this project then perhaps it is time to re-evaluate why the MPWMD was formed.

As a member of the 2010 Monterey County Civil Grand Jury I had the opportunity to carefully study water issues in the county. For many reasons the MPWMD has lost control of the water sources in the district. First with the court action regarding the Carmel River Basin and then with the court appointment of the Water Master for the Seaside Basin. In spite of very diligent efforts of staff the District lost all control and even meaningful input into the now defunct Monterey County Regional Water Project.

It is time for you to regain control of your water sources!

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers. The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

The business of my email being complete I would like to tell you that many members of the 2010 Grand Jury were impressed with the professionalism and reputation of the staff of the MPWMD. I personally was impressed the effort that has been made over the years in the search of new water sources and I share the members and staff frustration in not being able to find a sufficient water source or plant location within the district's boundaries.

Thank you,

Wade Einkauf

Beech Markup of staff submission, August 20, 2012

ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

14. CONSIDER APPEAL OF STAFF DETERMINATION TO AUTHORIZE PERMIT FOR FLORES (Well #1) WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM, APPLICATION #20110401FLO ON APN 103-071-002 AT 564 MONHOLLAN ROAD, CARMEL

Meeting Date: August 20, 2012

Budgeted: N/A

From: David J. Stoldt,  
General Manager

Program/  
Line Item No.: N/A

Prepared By: Henrietta Stern

Cost Estimate: N/A

General Counsel Review: Pending review  
Committee Recommendation: N/A  
CEQA Compliance: N/A

RECEIVED

AUG 20 2012

MPWMD

Submitted by David Beed  
Item 14

.....

Beech Appeal:

.....

The appeal did not identify which District Rules were violated.

➤ This is not correct. Violated rules were identified in section 'Detailed Grounds for Appeal'.

The four concerns above relate primarily to Rules 22- B and 22-C.

The requested relief in the appeal is for the Flores and Piseniti Wells to be tested again concurrently pursuant to MPWMD procedures, and that the Beech Well should be monitored during this time. Specifically, the requested relief in the appeal (page 4) is the following:

- A. The Flores Well #1 and Piseniti Well #2 shall be fully tested again "pursuant to MPWMD procedures" and not "some ad hoc partial test."
  - B. Well #1 and #2 should be tested concurrently in October to replicate 2010 conditions and assess the combined effect on the Beech Well. Concurrent testing would also reduce the number of days Beech could not use his well during the testing. [Note: Concurrent testing of two wells on separate parcels is not consistent with District procedures.]
  - > **The applicants requested simultaneous testing in October 2010, and this was granted by the District. We are only asking for repetition of this, to check cumulative impact on our well.**
  - C. A 95% recovery within six days shall be demonstrated by actual measurements of wells #1 and #2 rather than estimates. [Note: This request somewhat conflicts with Request #1 as it does not follow District procedures.]
  - > **We have shown that our request strictly satisfies written Procedures for Recovery testing. See Response to Oliver memo. The Board has the discretion to specify the "Evaluation" referred to.**
  - D. Well capacity shall be determined by the actual pumping rates chosen for the tests, with no use of estimates. [Note: This request conflicts with Request #1 as it does not follow District procedures.]
  - > **We have shown that our request strictly satisfies written Procedures for Recovery testing. See Response to Oliver memo, in which we also agree to adopt his wording for clarification.**
- Beech requests that the \$750 appeal fee be waived in light of "issues of public interest." Rule 70 allows the Board to take such action.

- **The earlier part of Rule 70 even allows that the General Manager can grant a fee exemption before the issue reaches the Board, but this has not been mentioned or acted upon.**

Suggested changes to District rules and procedures are not part of this hearing, and do not apply to an applicant's compliance to the rules and procedures in place at the time of application. It is noted that the recently approved Ordinance No. 150 improves future notification for Neighboring Well Owners of the opportunity to be monitored during a well pumping test, and enables better communication earlier in the WDS process.

- **We mentioned these changes only as evidence of public interest worthy of a fee refund – in your words,**
- **“improves future notification ... and enables better communication ...”. You do not mention our committee attendance and our suggestions incorporated in Ordinance 150.**

Some of the issues in the referral and appeal were already resolved by the Board in its action on November 21, 2011, and will not be addressed again in this hearing. The “Discussion” section below addresses the components of the referral and appeal. It includes a memorandum from the District Water Resources Division Manager, Joe Oliver, about certain assertions or calculations in the appeal related to hydrogeology that are incorrect (Exhibit 14-E).

- **Please see our separate markup responding to Mr. Oliver’s memorandum.**

The District also received a communication from the applicant’s hydrogeologist, Aaron Bierman, which is provided as Exhibit 14-F. This provides 2011 well monitoring data and new 2012 data showing lack of connectivity between the Flores/Pisenti Wells and the Beech Well. This submittal also includes a previously submitted timeline of events and letters from the Monterey County Health Department regarding the adequacy of supply for the two wells.

- **Although this communication was dated August 6<sup>th</sup> 2012, we did not receive any courtesy indication of it until it was referenced in the meeting package distributed late on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012, so we have had no opportunity for detailed analysis.**
- **However, it is immediately undermined by the fact that it made observations only on Pisenti Well #2 and not on Flores Well #1, on the grounds that Well #2 is closer to the Beech well. What kind of assumption is this in fractured rock? Completely ignored is the fact that the measured behavior of**

Well #1 in October 2010 (drawdown 61.11 ft., strong recovery) was much more like that probably experienced by the Beech well than that of Well #2, (drawdown 8.71 ft., very poor recovery).

- At what time of day was the “drive-by” espionage conducted by Mr. Bierman? Since much of our irrigation takes place during hours of darkness, was it with the aid of a flashlight? This is reminiscent of the professional opinion Mr. Bierman gave in his amended reports (March 22, 2011, p.20) that the Beeches “dewatered their own well”, based on looking at a Google map that showed we had green lawns, but despite the fact that the well had never run dry at any other time.
- We have no confidence in the estimating techniques being applied, and urgently request data-driven retesting. If the applicants are so confident that their estimated pumping rates derived from the 2010 tests are valid, why are they so reluctant to actually measure at those rates now there is the opportunity?

The Flores and Pisenti applications have an extensive administrative history. Please refer to the District website for previous Board action in September and November 2011 at:

<http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us/asd/board/boardpacket/2011/20110919/17/item17.htm> and

<http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us/asd/board/boardpacket/2011/20111121/16/item16.htm>. Also refer to the overview in the July 2012 Staff Determination in Exhibit 14-A.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** The Board has several options for action. Rule 71-C states the Board must “consider the record and such additional evidence as may be offered, and shall find whether, in its opinion, an error was made” by staff. The Board “may affirm, reverse, or modify the action appealed as it deems just and equitable...” Similarly, Rule 70 states, “The Board may deny, approve or continue any appeal. The General Manager shall notify the appellant and/or Applicant within ten (10) days in writing by mail of the Board action taken; namely continuance, approval, conditional approval, or denial.”

The applicants’ right of due process compels the District to show that any finding of adverse impact or permit denial is based on scientific evidence in the record.

- For scientific evidence of non-compliance with Recovery Procedures, see Mr. Oliver's memo, and our response. Non-compliance with notification of neighbors is already uncontested.
- Are the appellants also entitled to due process? There is no mention of this in the staff position, but we hope that the Board will take a wider view.

.....

.....

*Option 3- Continue Consideration of Flores Permit Hearing Until Well Testing Occurs:* This would be similar to Option 2, except that no action on the Flores WDS Permit would be taken by the Board until a test is performed that confirms lack of adverse impact to the Beech Well. The same restrictions and protocol described in Option 2 would be in place. From the applicant's perspective, this would be a de facto approval of the Beech appeal, with some refinement and greater oversight by District staff. The Board would need to specify the rationale for such action, which is not supported by the technical evidence in the record. There is also the potential for litigation by applicants due to perceived violation of due process rights.

- Whatever the applicant's perspective (is this speculation?), this would be far from approval of the Beech Appeal, which may be framed in these terms as follows:

*Option 3B - Continue Consideration of Flores and Pisenti Permit Hearing Until Full Well Testing Has Occurred Pursuant to MPWMD Procedures,*

- Specifically:
  - Simultaneous 72-hour pumping of Well #1 and Well #2 with concurrent monitoring of Beech well
  - 95% recovery within six days shall be demonstrated by actual measurements
  - Well capacity calculation shall utilize actual pumping rates, with no substitution of estimated values



- Hopefully the Board will see merit in Option 3B, and be prepared to adopt it without needing to hear debate of all the other detail in the staff positions.
- Failing this, we respectfully request that this stage of the Hearing be continued, as it is not humanly possible for the Appellants, or indeed the Board members themselves, to absorb so much material in so short a time.
- However, we are keen to see progress, and in the event that Option 3B is adopted, we are ready to schedule the retesting for dates after our return from vacation on September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2012.

Submitted by staff at 8/20/2012  
Board meeting. Item 13  
33

**Stephanie Pintar**

---

**From:** Molly Erickson <erickson@stampaw.us>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2012 6:34 PM  
**To:** Dave Stoldt; district5@co.monterey.ca.us  
**Cc:** Stephanie Pintar; Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Proposed draft ordinance no. 154 should be denied

Chair Potter and Members of the Board of Directors:

This Office represents Save Our Carmel River and The Open Monterey Project, which object to agenda item 13 on tonight's Board agenda.

Save Our Carmel River and The Open Monterey Project urge you to reject the proposed first reading of draft ordinance 154. This is a rushed ordinance and the CEQA review is inadequate. The draft ordinance needs sunlight and open accountable review by the public and the Water District.

More transparency is needed. Who asked the Water District for this ordinance? Why is the Water District rushing to meet the needs of two entities who are in litigation not involving the Water District? What communications have taken place between the District and Quail Lodge or Quail Lodge's attorney, Tony Lombardo?

There is no urgency to consideration of this matter. The stipulation that the Water District references is in effect for 120 days from June 1, 2012, and can be extended by the parties. That means that December 1, 2012 is the earliest possible date, and probably much longer is available. If the ordinance is a good idea -- and we do not suggest that it is -- then a longer, more responsible discussion and review period would be appropriate.

What is really going on behind the scenes? What is the Quail Lodge, Inc. CVR HSGE, LLC and Bay Laurel, LLC lawsuit about? The Water District should provide you and the public with a copy of the complaint in the lawsuit, along with a written explanation as to why the Water District should get involved now, at this point, in this rushed manner, without adequate public review.

The CEQA review period is too short and violates CEQA. CEQA allows a short 20-day review period for projects of local importance. The proposed ordinance does not qualify for that shortened period. Anything involving the CalAm water supply and the Carmel River -- like this ordinance -- has regional importance. The active involvement of the SWRCB and other state and federal agencies are evidence of the regional importance of the Carmel River and the use of CalAm water. The initial study and proposed environmental document must be recirculated for the standard 30-day period.

The CEQA review is inadequate. We reiterate the objections presented to the Water District in our letter on the previous draft ordinance (believed to be draft ordinance 146) considered in early 2011.

The Ordinance should be rejected. We refer you the Court of Appeal decision in *Save Our Carmel River v. Monterey Peninsula Water Management District* (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 677, which invalidated another District attempt to manipulate water credits.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Molly Erickson

Hebard Olsen  
 hebard@sonic.net (Do not send cc or multiple To s  
 720 Woodcrest Lane  
 Monterey Calif 93940

RECEIVED

AUG 20 2012

MPWMD

Dear Dave Potter;

I am Providing you with a DVD which can be played in DVD player Staff at Monnings office said cannot play in State owned computers

Of course I am in favor of public partner, public governance, public financing, and clear water rights before construction begins the latter which is available only for surface water as every other water right has been spoken for! On DVD hit skip at least 3 times get you to 15 minutes or 4 times which gets you to 20 minutes and view at least until 23 minutes or 34 minutes if you have time. You will conclude Cal Am has no rights to the water they seek on our behalf, please DEMAND they discussed this in the EIR and all other documents! Please DEMAND to see plans to switch to surface Sea Water before 5 + years at whatever that costs. I fear Cal AM will build 2 Desal plants one for brackish water which they will be compelled to turn off after 5 years and s second for surface Salt water full of sea organisms. They will earn 10% on all of this plus the litigation which may have doubled the cost of desal water already.

The silt behind the San Clemente dam should have been returned to the river at the average yearly rate which would have avoided /reduced the expense but then they could not have earned the 10% on a big cost. Us rate payers are counting on you to keep Cal Am from mining us with extra costs and collecting 10% on top.

I am providing the second DVD so you understand the economy which is entirely under the control of the banks via the Mortgages. No growth due to banks! Housing is the largest cost for most families. By controlling the number houses dumped onto the market they control the selling price of housing. When the prices drops new homes cost more to build than older houses are selling for so home builders go out of work reducing the number of jobs. As more people chase after fewer jobs some people are without jobs so they default on their mortgages which provides the banks with more mortgages which can now be sold for less money reducing the price more. When people do not have discretionary money they do not buy merchandise there by putting more people out of work. The banks will suck up almost all the discretionary money stagnating the economy for many years, possibly for my lifetime, PARAGRAPH ONE APPLIES TO THIS dvd ALSO.

Hebard Olsen

*Hebard Olsen*

Arlene Tavani

---

**From:** J G Archuleta <jgarchuleta@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 20, 2012 2:48 PM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** August 20th Meeting Agenda #16

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,

Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.

The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out. Please step up.

Thank you,  
Janice Archuleta  
Pacific Grove

Submitted by David Beech<sup>37</sup>

Markup response to EXHIBIT 14-E by Judy and David Beech August 19, 2012

MONTEREY PENINSULA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT *Item 14*

- One part of this discussion that is directly relevant to the Beech Appeal concerns demonstrated non-compliance with the Procedures for Drawdown and Recovery.
- Other parts bear on the options available to the Board, where Step 2 below specifies that "an evaluation of the test will be conducted by the District". The final evaluation could be carried out by the Board, and it is strongly suggested below that the evaluation should be on the basis of demonstrated 95% recovery and use of actual test data for the derivation of well capacity.
- Finally, the problems identified in the Procedures could be addressed later by the Rules and Regulations Committee, and we would be glad to offer any insights that we have gained.

RECEIVED

MEMORANDUM

AUG 20 2012

**Date:** August 6, 2012  
**To:** David Stoldt, General Manager  
**From:** Joe Oliver, Water Resources Division Manager  
**Subject:** Response Comments to Technical Items in August 1, 2012 Appeal Letter from Judy and David Beech, re: Flores and Pisenti Water Distribution System (WDS) Applications

MPWMD

- **Page 2, Background.** Regarding the pumping tests of the Flores/Pisenti Wells #1 and 2 that were conducted in October 2010, it is important to note that these tests were conducted simultaneously for 72 hours during the pumping tests that were testing would have been conducted under the anticipated operating conditions for these WDSs. (1)

- **Not relevant to compliance with Documentation of Drawdown and Recovery, which reads:**

- 
- "Step 2, Documentation of Drawdown and Recovery. ... Water level recovery data shall be measured until the recovering water level in the pumping well reaches 95% of the pre-test static water level. If 95% percent recovery is not achieved after two times the pumping period has elapsed, then an evaluation of the test will be conducted by the District to determine whether or not the calculated yield should be reduced.

- **Page 3, Failure to Comply with Documentation of Drawdown and Recovery.** The discussion states recovery measurements were not continued until 95% recovery was achieved. MPWMD concurs that the wording in the "Documentation of Drawdown and Recovery" section of the *Procedures* document does not clearly convey the intended requirement. The intention of the statement in question is clarified by the

highlighted additional phrase as follows:

Water-level recovery data shall be measured until the recovering water level in the pumping well reaches 95% of the pre-test static water level or two times the pumping period has elapsed, whichever occurs first.

- But this escape clause does not appear in the approved *Procedures*, which (bottom p.1) “outline the minimum requirements for production testing, analysis, and reporting of groundwater information to comply with the MPWMD rules and regulations.” Your suggested additional phrase is an unauthorized lowering of the bar below the minimum requirements.

It was not the intention that water-level recovery measurements must be made for an indefinite period of time until the recovering water level reaches 95% of pre-test level, as in practice this could require a considerably longer period than twice the pumping period and be difficult to achieve in some instances for reasons that would not affect the validity of the pumping test calculations (e.g., existence of other documented or undocumented pumping affecting the well's recovery measurements, natural seasonal water-level declines of the groundwater system superimposed on the recovery curve).

- This is a good point to note the corresponding requirement in Monterey County, based on
- Water Works Standards in Chapter 15 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations
- <http://www.cdph.ca.gov/services/DPOPP/regs/Pages/R-14-03-RevisionofWaterworksStandards.aspx>
- 
- “ ii. 72 hour or 10 day test
- a. 0-240 minutes – measure every 30 minutes
- b. 240 -480 minutes – measure every 60 minutes
- c. After 480 minutes, measure every 12 hours until either the water level in the well recovers to within two feet of the static water level measured at the beginning of the well capacity test or to at least ninety-five percent of the total drawdown measured during the test, which ever occurs first. “
- 
- This has now been adopted by Monterey County EHD. In October 2010, however, MCEHD did allow “evaluation”, and used the same formula as MPWMD, but with one important difference: the pumping rate fed into the formula was the one actually used in testing, rather than a recomputed higher rate as in MPWMD, before the reduction of the formula was applied. In the case of

**Flores/Pisenti Well #2, the adjusted rate in the Bierman report was 3.03 gpm, barely achieving the mandated minimum of 3.0 gpm. Given the unjustified nature of the estimating formula, a scientist would want to see the retesting demonstrate that with an actual rate of 3.03 gpm, 95% recovery was truly achieved.**

It is important to note that there is no certainty that a given well's recovery rate (fast or slow) is directly relatable to the sustainability of the well's yield. For example, it can be argued through hydraulic theory that a well tapping a relatively small effective storage system of a fractured-rock network could achieve a higher post-test recovery rate due to the faster refilling rate of this smaller volume system, compared to another well tapping into a relatively large effective storage system that achieves a slower post-test recovery rate due to the larger storage volume in that system. Which of these two wells is more reliable in terms of a sustainable supply? Regardless of this uncertainty as to whether a well's recovery rate is a valid and appropriate gauge of a well's sustainability, MPWMD has opted for consideration of reducing the calculated well yield in cases where 95% recovery has not been achieved after two times the pumping period, as an additional conservative measure to hedge against this uncertainty.

➤ **The present debate is not about whether 95% recovery is an appropriate criterion. That is the rule. MPWMD does not make conservative adjustments to it – quite the reverse. The State and County (even in 2010) only allow one pumping period for recovery, whereas MPWMD allows twice as long.**

It should also be noted that the precise role that post-test recovery data should play in evaluating a well's yield is not well defined and agreed upon in the professional hydrogeologic community. MPWMD plans to continue research and explore refinement of this aspect of well source assessments as part of future planned updating of the *Procedures*. As part of this update, the language associated with the time period during which recovery measurements must be made will also be clarified.

- **Page 4, Relief Requested.** Item 3 requests 95% recovery within 6 days shall be demonstrated by actual measurements for Well #1 and 2 with no use of estimates. See Page 3 response comment above. Also, it should be noted that the relative efficiency of water-level recovery after pumping only affects the well-yield calculation; it does not affect the calculation of predicted drawdowns (i.e., offsite water-level effects) in the vicinity of the pumping well.

➤ **Agreed – our appeal addresses both areas.**

- **Page 5, Relief Requested.** Item 4 requests that “well capacity shall be determined by the actual pumping rates chosen for tests, with no use of estimates”. This request does not conform to standard hydrogeologic practice and may reflect a misunderstanding of well hydraulics and aquifer analysis. It is the principle purpose of aquifer testing to utilize actual pumping test derived data (pumping rate, water-level drawdown, specific capacity)

➤ **Yes, this is exactly the point we were making – that the inputs to the computation should be “actual” and not estimated after recovery failure. Thanks for the clarification – we were not concerned with how those test data are used later in the process. We will edit our request to use your words and say “well capacity shall utilize actual**

**pumping test data for the wells, with no substitution of estimated values." Is that OK?**

- to calculate hydraulic characteristics of the aquifer (transmissivity, hydraulic conductivity, storativity) in order to determine well yield and pumping test data from well operations (i.e., by its natural rise and time and distance drawdown relationships. Setting a well yield equal to the rate that was achieved during a short-term pumping test is not standard hydrogeologic practice and can result in erroneous well-yield determinations that could be greater than the recommended well yield based on calculations from the pumping test data. [2]
- **Page 6, Detailed Grounds for Appeal.** The exercise provided under "Failure to comply with Documentation of Drawdown and Recovery" ignores important hydrogeologic considerations. The example calculations on Page 6 show changing percent recovery, but this example does not consider that other hydrogeologic parameters used to calculate well yield would be expected to change as the percentage recovery declines. Both Specific Capacity and the late-time to early-time transmissivity ratio (affected by the steepening slope of the drawdown curve) would be expected to decline under such circumstances, and would result in lower calculated well yields. In other words, it is incorrect and misleading to hold the calculated well yield "static" while reducing the percentage recovery, as the parameters used to calculate well yield would not be expected to remain static under changing recovery conditions, such as is assumed in the example provided.
  - **Agree, but the only parameter that appears changeable in the formula is the "adjusted 24-hour specific capacity of 0.283 gpm/ft. This alone adjusted the actual pumping rate from 6.25 up to an estimated 41.27 gpm, so it is no wonder that the "reduction" due to the formula still produced an estimated post-recovery rate of 24.52 gpm, nearly four times the original actual pumping rate, to be fed into the well capacity calculations. What kind of conservative reduction is this? What is your own expectation of how low a percentage recovery would still pass, allowing for lower adjusted 24-hour specific capacity?**

U:\staff\Boardpacket\2012\20120820\PubHrng\14\item14\_exh14e.docx

[1]

Well #1 test pumping rate = 6.3 gpm, 6.6 times dry-season demand rate of 1.23 gpm; Well #2 test pumping rate = 6.3 gpm, 5.4 times

[2]

Suggested references sources for well yield and recovery applications include:  
 Kruseman, G.P. and N.A. de Ridder, 1994. *Analysis and Evaluation of Pumping Test Data*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition; see page 27.



**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Joni Hoffman <jonihoffman@mindspring.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 26, 2012 5:10 PM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** August 20 Meeting Agenda #16

To the MPWMD Chair and Board,

Regarding Agenda Item #16 on August 20th:

I support the District taking leadership to own, finance and govern the new desal facility. Please take this decision to fulfill your mission, meet community demands, and protect ratepayers.

The Mayors Water Authority has designated the District to take the lead. The District must act, now, with clarity and commitment. Time is running out.

Joni Hoffman  
Seaside

# MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS

PO Box 4400  
Salinas, CA 93912

1370-B South Main Street  
Salinas, CA 93901


831-796-1499 Phone  
831-755-5485 Fax

www.MontereyCountyElections.us

elections@co.monterey.ca.us

**Linda Tulett**  
Registrar of Voters

**Clayton Valenzuela**  
Assistant Registrar of Voters



AUG 30 2012

August 30, 2012

David J. Stoldt, General Manager  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District  
P.O. Box 85  
Monterey, CA 93942-0085

**MPWMD**

Re: Statement of Findings to the Referendum Against Ordinance 152 Section Four, of the MPWMD

Dear Mr. Stoldt,

Enclosed you will find, "Statement of Findings to Referendum Petition", which includes a report of signatures that have been disqualified for specified reasons. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

In your letter dated July 31, 2012, you request that my office, as the Monterey County Registrar of Voters, verify all signatures in their entirety. The enclosed Statement discloses our findings<sup>1</sup>. You also asked three additional questions, which we have provided our answer:

*"b) Whether you will count signatures on the back of a sheet or on attached extra pages without the title or section subject to referendum printed on it?"*

No. We have referenced state law and petition guidelines and have determined that, per California Elections Code sections 9010 and 9011, and petition guidelines page 1 item #3 and page 4 item #26, we cannot count the referenced signatures.

*"c) Whether you will count any of the signatures on the page that appears to have been cobbled together on a copy machine and does not have the title or section subject to referendum printed on its top?"*

Yes. While we have referenced state law and, per Sections 9010, 9011 of the California Elections Code, the title or section subject to the referendum must appear on the top of each section, Section 9012 appears to be vague in its requirement. We have reviewed the petition guidelines and cannot find this particular scenario for guidance. However, it is in our opinion that we *can* include the signatures in the validation of the petition as the circulator of that section has substantially complied in making the text available to electors at signing, although the recommended procedure and format should have the title and/or subject of the referendum at the top of each signature page to avoid any potential inconsistency with Sections 9010 and 9011.

*"d) Please confirm the quantity of signatures required. Pursuant to the email attached, we believe the number should be 3,824, but the MPTA has stated in the press that 3,514 are required."*

The required number of valid signers must be greater than or equal to 3,824 (California Elections Code section 9341 requires signatures equal to 10% of the votes cast for all candidates the office of governor).

Respectfully,

Linda Tulett  
Registrar of Voters, County of Monterey

<sup>1</sup> Referendum petition signatures and addresses were validated under current California Election Law and the statewide "Petition Process Guidelines" as provided by the California Secretary of State in 1997

# MONTEREY COUNTY ELECTIONS

PO Box 4400  
Salinas, CA 93912

1370-B South Main Street  
Salinas, CA 93901

831-796-1499 Phone  
831-755-5485 Fax

www.MontereyCountyElections.us

elections@co.monterey.ca.us

**Linda Tulett**  
Registrar of Voters

**Claudio Valenzuela**  
Assistant Registrar of Voters



## STATEMENT OF FINDINGS TO REFERENDUM PETITION

AGAINST MONTEREY PENNINSULAWATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ORDINANCE No. 152  
A RESOLUTION OF THE MONTEREY PENNINSULAWATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT BOARD AUTHORIZING THE  
ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ANNUAL WATER USE FEE

I, LINDA TULETT, Registrar of Voters of the County of Monterey, State of California, hereby state:

THAT a Referendum Petition against a Resolution passed by the governing body of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District relating to Ordinance No. 152 was filed at the District's Office on Tuesday, June 26, 2012.

THAT, said Referendum was delivered to the Monterey County Elections Department on Tuesday, July 31, 2012 for the administrative duty of verifying signatures and addresses of voters; and

THAT, said petition consists of 1844 sections and 4810 signers; and

THAT, pursuant to Elections Code section 9341, the total number of signatures required on a referendum petition is equal to 10% of the votes cast for all candidates for Governor at the last gubernatorial election within the District; and

THAT, signatures and addresses of voters and circulators were validated under the California Elections Code and the statewide "Petition Process Guidelines" as provided by the California Secretary of State in 1997; and

THAT, each section contains signatures and addresses purporting to be of qualified electors of the District; and

THAT, the signature and address of each elector was verified by examining the records of registration of this County, current and in effect at the respected purported dates of such circulation, to determine what number of qualified electors signed the petition, and from that examination have determined the following facts:

Total number of unverified signatures filed	4810	
Total number of signatures needed to qualify petition	3824	
Total number of signatures verified	4810	
Total number of signatures found SUFFICIENT	4136	
Total number of signatures found NOT SUFFICIENT	674	(see exhibit A for details)

THAT, signatures and addresses contained in each affidavit of circulator, as required by Elections Code section 104 and 9022, was verified by examining the records of registration and have met the qualifications to circulate the petition.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have here unto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 30th day of August, 2012

Linda Tulett, Registrar of Voters  
County of Monterey



# Petition Statistics

8/30/2012 2:17:34PM

MONTEREY PENINSULA WATER DIST.

Petition ID:1105

45

Total Sigs Required	3,824
Total Sigs Submitted	4,810
Total Sample Size	4,810
Total Sigs Verified	4,810

		TOTAL CHALLENGED
ADD	ADDRESS DIFFERS FROM RESIDENCE	
	Total	126
ANTSG	ADDRESS NOT BY SIGNER	
	Total	38
ILL	ILLEGIBLE	
	Total	13
INC	INCOMPLETE ADDRESS	
	Total	1
INCOM	CIRC DECLARE NOT COMPLETE	
	Total	1
MADD	MAILING ADDRESS	
	Total	26
MAX	DUPLICATE (MAX EXCEEDED)	
	Total	27
NARIC	NOT ACTIVE REG (VALID CANCEL/INACTI	
	Total	7
NOADD	NO ADDRESS ON PETITION	
	Total	1
NR	NOT REGISTERED	
	Total	240
PFRMT	PETITION FORMAT	
	Total	28
PSIG	PRINTED SIGNATURE	
	Total	2
SIG	SIGNATURE MISCOMPARES	
	Total	8
SIGMI	SIGNATURE MISSING	
	Total	39
TYPED	INFORMATION TYPED NOT WRITTEN	
	Total	6
WDIST	WRONG DISTRICT	
	Total	102
WREG	WRONG REG DATE	
	Total	9
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>674</b>

TOTAL VALID : 4,136