



Supplement to 11/16/2015 MPWMD Board Packet

Attached are copies of letters received between October 6, 2015 and November 3, 2015. Correspondence is also included that was not provided in September 2015. These letters are listed in the November 16, 2015 Board packet under Letters Received.

Author	Addressee	Date	Topic
Priscilla Walton	David Stoldt	10/11/15	Monterey Bay Integrated Regional Water Management Process
Virginia Rosecrans	MPWMD Board	8/18/15	A 15-07-019
Nancyanne Lansdowne	MPWMD Board	8/14/15	Case A. 15-07-019
Melodie Chrislock	MPWMD Board	8/14/15	Copy of Protest Sent to CPUC
Vicki Williams	MPWMD Board	7/26/15	Cal Am's Proposed Rate Increase (A. 15-07-?)

U:\staff\Boardpacket\2015\20151116\LtrsRecd\LtrsRecd.docx

Carmel Valley Association
P.O. Box 157, Carmel Valley, California 93924
www.carmelvalleyassociation.org



RECEIVED
OCT 16 2015
MPWMD

October 11, 2015

Mr. David Stoldt, General Manger
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
PO Box 85
Monterey, CA 93942-0085

Dear Mr. Stoldt:

The Carmel Valley Association (CVA) wishes to raise an important point relative to development of the Monterey Bay Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) process as it applies to the Carmel River watershed. We hereby request that, as lead agency on this planning and management process, the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (WMD) fully engage the entire stakeholder group in the policy development and strategic response planning that will be implemented by the Regional Water Management Group (RWMG). CVA understands that:

- 1) The RWMG is a management group, not a policy making body. It is supposed to be a body whose task is implementation. IRWM policy should originate from collaborative efforts involving stakeholder groups in the region.
- 2) Not to convene stakeholder groups would be inconsistent with the goals of the South Monterey Bay IRWMP as stated in the goals subsections 3.3 and 3.6; the definition of stakeholders in 5.2; and the mutual understandings in 6.3, 6.4 and 6.6 of the Memorandum of Understanding. Those goals aim to achieve efficiencies, enhance public service and build public support for vital projects through coordination, collaboration and communication between stakeholders and other interested parties. Further, approval of the project lists should occur by consensus of the Water Management Group and Stakeholders.

It is appropriate to accelerate the process of engaging stakeholders to meet these requirements and ensure that funding can be secured by the RWMG. It will be important to be fully compliant with DWR's vision for IRWM, both when applying for Proposition 1 funding and negotiating for funding.

CVA has an active and continuing interest in protecting the Carmel River and watershed as well as enhancing the valley environment, which is inextricably linked to the health of the river. Please call a stakeholder meeting to inform us as to the status of the funding tactics and to receive input.

Respectfully,

Priscilla Walton, Carmel Valley Association

P.P. Priscilla Walton
President, Carmel Valley Association

Cc by e-mail. Gary Bardini, California Department of Water Resources; Larry Hampson, Chief Engineer, Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

Arlene Tavani

From: Virginia Rosecrans <ninnyrose@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2015 11:57 AM
To: 'California Public Utilities Commission'; 'Office of Ratepayer Advocates'; Arlene Tavani
Subject: A 15-07-019

I protest Cal Am's proposal to the California Public Utilities Commission.

Virginia Rosecrans
624-6251

Arlene Tavani

From: lansdowne@post.harvard.edu
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2015 12:59 PM
Cc: Zachary Lansdowne
Subject: case A.15-07-019

I am very much against Cal Am's proposal to raise low residential users' water rates by 43% while lowering commercial high users' rates by 18%. Current users we should not have to pay the \$40M Cal Am supposedly undercollected over 20 years, much less \$158M in interest. This proposal is simply outrageous. Please do not support it.

Nancyanne C. Lansdowne
6 La Rancheria
Carmel Valley, CA 93924

Arlene Tavani

From: Melodie Chrislock <mwchrislock@redshift.com>
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2015 10:14 AM
To: Arlene Tavani
Subject: Copy of Protest Sent to CPUC

Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
Letter of Protest on Rate Case A.15-07-019
August 14, 2015

Attention Commissioners,

Here on the Monterey Peninsula we are paying outrageous water costs under Cal Am's tier system! My Cal Am bill last month was \$784.36. This bill was for a family of three, on one acre, plus two weeks of kids and grandkids visiting for the summer. How did we come to pay these kind of water bills? Cal Am has had 40 years to solve our water problems, but failed miserably to do so.

We have recently learned that Cal Am is now asking to charge us \$177 million over 20 years in order to compensate itself for \$40 million in under collected revenue, plus \$137 million in interest and profit. This under collection of revenue is due to our conservation efforts and Cal Am's collection errors. We should not be asked to pay the \$40 million and certainly not the additional interest and profit!

Cal Am's tier system is the cause of their problem and they should solve it without more cost to us.

When you charge people so much for water...they will use less. Cal Am should have foreseen this before they put their penalizing tiers into effect.

They also propose to keep the tier system, but get rid of all the allotments for family size, acreage and summer watering. Why not just get rid of the tiers instead? That would solve their revenue issues.

Additionally Cal Am wants to charge commercial users 18% less than they do currently. Here's an example of what a commercial user pays now, compared to what I pay.

If a division 1 commercial user uses 17,503 gallons (as I did on my recent bill) but they were charged at the division 1 rate of \$1.51 per 100 gallons, plus \$50.55 for a 1" meter, their commercial bill would be \$314.84. Compare that to my tier 4 residential bill of \$784.36 for the same amount of water. It appears that I pay more than twice what a big hotel pays for the same amount of water. Not to mention that the hotel is profiting

8
from the water they use, while I am not. Why should a residential user pay twice as much as a commercial user? How is this even legal?

Certainly Cal Am should not be allowed to lower commercial rates by another 18%!

About Twenty percent of Cal Am's residential ratepayers are in tiers 3, 4 and 5.
So my personal example here affects more than just a few of us.

Please take the ratepayers here on the Monterey Peninsula into consideration when you consider Cal Am's proposed changes.

Thank you,

Melodie Chrislock
26235 Atherton Place
Carmel, CA 93923

Arlene Tavani

From: Vicki Williams <vickimwilliams@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2015 8:43 AM
To: public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov; Richard.rauschmeier@cpuc.ca.gov; Arlene Tavani
Subject: Cal Am's proposed rate increase (A.15-07-?)

Based on the statement below, what is the incentive for a single person at a single family residence to conserve water, who would know that single residence are using more water then necessary for only one person. This is designed to increase revenue for Cal Am but not actually save water for the Peninsula. I thought the main purpose here is to conserve water but this proposal make the main purpose getting more money for CAL AM. I see actual water use going up not down with this proposal when it comes to oversight of water use when cost is not an issue for a residence with only 1 person. Am I misunderstanding this proposal?

(It replaces a complex residential allotment system based on number of residents and size of lot with a standard block rate design allowing all single family residences the same amount of water per pricing tier.)

Vicki Williams