



# Supplement to 06/20/2022 MPWMD Board Packet

Attached are copies of letters sent and/or received between **May 11, 2022 and June 14, 2022**. These letters are listed in the **June 20, 2022** Board packet under Letters Received.

Author	Addressee	Date	Topic
<b>Ian Crooks</b>	General Manager	May 10, 2022	Pure Water Monterey Operational Impact on ASR Well-01
<b>Melodie Chrislock</b>	Board of Directors	May 12, 2022	CA Coastal Commission Just Denied Poseidon's Desal
<b>Melodie Chrislock</b>	Board of Directors	May 12, 2022	Coming Up- CA Coastal Commissioner Decision on Poseidon Desal
<b>Marianne Gawain</b>	Board of Directors and General Manager	May 13, 2022	Redistricting Recommendations for Various Monterey County Public Agencies
<b>Anya Spear</b>	Board of Directors and General Manager	May 13, 2022	Notice of Availability: Final Environmental Impact Report for the California State University Monterey Bay Master Plan
<b>Rudy Fischer</b>	Board of Directors	May 23, 2022	Communication for the MPWMD Board on: Public Water Now, Sustainable Water Supply, Measure J, MPTA lawsuit and a number of other topics.
<b>Karen Paull</b>	Maura Twomey, Executive Director with AMBAG	May 24, 2022	Available Water Supply to Meet AMBAG's 6 <sup>th</sup> Cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)
<b>David J. Stoldt</b>	Paul Bruno with the Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster	May 25, 2022	June 1 Watermaster Board Meeting – Old Business Item VII.A.i. Initial Findings from Replenishment Water Modeling Work and Recommendation to Perform Additional Replenishment Water Analyses

<b>CA Coastal Commission</b>	General Manager	June 2, 2022	Public Hearing Notice on Coastal Development Permit Application Number 3-19-0894 (Carmel River Floodplain Restoration and Environmental Enhancement Project) scheduled before the CA Coastal Commission on Friday, June 10, 2022 at 9:00 a.m.
<b>Paul Bruno</b>	David J. Stoldt	June 9, 2022	Well ASR-1 Issue
<b>David J. Stoldt</b>	City of Monterey – Mayor Clyde Roberson	June 13, 2022	Response to the City of Monterey’s Letter dated June 13, 2022   re: City of Monterey Regional Housing Needs Allocation

U:\staff\Boardpacket\2022\20220620\Letters Received and Sent\Supplemental Packet.docx



May 10, 2022

Hon. Mary Ann Carbone  
Chairperson, Monterey One Water  
5 Harris Court, Building D  
Monterey, CA 93940

Via email: [sandcityrep@my1water.org](mailto:sandcityrep@my1water.org)  
[MaryAnn@SandCityCA.org](mailto:MaryAnn@SandCityCA.org)

**RE: Pure Water Monterey Operational Impact on ASR Well-01**

Dear Chair Carbone:

California American Water's (Cal Am) current inability to use well ASR-1 to extract water from the Seaside Groundwater Basin, caused by the Pure Water Monterey (PWM) project's lack of compliance with regulatory underground retention times at that location, is a critical issue impacting available water supply for the Monterey Peninsula both this year and beyond.

Advanced treated wastewater is injected into the Seaside Basin by PWM where it is recovered by Cal Am for use by Monterey Peninsula customers. To protect health and safety, California regulations require that injections of treated wastewater from PWM into the Seaside Basin stay underground a minimum of two months before extraction for drinking water. This requirement is also included in M1W's NPDES permit for PWM (Order R3-2017-0003, section VI, paragraph 1).

ASR-1 is one of the largest-capacity extraction wells owned by MPWMD and operated by Cal Am to extract water (whether from PWM, the Aquifer Storage and Recovery program, or native basin groundwater) from the Seaside Basin, and has been relied upon as a source of drinking water for Monterey residents and businesses since 2003. As Carmel River supplies are reduced, the availability of ASR-1 is critical to meeting customer demand on the Monterey Peninsula. But now, PWM injections are not meeting the required underground retention times before reaching ASR-1, and State regulators have ordered ASR-1 to be shut down for extraction of potable water to customers until M1W and MPWMD can demonstrate that recycled water reaching those wells is in compliance with all regulatory requirements, including underground retention times. The loss of ASR-1 as

an extraction well for potable water supply threatens Cal-Am's ability to meet customer demand.

Cal Am was first informed of the failure of the PWM project to comply with underground retention times at ASR-1 in June 2021, even though the sampling for compliance was conducted in October 2020. Between June 2021 and March 2022, Cal Am met regularly with both regulators and M1W and MPWMD staff to come up with solutions to allow ASR-1 reactivation, including reductions in PWM injections – which would lengthen retention times - and Cal Am repeatedly emphasized the critical need for ASR-1. But on April 18, 2022, M1W and MPWMD informed Cal Am that they would not reduce PWM injections to allow activation of ASR-1 for extraction because, among other things, such reduction would “jeopardize contractual delivery of water,” “undermine meeting reserve requirements and delivery of ‘extra’ PWM water,” and “delay review and approval of” an engineering report. MPWMD also expressed concern that “any questions about travel time, should they become public, could influence the public perception of the health risks from drinking PWM water.”

On April 28, 2022, Cal Am informed M1W and MPWMD that their refusal to take action to correct the underground retention time at ASR-1 will interfere with Cal Am's water service obligations and constituted a breach of the PWM Storage and Recovery Agreement and PWM Water Purchase Agreement. These breaches trigger a dispute resolution process as outlined in those agreements.

Cal Am, in coordination with other agencies, is working on a variety of actions to ensure sufficient water supply in the near term, including developing additional wells in the Seaside Basin to safely extract water, adding wellhead treatment to ASR-4 (which are offline for extraction purposes due to unrelated water quality issues), and tying existing Seaside wells into the pipeline carrying water back to the Monterey Peninsula. Additional demand reduction through conservation measures or rationing may also be required. However, these potential steps cannot be seen as a replacement path for the immediate need to solve the retention time problem, thereby allowing ASR-1 to be reactivated. Only with ASR-1 in operation as an extraction well will Cal Am have the necessary operational reliability to meet customer demand while staying within source water limits, including legal limits on diversions from the Carmel River.

PWM is a complex project and technical challenges are not surprising. As we work through these challenges together, it is important to remember that the primary purpose of the PWM project from the beginning was to enable Cal Am to meet customer demand while remaining in compliance with the terms of the cease-and-desist order governing Carmel River diversions. It is unfortunate our project partners' staff seem to have lost sight of this purpose and have refused to take the steps needed to reactivate ASR-1, thereby forcing Cal Am to initiate these dispute resolution processes.

The reduction of PWM injection rates and regulatory coordination to reactivate the well are still within M1W's abilities. We respectfully request that you direct staff to engage with us to take the actions necessary to return ASR-1 to service and ensure that the water needs of our community will be met.

Sincerely,

Ian Crooks  
Vice President of Engineering  
California American Water

CC: M1W Board of Directors  
M1W General Manager Paul Sciuto



**From:** [mwchrislock@redshift.com](mailto:mwchrislock@redshift.com)  
**To:** [Alvin Edwards](#); [Amy Anderson](#); [Clyde Roberson](#); [Dave Stoldt](#); [George Riley](#); [Joel Pablo](#); [Karen Paull](#); [District 5](#); [SAFWAT MALEK](#)  
**Subject:** Coastal Commission just DENIED Poseidon"s Desal  
**Date:** Thursday, May 12, 2022 7:28:17 PM

---

Today was an amazing demonstration of the courage, commitment and the insight of the current Coastal Commissioners. They were very thoughtful in their denial of the Poseidon Huntington Beach Desal. Carole Groom who represents us on the Costal asked for a study on recycled water. – Melodie

Dayna Bochco No  
Stephen Padilla No  
Sara Aminzadeh No  
Caryl Hart No  
Carole Groom No  
Meagan Harmon No  
Katie Rice No  
EffieTurnbull-Sanders No  
Mike Wilson No  
Rick Rivas No  
Donne Brownsey No





**From:** [mwchrislock@redshift.com](mailto:mwchrislock@redshift.com)  
**To:** [Alvin Edwards](#); [Amy Anderson](#); [Clyde Roberson](#); [Dave Stoldt](#); [George Riley](#); [Joel Pablo](#); [Karen Paull](#); [District 5](#); [SAFWAT MALEK](#)  
**Subject:** Coming up - Coastal Commissioner decision on Poseidon Desal  
**Date:** Thursday, May 12, 2022 4:37:16 PM

---

**This will be historic! It will impact Cal Am's proposed desal project here.**

At 4:45 the Coastal Commission will end hours of public comment and start it closing discussions – Poseidon, then CC staff, then the CC commission discussion and the vote.

To watch the livestream, go to [coastal.ca.gov](http://coastal.ca.gov)

Melodie

Los Angeles Times | May 11, 2022

[https://edition.pagesuite.com/popovers/dynamic\\_article\\_popover.aspx?guid=f512f933-e077-4e47-ada8-f68e986e28e7&v=sdk](https://edition.pagesuite.com/popovers/dynamic_article_popover.aspx?guid=f512f933-e077-4e47-ada8-f68e986e28e7&v=sdk)

# Newsom's saltwater folly

## Vote on O.C. desalination plant is Thursday

STEVE LOPEZ

Gov. Gavin Newsom has weighed in again.

He supports the massive Huntington Beach desalination plant that comes up for a vote Thursday before the Coastal Commission.

I've weighed in too.

It's a really, really bad idea, as I explained in December.

Let's start with what Newsom had to say about the controversial project, which has been on the drawing board for years.

"We need more tools in the damn toolkit," Newsom told the Bay Area News Group editorial board in late April, doubling down on his earlier support. "We are as dumb as we want to be. What more evidence do you need that you need to have more tools in the toolkit than what we've experienced? Seven out of the last 10 years have been severe drought."

The governor is not entirely wrong.

We do need more tools to fight drought, a catastrophic threat to the state that could soon force drastic cutbacks in water use.

And we are as dumb as we want to be.

So let me now lay out five reasons this is a dumb idea, for the benefit of the governor and coastal commissioners who will decide what is expected by insiders to be a tossup, despite a recommendation against the project by the Coastal Commission staff.

First: That part of Orange County does not need the water.

Many parts of the state are in dire condition when it comes to water supplies, but not this particular area. As reported by me and others, that part of Orange County has groundwater reserves that are expected to last decades, along with plenty of recycled water, thanks to substantial conservation efforts.

Poseidon, the private company that is begging for massive public handouts to build the plant, is determined to pump 100 million gallons of water from the ocean each and every day, which might make sense if it had a customer. But no water agency has signed

up to buy the water.

That's not to say that desalination isn't part of our future on this scorched planet. It's in use all over the world, and California has 12 desalination plants in areas of the state where the water is needed. A smaller plant, proposed for the Doheny State Beach area, has widespread support and a water agency that actually needs the supply.

But desalination is expensive — which makes the water more costly than conventionally treated water, and that gets passed on to customers. If the idea is to transport desalinated Huntington Beach water to parts of the state that need it, that would make the water roughly the price of Champagne.

Second: There's an environmental price to pay.

State scientists and environmental groups have warned of harmful effects on plankton, fish larvae and the broader marine ecosystem, thanks to massive amounts of intake and discharge (the treatment process creates a super-briny soup that would be pumped back into the ocean).

And you don't run a plant this size on solar or wind power.

In my last column on the project, Andrea Leon-Grossman, of the marine conservation and environmental justice nonprofit Azul, noted that climate change and drought are directly related to greenhouse gas emissions. So it's counterproductive to erect a massive plant that would burn more fossil fuel.

Poseidon officials claim that environmental fears are overblown, or that they'll be mitigated. They'd have you believe the for-profit company, which is essentially privatizing a public resource while asking for taxpayer handouts, is doing us all a favor.

"The effects of climate change make seawater desalination a must in California," Poseidon executive Scott Maloni told me.

Sure, if the location and engineering make sense. But even then, desalination should be a last resort.

“This particular project is in the wrong place to serve the needs we have today or in the future, given the lower cost feasible alternatives available, such as recycled water from our existing wastewater treatment plants,” says Ron Gastelum, former general manager of the Metropolitan Water District. “Recycled water is, throughout the state, a large untapped resource.”

It would make more sense, and produce far more water, to speed up and expand recycling and conservation efforts around the state.

Third: The political stink may cause hypertension and nosebleeds.

Poseidon, owned by a Canadian company with hundreds of billions of dollars in assets, has spent nearly \$1 million lobbying on this project and applied for public loans and handouts totaling roughly \$2 billion. In its last act of shameless panhandling, the company applied for \$1.1 billion from a state bond fund intended largely to produce affordable housing.

But with friends in high places, why wouldn't Poseidon go for gold? Surely you recall the foie gras faux pas when Newsom was caught dining at the French Laundry in wine country while telling us commoners to stay home during COVID-19. Let's not forget why he was there. It was a birthday party for his buddy, a Poseidon lobbyist.

This is the same governor who disposed of William von Blasingame, a Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board member who raised inconvenient questions about whether the desalination plant was needed and what it would ultimately cost ratepayers. Von Blasingame, after being dismissed, shared with me a solid piece of advice for Newsom:

“When you're a governor, you sometimes have to say no to

friends.”

#### Fourth: Environmental justice issues can't be ignored.

The commission staff recommendation, which Newsom said he didn't bother to read in detail, succinctly spells out the issue:

“The proposed project location is in an area with a concentration of industrial development and a history of contamination problems. Area residents are concerned about adding more industrial development to an area already dealing with existing harm from a nearby wastewater treatment plant, power plant, partially remediated Superfund site, former oil tank farm, and former dump.”

Then there's a UCLA study that warned of likely “moderate to severe rate hikes” that would hit low-income households harder. Oscar Rodriguez, co-founder of a Huntington Beach neighborhood group called Oak View ComUNIDAD, told me it's unsurprising. Public projects, he said, often harm low-income communities first and benefit them last.

“I grew up in this neighborhood ... and we already have environmental issues,” Rodriguez said. “I think the governor needs to stand with the staff report and stand with our local communities. That's what the Coastal Commission was created for — to make sure the coast has protection from industrialization.”

#### Fifth: A defining moment for the Coastal Commission.

Rodriguez is right. The 12 coastal commissioners, four of whom were appointed by Newsom, are on the spot to decide whom they serve and what their mission is. Some of the commissioners are running for public office, which raises the stakes, because that can mean a choice between doing the right thing and keeping donors happy.

Several years ago, the commission veered off course from its

original mandate to provide coastal protection and enhancement, responsible development and access for all. Wealthy developers and homeowners hired powerful lobbyists to do their bidding. The lobbyists had connections all the way to the top of state government and cozy relationships with commissioners, some of whom were accused of breaking the rules on private conversations with developers and other parties, resulting in lawsuits and legislation.

Public scrutiny and good journalism were effective disinfectants, and today there's a different set of commissioners at the helm.

We'll find out a lot about them when they vote on desalination Thursday at 9 a.m. (To watch the livestream, go to [coastal.ca.gov](http://coastal.ca.gov)).

[steve.lopez@latimes.com](mailto:steve.lopez@latimes.com)



The League of Women Voters of Monterey County has been observing and participating in redistricting and initial districting this last year. We commend the many people who served on commissions, submitted maps, and made their preferences known.

We would also like to commend the many jurisdictions that worked hard to run a fair, transparent, and inclusive process. These entities sought public participation, actively communicating with the public, including through clear websites; they engaged knowledgeable staff and consultants with the ability to convey complex laws and criteria-ranking requirements; and they completed the process on time. In short, they handled a difficult balancing act well, especially considering the delays in the recent census.

The League of Women Voters of Monterey County would also like to make these recommendations to the county, cities, schools, and special districts when they redistrict after the 2030 census:

1. Strongly consider separate, independent commissions to make the decisions.
2. Select commissioners in a non-partisan manner to represent diverse communities of interest.
3. Exclude incumbency as a consideration in map-making.
4. Educate both commissions and the public on the legal framework for redistricting and the tools for map-making.
5. Minimize the number of deferred voters, i.e., those who will be unable to vote during an election cycle because of placement into a new district.
6. Provide a separate redistricting website, clearly labeled and updated to include schedules for public input and contact information.
7. Offer hybrid (in person and virtual) meetings for maximum public participation.
8. Give public notice, including bilingual publicity, well in advance of each meeting.

Approved by the LWV of Monterey County Board, April 13, 2022

*Marianne Gawain*, President  
LWV of Monterey County







**RECEIVED**

MAY 13 2022

**MPWMD**

**NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY**

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE**

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY MONTEREY BAY**

**MASTER PLAN**

**DATE:** May 11, 2022

**PROJECT TITLE:** California State University Monterey Bay Master Plan (Project)

**LEAD AGENCY:** The Board of Trustees of the California State University  
 401 Golden Shore  
 Long Beach, California 90802-4210

On behalf of California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB)  
 100 Campus Center  
 Seaside, California 93955

The Board of Trustees of the California State University (Board of Trustees) is the lead agency for the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.), and the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). The Board of Trustees has prepared this Notice of Availability of the California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB) Master Plan Final EIR in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088. The Final EIR addresses the environmental effects of the Project and analyzes reasonable alternatives to avoid or minimize significant environmental effects.

**Project Location:** The Project site is located at the existing CSUMB campus, on the former U.S. Department of the Army military facility known as Fort Ord. The CSUMB campus is located north of the Monterey Peninsula and west of the Salinas Valley. Portions of the existing CSUMB campus are physically located within the governmental boundaries of the cities of Seaside and Marina and within unincorporated Monterey County. Primary access to CSUMB is available from Highway 1 via the main entrance at Lightfighter Drive to the south and from Imjin Parkway to the north.

**Project Description:** The proposed Master Plan provides the basis for the physical development of the CSUMB campus through approximately 2035. Implementation of the Project would provide space and facility needs to support an on-campus enrollment of 12,700 full-time-equivalent students (FTES) and 1,776 FTE faculty and staff by the year 2035. Overall,

the Master Plan proposes approximately 2.6 million gross square feet of net new building space for academics, administration, student life, athletic and recreational uses, institutional partnership facilities, and housing. On-campus housing sufficient to continue to accommodate 60 percent of FTES would be constructed and existing housing would accommodate 65 percent of FTE faculty and staff, with a projected increase of 3,820 student beds and 757 converted residential units for faculty and staff. The Project also would accommodate redevelopment and growth of outdoor athletics and recreation facilities to serve campus needs.

The proposed Master Plan includes Project Design Features (PDFs) that address open space, transportation, water and wastewater systems, energy systems and greenhouse gas reduction, and design. For example, transportation PDFs will enhance and expand the campus's existing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program in order to further reduce vehicle trips and prioritize pedestrian and bicycle movement.

The Project includes specific development components identified in the proposed Master Plan and expected to be constructed in the next 10 years; these are referred to throughout the EIR as "near-term development components." These include Student Housing Phase III (600 student housing beds); Academic IV (95,000 GSF of classroom/instructional space); Student Recreation Center (70,000 GSF of recreation space); Student Housing Phase IIB (400 student housing beds); and Academic V (76,700 GSF of classroom/instructional space).

**Significant Environmental Effects:** The Final EIR identifies "potentially significant impacts" for the following environmental topics: biological resources, cultural resources and tribal cultural resources, paleontological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise. Implementation of feasible mitigation measures would avoid or substantially reduce all environmental impacts, with the exception of operational roadway noise at one off-campus location (6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Gigling Road), which would remain potentially significant and unavoidable.

**Document Availability:** The Final EIR is available online at the following website: <https://csumb.edu/facilities/planning/>

**EIR Certification and Project Approval:** The Board of Trustees of the California State University will consider the Final EIR for certification and the Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for adoption at its upcoming meeting on May 23-25, 2022. The Board of Trustees will also consider the proposed Master Plan for approval at the same meeting.

For additional information, please contact Anya Spear, LEED AP, Director of Strategic Initiatives, at 831.582.3530 or [aspear@csumb.edu](mailto:aspear@csumb.edu).

**From:** [Rudy Fischer](#)  
**To:** [Dave Stoldt](#); [Joel Pablo](#)  
**Cc:** [Eileen Sobeck - SWRCB](#); [E. Juaquin Esquivel - SWRCB](#); [cob@co.monterey.ca.us](mailto:cob@co.monterey.ca.us); [Kate McKenna - Executive Officer LAFCO](#); [Mary Ann Leffel](#); [Christopher.Cook@amwater.com](mailto:Christopher.Cook@amwater.com)  
**Subject:** Communication for the MPWMD board  
**Date:** Monday, May 23, 2022 1:58:32 PM

---

Ladies and gentlemen;

I see that Melodie Chrislock burdened all of you again last month with letters and e-mails which contain articles that you have most likely already seen in the newspapers, and for that I am sorry. I am also sorry to see that she still burdens you with complaints about my communications of fact. But, she is a silly person whose ramblings go from one year opposing a pipeline Cal Am wants to build in order to capture more water, to the next year wondering why Cal Am doesn't save her Public Water Now (PWN) friends on the MPWMD board from their own failures by drilling a well for them.

I notice she is also VERY concerned about Senate Bill 1157 though – probably for several reasons. It would certainly make it difficult for her to continue wasting the massive amounts of water she must use to maintain the jungle garden at her one-acre hilltop home in Carmel.

And it certainly puts the lie to her simplistic notion of how the Monterey Peninsula could meet all of its water needs if only everyone would go along with her. It really is unfortunate that a major drought, a Senate Bill, the need of some Peninsula residents to add water fixtures to accommodate their growing families, the hundreds of lots which are sitting vacant because the shortage of water won't allow building, the state of California, the Association on Monterey Bay Area Governments(AMBAG) housing requirements for more housing in cities, and reality should intrude on her – and Public Water Now's – fantasies!

She is fond of repeating “for the record neither Public Water Now, nor I, have ever taken a no-growth position. Public Water Now (PWN) wants an affordable, sustainable water supply for the Monterey Peninsula. That has always been our goal and our only goal.” Balderdash! It is easy to say you are not against normal growth when everything you do ensures that is what happens.

But I do not believe she OR Public Water Now wants a sustainable water supply for the Monterey Peninsula. Their one and only goal is to take over the assets of the local operation of Cal Am. While costing half a billion dollars or more, this would create no new water and would not get us off of the Cease and Desist Order. While it MAY lead to some cost savings eventually (because some communities and agencies would no longer receive the tax revenue they now get from Cal Am); their main goal is to control the water supply for the Monterey Peninsula. Period.

But since their members and supporters - George Riley, Karen Paull, Amy Anderson, Safwat Malek, Clyde Roberson, and Alvin Edwards - dominate the seven member board of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, they might get their way. That should be a concern for the water users, developers, and the cities which need more housing. It should also be a concern for current homeowners who cannot add water fixtures and the owners of vacant lots who cannot build or expand because PWN has blocked or killed past proposals for more water for over a decade.

I believe Public Water Now embraces the CDO and would like it to remain in place. That way they are assured that no new building or intensification of use occur on the Monterey Peninsula. I am pretty sure that is why they embraced the water supply report which seemed to show that just a few tweaks here and there would get us the minimum amount of water the Peninsula needs to add a minimum of new housing but still barely grow. But it seems pretty clear to me that when someone sets a maximum on the amount of water they want to see available, it is because they want to limit growth.

So those families which have grown and want to add water fixtures for their kids and other family members cannot. That way, also, they can make sure that the people who own vacant lots on the Peninsula and have not been able to build for decades cannot. And the real estate agents who have been tasked with selling unused lots cannot. And the restaurants, hotels, and other businesses which could grow and provide more job opportunities cannot do so; forcing

the children of current resident to have to move elsewhere for opportunities.

The shortage of available water also keeps housing prices and rental costs high and restricts additional housing so that the workers from our businesses cannot buy or rent closer to their jobs. This forces them to commute in from Salinas, King City, Marina, and other cities.

On a more immediate note, I do have grave concerns about the MPWMD and Pure Water Monterey NOT taking the appropriate action to ensure that all of the PWM water can be used. Since I was involved with the original approval and building of that plant, I understand the concerns, but do not for a minute believe that the claim that the water maybe toxic or unsafe is accurate. Nevertheless, the reality is that someone has ruled that Deep Injection Well 1 (DIW1) can not be used. So let's find a solution for that.

That may be as simple as proving that the travel time is actually longer than that claimed. Or it could be developing another DIW - but farther away from Cal Am's intake wells, in order to give the water more time to filter through natural sand and rocks. It might mean that you have to reduce the injection rate at that well or do whatever else needs to be done to make the injection well system support the extraction needs of Cal Am.

There is a Water Purchase Agreement between the MPWMD, Monterey One Water, and Cal Am which contains conditions which need to be met. Failure to meet those conditions might be considered a breach of the negotiated agreement, and will be another black eye for your agency.

I believe this situation makes it even more imperative to find other ways to meet the Monterey Peninsula's water. To do that, I feel that the MPWMD should go back to focusing on agency goals which have been in place for years:

1. To increase the water supply to meet community and environmental needs.
2. To assist California American Water in developing a legal water supply.

Those are goals you have had for many more years than the disruptive Measure J. Now, I realize the Public Water Now and its board members on the MPWMD don't care. They much prefer an antagonistic relationship with Cal Am while they try to take over the local operation for cheap. That way they can ensure that there is never a water supply for the Peninsula which would allow for additional growth.

It's a good thing that at least California American Water is acting in a responsible manner by pursuing a desal plant to ensure that the Monterey Peninsula gets the water it really needs in order to get the 27 year old Cease and Desist Order lifted.

We should not be in a situation where (as the General Manager recently said) "we can probably "cobble together" the water that is needed" for current housing only. It is scary that the system must search for 80 acre feet of water here and see if it can't find another 70 acre feet there.

Failure to develop a new source of water – and keeping up the antagonistic relationship with the Peninsula's water supplier - does the Peninsula's water users no good. Fighting Cal Am and potential spending well over \$500 million to pay for the acquisition of the local assets of Cal Am does the Peninsula's water users no good. Failure to work with Cal Am or others to develop the additional "sufficient and reliable" water needed to get off of the CDO does the Peninsula's water users no good.

Now you are in litigation with Cal Am, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), the Monterey Peninsula Taxpayers Association (MPTA), and all manner of other organizations? How can you expect your agency to continue to be effective when you are antagonistic to anyone who doesn't agree with the goals of Public Water Now? It is beginning to look like this board of Public Water Now members can't get along with anyone; and the goals of the MPWMD should be to work with others to solve the Peninsula's water problems.

The MPWMD must get back to its long-term goals. Maybe you could redirect some of the money being spent for studies and litigation to actually build a new well or develop more water. But whether it is Cal Am, a combination of MPWMD and PWM, or some yet to be identified provider; the Peninsula must move forward to develop new water sources so that we have the water the Peninsula needs and to get past the CDO.

Measure J passed on the basis of its potential “feasibility”. It is now clear the it is not cost effective,feasible, or a benefit to the MPWMD to continue to try to prove this only.. It is also quite old and outdated at this point and the board of the MPWMD – even though it is dominated by Public Water Now members – should acknowledge that and move beyond Measure J and actually work for the interests of the people of the Monterey Peninsula to finally get the Cease and Desist order lifted.

Regards,

Rudy Fischer  
Pacific Grove City Councilman 2010-2018  
Board of Directors, Monterey One Water 2013-2018  
Board Chair, Monterey One Water 2016-2018





VIA EMAIL

May 24, 2022

Ms. Maura F. Twomey  
Executive Director  
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)  
PO Box 2453  
Seaside, CA 93955

RE: Available Water Supply to Meet AMBAG's 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Regional Housing Needs  
Allocation (RHNA)

Dear Ms. Twomey:

Thank you for your letter dated May 19, 2022 regarding water to meet the region's RHNA goals.

Two years ago the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (District) and Monterey One Water began deliveries of water from the Pure Water Monterey project, which now provides 36% of the region's water needs. However, it is still not enough to lift the State's Cease and Desist Order (CDO) – to do so will require one more increment of supply which we expect to be in the form of an expansion of Pure Water Monterey. The expansion project is expected to be approved by the California Public Utilities Commission this summer and be built and operational in 2024. The District has calculated that the expansion will produce approximately three times the water required to meet the 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle RHNA goals within the District's jurisdiction.

The CDO is issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and is directed to California American Water Company (Cal-Am). Ordering paragraph 15 (p.27) states:

“15. The conditions of this Order, WR 2009-0060 and State Water Board Order 95-10 shall remain in effect until (a) Cal-Am certifies, with supporting documentation, that it has obtained a permanent supply of water that has been substituted for the water illegally diverted from the Carmel River and (b) the Deputy Director for Water Rights concurs, in writing, with the certification.”

Thus, the process of lifting the CDO starts with a discretionary action of Cal-Am and requires a response from the SWRCB. One can reasonably assume that Cal-Am could provide certification at, or shortly before, start-up of the new expansion water supply. The SWRCB response could take 2-3 months. The State Water Board staff has indicated that it may favorably consider a request by the District if Cal-Am fails to act.

Ms. Maura F. Twomey  
Page 2 of 2  
May 24, 2022

In the meantime, the District has been working with State regulators, local jurisdictions, and housing advocates on interim solutions to provide some water for near-term housing needs. Hopefully, such interim efforts will bear fruit soon.

We thank you for taking the time to contact us and encourage you to share this information with your Board.

Sincerely,

*Karen Paull*

Karen Paull (May 24, 2022 16:18 PDT)

Karen Paull  
Chair  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District





VIA EMAIL

May 25, 2022

Mr. Paul Bruno, Chair  
Seaside Groundwater Basin Watermaster  
PO Box 51502  
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

RE: June 1 Watermaster Board Meeting – Old Business Item VII.A.i.  
Initial Findings from Replenishment Water Modeling Work and Recommendation to  
Perform Additional Replenishment Water Analyses

Dear Mr. Bruno:

The Monterey Peninsula Water Management District strongly disagrees with the assumptions underlying Subtask 2.2 of the proposed Montgomery & Associates modeling work related to an additional replenishment water analysis. Specifically, assumption number 6: It makes absolutely no sense to reduce the yield of the expanded Pure Water Monterey project to 4,600 acre-feet per year. To do so would constitute an Event of Default under Section 20 of the Amended and Restated Water Purchase Agreement. Therefore, the only logical assumption would be to assume delivery of the full Company Allotment of 5,750 acre-feet each and every year.

Additionally, the proposed assumptions overly rely on the Cal-Am Urban Water Management Plan demand forecast which includes a variety of assumptions already proven to be false.

More effort should be undertaken to develop assumptions for this effort that are reliable and supportable, so that the model results are meaningful.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "David J. Stoldt". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "D" and "S".

David J. Stoldt  
General Manager  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District



**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT  
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
PHONE: (831) 427-4863  
FAX: (831) 427-4877  
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

**RECEIVED**

JUN 02 2022

**MPWMD**

# IMPORTANT PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

**Coastal Development Permit Application Number 3-19-0894 (Carmel River Floodplain Restoration and Environmental Enhancement Project (Carmel River FREE), Monterey Co.)** Application of Big Sur Land Trust and the Monterey County Housing and Community Development to restore historic Carmel River floodplain function (via removing Highway 1 roadbed fill, elevating Highway 1 on new bridge, opening up five notches along approx. .25-mile of river levee, and restoring approx. 100 acres of historic riparian corridor), create 23-acre agricultural preserve, develop 13,550 linear ft. of public access trails, and manage site to facilitate habitat, access, agricultural, and related resources on approx. .25-mile of Highway 1 and roughly 135-acre "Odello East" property just south of Carmel River in unincorporated Carmel area of Monterey County.

**The hearing will take place on June 10, 2022.** The Commission will hold a series of hearings this day starting at 9am and will move through each agenda item in order. This matter is on the agenda as item number 13a on Friday June 10, 2022.

**Staff report and staff recommendation.** A copy of the staff report (with the staff recommendation) for this matter is available at [www.coastal.ca.gov/mtgcurr.html](http://www.coastal.ca.gov/mtgcurr.html) (click on the Friday tab and scroll down to agenda item 13a).

**IMPORTANT! PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS WILL BE A HYBRID MEETING, WITH BOTH VIRTUAL AND IN PERSON PARTICIPATION ALLOWED.**

**How to provide testimony at this hearing.** Please see the Coastal Commission's Hybrid Hearing Procedures posted on the Coastal Commission's webpage at [www.coastal.ca.gov](http://www.coastal.ca.gov) for details on the procedures of this hearing. If you would like to receive a paper copy of the Coastal Commission's Hybrid Hearing Procedures, please call 415-904-5202. The in-person portion of the meeting will be held at the Hilton San Diego/Del Mar in Del Mar, (at 15575 Jimmy Durant Blvd., Del Mar, CA 92014). The Commission strongly encourages continued participation virtually through video and teleconferencing due to changing Covid-19 conditions.

**How to provide written comments for this hearing.** To submit written materials for review by the Commission, either email (via [CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:CentralCoast@coastal.ca.gov)) or submit such materials to Commission staff no later than 5pm on the Friday before the hearing (and staff will then distribute your materials to the Commission). Note that such materials received after this time will not be distributed to the Commission. Alternatively, you may also submit such materials directly to the Commissioners (a





VIA EMAIL

June 13, 2022

Hon. Clyde Roberson  
Mayor, City of Monterey  
City Hall  
Monterey, CA 93940

RE: City of Monterey Regional Housing Needs Allocation

Thank you for your letter dated March 17, 2022 regarding water to meet the City of Monterey's RHNA goals. In your letter you request the District's opinion if water will be available by 2023.

Two years ago the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (District) and Monterey One Water began deliveries of water from the Pure Water Monterey project, which now provides 36% of the region's water needs. However, it is still not enough to lift the State's Cease and Desist Order (CDO) – to do so will require one more increment of supply which we expect to be in the form of an expansion of Pure Water Monterey. The expansion project is expected to be approved by the California Public Utilities Commission this summer and be built and operational in 2024. The District has calculated that the expansion will produce approximately three times the water required to meet the 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle RHNA goals within the District's jurisdiction. The attachment shows the District's calculation of water required for RHNA goals.

The CDO is issued by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and is directed to California American Water Company (Cal-Am). Ordering paragraph 15 (p.27) states:

“15. The conditions of this Order, WR 2009-0060 and State Water Board Order 95-10 shall remain in effect until (a) Cal-Am certifies, with supporting documentation, that it has obtained a permanent supply of water that has been substituted for the water illegally diverted from the Carmel River and (b) the Deputy Director for Water Rights concurs, in writing, with the certification.”

Thus, the process of lifting the CDO starts with a discretionary action of Cal-Am and requires a response from the SWRCB. One can reasonably assume that Cal-Am could provide certification at, or shortly before, start-up of the new expansion water supply. The SWRCB response could take 2-3 months. The State Water Board staff has indicated that it may favorably consider a request by the District if Cal-Am fails to act.

In the meantime, the District has been working with State regulators, local jurisdictions, and housing advocates on interim solutions to provide some water for near-term housing needs. Hopefully, such interim efforts will bear fruit soon.

Mayor Roberson  
Page 2 of 2  
June 13, 2022

We thank you for taking the time to contact us and encourage you to share this information with your City Council.

Sincerely,

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "David J. Stoldt". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "D" and "S".

David J. Stoldt  
General Manager  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

## 2023-2031 Draft RHNA Goals by Local Jurisdiction\*

	Monterey	Pacific Grove	Carmel-by-the-Sea	Sand City	Seaside	Del Rey Oaks	TOTAL
Total Allocation	3,654	1,125	349	260	616	184	6,188
Very Low (30.0%)	1,177	362	113	59	86	60	1,857
Low (19.6%)	769	237	74	39	55	38	1,212
Moderate (14.2%)	462	142	44	49	156	24	877
Above Moderate (36.2%)	1,246	384	118	113	319	62	2,242

\*: Does not include unincorporated Monterey County, which might be 10-15 additional AFY to full build-out

## Estimated Water to Meet RHNA Goals

	TOTAL RHNA GOAL	Water Required (AFA)	Factor Used
Very Low	1,857	175	0.0945 AFA (multi-family)
Low	1,212	115	0.0945 AFA (multi-family)
Moderate	877	120	0.13725 (half single-family/half multi-family)
Above Moderate	2,242	340	0.1515 (2/3 single-family/1/3 multi-family)
<b>Total Allocation/Water Required</b>	<b>6,188</b>	<b>750</b>	

Multi-family factor = equal portions of 1 BR/1 BA and 2 BR/2 BA = 0.0945 AF  
 Single-family factor = 0.18 AF