

DRAFT MINUTES
Water Demand Committee
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
June 8, 2004

Committee members present: Larry Foy (Chair)
Kristi Markey
David Pendergrass

Committee members absent: None

District staff present: Fran Farina, General Manager
Stephanie Pintar, Water Demand Manager
Arlene Tavani, Executive Assistant

District Counsel present: David C. Laredo

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 PM in the District conference room.

2. Status Reports

A. Report on PAC/TAC Meeting of June 1, 2004

The committee discussed the plan for development of long-term water needs estimates, and agreed with the suggestion that each jurisdiction would provide buildout estimates based on general plans. The District would then apply water use factors to those buildout estimates. Committee members agreed to present this formula for estimating long-term water needs to their governing bodies for approval. Technical Advisory Committee Chair, Diana Ingersol, led a discussion on how the TAC and PAC perceived their roles. Ms. Ingersol later met with the Rules and Regulations Committee and reported to them that the TACs advisory role to the Board is very important and should continue.

B. Report on Implementation of the Expanded Water Conservation and Standby Rationing Plan

Ms. Pintar reported that in May 2004, California American Water (Cal Am) exceeded its monthly water production target for the second time. If water production continues to increase, General Manager Farina will call for establishment of Stage 3 conservation rules as required by the Water Conservation and Standby Rationing Plan. Stage 3 rules require establishment of water budgets for large water users; however, water audits must be completed for 175 to 200 of those properties. Cal Am has not conducted audits for over a year. District staff met with Cal Am staff and offered to assist with completion of the audits. Since the District has only two persons qualified to conduct water audits, the District will probably contract with a firm to carryout the audits, then bill Cal Am for the cost.

3. Action Items

A. Direct Staff on Modifications to Rule 25.5, Water Use Credits, Pertaining to Redevelopment Projects (This is a follow up item from the May 17, 2004 Board Meeting)

The committee agreed 2 to 1 (Markey dissenting) that Ordinance No. 115 should not be amended. However, the committee agreed unanimously that if the full Board determines that the ordinance should be amended, language submitted by District Counsel Laredo at the committee meeting should be inserted into the ordinance, and an initial study should be filed. This item will be placed on the July 2004 Board meeting agenda.

Language submitted by District Counsel Laredo: “Notwithstanding any other provision of Rule 25.5, a Water Use Credit shall not support creation of a new single-family User unless or until an applicant has continuously owned the Site for a period of at least twenty-four (24) months before the date of application. This limitation, however, shall not apply to any Site (a) that is owned, in whole or in part, by any Jurisdiction or by any Redevelopment Agency, or (b) that is subject to an Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (ENA) for purposes of redevelopment, or (c) upon which Affordable Housing or Low Income Housing is constructed.”

Director Markey expressed support for amending Ordinance No. 115. She maintained that the proposed 24-month ownership requirement is a compromise. She would prefer that water transfers between contiguous residential properties only be allowed if the properties involved were owned when the original transfer rules were in effect. She stated that Ordinance No. 115 gives an unfair advantage to persons who own contiguous lots, since water cannot be transferred to non-contiguous lots.

Public Comment: Thomas Jamison, representing DBO Development Company, submitted alternate language for Ordinance No. 115, “Notwithstanding any other provision of Rule 25.5, when the Site contains one existing single-family residence but includes between two and four legal lots zoned for single-family residential, and the Water Use Credit is proposed to be used to build an additional single-family residence on one or more of the legal lots on the Site, the Water Use Credit shall not support the creation of the new single-family User unless or until the Site has been continuously owned by the applicant for a period of at least 24 months from the date of application. This limitation is not intended to apply and shall not apply to any Site that is owned, in whole or in part, by a Jurisdiction or is located, in whole or in part, in a Redevelopment Agency Project Area. In addition, it shall not be construed or applied to prevent the assemblage and use of one or more sites to create affordable housing.”

B. Discuss Baseline Outdoor Water Requirements and Provide Direction to Staff

The committee members agreed that this item should be brought before the Technical Advisory Committee. The committee was interested in finding out from the jurisdictions if they were in compliance with the State of California's Model Local Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance, and also what baseline outdoor water requirements the jurisdictions had established.

Director Markey suggested that the proposal to require the installation of rain sensors in irrigation systems might be implemented soon, so that they are active by October when the rains begin. Another suggestions was that landscape architects, nurserymen and other persons involved in the landscape industry could be invited to meet with PAC and TAC to provide practical information on water conservation measures. Ms. Pintar reported that she made a request to California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo that they conduct a water audit workshop on the Monterey Peninsula so that more local people can be certified to conduct water audits.

Public Comment: Steven Beals suggested that installation of cisterns and drought tolerant landscaping could result in zero outdoor water use. This type of landscape plan might be allowed only by deed restriction if the local jurisdiction agreed to enforce the landscape plan.

4. Set Future Meeting Date

No meeting date was set.

5. Director Comments

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:15 PM