



EXHIBIT 1-A

DRAFT MINUTES Water Demand Committee of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District August 6, 2020

Call to Order

The virtual meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm via WebEx.

Committee members present: Alvin Edwards, Chair
Gary Hoffmann
George Riley

Committee members absent: None

Staff members present: David Stoldt, General Manager
Stephanie Locke, Water Demand Division Manager
Arlene Tavani, Executive Assistant

District Counsel present: David Laredo

Comments from the Public: No comments.

Action Items

- 1. Consider Adoption of July 2, 2020 Committee Meeting Minutes**
On a motion by Riley and second of Hoffmann, minutes of the July 2, 2020 committee meeting were adopted on a unanimous vote of 3 – 0 by Riley, Hoffmann and Edwards.

Discussion Items

- 2. Update on Water for Near-Term Housing Needs Initiative**
Stoldt presented the PowerPoint viewed by the Policy Advisory Committee on August 4, 2020. He responded to questions from the committee. Directors comments were as follows. (a) The allocation numbers presented were sufficient, the District should move ahead without modifications. (b) Concern expressed that the Carmel River was overdrafted. The SWRCB allowed California-American Water to exceed the legal water right, and this proposal would be yet another request to exceed allowable diversions and continue ongoing damage to the Carmel River resources. (c) If this effort was not successful, suggest that pressure be placed on the SWRCB to answer questions regarding Condition 2 of the Cease and Desist Order (CDO).

Stoldt made the following statements in response to questions from the committee. A permanent water supply could be developed within 30 months, and the proposed 75 acre-feet allocation was more than could be used by the jurisdictions in that time based on the pre-2009 growth rates of approximately 16 acre-feet per year. Water production was 3,600 acre-feet below that recorded in 2009. The District would not be requesting that the effective diversion limit be raised. The request to the SWRCB would be to recognize that water production was above the effective diversion limit, but nevertheless, due to health and safety concerns the District would propose to

utilize 2% of the conservation savings achieved for housing until a water project is complete. Counsel Laredo stated that the District must exhaust all administrative remedies before it could take legal steps to obtain action from the SWRCB on Condition 2 of the CDO. If the SWRCB did approve the request, it would likely impose a myriad of conditions specifying the types of projects the water could be allocated to.

Public Comment: **(1) Ande Flower**, Principal Planner for the City of Monterey, thanked the Water Demand Committee and staff for expressing solidarity with the City to be a frontrunner in development of affordable housing for the region. She stated that based on her discussions with developers and architects, the City of Monterey could use most or all of the anticipated allocation. She urged the District to request that the SWRCB allow the donation of water credits from property owners to the City for meaningful allocation. **(2) John Tilley** requested that a hydrologic analysis be conducted to show that this proposal would not decrease Carmel River streamflow. He stated the District’s reliance on the SWRCB to grant the community an increase in water production signaled that the agency was not doing its job of providing a long-term sustainable water supply and protecting water resources. He urged the District to support development of the Cal-Am desalination project. **(3) Kim Cole**, Community Development Director for the City of Monterey, reported that the City Council had identified sites for 100% affordable housing projects. She expressed support for the District’s effort to exhaust discussions with the SWRCB regarding Condition No. 2. **(4) Luke Coletti** asked a series of questions: if the proposal is approved, who would be the gatekeeper of the new allocation; who would determine the meaning of “affordable” housing project; and how would Condition 2 apply to projects that would be identified as not affordable.

3. Suggest Items to be Placed on Future Agendas

Provide an update on installation of a new CIMIS station in Carmel Valley.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 pm.