



Supplement to February 12, 2024 MPWMD Board Packet

Attached are copies of letters sent and/or received between **January 15, 2024** and **February 2, 2024**. These letters are listed in the Monday, February 12, 2024 Board Packet under Letters Received.

Author	Addressee	Date	Topic
Kevin Knapp	MPWMD Board	1/22/2024	Is Carmel River Navigable
Thomas Christensen	Kevin Knapp	1/22/2024	Carmel River is Navigable
Melodie Chrislock	MPWMD Board and David Stoldt	1/26/2024	California regulators want to spend billions to reduce a fraction of water usage

RECEIVED

JAN 22 2024

1-18-24

MPWMD

Monterey Peninsula Water
Management DISTRICT.

I am a board member of
the Robles DEL RIO WATER / MEADOW
COOP. We manage the RIVER lot
in Lower Circle in the Village,
off EL POTRERO. WE ARE
trying to find if the Carmel
River is considered a navigatable
river. I've done some Google
RESEARCH and have found
A VARIETY of DATA BUT NOTHING
definite. If you could
send a definite reference I
WOULD APPRECIATE IT. YOU CAN
E-MAIL IT.

KEVIN KHAPP54@gmail.com

Thank you

Kevin Khapp
25 EL POTRERO
Carmel Valley
CA 93924

~~KEVIN KHAPP54@gmail.com~~
COM

From: [Thomas Christensen](#)
To: KevinKnapp54@gmail.com
Cc: [Sara Reyes](#)
Subject: Carmel River is Navigable
Date: Monday, January 22, 2024 11:52:41 AM
Attachments: [CarmelRiver_Navigable.pdf](#)

Hi Kevin,

Thank you for your letter. The Carmel River is navigable. For more information see attached Public Use Memo from De Lay and Laredo (1992).

In general, this means that once people are in the river they can walk upstream and downstream and sit low next to the river (under ordinary high water). People must get into the river from a public-right-away like a bridge, park or through their own property. A person **can't** park in front of someone's house and walk through the side gate and through the backyard to get to the river (above ordinary high water) without permission. Ordinary high water is a little hard to define, but it's about 5 to 8 feet higher than the low flow summer water surface.

If someone got to the river legally and sat on the sand next to the river on Robles Del Rio property, they have a right to be there, but if they walked through the gate without permission (high above the river) then technically they need to get permission or access the river somewhere else.

I hope this helps.

Thomas

Thomas Christensen, P.G.
MPWMD Environmental Resources Division Manager
P.O. Box 85, Monterey, Ca 93942-0085
831-238-2547 (cell)

Sara Reyes

From: mwchrislock@redshift.com
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2024 4:02 PM
To: Alvin Edwards; Amy Anderson; George Riley; Karen Paull; District 5; Marc Eisenhart; Ian Oglesby; Dave Stoldt; Sara Reyes
Subject: California regulators want to spend billions to reduce a fraction of water usage (Dan Walters/CalMatters)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

California regulators want to spend billions to reduce a fraction of water usage

by [Dan Walters](#) January 26, 2024



María Dolores Díaz, who lives in Fresno County, keeps a bowl in the sink while she washes her hands to save water. Photo by Larry Valenzuela, CalMatters/CatchLight Local

In summary

Household use is a tiny fraction of California's overall water supply, but the state wants to spend billions of dollars to make a tiny reduction in that already infinitesimal bit of water consumption.

Hydrologists measure large amounts of water in acre-feet – an acre of water one-foot deep, or 326,000 gallons.

In an average year, [200 million acre-feet of water fall on California](#) as rain or snow. The vast majority of it sinks into the ground or evaporates, but about a third of it finds its way into rivers. Half of that will eventually flow into the Pacific Ocean.

That leaves approximately 35-40 million acre-feet for human use, with three-quarters being applied to fields and orchards to support the state's agricultural output, and the remaining quarter – 9-10 million acre-feet – being used for household, commercial and industrial purposes.

In other words, nearly 39 million Californians wind up using about 5% of the original precipitation to water their lawns, bathe themselves, operate toilets and cook their food.

That number is important because it is such a tiny amount, even though the state's perennial household water conservation programs imply that taking fewer showers or reducing lawn watering will somehow solve the state's water problems.

The ludicrous nature of those propagandistic appeals is quite evident in the state [Water Resources Control Board's new plan](#) to force local water agencies into cutting household water use even more, no matter the multibillion-dollar cost, and with penalties if they fail to meet quotas.

The water board says the plan, which was authorized by the Legislature in 2018, would reduce household use by 440,000 acre-feet a year when fully implemented. That would be about 5% of current use, which is only about 5% of average precipitation – scarcely a drop in the bucket.

The [plan is drawing some well-reasoned criticism](#) from two independent observers, the Legislative Analyst Office, an arm of the Legislature, and the Public Policy Institute of California, the state's premier think tank.



Environment

California's proposed water conservation rules too stringent and costly, analysts say

by [Rachel Becker](#) January 4, 2024

The LAO, in a [report to the Legislature](#), said the plan “will create challenges for water suppliers in several key ways, in many cases without compelling justifications.”

In essence, the LAO said, local water agencies would have to jump through the state's hoops by spending billions of dollars for a tiny reduction in overall water use that could have an adverse impact on low-income families.

The PPIC is [similarly skeptical](#), summarizing the plan as “very high cost for little benefit.” PPIC fellows David Mitchell and Ellen Hanak also pointed out its effects on low-income communities and the difficulty it would impose on local governments' programs to plant and maintain trees as a shield against hot summer weather.

California does indeed have a water supply problem, mostly because its political leaders for decades have failed to expand the state's water infrastructure that had been built during the mid-20th century.

Household use is not the problem. It cannot be because it is such a tiny part of the overall water picture and actually has declined, in relative terms, as the state's population reached 40 million, more than twice what it was when the last major water works were constructed.

The major mismatch of demand and supply occurs in the two largest categories of water use, agriculture and the environment. Agricultural water agencies and environmental groups have been jousting for decades in the Legislature, in Congress, in courts and in regulatory agencies such as the water board over how much water farmers can draw and how much should remain in rivers to protect habitat for fish and other wildlife.

That's the issue that must be resolved by reallocating existing supplies, building new storage and/or creating new supplies, such as desalination of seawater. Spending billions of dollars to save a few gallons of household water is just an expensive exercise in virtue-signaling that accomplishes virtually nothing.