

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** Dave Stoldt  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 11:07 AM  
**To:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** FW: feasibility study

More correspondence

**From:** bdmoore100@aol.com <bdmoore100@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 11:05 AM  
**To:** Dave Stoldt <dstoldt@mpwmd.net>  
**Subject:** feasibility study

Dear Mr. Stoldt,

I spoke to you briefly before the board's meeting in Pacific Grove to ask you about the availability of your report and your presentation materials that I saw when I attended the prior meeting in Seaside. I commented at the time that I thought you covered a lot of important points and I wanted to be able to look at them more carefully.

At both meetings I made brief comments. After listening to your presentation a second time and hearing more comments at the meeting in PG, I'd like to clarify or somewhat modify my remarks. Before I do that, I mentioned part of my background at the PG meeting because I hope it may help you and the board put my comments in context. I worked as Senior Legislative Consultant to the Majority Leader in the California State Assembly and was involved in writing significant legislation and getting it passed. Weighing the desirability of various statewide public policies and the financial feasibility of the policies was an important part of my work.

My main comment to you and the Board members was that I think the feasibility and desirability of public water are inextricably intertwined because one is usually willing to pay more for something that is very desirable. Upon further reflection, I also should have said more clearly that the voters have already made it clear that they want public water by passing Measure J by a wide margin. Therefore, the Board should conduct the feasibility study through the lens of trying to implement the desire of the voters by seeing if there is a financially feasible way to move to public water.

Of course, the collection of information and the analysis should be done in a fair, and as transparent, a way as possible. I am not at all suggesting that you or the board would, or should, do anything else. But, I respectfully suggest that the way one approaches the feasibility study does make a difference. I think the most fair approach is to construct and conduct the study in order to determine if there is a way to implement the voters' clear mandate to move from Cal Am to a public water system.

I would appreciate it if you would share my comments with the Board. I would be happy to talk further with you and to respond to your thoughts. Just one last thing, although I would love to see my water bill go down, I do think the Board needs to look at the long term. I cannot imagine that going to public water will not be less costly than continuing with Cal Am.

Barbara Moore