



This meeting is not subject to Brown Act noticing requirements. The agenda is subject to change.

Water Demand Committee Members:
Andy Clarke, Chair
Jeanne Byrne
Molly Evans

Alternate:
Brenda Lewis

Staff Contact
Stephanie Locke
Arlene Tavani

After staff reports have been distributed, if additional documents are produced by the District and provided to the Committee regarding any item on the agenda, they will be made available at 5 Harris Court, Building G, Monterey, CA during normal business hours. In addition, such documents may be posted on the District website at www.mpwmd.net. Documents distributed at the meeting will be made available in the same manner.

AGENDA
Water Demand Committee
Of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

Tuesday, July 10, 2018, 3:30 PM
District Conference Room, 5 Harris Court, Building G, Monterey, CA

Call to Order

Comments from Public - *The public may comment on any item within the District's jurisdiction. Please limit your comments to three minutes in length.*

Presentations -- *Public comment will be received.*

1. David Chandler – Update on MPUSD Landscape Water Conservation Projects

Action Items -- *Public comment will be received.*

2. Consider Adoption of April 18, 2018 Committee Meeting Minutes

Discussion Items – *Public comment will be received.*

3. Discuss Rules & Regulations Clean-Up Ordinance
4. Discuss Commercial Water Use Factors
5. Discuss Conservation Offset Program
6. Update from General Manager Stoldt on July 9, 2018 Meeting with State Water Resources Control Board

Set Next Meeting Date

Adjournment

Upon request, MPWMD will make a reasonable effort to provide written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. MPWMD will also make a reasonable effort to provide translation services upon request. Requests should be sent by 5 pm on Friday, July 6, 2018, to the Board Secretary, MPWMD, P.O. Box 85, Monterey, CA, 93942. You may also fax your request to the Administrative Services Division at 831-644-9560, or call 831-658-5600.

U:\staff\Board_Committees\WaterDemand\2018\20180710\July-10-2018-WDC-Agenda.docx

WATER DEMAND COMMITTEE

ITEM: ACTION ITEM

2. CONSIDER ADOPTION OF APRIL 18, 2018 COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Date: July 10, 2018

**From: David J. Stoldt,
General Manager**

Prepared By: Arlene Tavani

CEQA Compliance: This action does not constitute a project as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines section 15378.

SUMMARY: Attached as **Exhibit 2-A** are draft minutes of the July 10, 2018 Water Demand committee meeting.

RECOMMENDATION: The committee should adopt the minutes by motion.

EXHIBIT

2-A Draft Minutes of the July 10, 2018 Water Demand Committee Meeting



EXHIBIT 2-A

DRAFT MINUTES
Water Demand Committee of the
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
April 18, 2018

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 pm in the MPWMD conference room.

Committee members present: Andy Clarke, Chair
Jeanne Byrne
Molly Evans

Committee members absent: None

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

District Council present: No

Comments from the Public: No comments.

Action Items

- 1. Consider Adoption of November 20, 2017 Committee Meeting Minutes**
On a motion by Byrne and second of Evans, minutes of the November 20, 2017 committee meeting were adopted unanimously on a vote of 3 – 0 by Byrne, Clarke and Evans.

Discussion Items

- 2. Discuss Group I and Group II Non-Residential Water Use Factors**
The committee discussed the issue. A summary of their comments is presented here. (a) Group 1 and Group II could be combined under the Group II water use factor because they are likely similar. (b) Combining groups could save staff time and be more equitable for property owners. (c) Could charge a fee to move from a Group I use to a Group II use. (d) Suggest remove “dry cleaner with on-site laundry” from Group II. (e) Develop a stronger definition of “restaurant.” (f) Concerned that water use would increase by allowing a site with the previous use of a futon store to take on a Group II use. (g) Grandfather properties with Group I uses to the Group II factor. (h) Calculate the water use per square foot of a space based on its actual water use, and then compare that to the District’s factor for the use. The savings could be identified and allocated to the change in the factor. (i)

On average, implementation of Best Management Practices at a business with a Group II use will reduce the water use to that of a Group I category.

3. Discuss Conservation Offset Program

The committee reviewed the questions for discussion presented in the staff note. There was consensus regarding the following: (a) Project Specifications: project could be either District or developer designed. (b) Offset or credit ratio: continue with the District practice of allocating 15% of savings to benefit the river and 10% for a District reserve. (c) Permanence: offset benefits should accrue permanently. (d) Additionality: consensus that a project must create new water savings or supply that would not/is not expected to have happened anyway, either through District conservation programs, building code changes, expected customer behavior, etc. (e) An ordinance could be developed and brought to the Board after a determination is made on Condition 2 of Order 2009-0060.

4. Discuss Fire Service Requirement

The committee discussed this item. A summary of their comments follows. (a) Continue with current requirement. (b) Consider a deed restriction along with the current requirement. (c) Develop a waiver (determined by the General Manager) for those circumstances where the optimal installation cannot be implemented.

Set Next Meeting Date: No future meeting date was scheduled.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.

U:\staff\Board_Committees\WaterDemand\2018\20180710\02\Item-2-Exh-A.docx

WATER DEMAND COMMITTEE

ITEM: DISCUSSION

4. DISCUSS COMMERCIAL WATER USE FACTORS

Meeting Date: July 10, 2018 Budgeted: N/A

**From: David J. Stoldt, Program/ N/A
General Manager Line Item No.: N/A**

Prepared By: Stephanie Locke Cost Estimate: N/A

General Counsel Review: N/A

CEQA Compliance: To be determined prior to first reading

Material will be provided for discussion at the meeting. This is a discussion item. No action will be taken by the committee.



State Water Resources Control Board

MAY 17 2018

RECEIVED

MAY 22 2018

MPWMD

Mr. David Stoldt, General Manager
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District
5 Harris Court, Bldg. G
P.O. Box 85
Monterey, CA 93940

Dear Mr. Stoldt:

On March 19, 2018, the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District adopted Resolution 2018-05, purporting to interpret a term in a 2009 State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) Cease and Desist Order (CDO) regarding unlawful diversions from the Carmel River - State Water Board Order WR 2009-0060, Condition 2. The District undertook this action without notifying the State Water Board, and against our request for postponement, which we made after receiving the proposed resolution from a third party during the weekend prior to the District's Monday adoption meeting.

Condition 2 prohibits diversion of Carmel River water for "new service connections or for any increased use of water at existing service addresses resulting from a change in zoning or use" (emphasis added). Resolution 2018-05's interpretation of the italicized language improperly eliminates the Condition's specification of service addresses as the proper unit of measure for increases in use by adopting a "credit/debit/entitlement" system for calculating compliance across different service addresses. Additionally, the resolution's action in purporting to establish the baseline for analysis of a service address's usage as a generalized fixture unit or water use factors method, rather than looking at actual water use, is a strained reading of a requirement that targets increased use at existing service addresses.

As we reminded you prior to adoption, the resolution's interpretation is directly contrary to the State Water Board's formal interpretive letters issued on April 9, 2012 and May 31, 2013.

As you are aware, there have been stalled conversations regarding potential changes to the interpretation of Condition 2. In these conversations, District staff put forth proposals for both a credit/debit/entitlement system and a "capacity for use" baseline, and State Water Board staff indicated that the language and intent of Condition 2 did not permit such an interpretation. The formal interpretation letters of April 9, 2012 and May 31, 2013 specifically reject these interpretations.

Because the resolution would permit distribution of water in a manner contrary to State Water Board Order WR 2009-0060, the resolution creates a substantial threat of violation of the CDO.

MAY 17 2018

Monterey Peninsula Water
Management District

Investigation and prosecution of Condition 2 violations have the potential to distract energy from implementation of a new water supplier on the Peninsula. Staff is surprised and disappointed by this unilateral action. If you would like to meet to discuss a path forward in light of this conflict, please contact Jule Rizzardo at (916) 341-5368 or Jule.Rizzardo@waterboards.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Erik Ekdahl
Deputy Director
Division of Water Rights

EXHIBIT 6-B



May 18, 2018

Mr. Erik Ekdahl
Deputy Director
Division of Water Rights
State Water Resources Control Board
PO Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812

Dear Mr. Ekdahl,

Thank you for your letter dated May 17, 2018 regarding Condition 2 of State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board or Board) Order WR 2009-0060 (CDO.)

The point the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District (District) has been trying to make since 2012 is that the State Water Board staff's interpretation of Condition 2 simply doesn't work. Further, attempts to provide guidance have strayed from the interpretation letters, has been inconsistently applied by Board staff and California American Water Company (Cal-Am), and requires use of protected private data held by Cal-Am that cannot lawfully be shared by Cal-Am to the District or to others. Our community desires clarity and consistency in a fair set of legally implementable rules that are predictable and universal.

District Resolution 2018-05 does not propose a new approach, rather it reinforces a permitting regime that the District, local land use jurisdictions and the public have relied upon since the mid-1980s. The District respectfully asks the Board acknowledge the District's approach is the best method to achieve the CDO's goals.

The District's water use permitting and accounting regime is perhaps the most rigid in the State. When used in combination with our aggressive conservation programs it has resulted in significant reductions in water use since the CDO. We are chagrined Board staff never engaged in an effort or dialogue to better understand the District's Rules and Regulations and its demand management program. It is disappointing that all four State Water Board staff members who had extensive experience with this subject have now retired or moved on prior to achieving a resolution. We look forward to meeting with the new staff to resolve this problem.

There are specific deficiencies in your letter addressed below:

The State Water Board abrogated the interpretation letters of April 9, 2012 and May 31, 2013 at its July 19, 2016 hearing.

At the July 19, 2016 State Water Board hearing, twenty (20) speakers commented that Condition

EXHIBIT 6-B

Mr. Erik Ekdahl

Page 2 of 4

May 21, 2018

2 of Order WR 2009-0060 had not been accurately interpreted by Cal-Am and the State Water Board staff; they argued new guidance was needed to recognize historic property rights and past practice as allowed by District Rules and Regulations. The speakers, as well as State Water Board members, expressed concern that the Board staff interpretation letters of April 9, 2012 and May 31, 2013 were not in the public record and had not been subject to any public review or hearing process. As such, State Water Board Chief Counsel recommended the Board delete Section 5.3.1.5 from the July 15, 2016 draft Order narrative. The motion to adopt the proposed Order was amended to specifically direct deletion of Section 5.3.1.5. This removed any mention of the interpretation letters. The motion also directed State Water Board staff to meet and confer with the parties represented by speakers at the hearing and to report back to the Board within 60 to 90 days from the date of adoption. Since the 2016 hearing, State Water Board staff has failed to provide revised formal guidance on Condition 2 or report to Board members as explicitly required by the motion.

Before Board staff can rely on the letters identified in your May 17, 2018 letter, staff is required to meet with the parties represented at the July 19, 2016 meeting, must also place its interpretations into the public record, and report this action to the Board. Continued reference to the April 2012 letter is flawed as it is contrary to the explicit Board direction contained in the July 19, 2016 motion.

The May 31, 2013 interpretation letter is moot and should no longer be referenced.

The May 31, 2013 letter restated the April 9, 2012 letter, in part, and indicated the Board lacked information to provide additional guidance. The May 31st letter also requested additional information. As such, that letter did not modify the April 9, 2012 position. In light of this modification, the May 31st letter is moot. We ask you to agree that reference to the May 31, 2013 letter is not appropriate.

Changed conditions contradict the basis for the interpretation letters.

The April 9, 2012 letter states: “The intent of Condition 2 is to limit an increase in water consumption from the Carmel River that may be caused by regional or local zoning and land use changes to the conditions that existed at the time of the Order.” That was reiterated in the May 2013 letter. As a result of a steeply-tiered rate structure and a variety of mandatory and voluntary conservation programs, water use is now almost 3,000 acre-feet less than the conditions that existed at the time of the Order. *Is the State Water Board suggesting we can restore use of 3,000 acre-feet for new projects?* Of course not, but strict adherence and literal interpretation of the letter would suggest such a result is possible. We ask the State Water Board acknowledge the changed conditions and recognize it is a combination of District-wide, synergistic programs that have achieved these results.

Past practice by staff and Cal-Am has ignored parts of the interpretation letters.

Reliance on the interpretation letters, as drafted, is problematic. As an example, the Monterey Bay Aquarium met with staff to seek clarification of Condition 2, in order to allow the Aquarium to convert a predominantly vacant building into a learning center. Staff guidance was that the

EXHIBIT 6-B

Mr. Erik Ekdahl

Page 3 of 4

May 21, 2018

building was a commercial use and the renovation would be a commercial use, so therefore there was no “change in use.” However, the April 9, 2012 letter specifically states “Condition 2 prohibits any increased water use at an existing service address that results from a change in zoning or use approved by either MPWMD or a local land use authority...” In this case, MPWMD (the District) has a specific defined term “Change of Use” which includes going from one form of commercial use to another form of commercial use. The reason we do this is to ensure, for example, that a property doesn’t go from a low water use such as an office to a high water use such as a restaurant, without first identifying where that increment of water would come from. In this example, State Water Board staff ignored its own interpretation letter.

Board staff and Cal-Am also invented a rule-of-thumb that a building that was commercial and becomes residential, or vice versa, is a “change in use.” Nowhere in the April 2012 letter is this laid out. In fact, most cities promote mixed use projects in their general plan and have zoning in place where both uses are allowed. We believe decisions to implement Condition 2 should not be made on an ad hoc basis, rather a consistent interpretation is called for.

State Water Board interpretation calls for data that cannot be lawfully obtained.

The April 9, 2012 letter calls for establishing a baseline for past water use using “actual average metered annual water use for a year from the last five years’ of records...” California Public Utilities Commission privacy regulations prohibit third party access to and reliance upon historical water use records by anyone other than the specific account holder. Cal-Am cannot provide such data to prospective building buyers, to subsequent property owners, or even to property owners where the tenant is the account holder. This restriction would also apply to tenants where the owner has a master meter, or to would-be developers. Frankly, Cal-Am cannot provide specific account holder data to the State Water Board or to the District without account holder consent.

State Water Board interpretation is unworkable for permitting new projects or remodels.

It is not possible to look at a set of architectural plans and determine whether the proposed development will or will not use more water than the baseline. At the time a project is granted a permit, future water use is a mere projection or assumption. One can only approximate future water use based on factors reflected in the application, such as the type and scale of a business or the number of water fixtures in a residence. Future water use can only be estimated based on a review of plans. The District has decades of experience estimating demand based on factors (non-residential) and fixtures (residential) that has consistently resulted in projected use (capacity) that does not increase water use above what is available to a site.

Above, I identified just a few of the flaws inherent in the Board’s past guidance. You should not be surprised or disappointed that the District sought to provide clarity and objectivity on this topic based upon its decades of practical experience managing local water supplies. The District’s longstanding system of regulating and permitting water use relies on industry accepted water demand factors and fixture counts. This regulatory system has demonstrated its ability to ensure capacity to use water at a site remains neutral (water neutrality) following each new

EXHIBIT 6-B

Mr. Erik Ekdahl
Page 4 of 4
May 21, 2018

project, renovation, or any change in use at a site. The National Alliance for Water Efficiency has lauded the District's ordinances, rules, and regulations as one of the earliest in the nation to ensure water neutrality in land use permitting – a goal that is consistent with and supportive of Condition 2.

We believe it is incumbent for the parties to meet and develop a consensus. This effort should not be delayed or frustrated by inclusion of third party observers who do not have direct interests at stake; we propose that initial discussions be limited to key institutional parties. I have coordinated potential meeting dates for the District and Cal-Am and have determined we are all available to meet in Sacramento July 9th, 10th, or 13th. Please advise whether you and your staff would like to schedule a meeting on one of those days.

Sincerely yours,



David J. Stoldt
General Manager