

**From:** [bdmoore100@aol.com](mailto:bdmoore100@aol.com)  
**To:** [comments](#)  
**Subject:** Item 33 letter to California Coastal Commission  
**Date:** Monday, June 15, 2020 9:38:43 AM

---

Dear Board Members:

I am a homeowner in Monterey. I strongly urge you to write the California Coastal Commission and ask them to deny Cal Am's request for a permit for its desal project.

Among the reasons I urgently request you do this are:

There are now three studies/reports that show that the demand for water can be met with water from the Pure Water Monterey Project and the Expansion of the project combined with other existing sources.

The actual use of water is far less than assumed by the CPUC when it approved Cal Am's desal project. The current demand of about 9,800 AFY is more recent and more reliable than the nearly 14,000 AFY forecast by the CPUC. Cal Am is even using the lower figure in its proposal to the CPUC for yet another rate increase when we already pay more for water here than anywhere else in the nation.

The desal project will exacerbate even further the huge amount of money we pay. It will be more than 6 times as expensive as the PWM and Expansion (\$7,000 per acre foot versus \$2,300 per acre foot).

The PWM Expansion cost is \$2,300 per acre foot versus the Cal-Am Project at \$7,000 per acre foot. Cal-Am's Project will cost an estimated \$1.2 billion over 30 years compared to only \$190 million for the Pure Water Monterey Expansion. We cannot afford the exorbitant cost, and it is especially galling that we would be paying for water we do not need.

People in our community have made it very clear they do not support this hugely expensive, unnecessary desal project which will be very detrimental to our very special environmental conditions. You represent the people in the community, and we rely on you to do the right thing.

In this instance, the right thing is to tell the Coastal Commission your board does not support Cal-Am's desal project and urge it to deny the requested

permit.

Barbara Moore

**From:** [charles mendez](#)  
**To:** [comments](#)  
**Subject:** Letter to coastal commission  
**Date:** Sunday, June 14, 2020 5:42:30 PM

---

Hello. I support that you send the drafted letter 33-B in support of the PWN version. We do not want or need a huge Desal plant that will force the Cal Am customers pay more than 1.2 billion dollars ++. PWN will solve the overdraft of the Carmel river with plenty of water at a fraction of the cost to the consumers. Don't let the few elected officials, which do not include thousands of the customers who don't even have a voice in the matter, that support the Cal Am plan force this Desal plant. Thank you for your time.

Charles Mendez  
Del Rey Oaks

**From:** [Doane Hoag](#)  
**To:** [comments](#)  
**Subject:** Cal Am coastal permit for desalination  
**Date:** Sunday, June 14, 2020 7:05:51 PM

---

I strongly oppose the Cal Am desalination plant. Please advise the **Coastal Commission to deny the Coastal Development Permit for California American Water Company's** proposed desalination facility. We have a more than adequate alternative in the PWM recycle plant and expansion will take care of the coastal needs without the tremendous expense and environmental hazards a desalination plant will present.

R. Doane Hoag  
3268 Camino del Monte  
Carmel, CA 93923

**From:** [MWChrislock](#)  
**To:** [Arlene Tavani](#)  
**Subject:** Letter to the Board  
**Date:** Friday, June 12, 2020 11:33:50 AM  
**Attachments:** [PWN - PWM X vs Desal.pdf](#)

---

MPWMD Board members,

This is PWN's response to the May 8th letter from SWRCB Executive Director Eileen Sobeck which appeared to pressure the Coastal Commission on Cal Am's behalf. Her letter ignored the PWM Expansion as the more feasible solution of ending the illegal diversions from the Carmel River.

Over the past two weeks, more than 50 individuals sent their own unique letters to the SWRBC and those copied below.

Melodie Chrislock



May 27, 2020

Mr. Joaquin Esquivel, Chair  
Board of Directors  
State Water Resources Control Board

Re: SWRCB Position on Monterey Peninsula Water Supply

Dear Chair Esquivel and Directors,

Many of Public Water Now's 4,000 members have contacted me to complain about the letter your Executive Director Eileen Sobeck sent to the Coastal Commission on May 8, 2020.

Ms. Sobeck was quoted extensively in local papers implying that your agency only sees one solution to meeting the CDO and is pressuring the Coastal Commission to approve Cal Am's desal. Sobeck's public comment at the Coastal Commission last November appeared to reinforce this same attitude.

We are concerned that your board may not have all the facts in this situation. If you only hear from Cal Am, you are certainly not getting the whole story.

Cal Am has had 25 years to solve the problem of overdrafting the Carmel River. But in the last five years, three of our public agencies working together have solved our water shortage with the Pure Water Monterey Project. The attached chart compares this project with Cal Am's desal.

We are deeply concerned that your agency is undermining this sound and environmentally preferred solution in favor of Cal Am's desal. Pure Water Monterey (PWM) is by far the most promising water supply project the Peninsula has had in 25 years. By late summer, Cal Am will be able to draw this water from storage in the Seaside Basin. Over 500 AF of the 1,000 AF operating reserve has already been injected. Pure Water Monterey will provide the Peninsula with 3,500 AFY, and its Expansion could add another 2,250 AFY. This would meet the Peninsula's needs for decades to come.

Ms. Sobeck's argument about the continued overdrafting of the Carmel River and the danger to its ecosystem is based on the false assumption that Pure Water Monterey and its Expansion cannot meet the Peninsula's long-term demand. This is not true. We were surprised to hear NOAA echoing these same mistaken assumptions at the March Coastal Commission meeting.

Three current water supply and demand reports have all confirmed that the Pure Water Monterey expansion of 2,250 AF is enough water for growth and development for 30 years. All three agree. Can they all be wrong? Why does Ms. Sobeck continue to quote outdated information from the CPUC? That data is from 2007 to 2016, and it never looked at how fast growth and development would actually absorb a new water supply. Please review all of the current

reports.

Water demand on the Peninsula has dropped radically. We don't need 14,000 AFY. Our five-year average demand is 9,825 AF. Building a desal plant to provide water that won't be needed for 30 to 50 years is a bad idea. Cal Am's desal is not in the public interest.

Cal Am and its supporters in the business community still want desal at all costs, literally. They will tell you Pure Water Monterey has problems. It doesn't. PWM engineers are in the anticipated process of fine-tuning this innovative project. Four deep injection wells were in the original PWM plans, but only two were built to keep costs down. To meet its maximum injection potential, one more deep well may be needed.

The difference in cost between the two projects is staggering. Over 30 years, Cal Am's desal would cost an estimated \$1.2 billion. The Pure Water Monterey Expansion would cost \$190 million. We can solve our water shortage for \$1 billion less with the PWM Expansion. On the Monterey Peninsula, where people pay hundreds, sometimes thousands of dollars a month for water, this is crucial to the community's economic wellbeing.

Cal Am is oblivious to the public interest. Its only goal is to increase its capital investments and shareholder return with its 9.2% return on this desal plant. It does not make money on conservation or public projects, so it prefers capital investments. But Cal Am has already driven our water costs through the roof. They are the highest in the nation, and this desal would double our water bills.

Cal Am has been manipulating this situation. The supplemental EIR for the PWM Expansion was not certified by the Monterey One Board. This was not because the project is infeasible, but because of Cal Am's pressure and promises to the Board. This was an EIR for the expansion of an already approved and operating project. No deficiencies were found. There were no environmental reasons not to certify it.

But Cal Am did not want it certified, so they asked the Monterey One Board to

reject it. Now they are using this to claim the project is not feasible.

Politics are the problem here. The vote was close, 11 to 10, to deny certification of the SEIR.

Those voting against certification were the Salinas Valley interests. They don't have to pay for this desal, and they don't receive water from the Pure Water Monterey project.

But they receive something else. Cal Am plans to give Ag interests in Castroville desalinated water from the project for \$110 an acre-foot and charge Cal Am ratepayers the real cost, about \$7,000 AF. This highly subsidized water is the only reason the SEIR was not certified.

Ag interests on the M1W Board don't want the Expansion to replace Cal Am's desal. They wouldn't get the cheap water they've been promised. Their goal is to make the Expansion look infeasible to the Coastal Commission and to you, even if it means discrediting their own innovative project.

This is an outrageous situation. Why should the Peninsula pay \$1.2 billion for a desal plant we don't need to solve a seawater intrusion problem we didn't create.

But this is how Cal Am operates. This is why voters want them gone. We had no say in this desal. We never voted for it.

The solution to meet the CDO and lift the moratorium is the Expansion of Pure Water Monterey. This could happen much sooner than desal. But Cal Am is blocking the PWM Expansion because it knows that it would eliminate the need for its proposed desal project.

Cal Am refuses to sign a WPA for the 2,250 acre-feet from the PWM Expansion. They are essentially holding our water supply hostage.

We hope you understand that Cal Am is the reason the Peninsula has not met



the CDO. They are the ones to blame for their failures, not the Coastal Commission and not our community.

Recycled water is the future of water for California according to your own policy. We hope you will contact Monterey One and talk with their staff. Perhaps come and see this amazing project for yourselves. Our community is very excited to have a cost-effective, environmentally sustainable solution to meet our long-standing water shortage and our long term needs.

The good news is that the Pure Water Monterey project currently in operation will leave us only 800 AFY short of complying with the CDO on December 2021. And while neither the PWM Expansion nor Cal Am's proposed desal will be built by then, the Expansion can produce the needed 800 AF much sooner than desal.

Please let the Coastal Commission do its job without pressure or interference. We ask you to support the best option to meet the CDO, not the one Cal Am is selling you. We ask you to remain neutral and look at the facts and the science.

Sincerely,

Melodie Chrislock, Managing Director

**PUBLIC WATER NOW**

<http://www.publicwaternow.org>

[mwchrislock@redshift.com](mailto:mwchrislock@redshift.com)

cc:

Eileen Sobeck, California Water Boards

Jennifer Epp, California Water Boards

Michael Lauffer, California Water Boards

Steven Westhoff, California Water Boards

John Ainsworth, Coastal Commission

Tom Luster, Coastal Commission

Alison Dettmer, Coastal Commission

Steve Padilla, Chair, Coastal Commission  
Dayna Bochco Coastal Commission  
Effie Turnbull-Sanders, Coastal Commission  
Dr. Caryl Hart, Coastal Commission  
Sara Aminzadeh, Coastal Commission  
Donne Brownsey, Coastal Commission  
Linda Escalante, Coastal Commission  
Mike Wilson, Coastal Commission  
Carole Groom, Coastal Commission  
Katie Rice, Coastal Commission  
Erik Howell, Coastal Commission  
Roberto Uranga, Coastal Commission  
Thomas Gibson, California Natural Resources Agency  
Mark Gold, California Natural Resources Agency  
Scott Morgan, Department of Water Resources  
David Sandino, Department of Water Resources  
Mathew Dumloa, Office of Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis

**From:** [Michael Baer](#)  
**To:** [Arlene Tavani](#)  
**Subject:** letter from Baer on Item #33  
**Date:** Saturday, June 13, 2020 10:59:41 AM

---

Dear Chair Edwards and MPWMD Board members,

I am writing to you about item 33, the choice to send one letter, or its opposite, or neither.

The idea of sending a letter of support for CalAm's desal plant, 1) in the wake of measure J's results and your legal obligation to pursue its feasibility, 2) in the wake of your May 18 vote to adopt the water supply and demand analysis of your executive, and 3) in the wake of your potential legal wrangling with M1W on non-adoption of its FEIR that you invested \$750,000 on, borders on the absurd.

Plus, it is obviously not reflective of the views of the majority of your board members. That draft letter (33-A) also references 2012 as the point at which the board supported the desal plant, and ignores the drastically shifting landscape on the water demand and supply situation in the intervening years.

So the question really is whether to endorse denial of the coastal permit or remain neutral.

Rather than focus *solely* on the water supply issues with your support for Pure Water Monterey expansion (which is not actually before the Commission), I think it is imperative to include arguments about water rights, specifically the lack of them in this case. This is pertinent to your purview in light of potential eminent domain proceedings. Just as CalAm does not have the water rights to pursue its desal dreams, neither does the water district. It behooves you to take this opportunity to get on the record in support of water rights law. Allegedly, we are a nation of laws, and this is your chance to reaffirm that view to the world.

Choosing to do nothing is a mistake in my view. It implies your disinterest in the proceeding. If your Board chooses not to take a side, I still feel a letter is in order, expressing your support of the Commission and its staffs deliberate and hard work on the issue, and that you are watching the proceeding with interest.

Finally, I suggest an edit to any draft letter. Both letters use "I" rather than "we." You are a board, a collective, hence "we" is the appropriate term.

Thanks to you all for your service to the community. Stay safe in the time of covid.

Regards,

Michael Baer

## Letter from Monterey County Elected Leaders to the State Water Resources Control Board

June 11, 2020

Joaquin Esquivel, Chair  
Board of Directors  
State Water Resources Control Board

Dear Chair Esquivel and Board Members:

As elected leaders in Monterey County, it is our responsibility to advocate for the economic and environmental well-being of our citizens. We were concerned to read the letter from your Executive Director, Eileen Sobeck, to the California Coastal Commission that made several statements that need correction in regard to California American Water's proposed desalination plant.

We write to express our concerns about why this desalination plant is not the right solution for our region and should be set aside in favor of our Pure Water Monterey facility.

We support timely compliance with the SWRCB's Cease and Desist Order (CDO) on the Carmel River. Expansion of the Pure Water Monterey (PWM) recycling plant is the fastest way to meet the CDO. Cal-Am's desalination plant is not needed to meet the Peninsula's water demand and is rife with legal and environmental complications that will only further delay compliance.

Our PWM plant has now been celebrated by both the Newsom Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency for its innovative treatment of agricultural and municipal wastewater and its use of on-site landfill gas. PWM also comports with the SWRCB's policy to maximize water recycling in California.

### **The Pure Water Monterey is easily capable of meeting water demand on the Monterey Peninsula.**

The CPUC's 2018 decision to approve Cal-Am's desalination plant was based on antiquated data from 2007 to 2016 that assumed a demand of 14,000 acre-feet per year for the Monterey Peninsula.

Yet three recent studies and reports by local public agencies show the Monterey Peninsula's real water demand over the last five years is 9,825 AFY. These reports confirm that expanding Pure Water Monterey's current yield of 3,500 AFY by 2,250 acre feet would provide ample water to eliminate illegal diversions from the Carmel River and meet demand for at least 30 years.

In order to justify building a desalination plant that would yield an additional 6,200 AFY and over \$100 million in corporate profits, Cal-Am has disputed the 9,825 AFY demand figure. Yet in Cal-Am's current General Rate Case before the CPUC, Cal-Am's David Mitchell testified that our demand would be 9,338 AF in 2021, 9,478 AF in 2022, and 9,610 AF in 2023.

Despite the overwhelming evidence that the 14,000 AFY estimate is grossly inaccurate, Ms. Sobeck wrote,

"Even though actual water use within Cal-Am's Monterey District service area in recent years has been lower than the Public Utilities Commission's estimated current demand, State Water Board staff does not have a basis for concluding that the Public Utilities Commission's prior analysis and determinations regarding the water demand, sizing, reliability, or diversity of supply were unreasonable, invalid, or outdated."

Such a conclusion suggests an unfortunate bias in favor of a project that our constituents do not need and cannot afford. After the Coastal Commission staff recommended denial of Cal-Am's desalination permit last November, Cal-Am and its allies launched a sabotage campaign to derail the expansion of Pure Water Monterey.

Unfortunately, Ms. Sobeck's letter was recently used by Cal-Am and its allies on the Monterey One Water board as arguable rationale for their ongoing effort to deny approval of the final SEIR for the PWM expansion. Despite their efforts, we remain confident that the PWM Expansion will be approved.

We urge the Board to seriously consider the devastating consequences that an unnecessary desalination plant would have on the people and the environment of the Monterey Peninsula.

Environmentally, Cal-Am's desal plant would destroy 7 acres of Marina's beautiful coastal dunes. This desal plant would use a massive 38,000-megawatt hours of power from PG&E and become the region's largest emitter of greenhouse gases on the coast at a time when climate change is getting worse. The plant also creates gross environmental injustice for the lower-income, predominantly minority communities of Marina and Seaside.

Groundwater rights issues have not been addressed. Cal-Am's desalination plant would draw up to 17,300 AFY from the already overdrafted Salinas Valley Groundwater Basin. Under the SGMA definition of groundwater, most of the desal's source water is groundwater. Cal Am has no legal right to this water and the Agency Act prohibits exportation of groundwater from the Basin. Moreover, the project will - by design - exacerbate seawater intrusion, which endangers Marina's long-term water supply. It will also lower groundwater levels in the Dune Sand Aquifer, adversely impacting groundwater dependent ecosystems in the project area, including Coastal wetlands.

Economically, Cal-Am's desal would cost \$1.2 billion over 30 years compared to \$190 million for the Pure Water Monterey Expansion. Constructing and financing the desalination plant would double water bills when our constituents already pay some of the highest water bills in the nation. This increase would make the cost of living and doing business here unaffordable and would undoubtedly force residents and small businesses to leave our region. And this would make economic recovery from Covid-19 even more difficult.

Because of all these potential obstacles our local public agencies, despite Cal-Am, have worked together to solve our water supply problem with the Pure Water Monterey project and its proposed Expansion.

As it currently stands, Cal-Am only needs an additional 800 AFY to fully comply with the Cease and Desist order and the Seaside Basin overdraft payback. The additional 2,250 AFY from the Pure Water Monterey Expansion can easily provide this. Spending \$1.2 billion for a desal plant is not warranted.

All that stands in the way of the Expansion of Pure Water Monterey is Cal Am's refusal to sign a Water Purchase Agreement. The CPUC has the power to move this solution forward by requiring Cal-Am to purchase the necessary replacement water from the Pure Water Monterey Expansion. Problem solved.

We urge your agency to support this solution.

Respectfully,

*Senator Bill Monning, California State Senate, District 17*  
*Assemblymember Mark Stone, California State Assembly, District 29*  
*Jane Parker, Monterey County Supervisor District 4*  
*Clyde Roberson, Mayor of Monterey*  
*Ian N. Oglesby, Mayor of Seaside*  
*Bruce Delgado, Mayor of Marina*  
*Alison Kerr, Mayor of Del Rey Oaks*  
*Jason Campbell, Seaside City Council*  
*Jon Wizard, Seaside City Council*  
*Jenny McAdams, Pacific Grove City Council*  
*Tyller Williamson, Monterey City Council*  
*Alan Haffa, Monterey City Council*  
*Jeff Baron, Carmel City Council*  
*Tom Moore, Marina Coast Water District Board, President*  
*Jan Shriner, Marina Coast Water District Board, Vice President*  
*Matthew Zefferman, Marina Coast Water District Board*  
*Lisa A. Berkley, Marina City Council*  
*Gail Morton, Marina City Council, Mayor Pro Tem*  
*Regina Gage, Salinas Valley Memorial Hospital Board, Vice President*

Cc:

Eileen Sobeck, California Water Boards  
Jennifer Epp, California Water Boards  
Michael Lauffer, California Water Boards  
Steven Westhoff, California Water Boards  
John Ainsworth, Coastal Commission  
Tom Luster, Coastal Commission  
California Coastal Commission  
California Public Utilities Commission  
Wade Crowfoot, California Natural Resources Agency  
Mark Gold, California Natural Resources Agency  
Thomas Gibson, California Natural Resources Agency  
Scott Morgan, Department of Water Resources  
David Sandino, Department of Water Resources  
Mathew Dumloa, Office of Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis  
Jennifer Lucchesi, State Lands Commission  
Jared Blumenfeld, California Environmental Protection Agency





**From:** [Peggy Brown](#)  
**To:** [comments](#)  
**Subject:** Item #33 6/15 Board Meeting  
**Date:** Sunday, June 14, 2020 5:11:07 PM

---

Dear All,

As 20 year residents of Seaside and ratepayers to Cal-Am, we strongly urge you to send a letter to the CCC denying Cal-Am's Desal project. My family and neighbors would rather support an environmentally safer and less expensive alternative source for our water. Thank you for your consideration.

Scott and Peggy Brown  
Seaside, Ca

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

**From:** [Renee Franken](#)  
**To:** [comments](#)  
**Subject:** Item 33 on Agenda  
**Date:** Sunday, June 14, 2020 4:31:34 PM

---

Dear Board Members,

I am urging the board to send a letter to the California Coastal Committee that asks the CCC to deny Cal Am's request for a permit for its desal project. As you have heard all the arguments before, I will keep it brief.

1. The need for water over the next 30 plus years is about 9800 afy and that can be met by existing sources and the expansion of the water reclamation project.
2. The desal project is 6 times as expensive as the expansion of the water reclamation project.
3. The desal proposal by Cal AM will have major detrimental environmental effects which the water reclamation project does not.
4. Using the water produced by the water reclamation project, will allow our area to meet the State's Cease and Desist Order. The approval of the desal project is not required.
5. The rate payers of this area are already laboring under the highest water rates in the country. Approval of the proposed desal plant will double those rates.

There is time to evaluate whether any sort of desal project will be necessary for the Peninsula in the future. Don't saddle us with a \$1.2 billion monstrosity that is not needed.

Sincerely,

Renee Franken

**From:** [Troy Ishikawa](#)  
**To:** [comments](#)  
**Subject:** June 15, 2020 MPWMD Meeting Agenda #33  
**Date:** Monday, June 15, 2020 1:23:19 PM

---

Dear MPWMD Board:

I support MPWMD board to send a letter to the CCC recommending Agenda #33-B draft. The MPWMD board should recommend to the CCC to support Pure Water Monterey Expansion project. These are five reasons NOT to support desal.

- 1) Cal-Am does not have secure ground water rights to pump from an overdrafted sub-basin.
- 2) Cal-Am cannot legally export water from another district's water source according to the Monterey County Water Resources Agency Act.
- 3) The proposed pumping would violate a 1996 Annexation Agreement and groundwater mitigation framework for Marina area lands which limits CEMEX pumping to 500 AFY.
- 4) The project wells are designed to increase seawater intrusion which is inconsistent with the Central Coast Water Resources Control Board Basin Plan prohibition on deliberate contamination of groundwater.
- 5) The proposed slant well pumping is inconsistent with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) because it would deplete groundwater quantity and further degrade groundwater quality by increasing seawater intrusion.

Finally, the PWM Expansion project does no harm to Marina's groundwater. The PWM Expansion project benefits ratepayers into supporting a superior environmentally and cost savings project already pumping recycled water into the Seaside Basin.

Sincerely,

Troy Ishikawa  
Carmel, CA

**From:** [wiskoff@aol.com](mailto:wiskoff@aol.com)  
**To:** [comments](#)  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT ITEM #33  
**Date:** Sunday, June 14, 2020 3:10:18 PM

---

Chair Alvin Edwards and the Board of Directors  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

Dear Chair Edwards and Directors:

As 33-year California American Water ratepayers, we urge you encourage the California Coastal Commission to **DENY** a permit for Cal Am's proposed desalination facility.

**WE SUPPORT** the Pure Water Monterey Expansion for all the reasons stated in your own letter #33-B (reproduced below), and we urge you to send this letter to the California Coastal Commission.

Sincerely,

Karen & Martin Wiskoff  
Monterey, California

-----  
Via email: [John.Ainsworth@coastal.ca.gov](mailto:John.Ainsworth@coastal.ca.gov)

**RE: Application No. 9-19-0918 and Appeal No. A-3-MRA-19-0034 (California American Water Company)**

Dear Mr. Ainsworth:

On behalf of the Board of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District, I am writing to encourage the California Coastal Commission to deny the Coastal Development Permit for California American Water Company's proposed desalination facility.

- Pure Water Monterey (PWM) expansion is a feasible alternative to the desalination facility. PWM is an advanced water purification facility that is already producing water for potable supply. The expansion could be constructed in approximately 20 months.
- PWM expansion has less adverse environmental impact than the proposed desalination facility, and no new construction in the coastal zone.
- PWM expansion is more than sufficient to lift the Cease and Desist Order in our community. Based on the most recent pumping and demand history, only approximately 800 acre-feet per year (afy) of new supply is required to do so – at 2,250 afy PWM expansion is more than sufficient.
- Based on the report titled "*Supply and Demand for Water on the Monterey Peninsula*" adopted by the District on May 18, 2020, PWM expansion provides a new water supply sufficient to meet the future needs of the Peninsula for the next 20 to 30 years.
- While both proposed water supply projects meet the current and future needs of the Peninsula, PWM expansion will save the ratepayers approximately \$1 billion compared to desalination over a 30-year lifecycle.

Desalination can be looked at for providing the next increment of water needed on the Peninsula, and perhaps regionally, somewhere down the road when additional supplies appear to be required.

Thank you for your consideration of the District's position.

Sincerely,

The Board of Directors  
Monterey Peninsula Water Management District