

**Arlene Tavani**

---

**From:** David Beech <dbeech@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Saturday, March 16, 2019 2:08 PM  
**To:** alvinedwards420@gmail.com; rileyforwaterdistrict@gmail.com; Molly Evans; jcbarchfaia@att.net; gqhwd1000@gmail.com; dpotter@ci.carmel.ca.us; district5@co.monterey.ca.us; Dave Stoldt  
**Cc:** Arlene Tavani  
**Subject:** Public Comment for 3/18 Board Meeting

Chair Evans, Directors, and General Manager,

Please accept the following submission relative to the discussion item 19 on the agenda.

While generally supportive of the General Manager's recommendation, and the scopes of work of the consultants, I am concerned that there does not appear to be explicit provision yet for the "written plan" required by Rule 19.8 by the 9-month deadline. The separate work products of the consultants sound as though they will need to be edited into a different work product, the "written plan", and I am not sure that sufficient time has been allowed for this, unless work begins immediately and provides a structure for the consultants' work, and a process for handling interactions between them.

My March 10 letter to the Monterey Herald (below) was submitted under the heading "Written Plan for Cal Am Acquisition", but the editor overrode this with "Acquisition, not feasibility, should be priority", which led a Pacific Grove reader to accuse me of being carefree about spending other people's money, which is far from the case. I want feasibility to be thoroughly evaluated, once the consultants have provided their detailed options. In fact, I want to see the lowest possible initial valuation of Cal Am, and I am hopeful that when the consultants take into account Cal Am's severe deferred maintenance and other liabilities, Cal Am's net value may be found to be less than any estimate so far floated.

Herald letter:

According to Jim Johnson's March 2 article on Water Management District activity, "Stoldt said the feasibility analysis, which is due by the end of July and is expected to be presented to the district board on Aug. 27, is expected to produce a range of public takeover scenarios."

This seems to invert the emphasis of what was approved by voters in Measure J: "The General Manager shall, within nine (9) months of the effective date of this Rule 19.8, complete and submit to the Board of Directors a written plan as to the means to adopt and implement the policy set forth in paragraph A, above. The plan shall address acquisition, ownership, and management of all water facilities and services ..." Feasibility is a subsidiary topic to be addressed since paragraph A qualifies the acquisition policy by "if and when feasible," but it is only part of what is required by the 9-month deadline.

Let us hope that the Directors, in their March 18 meeting, make it clear that they are expecting to receive a full written plan by the deadline, and that the consultants share this understanding.

— *David Beech, Monterey*