

**SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR ITEM 8
CONSIDER APPLICATION TO CREATE SEPTEMBER RANCH WDS**

**Comments and Requests Received on November 19, 2012 Agenda Package
Today's Date: November 19, 2012 at 3:00 PM**

APPLICANT:

The applicant had a variety of requests regarding the staff report, findings and conditions of approval as noted below. See Supplemental Exhibit 8-S-1 for revisions to Findings and Conditions.

Staff Report, pg.17 of board packet, first full paragraph: Applicant requested a description of how the 57.21 AFY was determined by the County. Appendix C, Chapter 5 of the 2006 Draft EIR described how the 57.21 AFY value was originally derived, summarized as follows:

Market Rate Houses	73 homes x 0.5 AFY= 36.50 AFY
Other Housing	22 homes x 0.231 AFY= 6.83 AFY
Landscape Irrigation	7.17 AFY
Subtotal	50.50 AFY
Equestrian Center	3.00 AFY
System Losses	3.71 AFY
TOTAL	57.21 AFY
	No pasture irrigation in future

The demand estimate portion of the 2006 Final EIR was required to be recirculated by the Superior Court. The water rights and impact sections were deemed to be adequate.

Page 17 of the Nov. 19, 2012 board packet, first full paragraph, describes how the estimated value changed slightly over time. The August 2009 Draft Revised Water Demand Estimated calculated 55.798 AFY production, based on District worksheets and calculation formulas, along with losses due to water treatment and transmission (Exhibit 8-K on page 97 of packet). The estimated use by September Ranch residences was also compared to actual use by homes in similar developments. In August 2010, the Final Revised Water Demand Analysis incorporated MPWMD's 2009 comments and estimated total production at 56.978 AFY. MPWMD concurred with this revision. Given that average estimates are not perfect predictors of future use, the small difference between 56.978 and 57.21 AFY (0.4% difference), and that the 2006 Final EIR had already evaluated impacts of 57.21 AFY production (as confirmed by the Superior Court), the 57.21 AFY amount was used in the Monterey County approval documents. The attached table (Exhibit 8-S-2) is from page 26 of the August 2009 Draft Revised Water Demand Estimate report, which basically shows how the 57.21 AFY would be divvied up. A total of 48.9 AFY was estimated for water deliveries (as compared to 47.69 AFY using District worksheet calculations), then 10% treatment loss and 7% system losses were added, resulting in a total production of 57.213 AFY.

<http://www.mpwmd.dst.ca.us/asd/board/boardpacket/2009/20090921/18/item18.htm>.

RICHARD STOTT:

In an e-mail received 11/19/2012, Mr. Stott expressed opposition to connecting September Ranch to California American Water (Cal-Am). He stated that September Ranch was approved on the condition that the project has its own water supply, and the project should not be allowed to take water from the Cal-Am system.

Both Monterey County and MPWMD Conditions of Approval prohibit service by Cal-Am and disconnection of any current Cal-Am water meters. The only exception is that MPWMD rules allow homes within the Cal-Am service area to set a special standby meter to be used only in a fire emergency to serve sprinklers in the ceiling of the structures.

SANDRA SCHACHTER:

In an e-mail received 11/19/2012, Ms. Schachter encouraged the Board to direct Cal-Am to disconnect the entire Ranch project from any Cal-Am connections. She expressed concern that if the September Ranch WDS ran out of water, Cal-Am would be obligated to provide it after the fact if there are connections, similar to the Carmel Valley Ranch situation. She is concerned that the development may eventually take water that they should not rightfully have.

As noted above, both Monterey County and MPWMD Conditions of Approval prohibit service by Cal-Am and disconnection of any current Cal-Am water meters. The only exception is that MPWMD rules allow homes within the Cal-Am service area to set a special standby meter to be used only in a fire emergency to serve sprinklers in the ceiling of the structures.

The District Board may wish to consider prohibition of any Cal-Am water service, even in a fire emergency. This would address the above concerns but also could hinder fire-fighting capabilities in a major blaze, which could jeopardize the safety of citizens in Carmel Valley. The District Board may also wish to consider the concept of requiring the applicant to initiate proceedings before the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to de-annex September Ranch from the Cal-Am service area if there is a concern that Cal-Am may end up serving the subdivision if the September Ranch WDS fails. It is noted that the September Ranch water source is more alluvial in nature (not fractured rock), which is a relatively productive water-bearing formation. Thus, the risk of failure to meet supply is relatively low.