

March 24, 2023

To: Tim Maybee President, Rancho Murieta CSD
cc: Directors: Jenco, Booth, Butler, Pohl
cc: Amelia Wilder Rancho Murieta CSD District Secretary
cc: Michael Fritschi Interim General Manager Rancho Murieta CSD

Enclosed are the two sets of questions distributed at the the Saturday, March 18, 2023 CSD Water Meeting. Lisa Maddaus has received a copy of all the questions and copies were distributed to the attendees. I suggested, prior to the CSD meeting, that Michael Fritschi meet with Janis Eckard and I to review our questions. Michael referred me to his facilitator, derailing any detailed water conversation.

Some of our questions were asked by ratepayers from the audience, however, many questions, critical to an accurate water assessment, remain unanswered. Janis and I are open to a meeting with Michael and Ms Maddaus. We expect the developer to enjoy a level of communication with the staff, board and consultant that will significantly exceed what will be made available to the ratepayers. I am sure our interpretation of both the process and data differ widely from that of the development community. We would like to clearly state our concerns prior to meeting with the relevant agencies, boards and public officials.

Please see CSD Policy 90-2 (enclosed). This policy mandates up to a mandatory, 50% level of conservation should the river flow at 1977 levels. We recommend that the board suspend item 2 of this policy before beginning the analysis. The use of a mandatory, 50% conservation as a *District planning tool* is evident in the 2016 Water Supply Assessment. The WSA uses this severe, 50% stage of conservation to justify its conclusions. I quote from that report:

“In the event of prolonged drought conditions, the District would implement their Water Shortage Contingency Plan (WSCP). The Plan provides a framework to address demand curtailment of up to 50 percent within the service area. Per California Water Code, the District has complied with preparing a WSCP down to an assumed 50% reduction in supply.”

It has always been understood that the District must *anticipate* a 50% conservation level and incorporate this contingency in its drought plan. That is not what is at issue here.

Because CSD has incorporated the most severe level of conservation (50%) into our drought planning, the Water Supply Assessment confidently uses Policy 90-2 to justify all of the water connections requested by the developer. Doing so, the Water Supply Assessment virtually guarantees severe conservation in a period of sustained drought and low river flows. In layman's terms, this report implies that CSD will force this level of conservation on its ratepayers, and proceeds to do exactly that. Again I quote from the water supply assessment.

“Therefore, the water demand associated with the proposed project and all foreseeable development could be accommodated during multiple dry years through implementation of the voluntary and possibly mandatory demand reductions.”

The report goes on to say:

“.....the District's water supply, under critically dry conditions and limited to full storage capacity in the first year, is capable of supplying water for a 3 year period under extreme drought conditions (meaning no river diversions possible) as documented below:

Beginning Supply 5,283 AF (full reservoir capacity and recycled water) / 1,714 AF (50% demand cutback at full buildout) = 3.08 years of estimated supply.

The Water Supply Assessment is the document with which CSD notifies the County that the water supply can or cannot support the developer's request for water. By maximizing conservation to its most severe level, allowing no margin of safety and using an expired policy to justify its actions, the District places the entire risk for this project on the backs of the current ratepayers. To say that the report is “developer friendly” is an understatement.

Maddaus uses a “Shared Vision Model” and is capable of evaluating risk based upon many scenarios. These include lowering the total number of connections, changing levels of conservation as a planning tool and

estimating additional water supply by adding water storage. It is capable of testing additional, developer financed infrastructure. The levels of safety revealed in the model should be presented in an open meeting and each model should be reviewed and discussed. After carefully considering its options, a strategy guiding the report should be adopted by the board of directors. This analysis must not support full development as a predetermined conclusion. Use of the model will help eliminate bias and guarantee transparency.

The CSD has never studied the economic impacts of severe conservation. These include its loss of water revenue, the destruction of landscape and parks and the impact on home values should the ratepayers experience an interruption in service. Without this analysis, the district can not fully assess the impact of any conservation model. This is unwise, and is a breach of the boards fiduciary responsibility.

We look forward to a continuing dialog as the analysis moves forward. Success will be measured with a presentation of a draft document that contains no surprises and guarantees development with a consistent level of safety for all the current ratepayers.

Thank you for your time.

John Merchant
Resident
merchant30@gmail.com

RANCHO MURIETA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Category:	Water	Policy # 90-2
Title:	District Water Supply	

PURPOSE

The Rancho Murieta Community Services District Board of Directors, having received and filed the February 9, 1990 report titled "**RANCHO MURIETA WATER SUPPLY: Planning for Future Droughts**" prepared by Giberson & Associates, hereby adopts the following as the **Water Supply Policy**:

FINDINGS

- 1) The District's raw water supply is a rare and precious resource that shall be managed in a prudent and responsible manner.
- 2) The District's Water Supply Reliability Standard shall be as follows:

The District's water supply system shall be designed to:

 - a) Provide normal annual water demands during a water year similar to 1924 without conservation.
 - b) Provide annual water demands during a water year similar to 1977 with a maximum conservation rate of 50%.
- 3) The District's existing raw water supply system, on July 18, 1990, has the capability of serving only 3,951 Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU).
- 4) The Rancho Murieta Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.) allows for approximately 5,968 EDU consisting of not more than 5,189 residential DU and approximately 779 EDU of commercial, industrial and institutional uses.
- 5) The volume of water stored in the District's existing raw water storage reservoirs will be:
 - a) Significantly reduced upon development of 3,951 EDU during normal water years;
 - b) Nearly depleted upon development of 3,951 EDU during a water year similar to 1924; and,
 - c) Totally depleted upon development of 3,951 EDU during a water year similar to 1977.
- 6) The September 19, 1986 Acquisition and Services Agreement requires the lands encumbered by the Agreement to pay the cost of developing additional water sources and storage facilities to serve the Rancho Murieta P.U.D.

POLICIES

- 1) The District will take reasonable and timely steps to plan and develop additional raw water sources and storage capacity to serve the full buildout of the Rancho Murieta P.U.D. (5,968 EDU or such lesser number to which owners of undeveloped land within the District may commit to limit their development) in accordance with contractual and legal obligations.
- 2) Prior to the District making any additional commitment to serve, any applicant whose property is subject to the September 19, 1986 Acquisition and Services Agreement, will be required to participate in a funding mechanism to expand the District's raw water supply system to serve the development.
- 3) The District will give first priority to domestic water needs within the community in the event of a water shortage.
- 4) In the event of a water shortage, the District will give lowest priority water uses such as to:
 - a) Customers that waste water.
 - b) Maintenance of the level of water in the community's lakes for aesthetic purposes.
 - c) Irrigation of landscaped areas.
 - d) Irrigation of agricultural lands, golf courses, etc.
- 5) The District will enforce water conservation measures during a water shortage to reduce customer demands as follows:

DROUGHT EVENT

LEVEL OF CONSERVATION

1924
1977

0%
50%

- 6) The District will provide reclaimed waste water for the irrigation of golf courses in accordance with contractual and legal obligations.
- 7) The District will encourage water conservation programs, including the use of efficient landscape irrigation practices.
- 8) The District will develop a "Drought Contingency Plan" to be instituted by the District during a water shortage.
- 9) In order to preserve the District's water supply, the District may implement other reasonable and prudent measures as deemed necessary by the District Board from time to time.
- 10) The District will enforce the provisions of the September 19, 1986 "Acquisition and Services Agreement" requiring the lands encumbered by the agreement to pay the cost of developing additional water sources and storage facilities to serve the Rancho Murieta P.U.D.

- 11) As the District Board solely deems reasonable and appropriate, this policy may be amended to increase or decrease the allowed issuance's of "will-serve" entitlements, depending on the adequacy and reliability of the District's water supply and the willingness of an applicant to participate in the District's water supply augmentation program. However, the beneficial results of water conservation programs will not be converted into water "will-serve" entitlements for new development except as required by contractual and legal obligations.
- 12) This policy shall be subject to periodic review and modification by the District Board as deemed necessary from time to time.
- 13) Nothing contained within this policy is intended to modify and/or alter the content or meaning of any provision of any contractual or legal obligation of the District.

Approved by CSD Board of Directors	July 18, 1990
---	---------------

2034 Integrated Water Master Plan Meeting

March 18, 2023

Questions Our Community Should Ask

- 1. WILL THE BOARD CONSIDER LOWERING THE SEVERE LEVEL OF CONSERVATION REQUIRED TO SUBSTANTIATE NEW DEVELOPMENT IN PERIODS OF EXTREME DROUGHT?**

- 2. HAS THE BOARD EVER CONDUCTED RESEARCH TO DETERMINE THE IMPACT OF SEVERE CONSERVATION? (DICK BRANDT CALLS THIS LEVEL OF CONSERVATION “SUICIDAL”)**

- 3. IS IT THE DISTRICTS INTENT TO MAXIMIZE DEVELOPMENT TO THE FULL EXTENT THAT DEVELOPMENT CAN BE SUPPORTED BY OUR WATER SUPPLY? IF SO, WHAT DOES THE DISTRICT SEE AS DANGERS IN ACCOMPLISHING THIS OBJECTIVE? IS THERE ANY SAFETY FACTOR THAT WILL BE CONSIDERED?**

- 4. THE 2010 IWMP WAS PERFORMED TO AN “URBAN STANDARD” AS WAS DIRECTED BY ITS BOARD. THE CSD HAS LOWERED THAT STANDARD FOR THIS PLAN TO SAVE MONEY. WHAT IS THE ACTUAL DIFFERENCE IN WHAT WILL BE DONE IN 2023 VS. WHAT WAS DONE IN 2010?**

- 5. WILL THE DISTRICT USE ACTUAL DATA (SEE ATTACHED) TO DETERMINE DEMAND FOR WATER? WE NOW HAVE ACCURATE COUNTS OF THE RESIDENTIAL HOUSES THAT ARE APPROVED OR PENDING COUNTY APPROVAL? THE 2010 REPORT IS BASED LARGELY ON ESTIMATES AND MODELS.**

- 6. WILL THE DISTRICT RE-EVALUATE ACTUAL NON RESIDENTIAL DEMAND (SEE ATTACHED) AND FORECAST THE NON RESIDENTIAL GROWTH BASED ON THESE UPDATED ESTIMATES?**

7. WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF PERMIT 16765 WHICH WAS NOT ISSUED AT THE SAME TIME AS OUR PRIMARY DIVERSION PERMIT (16762). THIS PERMIT CLASSIFIES THE WATER RIGHT FOR LAKE CLEMENTIA AS “RECREATIONAL USE”. IT ALSO IS RESTRICTED TO NON POTABLE USE BY ITS AUTHORIZED BODY CONTACT FOR SWIMMING AND RECREATION.

8. DOES THE DISTRICT BELIEVE THAT IT CAN AUTOMATICALLY CHANGE THE USE OF LAKE CLEMENTIA BY SIMPLY REVOKING THE PUBLIC HEALTH AUTHORIZATION FOR BODY CONTACT? DOES THE DISTRICT BELIEVE THAT IT CAN USE CLEMENTIA’S BACK UP WATER WITHOUT SUBMITTING A REQUEST FOR “CHANGE OF USE” OF PERMIT 16765.

9. EVERY WATER SUPPLY REPORT DONE BY THE DISTRICT HAS SAID THAT CSD NEEDS MORE STORAGE CAPACITY TO PROTECT ITSELF FROM SERVICE INTERRUPTIONS. THIS HAS NEVER BEEN DONE. THE 2016 WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT IGNORED THIS RECOMMENDATION AND TOLD SACRAMENTO COUNTY THAT OUR EXISTING WATER SUPPLY WAS MORE THAN ADEQUATE TO SUPPORT ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT.

10. PERMIT 16762 ALLOWS DIVERSION OF WATER ON AN ANNUAL BASIS. THIS DIVERSION IS LESS THAN THE AMOUNT OF WATER THAT CAN BE HELD IN OUR TWO POTABLE RESERVOIRS PLUS LAKE CLEMENTIA. WHAT HAPPENS IF YOU EMPTY CALERO AND DRAW DOWN CHESBORO? LOOK AT THE PERMIT (WHICH ALLOCATES WATER TO EACH RESERVOIR)READ PERMIT 16762 AND DO THE MATH....

11. WHAT HAPPENS TO NATURAL DRAINAGE (SEE PERMITS 16763 & 16764) WHEN HOUSES ARE CONSTRUCTED IN THE DRAINAGE WATERSHEDS? DRAINAGE, IN DEVELOPED AREAS BECOMES URBAN STORMWATER AND CANNOT GO INTO OUR RESERVOIRS OR LAKE CLEMENTIA. WILL YOU REMOVE DRAINAGE AS A “SOURCE OF SUPPLY” WHEN YOU COMPUTE AVAILABLE WATER AND WATER STORAGE?

12. TWO DOCUMENTS WARN OF SEVERE CHALLENGES TO OUR WATER SUPPLY. THESE ARE STATE WATER BOARD RESOLUTION 2017-0012 AND THE OCTOBER 2022 AMERICAN RIVER BASIN STUDY. CAN YOU TELL US HOW THE DISTRICT WILL USE THIS CLIMATE DATA TO RE-EVALUATE THE NORMAL AND EXTREME WATER YEARS THAT WILL BE THE BASIS OF YOUR REPORT.

13. CSD WAS ORDERED TO STOP DIVERTING WATER IN MAY 2022 BEFORE ITS AUTHORIZED PUMPING SEASON HAD ENDED. A CSD MEMO WARNS OF THE IMPACT OF THIS. THE STATE SAYS IT WILL NOT CONSIDER PERMITS AS OUR EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO DIVERT WATER. WHAT DOES THIS MEAN? HOW WILL YOU TREAT THIS UNKNOWN IN THE REPORT? WILL THE 2023 REPORT SUPPORT A NEED FOR SAFETY AND A NEED TO REEVALUATE THE 50% CONSERVATION RULE?

14. HOW DOES THE DISTRICT PLAN TO ESTIMATE ACCESSORY DWELLINGS AS A DEMAND ON THE WATER SUPPLY. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF HOMES WILL BUILD AN “AD” IN THE NEXT 20 YEARS? WHAT IS THE CONSIDERATION FOR “CASITAS” CALLED OUT IN THE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION (BEFORE THE “AD” LAW WAS ADAPTED.

15. DEAD STORAGE (WATER THAT CANNOT BE EXTRACTED FROM OUR RESERVOIRS) IS A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON OUR TOTAL WATER STORAGE. IS CSD CERTAIN THAT THE ESTIMATES OF DEAD STORAGE ARE ACCURATE? NOTE: THE 40 YEAR OLD ESTIMATES OF OUR RESERVOIRS WERE NOT ACCURATE.

16. WHAT STANDARD WILL BE USED TO MEASURE EVAPORATION IN OUR RESERVOIRS?

17. WHAT CRITERION WILL BE USED TO ESTIMATE RIVER FLOWS IN DRY YEARS AND NORMAL YEARS? WILL THESE VARY FROM 2010 STANDARDS THAT USED 1930 AVERAGES AND THREE YEARS OF DROUGHT IN THE 1970’S?

18. WILL THE DISTRICT REVIEW THE STATUS OF OUR 2020 APPLICATION TO RENEW OUR 4 WATER RIGHTS (16762-16765) PRIOR TO ISSUING THE DRAFT REPORT?

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT ?

- A. THE STATE ALLOWED RMCSD UNTIL DECEMBER, 2000 TO SATISFY BENEFICIAL USE, HOWEVER, THE DISTRICT WAS **ONLY** GIVEN UNTIL 1990 TO COMPLETE ANY **“DIVERSION WORKS CONSTRUCTION”**
- B. THE DISTRICT FILED (AGAIN) IN 2000 FOR AN EXTENSION AND FILED AN AMENDED FILING (AGAIN) IN 2006
- C. CSD’S 2006 EXTENSION DELETED ANY REQUEST FOR DIVERSION CONSTRUCTION
- D. THE STATE ALLOWED (AGAIN) THE DISTRICT TO EXTEND “BENEFICIAL USE COMPLIANCE UNTIL 2020.
- E. CAN THE DISTRICT EXPAND ANY DIVERSION OR WATER STORAGE WITHOUT A FULL REAPPLICATION? IT NO LONGER HAS A TIME EXTENSION TO EXPAND STORAGE.

19. ARE YOU, TODAY, PUBLICLY STATING THAT YOUR RATEPAYERS WILL HAVE A MINIMUM OF 45 DAYS TO REVIEW AND COMMENT ON A COMPLETED, DRAFT 2023 REPORT?

20. DO YOU AGREE THAT THE FINDINGS OF THE AMERICAN RIVER BASIN STUDY ARE CAUSE FOR ALARM? DO YOU AGREE THAT WATER FLOWS MAY BEGIN EARLIER IN THE SPRING (OR LATE IN WINTER) AND THAT THESE FLOWS WILL BE INCONSISTENT WITH OUR NOVEMBER TO MAY PUMPING SEASON

THE 2016 WATER SUPPLY ASSESSMENT (PREPARED ALSO BY MADDAUS), THE REPORT STATES THAT THE COSUMNES IS A PRECIPITATION BASED WATERSHED, AND “NOT HEAVILY INFLUENCED BY SNOW PACK” WHILE 16% OF THE WATERSHED IS CONSIDERED ABOVE THE SNOW-LINE, PRECIPITATION (RAIN) IS EVEN MORE CRITICAL TO DELIVERING WATER FLOWS ELIGIBLE FOR DIVERSION INTO OUR RESERVOIRS.

21. WILL THE STUDY ADDRESS WATER PLANT REDUNDANCY TO PREVENT A TOTAL BREAKDOWN OF OUR ABILITY TO PROCESS WATER? HOW WILL THE DISTRICT LACK OF CONSISTENCY BETWEEN PLANT 1 AND PLANT 2 TO ELIMINATE MANGANESE (YELLOW WATER).

22. IF WELLS ARE SUGGESTED (VS. ADDITIONAL STORAGE), WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE COSUMNES GROUNDWATER AUTHORITY? WHY DO 2016 “PREVIOUSLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT WELLS SAY THAT EMERGENCY WELLS ARE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF EXISTING RESIDENTS. (IF THERE IS NO DEVELOPMENT, WE DO NOT NEED AN EMERGENCY WATER SUPPLY).

23. HOW WILL THE DISTRICT RE-ASSESS ACTUAL SYSTEM LOSSES FROM LEAKAGE IN AN AGING SYSTEM? ARE LOSSES HIGHER IN 40 YEAR OLD PIPES THAN THEY WOULD BE IN BRAND NEW PIPES?

2023 Integrated Water Master Plan Meeting Questions

- 1) Under severe drought conditions, will the study use the developer's predetermined conservation rate of 50%, used in prior studies, or the current industry standard 20-25% conservation rate? How long will the study assume restrictions be in place? Will the study's conservation rate be in addition to or include SB7 compliance? (SB7 is a state mandated 20% reduction in water usage, by the year 2020.) Will the study quantify the community's financial losses based on the assumed conservation rate?
- 2) Will the study use the predetermined developer assumption that the lakes are at their flashboard* capacity, (going into a drought) contrary to normal planning practices per the Department of Public Health and CSD's prior water study engineer, Ken Giberson? *Boards placed in the lake spillways to raise water levels.
- 3) Lake Clementia's capacity has been utilized in past studies, even though it is solely permitted for recreational usage and not for residential consumption. Will this study rely on that capacity?
- 4) Will the study use the developer assumption that park irrigation will be eliminated during severe drought conditions?
- 5) A developer's reduced evaporation/seepage rate has been used in recent studies. Will this analysis use the Department of Water Resources recommended Davis pan when calculating this rate or the predetermined reduced developer rate?
- 6) The 1990 CSD study used a 10% system loss rate, because the system was new and less prone to breaks and leaks. A reduced developer's assumption rate, has been used in recent studies, even though Rancho Murieta has an aging system, more prone to leakage. What rate will this study use?
- 7) Downstream water rights are over drafting the Cosumnes River and ground water, causing changing river flow conditions that could directly impact Rancho Murieta's water rights and future pumping. Because the Cosumnes River is Rancho Murieta's only water source, will the study address these changing conditions?
- 8) Will the study use an industry standard EDU (Equivalent Dwelling Unit - the water used by the average household), based on actual water usage numbers or the developer's "Hybrid" EDU Factor?
- 9) Will the study use the developer assumption that future lots over 12,000 square feet have a reduced water allocation? If so, how will this be achieved?
- 10) Will the study contain the capacity of the system (missing in the prior study)?
- 11) Will the study address the impact Senate Bill 9 or the "Duplex Bill" will have on Rancho Murieta's water supply?
- 12) Will the study show the reduced storage capacity found during recent drone surveys and also address the fact that building around the reservoirs will decrease runoff water capacity?
- 13) Will the study address ALL omissions and concerns raised in the (County ordered CSD review) January 4, 2010 West Yost Associates Technical Memorandum and the Oct. 5th 2010 and Nov. 16, 2012 letters written to the CSD, from the Department of Public Health?
- 14) Will the study contain a trigger point when drought conservation measure levels must be administered (missing in the prior study)?
- 15) Recent studies assume the usage of recycled landscape water for ALL new homes. Will this study account for the CSD guarantee to fulfill the Rancho Murieta Country Club recycled water needs, before providing water for residential usage? CSD's current tertiary water does not meet residential usage quality requirements and a multi-million dollar investment is needed to meet state regulations. If this assumption is used, is it achievable and who will pay for the treatment plant improvements?

Paula O'Keefe

From: Marklin Brown <marklinb@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2023 11:23 AM
To: Tim Maybee; Randy Jenco; Linda Butler; Martin Pohl; Stephen Booth; Amelia Wilder
Cc: Michael Fritschi
Subject: Special Board Meeting 3/27/2023

March 24, 2023

Directors and Management of Rancho Murieta Special District, Community Services District,

My schedule precludes my attendance at the Special Meeting on March 27th at 2:00 pm. I am writing this missive in lieu of addressing the board on that occasion.

Although I am representing only myself in this presentation, be assured there are many residents that would support what is stated, in part, and in total. This no doubt is or should be apparent to you at this juncture.

The primary concern is not just the issues being addressed through the Grand Jury inquiry, but whether the CSD management and Board should be ratifying any major financial commitments while the inquiry is in progress. The Vendors or other service providers may not be legally bound by these agreements if the investigation should cause them to become null and avoid due to the opinion that the CSD management and board do not have clear authority while under investigation.

Outside of this gray area of a legal quandary, should the management and board restrict any actions voluntarily during this inquiry under the guise of due diligence and fiduciary responsibility demonstrating to the residents of Rancho Murieta their genuine concern for their genuine concerns?

It is no one's contention that the current sitting Management is wholly or partially responsible for the present state of affairs, however, it will become their responsibility if decisions that should have been held in abeyance for reasons of propriety are made when a delay would have been a more sound approach.

Thank you for your time,
And your service

Marklin Brown,
marklinb@gmail.com
Lot 1109



Linda Butler <16dola@gmail.com>

Pipeline.

2 messages

Linda Butler <16dola@gmail.com>
To: Amelia Wilder <awilder@rmcsd.com>

Tue, Mar 7, 2023 at 6:54 AM

Hi Amelia,

These are the additional comments for the communication committee discussions.:

#4. Added 700+ residents to the printing and mailing list of the Pipeline to all residents no matter how they pay their bill.

#5. Reviewed the Progress on the IWMP meeting March 18th ..

Committee assignments Steve-Flyers: Linda Banners. Linda Contact Lucy regarding progress on Banner design and other items regarding the meeting.

Thanks,
Linda B
Director

Linda Butler <16dola@gmail.com>
To: Amelia Wilder <awilder@rmcsd.com>

Mon, Mar 13, 2023 at 12:19 PM

Hi Amelia ,

I sent these comments to put in the Pipeline but do not see anything from the meeting draft that indicates they are there. Can this be corrected? I am assuming they will go into the Pipeline with the additional comments.

Thanks,
Linda

[Quoted text hidden]

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 27, 2023
To: Board of Directors
From: Michael Fritschi, P.E. – Interim General Manager
Subject: Integrated Water Master Plan Contract Ratification, Task Order Approval and Budget Amendment

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommend ratifying the contract for the Integrated Water Master Plan, and amendments thereto, with Adkins Engineering & Surveying and Maddaus Water Management in the amount not to exceed \$295,000 (CIP# 23-09-01) and to authorize the General Manager to execute Task Order #1 with Adkins Engineering & Surveying for public outreach efforts in the amount of \$40,737, amend the FY 2022-23 Budget in the amount of \$135,737 to increase CIP# 23-09-01 total project cost of \$335,737 and appropriate funds, and Authorize a transfer of funds in the amount of \$135,737 from Water Replacement Reserve (200-2505) to Water Operating Capital (200-7900-01).

BACKGROUND

Per the Board's request, staff have requested a scope and fee from Adkins/Maddaus to cover the District consultant IWMP public engagement efforts. The scope of this Task Order includes preparing specific and substantial meeting materials for and attending several public meetings during the IWMP process. Please see the attached scope and fee for a Task Order to the IWMP to provide public engagement for specific description.

While the Task Order is substantial, it is reasonable for what the District is requesting with respect to the extensive public engagement that will occur at every step of the IWMP. The Task Order fee is also in line from earlier estimates from Adkins/Maddaus for the public education scope.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The budgeted amount for CIP# 29-09-01 was previously incorrectly reported at \$250,000, when the budgeted amount is actually \$200,000. This requires that the Board appropriate an additional \$95,000 for the original contract and \$40,737 for the public education task order. This will bring the total contract amount to \$335,737.

RESOLUTION R2023-05

A RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE CONTRACT WITH ADKINS ENGINEERING & SURVEYING AND MADDAUS WATER MANAGEMENT, INC FOR INTEGRATED WATER MASTER PLAN AMOUNT OF \$295,000 (CIP# 23-09-01); AUTHORIZE THE GENERAL MANAGER TO EXECUTE TASK ORDER#1 WITH ADKINS ENGINEERING & SURVEYING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$40,737, AMEND FY 2022-23 BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS

WHEREAS, A contract was signed by the District and joint effort from Adkins Engineering & Surveying and Maddaus Water Management, Inc. to prepare an Integrated Water Master Plan on December 22, 2022; and

WHEREAS, The District appropriated funds in the amount of \$200,000 in the FY 2022-23 budget for CIP# 23-09-01; and

WHEREAS, The District approved the contract for the Integrated Water Master Plan from Adkins Engineering & Surveying and Maddaus Water Management in the amount of \$295,000; and

WHEREAS, The District received a supplemental task order for the public outreach portion of the project from Adkins Engineering & Surveying and Maddaus Water Management in the amount of \$40,737, and;

WHEREAS, The District approved, amended the budget and appropriated funds in the amount of \$40,737 for a supplemental task order for public outreach.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE RANCHO MURIETA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS

1. Ratify the contract, and amendments thereto, with Adkins Engineering & Surveying and Maddaus Water Management in the amount not to exceed \$295,000 (CIP# 23-09-01).
2. Authorize the General Manager to execute Task Order #1 with Adkins Engineering & Surveying for public outreach efforts in the amount of \$40,737.
3. Amend the FY 2022-23 Budget in the amount of \$135,737 to increase CIP# 23-09-01 total project cost of \$335,737 and appropriate funds.
4. Authorize a transfer of funds in the amount of \$135,737 from Water Replacement Reserve (200-2505) to Water Operating Capital (200-7900-01).
5. The General Manager is authorized to take all necessary and appropriate actions to carry out the purpose and intent of this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 27th day of March, 2023 by the following roll call vote:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Abstain:

Timothy E. Maybee, President of the Board
Rancho Murieta Community Services District

[SEAL]

Attest:

Paula O'Keefe, Director of Administration