

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
1	A	<b>Blue Lake Springs MWC</b> , Lee Schmedes, Office Manager, May 24, 2011	Tab 4-2	BLSMWC connections = 2, not 1	Revised.
2			p. 23	The reason half of our water is CCWD water is because our groundwater and their surface water don't mix. To use CCWD water, we fill one tank for areas that tank supplies.	Noted.
3			p. 317	Check groundwater	Revised.
4				Since April of 1994, BLSMWC has been improving its infrastructure yearly by laying 54,378 feet of 6" diameter main in the streets of the subdivision, adding 119 fire hydrants for fire suppression and installing idlers to facilitate the installation of water meters. It's future improvements have been put on hold while the water issue between CCWD and BLSMWC is resolved.	Added.
5	B	<b>Murphys Sanitary District</b> , Cynthia Trade, Board President May 24, 2011		We respectfully request an extension of the comment period.	Granted by LAFCO.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
6			p. 5	The MSR's assumption that the lack of contested elections is an indication of little interest by the District's customers is inherently flawed. The lack of contested elections can also occur when a District's customers are satisfied with the operation of the District. As anyone who has worked with agencies in Calaveras County can attest, the majority of interest in Districts affairs is normally associated with a customer's negative views of the item under consideration or dissatisfaction with Board decisions.	Noted.
7			Fig. 11-2	Fiscal year 07-08 is color coded wrong, reverse the blue colors to correct it. The tallest column shows a combined Revenue Net Contributed Capital that should be the darker blue.	Not revised. Color coding is correct.
8			p. 212	Re-word paragraph about contract services. MSD does provide and share services with other agencies when needed.	Revised.
9			p. 212	Approval by LAFCO for the existing service to Ironstone which commenced in 1999 was not required. Approval by LAFCO for service outside a Districts boundaries was not required until 2001 with the adoption of California Governmental Code 56133. Therefore this sentence is misleading and should be deleted from the MSR.	Clarified that LAFCO approval was not necessary for services provided prior to January 1, 2001.
10			p. 220	The delay in responding to LAFCO's consultant's information requests was the result of a onetime issue with the District's office staff. To state that a District has minimal accountability due to a onetime issue is incorrect and misleading. The District requests this statement and others in the MSR stating the same or similar concern be deleted.	Clarified on p. 209.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
11			p. 220	MSD is fiscally sound and will continue to strive to remain fiscally sound in the future. MSD will expand and continue to serve our customers. MSD is in the process of developing a new disposal site for future expansion. There is no data to support the assumption that CCWD or another existing/new agency would better serve our customers.	Added additional content on p. 223. If initiated by LAFCO, a consolidation study could explore this topic more in depth.
12			p. 224	MSD has secured our domain name <a href="http://murphyssanitary.com">murphyssanitary.com</a> and expect to have our website up and running by the end of 2011. MSD Agenda is posted for public view; MSD Minutes are public and available upon request and both will be available through the District website.	Added content on p. 208 and p. 225.
13			p. 224	MSD does not have a high rate of staff turnover. The delay in responding to LAFCO's consultant's information was the result of a onetime issue with the District's office staff. This statement should be stricken. MSD does and is maintaining a full Board and this statement should be stricken as well.	Clarified on p. 209.
14			p. 224	MSD has worked diligently to maintain our financial accountability. MSD retained a full time Financial Manager in June of 2010, implementing new accounting software to better serve our accounting needs. The Board Treasurer works with the Finance Manager weekly to retain a high level of accountability. MSD District Audit for FY 2010 showed no deficiencies.	Added content on p. 210. Made changes for consistency to p. 220 and p. 225.
15 B		<b>Union Public Utility District,</b> Gary Ghio, District Engineer May 25, 2011		We respectfully request an extension of the comment period.	Granted by LAFCO.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
16	C		pp. 3, 57	all options should be presented including leaving the District boundaries as they currently exist and reducing the City's SOI; approving the City's SOI with a Memorandum of Understanding between the City and UPUD with regards to future water service and property taxes as well as other viable options. The current wording makes it appear that the detachment of that area is the only option available.	Not added. Governance <u>alternatives</u> represent alternatives to the status quo.
17			Tabs 4-1 & 4-2	The number of connections shown in these two tables does not match. In addition, the water (af) shown for UPUD as 861 in Table 4-2 should be 1,865.	Revised.
18			pp. 25, 251, 260, 261, and 262	Delete the statement, "it should be noted the District lacks a map depicting its service area." The District provided plans to your consultant which delineated the District's boundaries as well as locations of all waterlines.	Revised.
19			pp. 28, 255	All connections within the UPUD are metered. There are some accounts, such as hotels, multiple businesses in one building, etc., that have additional "minimum" charges associated with their monthly service fees based upon the District's rate structure.	Revised.
20			5. Page 29, Table 4-4; Page 258, Page 261, and Page 262	These sections of the MSR state the District did not provide demand projections for its water system. With its comments, UPUD provided projections through 2030 based on its 2004 Water Master Plan.	Added. Note that District projections are countywide DOF growth projections, and do not consider growth in the UPUD service area.
21			p. 32	"...agricultural water for Vallecito" should be modified to state "...agricultural water for Douglas Flat, Vallecito, and Carson Hill..."	Added.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
22			p. 43	Table 4-8 indicates that improvement is needed for capital planning, advance growth planning, and compliance efforts. In addition, the last paragraph on Page 43 states, "these plans do not indicate anticipated timing for capital improvements." Please be advised the District's 2004 Master Plan provided to your consultant does contain anticipated timing for capital improvements as shown on Table 15. In addition, as stated on page 55 and page 262 of the MSR, the District is one of only two agencies which plan for projected water needs for their SOI or projected service areas (i.e. the District does perform advance growth planning in addition to capital planning.) Therefore, Table 4-8 and the statements contained within the MSR should be modified to reflect the actual planning work performed by the District.	Not revised. Although the 2004 Master Plan provides target dates for future construction projects, there is not an actual timeline for financing those projects or ongoing capital improvements. UPUD provided countywide growth projections and did not provide growth projections tailored to the UPUD service area, and therefore does not appear to monitor growth potential and plans within its service area.
23			p. 48	This figure is titled "Water Connection Fees, 2010" but depicts not only water connection fees but also wastewater connection fees. In addition, the water connection fees for the UPUD are not indicated.	Added UPUD to figure
24			p. 55	the statement "UPUD should make efforts to ensure better compliance records" is unfounded as the District made and continues to make all efforts to ensure complete compliance with all state water contaminant limits and monitoring.	Not revised. The MSR focused on each agency's 10-year track record. UPUD has not had violations in the last 5 years. If UPUD continues its recent track record, the next MSR cycle will reflect that.
25			p. 248	the District evaluates its operations annually during the District's budget review, annual financial statement prepared by the auditor, its annual review of treated water (CCR), and through its annual inspection with the Department of Public Health.	No revision to statement that UPUD "reported that it regularly evaluates operations, but could not provide specific examples of how it evaluates operations."

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
26			p. 248	The last sentence of this paragraph states “UPUD has an Operations Plan that was last updated in 2000.” The UPUD Operations Plan was updated in 2007.	Not revised. The Operations Plan provided to LAFCO was dated 2000.
27			p. 249	“wineries” should be added	Added.
28			p. 249	The last sentence of this paragraph contains the following statement “UPUD had nearly reached this demand level by 2010.” This statement is misleading as it leads to the erroneous conclusion that the District has already nearly reached the projected 2040 demand level. The District’s projections are based on the assumption that irrigation water use will not increase within the District due to the limited amount of water available from the UPA as well as system limitations. Therefore, the Master Plan projects growth only on domestic customers. Based upon the growth rates and projected flows contained in the 2004 Water Master Plan (see item 5 above) and the assumption of no additional irrigation users, the projections were and still remain valid.	No revision. UPUD's zero growth projections for irrigation water over the long-term constitutes a lack of planning for irrigation uses.
29			p. 250	This table indicates the Walker Development is “in bounds” of the District. This should be modified to state “partly in bounds” as portions of this proposed development lie outside the current district boundaries.	
30			pp. 250, 252	These sections of the MSR indicate the Water Treatment Plant upgrades were completed in 2008. The actual completion of construction occurred in 2006.	Revised.
31			p. 251	The second to last sentence of this paragraph contains the statement “CPUD purchase...” This should be revised to “UPUD purchases....”	Revised.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
32			p. 251	CCWD should be removed from this sentence. The District receives water deliveries from the UPA only.	Not revised. CCWD's contractor operates upstream water delivery facilities.
33			p. 252	This should be modified to state "...agricultural water for Douglas Flat, Vallecito, and Carson Hill customers..."	Revised.
34			pp. 252, 254	These sections of the MSR state the District's water treatment plant capacity is 3 MG. The actual water treatment plant capacity is 2 MG per day.	Revised.
35			pp. 253, 257	The 2004 Master Plan actually contains a historical average loss rate of 11 percent for the month of August only. In addition, the 2004 Master Plan presents the average historic loss for the month of July, which was 8 percent. Combining these two yields an average loss rate of 9 percent for the District's domestic system in lieu of the 11 percent quoted in the MSR.	Added that UPUD estimates its domestic loss rate at 9 percent. The Master Plan provided historical (1995-2002) water loss rates. The 2002 loss rate was substantially higher than the average. Also the comparison of demand to UPA deliveries would indicate water losses may be higher.
36			p. 258	The statement "The District did not provide water growth projections to LAFCO" should be deleted based upon the information supplied in item 5 above.	See response to comment 28.
37			pp. 258-262	This bullet point states "It is unclear whether the District's challenges in completing basic planning efforts..." As delineated above, the District does comply with the criteria for completing all planning efforts as defined within the MSR; therefore, this statement regarding challenges in completing basic planning efforts should be deleted. All pages should be modified to indicate the District does complete basic planning efforts.	Revised, however, the authors strongly believe the District needs to make substantive planning efforts for likely growth and for irrigation.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
38			p. 259	that the District performs all facility planning efforts as requested in the MSR, the only remaining deficiency identified for the District throughout the MSR is the lack of a website. To imply there are accountability and management challenges at UPUD based upon only the lack of a website is inaccurate and untrue.	See response to comments 22 and 28.
39			p. 261	This paragraph commences with the statement “In light of the lack of a cooperative work relationship between MSD, CCWD, and UPUD...” This statement does not appear to be based upon any factual information contained within the MSR and in reality is unfounded. As stated in other portions of the MSR, the District cooperates with CCWD and MSD with regards to material purchases as well as sharing of resources whenever possible.	While cooperating on materials purchases does exhibit some cooperation, there was contrary evidence with respect to inter-agency collaboration for major capital needs.
40			p. 262	The abbreviation MSD should be modified to UPUD.	Revised.
41	D	<b>Calaveras Public Utility District,</b> Donna Leatherman, General Manager May 25, 2011	p. 157	Remove/reword the word “raw” in first line as the District only serves 4 customers raw water and emphasis should be “provides treated water services...”.	Not revised.
42			p. 161	1,461 single-family residential connections	Revised.
43			p. 163	3 pump stations	Revised.
44			p. 166	Remove last sentence “A pressure-reducing station is needed in Paloma” this project was completed in 2008.	Updated.
45			p. 169	3 personnel with D3 or higher certification for distribution systems and 2 personnel with a T3 or higher certification	Revised.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
46			p. 170	Remove sentence "A pressure-reducing station is needed in Paloma" this project was completed in 2008.	Updated.
47	E	<b>Utica Power Authority,</b> Vern Pyle, General Manager May 25, 2011		That CCWD provides countywide water services is unclear and misleading.	Noted.
48				Is CCWD thereby mandated to apply for new or expanded water rights permits from the State to meet present domestic and irrigation needs within the SOIs of other Calaveras County water providers, or to meet the future needs in other water providers?	Noted.
49				Is CCWD required to share the "countywide water rights" with other Calaveras County water service providers? If so, is CCWD entitled to charge for that water, and at what price?	CCWD is not mandated to perform water rights duties of other service providers.
50				Does a property owner in the County who wishes to build a new subdivision, or plant a vineyard, have the right to demand that CCWD file an application to appropriate more water for that development, or to demand that CCWD share the "countywide water rights" with the property owner?	No, but CCWD responded that it would work with an interested party (outside the SOI of another provider) to accommodate their projected demands.
51				Is CCWD required to challenge downstream water users, by court action if necessary, to protect the availability of water for use within the SOIs of other Calaveras County water providers, private water companies, or individual property owners?	There is no such requirement.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
52				What are these “countywide” and “county-of-origin” water rights – how much water is involved, and where can that water be used? Do they include CCWD’s water rights permits.	County-of-origin water rights quantification depends in part on future growth.
53				It is unclear why selling wholesale water to these water providers is characterized as a countywide water service.	Because it occurs outside the retail service area of CCWD.
54				The draft MSR contains no factual support or references for the conclusion that CCWD provides a countywide service of groundwater management and monitoring.	Revised. CCWD’s groundwater monitoring activities are focused on the overdrafted groundwater basin in west County.
55			pp. 27-30	Add a section on irrigation services and demand.	Noted.
56			pp. 30-36	Additional details re: water sources and rights should be included. All water rights should be tabulated with designated place of use, amount and purpose.	Unfortunately, this request is beyond the budget/scope for the MSR project.
57			p. 32	Add the additional facts that PG&E held 88 cfs pre-1914 water rights, which were sold to CCWD. CCWD transferred 60 of the 88 cfs to UPA, and transferred 28 of the 88 cfs to NCPA.	Added.
58			p. 33	CCWD did not retain any of the water rights that it purchased from PG&E; therefore, the words, “In addition to the rights purchased from PG&E” should be deleted, as the sentence as presently worded implies that CCWD still has water rights purchased from PG&E in addition to CCWD’s water rights permits for 8,000 afa for use in the Ebbetts Pass area and 6,000 afa for use in Copper Cove.	Revised.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
59			p. 33	While CCWD has various water rights permits from various permits from the State Water Resources Control Board for water from the North Fork Stanislaus River water and its tributaries, all of that water is committed, by contract with NCPA, to power generation at the Collierville power plant, leaving a maximum of 8,000 afa available for use in the Ebbetts Pass area.	See CCWD response letter.
60			p. 33	8,000 afa that CCWD may use in the Ebbetts Pass area would be delivered through the tunnel tap on the Collierville Tunnel, but is subject to a restriction in a contract between CCWD and NCPA that the water cannot enter the facilities of the Utica or Angels Hydroelectric Projects without NCPA's consent. Thus, unless CCWD obtains NCPA's consent to allow some of that water to be conveyed through UPA's ditch and flume system, there are significant infrastructure limitations on putting that water to use anywhere other than in the Arnold area or Forest Meadows.	Added.
61				UPA, along with its member agencies, is requesting a 30-day extension of the May 25th deadline and a postponement of the June 20th scheduled Public Hearing. In addition, UPA reserves the right to amend any comments as new, revised or additional data and information become available.	LAFCO granted additional comment time.
62				"Errata" comments on UPA water rights, storage, conveyance and hydroelectric facilities.	Revised in some cases.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
63	F	Calaveras CWD, Joone Lopez, General Manager May 25, 2011		The current county-wide SOI is appropriate given our broadening and growing roles in local, regional and statewide matters. In the last several months, we have received several inquiries regarding annexation by other water/wastewater providers in the county. Additionally, we continue to participate in two integrated regional water management planning processes and have become a regional voice in the statewide Delta discussion that will significantly impact water rights in California.	Noted.
64				CCWD believes it is vital and solicits LAFCO's concurrence to retain a countywide CCWD SOI for those countywide functions for which it was established.	Noted.
65				2005 Jenny Lind Water System Master Plan submitted to LAFCO	Received.
66				Detailed mark-up of MSR page-by-page provided by CCWD	Revised in some cases.
67	G	Calaveras County Planning, Brenda Gillarde General Plan Coordinator, May 26, 2011		The document was very well presented and contains a wealth of information.	Appreciated.
68				Based on our knowledge, Arnold is not likely to absorb more development as it is mostly built out and surrounding lands are very steep and not readily developable. New development will be mostly infill on smaller parcels and improvements to enhance downtown economic productivity.	Revised.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
69				<p>Copper Valley Ranch Master Project: On hold pending start up of environmental review</p> <p>Mission Ranch: On hold pending completion of environmental review</p>	Revised.
70				<p>The County 2035 projections were not based on proposed zoning alternatives. They were based on 3 land use alternatives that were then run through a land use modelling tool called UPlan. UPlan uses a series of attractors and discouragements to place development in the most likely areas. The results vary depending on which factors are identified as attractors and discouragements. The numbers quoted in Table 3-2 represent the initial output from the model that was done for the General Plan Alternatives Report in February 2010. Subsequently a preferred alternative was selected and an additional model run conducted. The final model run indicated less development in certain smaller communities than shown in the Alternatives Report. A footnote should be added to the table explaining that these were the results as of February 2010 and they have been recalculated for the preferred land use alternative which, if adopted, would yield a different distribution of growth than reflected in the table. Also the sentence stating the updated projections would be available April or May 2011 should be deleted, as such numbers will not be released then.</p>	Added.
71				<p>buildout horizon of proposed County general plan is 2035. why was 2030 chosen for the MSR report?</p>	LAFCO planning horizon is 20-year.
72				<p>Revised GP release date is mid-2011</p>	Revised.

## Log of Comments

### Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Water and Wastewater

Comment #	Attachment #	Commenter	Page Section	Comment (Abridged)	Response
73	H	<b>Wallace Community Services District, Cathryn Jackson,</b> Board Vice President, June 13, 2011	General	This wealth of comprehensive data needs follow-up soon to encourage affects special districts to do a special study to make the most of opportunities for improvements. WCSD recommends LAFCO send a letter to each district board about cost reductions and planning benefits with tie-in to the General Plan Update.	Thank you for the compliment. LAFCO will consider your suggestion.
74				Could the County's 2010 Census data give more defensible sub-area data?	The County will update the projections in its General Plan to be released Summer 2011.
75				Could districts expand irrigation water or recycled water to meet water demand/needs?	Yes
76			p. 29	Replacement programs for aging customer water meters can mitigate losses.	Added.
77			p. 45	Calaveras County Water/Wastewater Technical Advisory Team (CWWTAT) no longer functions. Is LAFCO still willing to sponsor a similar function?	Clarified that CWWTAT is not active.
78				Update to add changes since the MSR was drafted relating to WCSD staffing, service contract with CCWD, special assessment, and possible rate increase.	Added content to p. 50, 96, and 295-296.
79			SOI Options	WCSD is interested in SOI option #1 as the most conservative choice.	Updated agency proposal on p. 313 to reflect comment.
80			SOI Options	There is a lack of financial data on adequate expenditures for roads, gates, lighting and other services that WCSD provides that have been considerably underfunded for years.	Noted.