

Janis Eckard  
15417 De La Cruz Drive  
Rancho Murieta, Ca. 95683  
[janiseckard@ranchomurieta.org](mailto:janiseckard@ranchomurieta.org)  
(916) 799-2745 Cell  
(916) 354-2745 Home

May 15, 2024

Board Members, Ms. Mimi Morris (General Manager) and Mr. Michael Fritschi  
Rancho Murieta Community Services District  
P. O. Box 1050  
Rancho Murieta, Ca. 95683

Dear Board Members, Ms. Mimi Morris and Mr. Michael Fritschi,

The purpose of this letter is to showcase just two of the study's numerous inaccuracies:

**POTABLE WATER** - BASELINE EXISTING DEMAND NUMBERS (PAST AND PRESENT) ARE INCORRECT. (Baseline existing demand is water used by the current residents)

On October 5, 2010, the Department of Public Health wrote a letter to CSD explaining that the (PAST) CSD's 2010 IWMPU's baseline potable water demand number of 1,710 Acre Feet Per Year was UNDERSTATED by 8%.

The (PRESENT) study states the existing potable water demand is 1,716 Acre Feet Per Year. NOTE: CSD's 2010 and 2024 baseline demand numbers are almost identical. Remember the 2010 number was understated, by 8%.

Rancho Murieta has grown since 2010. The 83 room Murieta Inn and Spa was built, the Murieta Gardens constructed, the BelAir store was added, several commercial buildings and a portion of The Retreats were completed, the FAA building was converted into a thriving church and the equestrian facility was expanded, etc.

The 2010 number is understated by 8% (per the DPH letter) and the community has grown since 2010, so how can the current Baseline Potable Water figure be accurate?

By understating the existing demand, the study creates the *illusion* that there is additional water available to service the developer homes.

**RECYCLED WATER** - THE FUTURE SYSTEM SUPPLY NUMBER IS INACCURATE.

The current study - Recycled Water:

Future system supply = 955 AF (**average precipitation years**) - *Bold Letters added*

The study assumes that the existing and future homes will use recycled water and the golf courses will irrigate with raw river water. Think about it. The golf courses already have the infrastructure in place to receive recycled water. The existing community does not. The cost to implement this recycled water idea, would be astronomical. The CSD already knows there's insufficient recycled water to irrigate the golf courses, in addition to the developer homes. As a result, CSD altered the plan. There's still insufficient water, but with this option, the numbers are altered to make it *appear* as if the assumption works.

Here's how it was done:

The study used an 'average precipitation years" supply, which would never be available during a drought. The only reason to assume an "average precipitation years" supply (when analyzing *severe drought conditions*) is because *if you use the correct number, there's insufficient supply and the assumption is unachievable*. Test my theory. Have Ms. Maddaus change the study number to reflection an accurate drought figure. Then have her use the computer program to show you what the lake levels will look like if the recycled water assumption is not achieved.

During the last Board Meeting Director Randy Jenco expressed concern that there may be insufficient raw river water to keep the golf courses alive (during summer months) based on the recycled water assumption. Michael Fritsche stated that any golf course shortfall could be supplemented with recycled water. That sounds good, in theory. However, as stated before, if the recycled water portion of the study needs to use average rainfall data during drought conditions, there's insufficient recycled water to supply both the developer homes and the existing community. As a result, there will be NO recycled water available to supplement golf course irrigation. Also, there's proven evidence that there may be insufficient river water to keep the golf courses alive.

*Bottom line, the recycled water assumption does not work.*

Rancho Murieta's future is in YOUR hands. Without an accurate, fact based study using achievable assumptions, it's impossible to know whether or not future development will run the community out of water.

Sincerely,

Janis Eckard