

Water Funding Corrections: Letter to the Board (for the meeting record)

October 21, 2026

Board of Directors

Rancho Murieta Community Services District

15160 Jackson Road, Rancho Murieta, CA 95683

Re: Request to correct the public record on how new water supply is funded

Dear President and Directors:

Please include this letter and its attachments in the record of tonight's meeting. Attached are copies of three posts by Director William Gere, appointed July 16, 2025, whose seat is on the November 3, 2026 ballot ([Sacramento County Elections](#)), and who is a candidate in that election: September 14, 2026; Nextdoor, October 5, 2026; and the RM Community Page (Residents Only) on Facebook, October 18, 2026. Several statements in them conflict with the District's own records. Each is listed below with the record that addresses it.

1. Claim: New water would cost "around \$20,000 per home if residents are forced to pay for it."

The \$20,000 figure is a proposed fee on new development, not a cost to residents. The Developer Fee Study in the [November 19, 2025 Board Packet \(full report\)](#), Table 5.1) proposes a Water Supply Augmentation Fee of \$20,436.24 per equivalent dwelling unit (EDU), 87% of total proposed developer fees, against \$7,540.23 then in effect. The District counts one EDU as 750 gallons per day of average use, roughly one home. A public hearing to consider the fee was scheduled for December 17, 2025. The proposed fee has not been adopted: the District's [2026–27 Rates and Fees sheet](#) and [connection fee schedule effective July 25, 2026](#) both list the fee at \$7,752.71 per EDU.

The fee's purpose has been stated consistently since at least 2017: to fund additional water supply for the needs of new development. See the [2017 Fee Study Report \(Ordinance 2017-02\)](#).

2. Claim: "If the developers were willing to pay for it, this wouldn't even be up for debate."

Developers are already required to pay. [District Code Chapter 8](#) imposes the Water Supply Augmentation Fee on new development. A development agreement in the [February 5, 2019 Improvements Committee Packet](#) (Section 16) states that the project is subject to the fee, payable for each building, and has the developer design and build a recycled water pipeline at its own cost.

The District's [2017 Background summary](#) states that the District does not intend to pre-fund developer costs and that expanded treatment capacity is to be funded by the party that benefits. Director Gere's October 5 post says developers should pay the costs their projects create. District policy already does this.

3. Claim: "Saying that we have special accounts set aside just for them is false."

The District keeps a dedicated account. The [April 2022 Regular Board Meeting Packet](#) lists "Water Supply Augmentation" as its own fund account (200-2511), with a balance of about \$2.05 million at that time. The [March 2026 Finance Committee Packet](#) reports Water Augmentation Fees as restricted reserve revenue, separate from operating income.

State law requires this separation. [Government Code section 66013](#) directs that capacity charges be deposited in a separate capital facilities fund, not commingled with other money, and spent solely for the purposes for which they were collected. The board has authorized spending from this fund before: in early 2025 it approved \$30,000 from the Water Supply Augmentation Fund for a Sacramento County Water Agency feasibility study ([River Valley Times, Feb. 14, 2025](#)).

Requests

1. That staff present a plain-language report at a future regular meeting on the Water Supply Augmentation Fund: the fee per home, the current balance, what it may be spent on, and what has been spent from it. These facts are in District records, so staff can prepare the report without outside counsel unless a specific legal question requires it.
2. That the report be posted on ranchomurieta.org.
3. That Director Gere retract the statements above, and that directors who speak publicly about District finances point residents to these records.

Residents can disagree about growth and water policy. Those debates work best when everyone starts from the same facts, and the District's records are where those facts live.

Sincerely,

Jeff Pearson
Rancho Murieta Properties

Attachments:

- (A) Nextdoor post, Oct. 5, 2026
- (B) Post, Sept. 14, 2026
- (C) Facebook post, Oct. 18, 2026
- (D) RMCSD Developer Fees, Current vs. Proposed
- (E) FY 2021-22 Draft Reserve Beginning Balances
- (F) RMCSD 2024 Statement of Net Position (excerpt)

NEXT DOOR
10/5/2026

A

12:00 [📷]

D What's happening, n...



Bill Gere

Rancho Murieta North · 5...



Your ballot should arrive early this week—I received mine today. Please learn about each CSD candidate and vote!

My position is clear: We must be fair to everyone. Developers should pay the costs created by their projects rather than shifting those costs to the community.

We must also protect our water security. We cannot approve risky development that eliminates our safety buffer and leaves our community vulnerable to severe water shortages during future droughts.

My i



Home



Search



For Sale



Local Faves



Post

commitment to these values.



1 GBLS 9/14 3

From: [Amelia Wilder](#)
To: [Dyanne Fleet](#)
Subject: FW: Director's Comments on Social Media
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2026 11:00:12 AM
Attachments: [RMCSd Board Meeting open question topic Gere 9-16-2026.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Public comment for next month...

Amelia Wilder
Interim General Manager
Rancho Murieta CSD



15160 Jackson Road
P.O. Box 1050
Rancho Murieta, CA 95683

(916) 354-3700 * FAX 916-354-2082

awilder@rmcsd.com
www.rmcsd.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication with its contents may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information. It is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s) and not for public dissemination. Unauthorized interception, review, use or disclosure is prohibited and may violate applicable laws including the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

From: Jeff Pearson <JeffP@liveoaklegacy.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2026 10:03 AM
To: Patrick Enright <penright@rwglaw.com>
Cc: Amelia Wilder <awilder@rmcsd.com>; Bill Gere <wpgere@gmail.com>; Tim Maybee <TMaybee@rmcsd.com>; Linda Butler <lbutler@rmcsd.com>; Randy Jenco <rjenco@rmcsd.com>; Tony Velez <tonyv@liveoaklegacy.com>; Carol Ward <caresforhorses@gmail.com>
Subject: Director's Comments on Social Media

Mr. Enright,

Good morning. Yesterday afternoon, as you're aware, I took the opportunity under item #4 (Public Comments) on the RMCSd Board Meeting Agenda to speak to an issue which I also addressed at the previous Board meeting. You're certainly aware of that, as you received the material.

I understand that no one from the Board is required to respond to comments in this section, so I had

Gere 9/14
2

no real expectations.

That however doesn't excuse the current practice and exposure (my opinion) that this creates for RMCS. These comments made by Director Gere are baseless and inflammatory, at least and came with no foundation or explanation. The real problem as presented is that we don't really know from what position or perspective these comments are written. Director, personal, candidate, or any combination.

We are customers of this District, and some live within the District. We question the practice that has the potential to create such confusion and misunderstanding, at least.

We hope that The District can work to resolve this so there can be more clarity of communication to the community.

Thank you,

Jeff Pearson
Murieta Management
jeffp@liveoaklegacy.com
916-548-6251

GOLF 9/14
3

10:24 [📷]

📶 6 📶 80



Tom Shewchuk

Rancho Murieta Nort...



Bill Gere 2d · Rancho M...



Jeff (and Jeff B and Tom S and Catherine S)
"Who pays" for exploration is THE question of the day. The developer has repeatedly stated they refuse to pay., so the entire \$2-3 MILLION Dollar cost that your slate advocates would need to be paid for by the residents. It is

6525 9/14

4

completely appropriate
to discuss this here.

Transparency and facts
matter Jeff!!!

♡ Like ☆ Helpful ○ Re | 

J

Add a comment...



1:18



mobile.facebook.com

**RM Community Page (Residents Only) ...**

Bill Gere • 1h •

To all Rancho Murieta residents:

An important election is just two weeks away.

I have repeatedly invited "The Slate" (Tom, Jeff, and Catherine) to engage in a constructive debate.

Instead of debating, they hide and speak only where their claims can remain unchallenged.

They accuse me of avoiding dialogue. Nothing could be further from the truth. I seek this dialog and debate of strategy for our future.

This conduct undermines our community and our local democracy.

The facts are simple: we do not have enough water today, and we certainly cannot support more homes.

Securing and processing new water sources is extremely expensive—costing around \$20,000 per home if residents are forced to pay for it.

If the developers were willing to pay for it, this wouldn't even be up for debate.

That is where their misleading tactics come in.

If you attend any of their events, ask one simple question: "Who will pay for new water?" Reject any answer other than "The developers will pay 100%." Saying that we have special accounts set aside just for them is false.

Tom has worked to reduce our safety net! Ask him "Who will pay" when we have a drought and your yard and landscaping all dies from lack of water.

RMCS D DEVELOPER FEES | CURRENT VS. PROPOSED

Lumos & Associates · Developer Fee Study · November 17, 2025 | Dollars per Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU)

FEE CATEGORY	CURRENT FEE	LUMOS PROPOSED	CHANGE
Water capital improvement	\$2,196.80	\$1,174.50	-\$1,022.30
Sewer capital improvement	\$3,059.01	\$885.91	-\$2,173.10
Drainage capital improvement	\$0.00	\$966.44	+\$966.44
Security capital improvement	\$83.81	\$10.07	-\$73.74
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT SUBTOTAL	\$5,339.62	\$3,036.91	-\$2,302.71
Water supply augmentation	\$7,540.23	\$20,436.24	+\$12,896.01
TOTAL CAPITAL COMPONENTS	\$12,879.85	\$23,473.15	+\$10,593.30
Water meter installation	\$507.90	\$1,635.73	+\$1,127.83
Water meter inspection	\$160.62	\$1,987.88	+\$1,827.26
Sewer inspection	\$160.62	\$1,987.88	+\$1,827.26
TOTAL PER EDU	\$13,709.00	\$29,084.63	+\$15,375.63

Overall proposed increase: \$15,375.63 per EDU (+112.2%). Figures reflect Lumos Water Capital Improvement Alternative 2 (\$1,174.50), as used in the study's published totals. Alternative 1 (\$11,577.18) would yield higher total fees.

Source: Lumos & Associates, RMCS D Developer Fee Study Report, Table 1.1, page 3. Proposed amounts are study recommendations, not confirmation of adopted District fees.

FY 2021-22 - Draft Reserve Beginning Balances

TB run ending 03/31/2022

Reserve Descriptions	Account #	FY 2021-22 Beginning Balance July 1, 2021	YTD Total Debit	YTD Total Credit	Year to Date Ending Balance March 31, 2022
Capital Improvement Reserve Fees - Admin	100-2510	0	0	0	0
Unreserved Fund Balance	100-2800	0	0	0	0
Subtotal		0	0	0	0
Water Capital Replacement	200-2505	1,990,869	165,093	568,272	2,394,048
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Admin Alloc	200-2505-99	39,990	0	0	39,990
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Water	200-2510	(115,491)	0	4,716	(110,775)
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Admin Alloc	200-2510-99	210,003	0	0	210,003
Water Supply Augmentation	200-2511	2,008,948	3,921	43,946	2,048,974
WTP Construction Fund Reserve	200-2513	(794,549)	251,637	234,889	(811,298)
Unreserved Fund Balance	200-2800	1,340,521	808,477	377,305	909,350
Subtotal		4,680,292	1,229,128	1,229,128	4,680,292
Sewer Capital Improvement Connection	250-2500	4,342	0	0	4,342
Sewer Capital Replacement	250-2505	3,139,652	244,463	579,739	3,474,928
Capital Replacement Reserve Admin	250-2505-99	29,236	0	0	29,236
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Sewer	250-2510	73,246	0	3,601	76,847
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Admin Alloc	250-2510-99	159,077	0	0	159,077
Unreserved Fund Balance	250-2800	1,448,601	583,339	244,463	1,109,725
Subtotal		4,854,154	827,802	827,802	4,854,154
Drainage Capital Replacement	260-2505	78,534	0	0	78,534
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Admin Alloc	260-2505-99	3,866	0	0	3,866
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Drainage	260-2510	344,134	764	764	344,134
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Admin Alloc	260-2510-99	35,262	0	0	35,262
Unreserved Fund Balance	260-2800	98,254	764	764	98,254
Subtotal		560,049	1,528	1,528	560,049
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Admin Alloc	400-2505-99	6,418	0	0	6,418
Unreserved Fund Balance	400-2800	244,476	0	0	244,476
Subtotal		250,894	0	0	250,894
Capital Replacement Reserve Security	500-2505	58,468	0	0	58,468
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Admin Alloc	500-2505-99	7,701	0	0	7,701
Capital Improvement Reserve Fees - Security	500-2510	(41,393)	0	3,043	(38,350)
Capital Improvement Reserves Fees - Admin Alloc	500-2510-99	135,466	0	0	135,466
Security Impact Fee Reserves	500-2513	38,488	0	0	38,488
Unreserved Fund Balance	500-2800	339,551	9,634	0	329,916
Subtotal		538,280	9,634	3,043	531,690
Total Reserves		10,883,668	2,068,092	2,061,501	10,877,077

F

RANCHO MURIETA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT
NOTES TO THE BASIC FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (CONTINUED)

June 30, 2024

NOTE 7 – NET POSITION

Net Position is the excess of all the District's assets and deferred outflows over all its liabilities, and deferred inflows. Net Position is divided into three categories as follows:

Net investment in capital assets describes the portion of net position which is represented by the current net book value of the District's capital assets, less the outstanding balance of any debt issued to finance these assets, excluding unspent proceeds.

Restricted describes the portion of net position which is restricted as to use by the terms and conditions of agreements with outside parties, governmental regulations, laws, or other restrictions which the District cannot unilaterally alter. These include connection fees restricted to capital expansion by Section 66013 of the Water Code and service charges received for use on capital projects consisting of the following:

	Water	Sewer	Drainage	Security
RESTRICTED:				
Capital replacements	\$ 3,166,870	\$ 3,832,542		
Water augmentation	2,330,724			
Capital improvements	110,939	603,538	\$ 253,058	
Security projects				\$ 125,101
TOTAL RESTRICTED				
NET POSITION	\$ 5,608,534	\$ 4,436,079	\$ 253,058	\$ 125,101

The District's Water Treatment Plant Construction Fund, which has a deficit balance of \$791,260, borrowed from the water augmentation restricted net position to partially fund the water treatment plant project. The balance owed at June 30, 2024 is \$83,787. Monthly principal and interest payments of approximately \$4,000 are being made.

Unrestricted describes the portion of net position which is not restricted as to use.

Designations of unrestricted net position may be imposed by the Board of Directors to reflect future spending plans or concerns about the availability of future resources. Designations may be modified, amended or removed by Board action. They are reported as part of the District's unrestricted net position.

The District's unrestricted net position consists of the following at June 30, 2024:

	Water	Sewer	Drainage	Solid Waste	Security
DESIGNATED:					
Property Tax Assessment					
Reserves				\$ 32,844	
Capital replacements	\$ 82,574	\$ 57,184	\$ 68,456		\$ 326,814
TOTAL DESIGNATED	\$ 82,574	\$ 57,184	\$ 68,456	\$ 32,844	\$ 326,814
UNDESIGNATED	(1,386,103)	(488,953)	252,260	(153,633)	(361,215)
TOTAL UNRESTRICTED					
NET POSITION	\$ (1,303,529)	\$ (431,769)	\$ 320,716	\$ (120,789)	\$ (34,401)