

2/18/2026

RMCS D Board Meeting

5:00 p.m. District Office

I'm Jeff Pearson, Project Manager for Rancho North.

I can sure appreciate and respect the amount of time and effort that Ms. Eckard spent preparing the February 12 letter that explains her perspective. It's certainly no small thing, and that kind of dedication should be acknowledged.

I'd like to present an alternative viewpoint to Ms. Eckard's letter.

The premise of that letter is anchored on her opinion

1. that the District is looking for an additional 3,000 acre feet of water annually to cover the existing drought deficit and to provide sufficient water for the already approved development and full buildout and
2. CSD needs a single well or series of wells that can produce 1,800 gpm and that production level assumes that the well or wells can pump 24 hours a day 7 days a week 365 days a year.

To address #1, I submit that there is no completed engineering or professionally prepared document that The District has formally adopted where this number can be found. One that has the correct buildout schedule and up to date usage details and includes the need for 3,000 acre feet of additional water. Extrapolated numbers from an incomplete, unadopted document should not be used for future planning where millions of dollars of ratepayer's money will be committed.

To address #2, this statement draws a conclusion based on an understandable lack of technical knowledge on how commercial and municipal well and groundwater systems work particularly in the case of resiliency or augmentation.

Under Ms. Eckard's premise, for instance, the 2025 demand of 1575 af would be added to her additional 3,000 af which creates a total of 4,575 af of usage in the year and the wells will be run 24/7 365 to produce that. My understanding is this isn't typically how modern potable water distribution systems work from groundwater supply.

There is no reasonable scenario where this community needs that amount of water, particularly in a drought where mandatory RMCS D conservation mitigation begins in February of a drought year.

Consider this other non-engineer perspective:

On the DEMAND SIDE

- Existing demand – 1574 af (taken from 2025)
- Add for new homes around 30% of the existing and add for possible multi-family gives around 2100 af.
- Reduction for drought conservation and you're at about 1,628 af plus or minus.

And for the STORAGE SIDE

- Storage October 31, 2025 which is at the beginning of pumping season is 2,118 af
- Account for dead storage, evaporation, and seepage and you're at a supply available for that 12 months of 1,549 af.

So, here we are within 79 af of balance. This assumes no Clementia for an Emergency (which in the words of Director Merchant's favorite farmer Jay Schneider is crazy) and no dynamic pumping at all which would be any pumping replenishment that might come available during that season.

I understand that this is an over-simplification for the purpose of brevity, but the point is that I don't believe we are looking for even close to that 3,000 af number even considering resiliency.

This is good news! A lower number is less expensive.

Consider please that the last reliable document concerning water supply projections was the 2016 WSA. If you compare the 2016 projected 2025 consumption against the actual 2025 consumption, the District is doing about 25% better than projected. Getting the number right is mandatory.