

## February 10, 2026 Special Board Meeting Final

Thank you. We'll start the First things first if you're cell phones not on silent would you please do please do so. If you speak right into the microphone.

So. This is the February 10, 2026 special meeting of the Rancho Murrieta Community Services District. Madam Secretary, would you call the roll, please? Yes.

Here. Here. Here.

Here. here item 2 is comments from the public for this special meeting members of the public may only comment on items specifically agendized with certain exceptions the board may not discuss or take action on items that are not on the agenda if you wish to speak during the comment period from the public or would like to comment regarding the board's please fill out a comment card and submit it to the board secretary prior to the public comments speakers presenting opinions whether individual or on behalf of a group of speakers shall have three minutes to speak this three minute limitation will be strictly enforced there are a lot of us speakers will not be allowed to make more than one public comment moving on to item three correspondence there is correspondence in the filers there any comment to that hearing none we'll move to item for public hearing to consider imposing a water emergency the first item on that is a presentation by staff which will be made by our our counsel mr. Patrick and right thank you so we got the slides all right so so first of all thank you I've got a I think it's 25 slides so we'll try to do this I know everyone wants to comment so so next so the objectives of the presentation is steps for the adoption of a declaration we're looking at water code section 350 to declare a water emergency and what is needed to do that we'll look at finding the facts necessary the public notice requirements which is the public hearing of tonight and the board has the authority if they decide to go forward to adopt regulations about the water emergency next I can barely write that hang on here the purpose of the hearing is to give an initial overview of the status of the district's water supplies and demands the process for implementation of the water emergency comments if they have any clarifications or questions and we'll take public comments and the board will deliberate and and public comments and any evidence and information that we received tonight and then the board may take the following actions they could decide not to take any action to declare an emergency they could continue the hearing to a future date to receive more documentation and public comments they can schedule additional public hearings or we can adopt a resolution for a water emergency next so right now the status of water supplies for the district is we've had numerous studies over the years we had an integrated water master plan in 2006 we had another one in 2010 we had a water supply assessment in 2016 and we also had a 2024 draft integrated water master plan which was never adopted or approved by the board 2016-2010 integrated water master plan in the water supply concluded the district had adequate water supplies for full buildup concluded that but it also in most cases assumed that there would be sometimes they called it a contingency sometimes they said augmentation but it would would be advisable to

have a backup water source of some amount the 2024 integrated water master plan concludes the district may not have an adequate water supply for the current customers during a drought and the district requires a backup water source also the state has adopted legislation in 2021 which requires that we have a backup water source next so the the evaluation was for the average recent rain there's adequate water to meet current demands but at full build out we would have less than 100 acre feet of remaining water supply this assumes no use of clementia and no additional source of water no augmentation the water if we have a worst case drought here the current water demand reaches close to zero water supplies with full build out the system runs out of water with a significant deficit it provides no water augmentation with these assumptions next so so these are the evidence that we have and we'll receive any other evidence that we have that we received tonight all of the water master plans have been conducted over the years the district's history of water demand from 2010 to 2025 obviously any public comments we received tonight and that includes any written documentation that we received either tonight or prior to tonight's meeting any documents presented or submitted by digital developers and we've had several documents prepared by working groups just as a background on california planning requirements for water california does not require that the public water agencies maintain an active water master plan by law if you have 3,000 connections right now we have about 2,225 connections 2,900 but did i say 2,929 29 connections so we're just under the 3,000 limit and we're also below the 3,000 acre feet per year so once we get over 3,000 then we have to adopt and this is mandatory an urban water master plan which is similar to an integrated water master plan although i describe it as more robust required by the state and it would have annual requirements of reporting to the state um so once we get to 3,000 we have one year to prepare the urban water master plan to be in compliance with state law and so um so my recommendation has been that perhaps we should take a look at it now because just based on the integrated water master plan it took us well over 12 months to get where we are but that's something we can discuss later i also want to highlight that the plans are over a 20 year planning time frame so we're looking at a water plan for the next 20 years um not the next 40 60 80 years the state's looking out 20 years and that's what they want to see us plan for um it would describe the demand management measures and water um sharing contingency plans that we have it would also like i said require reporting to the state um next status of development right now is that the 2024 draft integrated water master plan assumed full build out of at least 39 42 connections uh with about 38 31 being a residential and 111 being commercial currently we have in the number i guess it's now 2 929 water connections and we also have will serve letters that we've issued to riverview um and residents um 198 units and most of those have not been built yet next um future growth um like i said the 2024 integrated water master plan assumed over 1100 units including the 39 acre parcel in rancho north it's been reduced down to 561 with the application before the county at this time um the county has uh reviewed the application and i believe it's like 95 percent complete but it has not been deemed to complete at this time um the 39 acre parcel has been removed from the plan so there are no future plans for the 39 acres um over the years various things have have been proposed for that 39 acres and there's a few commercial lots to be developed um in the shopping center there's also a few undeveloped lots in the district itself

but i think that number is 25 or fewer um so the assumptions of the draft plan were based on numbers as of late 2022 so we probably need well we would need to update that to include the last three years and here i give what the district has used the last four years um an acre feed each year as you can see um last year was a little lower than normal but generally we're between 16 to 1800 acre feet for the current residents of the district right now um fluctuates a little bit depending i think primarily how hot it is in july august september when the most water is used and a lot used for irrigation but i'm sure there's other factors too when the rainy season ends and things like that um next so water demand mitigation um the district um usage appears to be fairly flat depending on seasonal fluctuations right now um and that's probably attributed to various rebates and installation of water efficient appliances both that the district incentivized as well as the states requiring converting to drought tolerant landscaping for some landscaping of individual lots i realize few people want to have their lots totally drought tolerant but some some are at least reducing the amount of water usage and of course new development we can condition on drought tolerant landscaping and new efficient standards both us and the state require a good large percentage of those and the last thing we can do is try to decrease leaks in the pipelines first of all determine how many leaks we've got and try to reduce that so that we are not not not not having have to use water that's just going out outside the system the water demand we need to determine future water demand on a full build-out that would include the current connections the 561 Rancho North we need to decide about the 39 acre parcel like i said it's over a 20 year planning horizon so i don't know exactly what the horizon is for that 39 acres and commercial in the shopping center at full build-out right now our sole water source is from the Cosumnes river it's pursuant to a permit that we have from the state the permit allows us to divert water from the Cosumnes river from November 1 to May 31st when the river flows at or above 70 cubic feet so in reality rarely do we get to start on November 1 but usually sometime in late November early December as we receive rains we we are allowed to divert the water we're looking at 3,900 acre feet per annum to be stored so 1250 in Chesilor 2610 in Calero 850 acre feet in Clementia which is primarily runoff and 40 acre feet in fairway number 10 the combined of Calero Clementia and the fairway number 10 cannot exceed 2650 acre feet i.e that's how we come to the 3,900 acre feet next drought resiliency with some of the recent droughts in California especially from like 2012 to 2018 California adopted several pieces of legislation to encourage drought resist drought resiliency and water planning both for groundwater and for water districts in general in the last drought several small districts essentially ran out of water especially down in the central and southern part of the San Joaquin valley so the state has required that we have a backup water system a backup backup system of water supply that would meet current water quality requirements and is sufficient to meet the district's average daily demand the average daily demand is what's typically referred to as the daily water consumption that a water system must be capable of meeting through the backup sources during a drought condition so this is something that like I said earlier it's been mentioned in numerous documents all the way back to 1994 there was talk about having a backup augmentation or contingency plan to besides the Cosumnes river in the form of wells or other sources of water and it's something the district will need to look at seriously in the future whether or not we adopt a water emergency the water

emergency would not relieve the district of the requirement to come up with a backup water source it would also not relieve the district of the requirement to vigorously look for additional water sources to meet the needs of the community so so what I quote was out of the California code of regulations and it also gives a formula to calculate the average daily usage next so backup sources that we've looked at are of course wells currently we've got a study I think with six proposed well sites but there may be more we've also looked at clementia right now we cannot use clementia for water but we've looked or considering looking at using clementia either for potable water or for irrigation water and what we'd need to do to get the permit changed the other thing that is in the SB 552 is the idea of an intertie to another system which would be allow you to have a backup system this would be with another public agency probably it could be a private agency but another water system where if there was a drought and they had excess water you could intertie back and forth unfortunately Rancho Marietta is fairly far from Folsom Rancho Cordova and other water sources so it would probably be difficult but I think we are looking at the El Dorado irrigation district if there's something we could do in that regard there's also the possibility of water banking the Sloughhouse resource conservation water district is looking at grants so it's something that we could take a look at and and also recycled water if we could potentially use more of that um so all of these and reducing leaks um which we talked about previously so all these would be options to potentially reduce either the water demand or provide an augmentation and backup water source and next we've also of course got the financing and servicing agreements that we entered into in 2014 with both what's commonly called the 670 FSA since originally it was to include 670 lots and the Rancho what I call the Rancho North FSA um so we've got to address both of those the developers did front the cost of the water treatment plant expansion um and some developers participated in that cost others are to reimburse the participating developers when they have their final map approved by the county at the time the assumption appears to the district had adequate water supply at least for a normal year but we did even in the bonds that were issued for the community facilities district did make clear that we were looking at potentially um wells and other other sources to augment the water supply so it's always been an issue um that we need something to augment the basic water supply um and it also allows for the bundle fee what they call bundle fee which is basically a development impact fee for water augmentation capital improvements water under sewer water and sewer inspections and the security fee was included there too pursuant to the mitigation fee act next so some of the things that have changed since 2024 is of course the droughts that California experienced and the legislation that California has passed to try to address or um ameliorate future droughts so that no district ends up with not adequate water for for residential customers so um so they passed SB 552 like I said dealing with the resiliency and the requirement for backup water sources they've also adopted 1668 which requires a water management plan um and the district drafted it or started preparing an integrated water master plan showing that we could not meet our average water demand without um severe water conservation measures if we did not have a additional source of water um I guess on the side is that Rancho North has been reduced originally it was over 1100 uh lots and Lakeview was never developed next so so the findings that the district needs to make under the water code section 350 it grants the board the

authority to declare a water shortage emergency the declaration is contingent upon findings that ordinary water demands cannot be satisfied without compromising essential water needs this this includes public health primarily um sanitation uh fire um just sanitation and and fire issues so must find and determine the ordinary demands cannot be met without depleting the water supply to the point where it becomes insufficient for water consumption primarily sanitation and fire demand so we must be able to meet the basic demands of our customers as well as provide for fire protection adequate fire flow um and includes both immediate existing water shortages and if we have a threatened future shortages the courts do not require for us to wait until we actually have a shortage if we can see and anticipate that we will have a shortage based on future growth and the demands that we currently have and this applies um the board don't know where that one came from give me a moment that was embarrassing okay try again okay the board the board must exert reasonable efforts in the courts that's what they would look for to augment its water supply to meeting increasing demands as the emergency is intended to be limited to the duration of the emergency number is a mathematic impossibility making that assumption unachievable nine studies since 2006 rely on the flashboard capacity of the reservoirs which the department of public health has stated when planning for future development is not an acceptable practice 10 studies from 1990 on did not use an industry standard method of calculating water usage 11 studies 2006 on did not use the department of water resources recommended pan when computing the the reservoirs evaporation sea beach rate your time is up ma'am please finish your thoughts okay um okay just one one last comment then rancher ready needs to know how many homes can be safely supported by the existing water supply and taking a pause to get this right by issuing a water emergency is a step in the right direction thank you jane schwinn followed by tony velez she'll pass tony velez followed by bonnie yes berberol good evening my name is tony velez i've been a resident of rancher marietta for over 40 years and have been involved in the development of ranch marietta for 13. the board should be very careful in voting in favor of tonight's resolution we the developers have been very willing to help solve the water solution throughout the years that rancher marietta has been in existence we along with the district stated started well augmentation projects since 1988 some progression was made throughout the years and got to the point of test wells in 2012 or thereabouts a district was granted over 500,000 by the state to assist with water augmentation and for whatever reason the project stopped the remaining funds were allocated to a different fund instead of being used for its intended purpose now here we are in 2026 and the test well solution has reappeared the district formed the water vision group and has tasked them in solving the water problems wsc has been hired by the district to find suitable well sites we the developers have also hired the previous contractor nv5 patrick dunn to continue with the well study and validate the findings our hope is that this water augmentation project is successful and the district satisfies the requirements under sb 552 but here's what i'm fearful of i'm fearful the district will vote in favor of the water moratorium with it will come legal battles in my experience there has never been any positive outcome just a lot of money being spent between two parties the project then gets stalled and the district continues to try to find a solution that goes on forever the district needs our help in solving some of these problems without us these problems will most likely not be resolved the

land where the wells will be located is owned by the developers the district needs our help to be granted easements and obtain the rights to drill the wells the land where the most suitable location for a two and a half million gallon water tank is owned by us we need you need our help to purchase and gain access to this land in order to construct the tank many of the streets are private many of which are owned by us the district needs easements to gain access to these streets without our permission it will be difficult difficult for the district to gain access the tertiary water that the water district produced that the district produces is sprayed on the golf course property that is owned by us the district needs our assistance to be able to continue with this process the open space that the community has access to is open space that is owned by us we allow the community to enjoy the trails and open space thank you for your comments please finish your thoughts sir we are not the problem we are part of the solution without us some of the solutions that the district is seeking will be very difficult to fulfill we are here to work with the district and prefer not to fight legal battles the district needs to stop wasting the rate payers money set your personal differences aside think clearly of the consequences you're about to impose onto the community the economic impact that will be negatively affected us all will not be good Rancho Murrieta will soon become a community filled with strife you control that destiny with your vote we the developers are here to help and work with you let's make that happen bonnie berbero and kareem dryman hi my name is bonnie burberry actually pronounced burberry as far as i know lake clementia is not permitted for potable water use it would take several permits and several years to get that changed and from what i understand csd deeded lake clementia over to rma rma apparently owns the rights to lake clementia and we would have to deal with them also to get it back to be able to use even though right now it's not considered potable water thank you kareem dryman followed by cindy price all csd studies 1990 on raised the drought conservation rate from industry standard rate of 15 20 up to 15 50 a 50 conservation rate includes no exterior watering the conservation level was established by an agreement with the developers in 1990 the agreement has expired and is no longer binding on csd the latest study assumes some form of conservation begins with lake levels drops to 95 of capacity in other words the community will be under drought restriction almost year-round including years of heavy rainfall a sacramento county ordered review of rancho marietta's water study states and i quote drought planning assumes an aggressive drought rationing target of 50 if this program is not achieved there may not be enough supply to serve the community during a severe drought scenario end of quote the review goes on to say that conservation rates greater than 25 percent result in the loss of vegetation and create a financial hardship on the community csd's latest study does not include the financial cost on the community for this measure or address how the restrictions would be implemented or enforced a 2010 department of public health letter written to the csd warns that the 50 conservation rate is too aggressive and places the community at a risk of running out of water the 2024 study states quote and the level of planning to 50 percent reductions is needed to meet the requirement of california water code section 10632 end quote this statement was incorporated to initially mislead the reader water code 10632 requires districts have a plan in place to reduce usage 40 to 50 percent in response to an existing drought the regulation does not apply when planning for future development for planning purposes the industry standard

conservation rate is 15 to 20 percent in other words you would never plan development that creates a financial hardship and places the community at risk or running out of water like so many of you i support adopting a water shortage emergency thank you cindy price followed by michelle kyle hello my name is cindy price i was living in the oakland hills in 1991 when the fire broke out 25 people died houses were consumed in under an hour 762 houses were consumed by fire in under an hour it was horrible my concern is evacuation i live as far away from the gate as you possibly can and the only other gate we have is the stone house gate which if it got open great but if it didn't how many people would be trying to get out of here adding more homes means adding more traffic adding to the fear that other people will not be able to get out in a major fire that's my concern thank you michelle kyle followed by frank randolph mr merchant hi can you please confirm that this letter is accurate the district includes the residences and riverview in the population that they are entitled to receive water services from the district should water be available you are not subject to the emergency declaration this does not however resolve the situation around the obligations of the residents have to identify the district from the 670 fsa agreement whatever that okay this was in january 12th 2026 so can you please confirm that this is the case that you're hearing wait this is not a question and answer this is okay that's fine that's fine into public comment we'll address you can't do that then bad timing okay feel free to use your three minutes frank rand randolph followed by ellen moshal frank randolph okay ellen moshal good evening my name is ellen moskal not moshal i haven't gotten that one before i'm an attorney with the firm somac simmons and dunn and i'm here on behalf of rancho marietta properties tonight we are all here because this is a critical issue it has significant practical and legal consequences that will affect the community and the district and therefore must be seriously considered before the board takes any action we submitted a comment letter this afternoon which i will not repeat however in addition to our written comments there are several other key points to consider regarding the text of the proposed regulation right apologies resolution not regulation first the findings and the resolution do not meet the legal standard set by water code section 350 the board's emergency declaration must be based on specific findings and supported by evidence of insufficient water for essential uses the resolution falls short of this standard it finds only that supplies will not reliably meet demands during undefined periods of sustained drought and it relies only based on the text of the findings of the resolution on the draft integrated water master plan and the work group conclusions we have detailed several issues with these materials in today's letter which i will not repeat here i emphasize however that they do not provide adequate evidence to legally support a finding by the board as proposed in the resolution critically the resolution does not acknowledge any of the serious data issues in the draft plan despite the fact that some of these deficiencies were at least acknowledged in the district's presentation today second the effect of the proposed resolution is fatally ambiguous under resolution number two it states that the restrictions in this resolution are effective immediately however there are no actual restrictions imposed in the regulation does it recognize that declaring an emergency authorizes the district to impose regulations or restrictions yes it does does it specify any actual restrictions it certainly does not all the resolution does is purport to declare an emergency and commit the district to review unidentified options to expand its water supply given these

shortcomings the proposed resolution if adopted is wholly inadequate and unreliable rendering the legal effect and adequacy of the resolution to be dubious at best to the members of the board we urge you to vote no on the resolution before you tonight at minimum this vote must be delayed until the public has sufficient time to review the supporting packet and the voluminous materials contained therein many of which are highly technical in nature but this district purports to rely on as evidence to support its actions the district has discussed the possibility of declaring an emergency for years as staff noted in the presentation development is still years from being shovel ready there is simply no reason other than to stifle the public's ability to meaningfully participate to now provide only two business days to review these materials and respond to the same for all of the reasons that i have covered tonight in addition to our letter if the district does decide to adopt this resolution it will do so in violation of the law and it will face the consequences tom shushak followed by jim farrell so thank you tom shuchuk i've been a resident here for 35 years and for the last year and a half i've been attending all the csd board meetings and as you all know all the improvement committee meetings so i've also been following all the online discussions and the pros and cons from both sides i talk to people who are pro emergency i talk to people who are anti water declaration emergency and i understand all the data that csd has pretty well i'm a data guy um i want to thank csd for providing all the what i call preliminary info contained in the package interesting that the draft imp iwmp is included that hasn't been accepted by the board yet is it is used in mr enright's presentation with all the options documented in the iwmp on how to address the water concerns the dunn well study from 2014 that everybody now knows that hasn't been acted upon for the last 12 years and towards the end of the packet there's an unreviewed sp 552 calculation that suggests that current residents might have to pay for four groundwater wells so i surely hope when we have a final recommendation from a water consultant it's only two groundwater wells and we can reduce that expense by half so while all of this information is great it doesn't appear that the board has sufficient approved information to make a responsible decision today so so that i hope that this board will continue to refine and approve the needed information before it renders a decision in the meantime i hope csd and the developer can continue to make progress on groundwater wells the new water tanks and lake clementia re-permitting i also hope the community can band together to start looking at water usage because most of us in the community don't know how much water we use okay that's a fact and we should be focused on reducing our average daily demand so that we don't have to pay for as many sp 552 required wells when the time comes to build them i pledge my support to help csd in the community to develop solutions to these water concerns let's all work together to solve these issues thank you jim farrell followed by steve booth uh first i'd like to thank the board for keeping us all informed and involved in this process i think probably more than most maybe with the exception of tom i've been kind of a fixture of most of these board and committee meetings as we talked about this water issue i wrapped up my career uh in charge of long-term strategic planning for a large organization with hospitals and clinics all across northern california so i was kind of interested in seeing how to how we did this with water um all good plans start with data and we've got a lot of data here and i know there are some people who think that there isn't enough data and let me assure you there is enough

data one of the problems is that we don't necessarily agree on some of the pieces of the data and then there are also those people who totally distrust the data let me read you from the petition that got circulated last year with two more than 2 000 signatures on it we the undersigned members of the ranch marietta community will not support the findings of the iwmp until it is fully audited fact-checked peer-reviewed for accuracy and viability so when then president booth i set up a work group to look into these concerns i was asked and agreed to participate in that work group and we put together a report it is part of your package and many of you who have i've heard comments from tonight read the report read the work group report you'll have answers i think to some of your questions or you will see that we have raised the same questions that you're raising um so i would encourage you to do that so i can't get into that report i just want to make three three quick comments because i can see my clock is sticking here first of all based on the best data that we have available this community will run out of water if we are confronted with a another severe drought that is going to affect not just water but wires water safety we don't want to end up like palisades with hydrants that don't work and reservoirs that are empty second i don't see how we can ever come up with any kind of solutions our real plan including the finances until we get our heads together on this data and resolve these these issues and come to a common ground if we don't do that we're going to end up with things like wells that don't get drilled 15 year recycling misadventures that never really produced any more water or we're going to be out drilling walls not even understanding or agreeing upon how much water we're looking for and so my last point then is that board members as well intended as you are you can't solve this problem you can't solve this problem because in many ways there's a lot of division that's recognized in the community and it leaves many of us wondering who's really making interest in the best making decisions in the best interest of this community you need to get a third party advisor consultant here to help you get to some common ground so you can approach this in a common way but also i would encourage you to go one step further and that would be bring them on board it's like an account executive or something like that so you've got somebody to help you not only with the planning things that need to be done but also with the plan execution things because a plan is not enough you've got to execute it so i'm just going to end with i know my time's up so i don't want to sound like an alarmist but we've been put on notice almost two years ago that this is a problem we need to kind of move and move forward now steve booth followed by brad beer good evening and thank you numbers regarding available water have been revised since the last iwmp reflecting more accurate calculations for storage capacity in each reservoir and projected usage these numbers have been widely accepted by individuals on each side of this issue the data demonstrate there is not sufficient water supply to support the projected buildout pending before sacramento county we should hope for the best and prepare for the worst in this regard unless and until additional water sources are confirmed and pursued a backup supply confirmed and other regulatory requirements met any development of property that is not already entitled pursuant to a will serve letter should be precluded and those efforts should be accelerated the premise that more housing is needed to support the country club is a non sequitur we have more homes now than ever have existed in rancho murrieta and the country have club has near lowest membership ever additionally the district engineer has

reported that the rio oso storage tank will not support the 197 properties approved for the residences unless this shortfall is remedied by either cross-patching between rio oso and the van vleck tanks or an additional tank or tanks are in place that development should be restricted at the number identified by mr diminichelli thank you brad bear followed by carol ponzo franzo carol prenzo well i didn't write anything down um but i've been listening to this uh ordeal for some time now and uh i've been listening to this ordeal for some time now about water out here and you know california going back centuries is an arid state and water has always been a concern but it's not going to be solved by reactionary issues tonight or a reactionary finding it's it's proactive it needs to be proactive by everybody in this room we're all here we all live here so we need to work together the best effort that we can put forward here tonight is to continue this on and everybody work together to solve the problem instead of causing more roadblocks because i've seen this board spend countless probably millions of dollars in legal fees all this other stuff in the past and it won't accomplish a thing so all i'm saying is i've got 100 acres out there i've got friends in this in this room we've got property out here too to drill you know wells or help any way we can but it won't get solved by just stopping and uh you know stalling and and the solution is in this room so let's take advantage of that i mean everybody in this room there's there's there's some good minds in this room there's there's consultants there's we don't need to go down this path to stop so i'm saying is i would just reconsider this moratorium and let's just find a way to go forward together not not be secular and that's really what i have to say is i i mean we all need water we all want foundation we all want our kids to grow up and be saved so all i'm saying is let's work together not not not called divisiveness we don't need that so that's it thank you carol prinzo followed by jeff coharty good evening thank you for allowing me to speak i've kind of changed what i'm going to say after everyone else has spoken i'm glad to hear that there is a water guru from fulsome out here to help us figure out where the well water is because all the past studies that csd has done looking for well water have been fruitless we've spent a ton of money and got nothing for it the last well study that was conducted with their report was submitted on december 15th of 25 and it shows that uh five wells were dug although i'm hearing now that there were six i don't know about the sixth but between the five that i know about the rate of gallons per minute ranges from five to four hundred we need a whole lot more than that or probably a dozen wells to get that as a secondary water source beside the cosumnes river and then where are you going to put it we need a new reservoir we need another multi million multi-million dollar or not dollar i'm sorry gallon water tank the people in this room have the answers this the people in this room are willing to work together i'm hearing that tonight for the very first time and i thank them for that because that's what i've been hounding on i feel like a broken record on that this community deserves to have a safe reliable and resilient water supply the cost of that problem that has been handed down to us should not be on the backs of this community this community deserves nothing less thank you thank you jeff kahardi and candace hearn candace hearn and yeah come on leah smith it's hard to read the first name okay it's obvious that rancho murrieta has serious water issues to be dealt with this is without saying we need to find come together sit together at the table to find the solution a pause is needed for this to happen we cannot resolve the matter until we know how much additional water is needed to safely

support existing and future homes during my discussion i'm going to make reference to a water term the flashboard or top log capacity of the reservoirs flashboards or stop logs are temporary boards placed in the reservoir spillways to increase capacity csd studies after 1990 assumed that the reservoirs are their flashboard or stop log capacity going into a drought here's why that assumption is not considered an acceptable practice when planning for future development it's prudent water policy to fill this additional reservoir capacity annually when there is a possible whenever possible however there are conditions when doing so may be unachievable rancho murrieta's reservoirs and the consummest river pumping permits all contain restrictions creating a limited winter of a limited window of time when this capacity can be filled flashboards must remain out until april 16th each year and the river pumping must stop at may 31st this means there's only six weeks out of the entire year that the flashboard can be filled to capacity rancho has been able to do that most years but not always csd consummest river pumping permit has limitations in place the river must flow at a minimum of seven cubic feet per second at michigan bar pumping station all the way down to mcconnell pumping station therein lies the problem historically the consummest river was a gaining river where the river fed the groundwater years of overdrafting surface and groundwater have depleted the aquifers located under the river forcing the stream to go underground your time is up ma'am please finish your thoughts i'm sorry i said your time is up please finish your thoughts um oh okay i have lots more thoughts though okay okay well what we're finding is that again the public department of health and ken gibberson who did the earlier studies uh both said that relying on flashboard capacity of the reservoirs is not an acceptable practice when planning for future adult uh development in other words if works if csd plans on developer homes that rely on the reservoirs flashboard capacity and the water isn't available there'll be a shortfall thank you so much for your comments my name is lisa my name is lisa smith it's spelled weird i know blame my mother so um in doing all this research a lot of things said go to the water resource board i followed that i went to the water resource board the water resource board led me to the department of water resources and they talked extensively about how the consumers river is sinking going underground and the water is not available it's filling aquifers and the 2026 project that the department of water resources are doing requires the aquifers to be filled from the consumers river and to go downstream to keep the habitat alive which is going to deplete what we're going to be able to get so our ability to draw off the consumers the way i look at it i think it thinks it might be in question and we're already on a very short period of when we can draw from so that's my concern and yet i haven't seen any of that discussed in any of the stuff that you see on next door or facebook which i'm not even on but there's certainly stuff that's been in all the discussions in the community and that's what i'm bringing forward is i want to know i want to see more about the department of water resources project 26 that is going to probably restrict some of our ability to draw off the river thank you javier followed by mike metzger my name is javier lopez i've lived here since 1979 and i'm going to address mainly the information which the board spoke about in which they projected onto the screen if my understanding of if i heard you correctly there is approximately 3,900 acre feet of water available to serve as a community and you stated that at the present time there's 2,922 services and with a projected increase to 3,200 now if i take those numbers being accurate and

true then that means that we're allowing approximately one acre feet of water per residence one acre feet of water is 326,000 gallons now i don't know whether uh how much uh the average consumption is here in the community but if i allow 100,000 gallons a year 8,000 gallons a month that still leaves quite an excess now all this to say that either the the numbers that were presented are misleading or they're or they're not as accurate as they should be i don't know what the emergency situation is for our water shortage but i would suggest that the numbers be looked over again and i would like to leave my last comment with the uh statement about drilling wells now a two to three million gallon tank sounds like it's a whole lot of water that's eight acre feet and that's lake clementia holds 850 acre feet so that would uh lake clementia holds a hundred times more than an eight uh than a two or three million gallon tank would hold so i would suggest throwing suggest that these uh figures be looked over again and as to the cost of what the wells would cost and the infrastructure to take that water from the wells to be distributed it's going to be much more than i think than the community would be willing to uh to support thank you thank you mike mike metzger followed by michael mazzara all right ladies and gentlemen of the board and my fellow rancho marietta neighbors thank you my name is mike metzger and my family and i moved to the north side in 2022 and like every parent raising their kids here two daughters two and four i want a community that's safe stable and built on facts not fear i'm here because we're facing a problem that's clearly been ignored for 35 years and tonight that stops i want to acknowledge the concerns of the solos group gathering 2 000 signatures calling for a moratorium based on a draft water plan their passion is real their concerns are real but the petition also proves the real issue we depend on one river and the back of water supply we were promised decades ago still does not exist a moratorium won't build wells a moratorium won't create water a moratorium is simply a pause on progress and a green light for decline the 1990 the district's own gibberson report adopted his policy 90-2 said the consumeness river can support just over 3900 homes not the 59 68 were built for the policy committed csd to take reasonable and timely steps to build additional supply and storage that promise wasn't optional it was a basis for every home approved every fee charged every project allowed to move forward the community upheld its side of the deal the district has not board members i have to ask you to directly isn't it true the district identified this water shortfall back in 1990 isn't it true the district committed in writing to adding storage wells and storage and water augmentation at that time and isn't it true that those commitments may remain completely unfulfilled after 35 years the fees we've all paid developers have poured millions into water supply augmentation fund and ultimately the homeowners bear those costs 2.2 million dollars in the fund csd had in 2016 plus 5 million more projected with a 500 thousand dollar state grant we paid for wells we paid for backup supplies we paid for the system that should already be protecting us today the money was collected the work wasn't completed full stop the wells that never happened we've talked a lot about them tonight 2013 test holes had positive results 2014 2015 rfps 2016 another attempt planned and after that silence a total a decade of total inaction while the community assumed progress was being made this is not a water shortage this is a leadership shortage the draft iw the draft iwmp the the moratorium is being pushed using a draft report that's unverified unstamped and unprofessional from a liability standpoint in my 20 years in crean development reviewing environmental reports drafts

drafts carry zero weight if the data is real finalize it if it's not stop using it to scare people thank you for your comments sir your time is up the real damage of this moratorium the moratorium doesn't protect us it harms us immediately home values fall 10 to 20 percent overnight insurance costs jump or coverage disappears the country clubs collapses the half built retail center doesn't get built out we cannot survive on zero growth our taxes and fees are going to rise as lawsuits mount thank you for your comments our community gets branded as a no growth dead zone hunting schools businesses and families we don't need a moratorium we need execution we need a better path forward developers thank you for your comments sir michael mazur and bob kyle good evening michael mazur rancher maria north no community is risk-free especially when it comes to essential resources like water good decisions are rarely made under urgency but they are almost always consequential reliable infrastructure is one of the quiet foundations of a stable community a core responsibility is to understand future needs and help ensure we are prepared so residents are never caught off guard by decisions that are difficult to reverse major infrastructure decisions shape communities for decades and when they're wrong the consequences are felt for decades thoughtful planning matters not only for residents but also for the long-term certainty that builders and investors rely on this is direction our board alongside the community is demonstrating planning early acting thoughtfully and giving residents confidence in this community's future my comments are really about the value of predictable long-term planning because decisions like these shape a community for decades thank you bob kyle followed by alan chase in excuse me in 2016 the district claimed it had collected 2.2 million dollars in water supply augmentation fees that money gets invested by the district and today with a three percent compounded annual rate that would be about 2.8 million in the last couple of years the district has collected 44 fees from riverview 84 from the retreats which is another million dollars that means the district is holding almost four million dollars in water supply augmentation fees the district is required to use or designate these funds for specific projects which they have not if they don't do this after five years they'll need to return the money the 2.8 million dollars is currently in jeopardy of being returned it is your responsibility to augment the water supply not the developers the 1990 water policy states the district will take reasonable and timely steps to plan and develop develop additional raw water sources and storage capacity to serve the full build out of rancho murrieta wsc is prepared a well siting study that has identified multiple well locations the landowners have expressed willingness to negotiate a deal on those well locations the district has the money in the bank we're going to be drilling wells in the next few months why establish a water emergency now when a few months will know more about clementia in the wells why subject this community to lawsuits and damage to the real estate market and who knows what other unintended consequences when we are already working on solutions you don't need a moratorium to do the solutions since 2019 the district has had five general managers four directors of operations four finance directors a grand jury report the district has paid out hundreds of thousand dollars in employee settlements since there was no accounting for seven years at csd we're spending hundreds of thousands of dollars rebuilding our books and completing overdue audits the district just wasted five hundred thousand dollars on an iwmp that will never be finished the district wasted a five hundred thousand dollar grant that was supposed to be used drilling wells

this board has wasted millions of dollars of the community's monies with bad decision after bad decision don't compound your mistake and send us down the road of litigation drill the wells and let's talk about it thank you alan chase don perks good evening to the board and my fellow residents that haven't left to watch the olympics um i'm the probably the only person who's going to be speaking on behalf of a geologist tonight um dr greg wheeler wrote a letter to the board and i'm just going to read it to you um i am working in panama cannot come home for the meeting i have lived at 63 27 playa del rey for eight years i first moved to the sacramento area in 1978 i was hired as an assistant professor at california state university sacramento over the last 48 years i became an associate professor a professor and for the eight years before retirement i was the associate dean for undergraduate education i've been a fellow in the 25 000 strong geologic society of america for 19 years i've studied lead field trips and published geology on the sacramento area although the precise units vary the principal formations in this area are the gopher ridge formation and the ion formation the gopher ridge formation consists mostly of volcanic rock and is known to produce water only when it is well fractured and this water is rapidly depleted the ion formation is known as an aqua cloud and aqua contains no available water and actually prevents the movement of water in the ground even if a suitable aquifer a unit that contains water transmits water is found in the area the cost of drilling is very high and the amount of water will be very limited the availability of groundwater is regulated by the state and drilling near the river or other places that would endanger existent water supplies will not be allowed if we build all the development plans we will lack a water supply in drought years it is regrettable that the community ever said we could build more homes well water will not solve the problem you the elected officers of csd should know that increasing the number of water users at the expense of those who already live here is not responsible sincerely dr greg wheeler thank you for your time thank you don kurtz followed by betty ferraro don kurtz has left the building okay yes ma'am betty ferraro followed by deb brihan okay it's easier this way i'm too short i'll grow my name is betty ferraro for those that have not seen me i stayed on csd board 19 2009 through 2016 i was on the board when we discussed everything you're hearing tonight so i'm sorry i'm turning my back to the board because they've already had the report from their manager and she was very well prepared okay for my education for you during the time i served i fought for you to make sure that you had ample water and not always succeeding in everything i did we did find water after the then manager told me there was no water available except what was down the river thanks to carol anderson ward she was allowing us to come onto her property and tap for four wells within that tapping one provided more than any of the other three so we went ahead and tapped it okay so that's where you are however the downside was we were supposed to go ahead and drill deeper we only went down about three 300 feet we needed to go deeper we did not find arsenic we add normal things in the water in the ground okay after the fact when i got off the board the next board decided that they we did not need that well they did not realize what we were trying to do so they turned around and stopped that was not anderson for doing anything other than supporting us my question today is if we tap wells on her property or family's property do we have an agreement with her and her boards to go ahead and continue to develop what the other gentlemen have said there was more to this i could go into that we again fell short on because the board i sat on

we went through a whole process we were stopped by our then manager okay so the gentleman that spoke about managing that was the answer we couldn't go further because we did not have support of the manager we elected to take the job so if you need more history i'll be glad to come at another time in local groups and fill you in debrie hodd followed by jay schneider it's deb britton for the record but thank you very much um i just want to say you know i moved to rancho marietta eight and a half years ago and i've lived all over the world and i've never lived anywhere as amazing as this community this community is what community is all about and what i've sat here so humble today and heard is that every answer that we are looking for is already sitting in these seats and what grieves my heart and has broken my heart these past weeks is to watch the divisiveness that has been sown through fear in our community instead of working towards constructive solutions and so what i know that we need is we need wisdom what i know that we need is that we need integrity and what i know that we need is we need transparency and i know that in order to have those things we need to look to something that's much larger than the beauty that is in this room right now and that is to heaven so father god i come before your throne right now and i thank you and i praise you for each and every member of this board god almighty i ask that you give them wisdom you say if we ask we will receive and so i'm asking them for that wisdom right now lord i thank you for the incredible wisdom and and power and just purpose that has come through with all of the passion in this room because everyone in this room lord i know loves rancho everyone in this room i know wants a solution to the water problem and god i know that only through unity will we be able to accomplish that so god right now i thank you that the plans you have for us are good that you have promised us a future and a hope and i am prophesying that into effect right now in jesus precious name amen thank you jay schneider hello board and hello uh audience uh my name is jay schneider i'm a rancher across the river i participated in all the rancher man's water things from the beginning including the environmental abuse to assure that they had a water supply enough to get all of the uh 5,210 homes then planned and approved for and get to uh emergencies they had a deal with el dorado irrigation district the 19th i come here to talk in two specific things that and i don't use this word lightly the acidity of some of this well drilling idea and the second one is the blatantly false statement number two blatantly false now the night there was no claro eid 77 a 500 year drought the only time all the history of the cusumes when you couldn't have got the full allotment for the 5,210 homes now reduce well below 4,000 okay and ken gibbertson participated in those studies after the 77 claro is the backup supply it's in the old reports it's in the resolutions that things so yes that's the backup supply and uh this is 100 false okay now wells like the geologist guy said there is no ground right out here you keep trying look on the highway from here to rancho seco there's like 30 40,000 acres with like 12 homes and no irrigated agriculture so look up to the west all those homes are single family homes with well and septic systems they need the ground order they can't even irrigate hardly their yards so you as an industrial user would dig a well when would you have lots of resources and then deprive them the groundwater law won't allow that i'm on the rcd and we've been over for 2015 working on a groundwater sustainability plan for this area so we know there's no groundwater out there now the well was decided as one man said in 2002 when they came to the schneider's and they dug a well on our ranch kind of near the river it's so simple they found

the water they capped it so it could be redrilled and widened it the well exists dug by rancho meta we didn't charge any fees and we agree now and i agree den if you want to use that well use it free and not only that there's another well that we use to irrigate right nearby the environmental loves this solution then you can't speak for him now but the idea was if it dropped below up here like it ever did in 77 a 500 year event then you could pump the water out from your own facilities and then turn the well on down there and pump the water back in the river except the environmental like this idea instead of pumping the water groundwater then you would pump the groundwater in and the river got lower so that they keep it alive a little longer so you could take it out up here when it was 60 or 50 cfs and pump it back in down there when it was 40 to keep it going 40 is the number it takes to get to macauley like somebody else said so the solution is right there it's free just just come out i can i i represented our family there and i represent now i guarantee we'll let you use that land as long as all we ask for is like an insurance warranty so it doesn't cost us any money and we don't have to take this but this is and there's other wells down there just pick any one of them next to the kasumi's and the groundwater down there hoover said it's lowering it's not our wells in that vicinity from duod road north and down this is the same depth they were in the 50s when we dug them the same way as the depth they were in 85 when they were tested the same they were in the early 90s and this is just two years ago we did the groundwater depth again same almost no variation near the river down there up here you can't get groundwater there isn't any and all you'll be doing is harming the people if you put an industrial around well around here that need it desperately that's their water that's their only water and you guys got abundant water this river is unbelievable unbelievable so if you're clara was the back that's right and then the one last thing the idea that you wouldn't use clementia is a joke look at kitten gibberish and so on sites in an emergency you would use it you don't have an emergency swim in it fine it already went through the treatment plant it's already there it was used for years it was used for years okay thank you very much for allowing me an extra minute or so i appreciate it i've been i've worked with rancher to try to reach solutions all of our family did and all of our neighbors we work with kittens gibberish and we work with the opening charnley heart no water district we work with the state water resources we work with education we work with a pension trust fund we everybody worked together to find a solution that you could have enough water and not harm the neighboring matches notice the schneider family still there the van black family still there the rumen family is still there all your neighbors are still there because we got a system in place that allowed the neighbors to stay in agriculture you should be proud of what the forefathers did when they designed this development it was a broad development that worked in an agricultural community because we worked together thank you so much jay there are no more public comments there are no more comments thank thank thank you for all of those comments uh we'll now uh ask the board if they have any further comments starting to the left tim yeah i'm not sure where to start first of all thank everybody for your time your input supervisor for taking your time thank you um i'm gonna ask a couple of questions and i think they're point of order um mr enright stopped me when i i start going over my legal boundary um amelia who directed you to put this resolution on the agenda sure it it wasn't the direction of uh the president well the ad hoc committee so okay so i'll ask the question again um the

direction was given either by the board president or the ad hoc committee which one i'll i'll take i'll take the responsibility for putting it on the agenda without it being on the agenda we couldn't act on it at all we have now the options in front of us of using it or not using it thank you um and mr enright this is where you're going to have to tell me if i'm crossing the boundary um i thought the board gave you direction from consents consensus last closed session um we had consensus as a board what was going to move forward and what actions were going to be taken um that no resolution was going to be um i'm gonna stop you there closed session is um confidential and so i'm not gonna understand thank you i'll on um i do not uh support this resolution uh i i asked the board i asked the board for a pause in this process um and direction was given to legal counsel uh to move forward with the developers at at that level almost removing the board from the negotiation process we have a natural pause right now uh with developments on the north uh potentially a couple years off to me it was natural that we would use that pause refocus our intent of everything that we just heard with the exception of a couple people that said we have no water uh but to to work together so uh with that i'm done thank you john well i'd first like to thank everyone for coming out uh you know i applaud you for being part of the community being part of the community doesn't mean that you agree with everyone it just means that you're willing to sit next to them and listen to them and i think that's very important uh and i learned a lot tonight it's interesting to see i've only been on the board eight months and it's interesting to me to see that we've pretty much been fighting this water thing over and over and over again since for 10-15 years and i scratch my head and sometimes it kind of drives me nuts to see us doing this when the the obvious seems so clear um i think we should really work forward to finding a solution and i'm not sure that wells is going to work but the one thing that we didn't really talk about is putting in a pipe between here and some other water district which i think is on the easily doable and it certainly is easily doable if the developers and us work together to make that happen um beyond that you know i took notes uh voraciously from every one of your comments uh and i haven't really digested them and i'd like to say john you know at this time i'm not ready to vote for uh a water emergency so now i i want to look it over and and jeff i'm looking right at you you know i i said last week i'd like to talk to you and tom and see if we can't just take a deep breath and make something actually happen because i think it's doable but you know with that i'm going to reserve comments and and my position until i can think it over and and talk to people and thank you all again for coming linda linda linda um thank you excuse me can you hear me bring it closer can you hear me now okay again from um uh other board members but also myself i appreciate the fact that everybody has come um it's important to hear everything that's being said um we do have differences of opinions but that doesn't mean we can't hear what other people are saying so i'm very pleased to have um been part of this and um we're open for discussion i am i think there's a there's a bar that you have to get over if you're going to do if you're going to cite section 350 and use it to create a water moratorium i don't think this i don't think we're anywhere near that bar we we've uh we the only thing in this packet i it was very disappointing to see it on friday what was in the packet regurgitation of past things that just don't add up to to the specific findings that would be required by section 350 a lot of people have said this uh that the um the iwmp is just a draft and can't really be used i do have to

correct one person that got up and and spoke about it that said that the board fired uh mattos because we didn't trust their numbers the board did not fire mattos it's a mystery how mattos got fired and we may never get to the bottom of how that happened which is very sad um i will reiterate what i've been saying since this subject came up and that is that to go forward on with this water moratorium based on the findings that we have at this time would lead someone said this it would lead to consequences yes bad consequences there would be liability for not only the board but individuals that that carried this forward and quite honestly i don't care about the individual's liability that's up to them but it's liability that would be on the board and it would be money that would cost the rate payers in the long run and that's what i've said from the very beginning this would cost the rate payers there is absolutely no sense in going forward with this i can sum this up um with what is important in the history of what has guided various boards through this process since the early 2000s when the beginnings of a 2006 integrated water master plan began and through that report and subsequently in another report that was done in 2010 and a report that was extracted from that data to create a water supply assessment that went to the county in 2016 all the way up until we commissioned the existing 2022 2324 water integrated water master plan we had a consistent message through that entire period that there was enough water existing in this community to satisfy all of the development and remarkably each time those reports were made the number of houses that were required to support went down and the answer continued to be rosy until the point of the 2016 water supply assessment which was striking in its in its continuing comment through all of these that hey look as long as you continue to support development with 30 to 50 conservation on the existing community we're going to make it and not only are we going to make it we're going to make it in as it said in the 2016 report solely by using lake clementia so some of what has gone on here through the years and i was on the board before they created the 2006 plan and voted on it in 2007 and i came back to the board after the 2010 report was done and the 2016 report was done but there was there was continuing guidance for those boards in the fact that there was enough water here already they recommended in the first one that we pick up 300 acre feet they represented they they they they stated in the next two that we pick up 600 acre feet which was really the basis of when they started to look for the water that the gentleman referred to in the dunn report that water was being that water was being searched for and would have been harvested to to to satisfy emergencies that had nothing to do with future development it was water for emergencies i.e we had a breakdown in our water plant or some other catastrophe so remarkably when i sit here today after battling the 2010 report and and the water supply assessment i think it's remarkable that we've come to a point for the first time that i think with a few exceptions that came to the podium tonight we have a universal agreement that we have a water problem miss mrs eckert has been at this since 1990 i joined her in 20 in i joined her in 2010 when it became apparent to me that we were we were supplementing the report not with additional water but with with with with voodoo type transactions of 20 percent reductions by the state and and the ever increasing abundance of recycled water which has not materialized so we we i want to culminate that just with one one one recount one incident where back in about 2016 or 2017 and my dates now all run together on this stuff uh mr kyle came to me and he asked me if i would meet with the newly appointed

head of of the uh the rancher north team which was mr dyer and in that meeting i asked bob if he thought we had enough water to support development and he said no and then i said to him well if i go to this meeting with mr dyer and i ask him the same question what's he going to say and bob said to me he's going to say no and i i i think i remarked with some expletive that i didn't trust what was being presented to me but i i i took the meeting and i went to the meeting and mr velez and jeff were at the meeting and i asked that question first and foremost and mr dyer told me no we didn't have enough water so i think when we sit in this room and we debate a water emergency and we hang that over the head of the community if we go a different way uh we have achieved a great deal by getting to this point and maybe it took a very large hatchet to get there because until we did this report and every one of those reports was done by the same consultant okay until we got to that point we're all right let's let's go back and and until we until we got to this point we didn't we didn't have we didn't have the universal acceptance i think we're going to need to solve the problem and i agree that and i agreed wholeheartedly with with bringing wsc in to do the well study uh what concerns me greatly with the well study is if we if we look at the existing water supply and what is concluded by madis in this fourth report that she did and what we did when we extracted her data not our data and applied it to the report where we we reviewed what she did we came up we came up with the conclusions that we we we really we really need a supplemental supply and it's reinforced by 552 we have to do that so if we do the wells and and miss anderson's project was never here ever just never never created never never a problem and we didn't give the entitlements to the 300 units in riverview and residences if those were off the table guess what what this data is showing us is that we have the very same problem we have a water deficiency with the 2900 and 25 houses that we have in front of us today okay so we need to deal with that and we've we've said we're going to embark on a program to look for wells and and and there's been all kinds of comments uh up to one of my favorite ranchers in the world jay uh that you know there is water here and there's not water here and and and and we were we were influential in creating that groundwater authority that he he mentions uh and and we should do that what what disturbs me in that process is that when this water is found and it's found on someone else's property three things can happen there's no water at all which legally is no problem there's all the water in the world which is legally no problem but somewhere in the reality and what happens if we only get part of the water who gets it and it's not important at the moment to decide who gets it and it's not important at the moment to not negotiate who's going to pay for it okay but it's it's it's vastly important that an agreement be put in place to do that and when you look at the wells in my opinion you know we've been labeled all the way across the board as a high-risk district our water supply is is fragile and it's fragile for a lot of reasons and and i think it's important that we look for alternative sources of supply and they are available i spent about a month researching what's called indirect diversion of recycled water and it started in the in the in the state assembly in 2018 and it came together in 2023 when it became law that we could we could double treat that water and we could use that water as a potable resource what it is for us is somewhere in the neighborhood of five to six hundred acre feet of water that we're going to have every day of the year whether it rains whether it snows as long as someone takes a shower we're going to create that water we need

to find a meaningful way to use it and it's not going to be easy because they've already told me when i when i when i queried the water board to say could we do this they said yes but of course like they say every other time we're going to have to test that if i could director merchant what you're providing is is absolute required knowledge and history but we do have an action item that we're to discuss on for the resolution we do so i i would humbly ask that we call for a vote on it okay and before before we do that i have one more i want to i want to i i just i just want to reinforce too that as we move through this we have to do something as a board we need two things here to to take us through the rest of this process because there are other there are other alternatives um i was under the impression that we had ruled out uh any any any any conversation with the eldorado irrigation district and and and in researching back emails through the district kind of believe that maybe we hadn't done what we should have to fully mine that resource so i called up there and i talked to two people and uh from the general manager the eid i got a selection of eight dates to choose from when we could come up and talk to so i think we ought to try that uh it's it's complicated and it may not work but i wouldn't read or i wouldn't write it off until we can do that um every one of our permits has to be negotiated we're not we're not in any position to to do that without sophisticated uh support from from from a water rights lawyer we don't have one and we need one every single thing that we mention as mitigation requires a change in our permits and some of them are licenses which are even more difficult to change so i think i will support a deference on this issue but i want to make it clear there are things we need to do and and things we need to rectify as we go through the process the final thing and it's very important we have arbitration and that arbitration is called a water supply assessment we are going to at some point in time and i don't think it's anytime soon we're going to get a we're going to get a mandate because it's water law from the county that we do a water supply assessment and we will do that with an with it with a with a qualified engineer who can use at their discretion the data that's been created by mattis and the working group report that we've created and they can use that data as they see fit and do and and do an unbiased report on their own and report back to the county whether or not this water is here and that's going to happen the law requires it to happen so i don't know when that will be it doesn't seem like it's going to be anytime soon but perhaps we can start on the rest of the process and wait for that arbitration to appear so i'm finished now and we can we can move for a motion on the on on the resolution i i would like to uh see a vote i make a motion that the uh resolution be approved what i want to see a vote we have a motion do we have a second that motion dies i'd like to make a motion that we defer uh action on this resolution to a to a future date if there's no second we need there's still no second so we then i need i need i need another motion i make a motion we adjourn can we do that without acting on that action item yeah we can always adjourn all right there's a motion to adjourn i'll i'll second that motion the before adjournment i i would like to thank uh supervisor rodriguez for being here your time brian little and yes uh brian little and eric dutton for for letting us have the place we got kicked out of the first one and then to staff for everything that you've done thank you do we need do we need a vote to adjourn yes you need a vote all in favor hi you read all