

NIPOMO COMMUNITY

BOARD MEMBERS

JAMES HARRISON, PRESIDENT
LARRY VIERHEILIG, VICE PRESIDENT
MICHAEL WINN, DIRECTOR
ED EBY, DIRECTOR
DAN A. GADDIS, DIRECTOR



SERVICES DISTRICT

STAFF

MICHAEL S. LEBRUN, GENERAL MANAGER
LISA BOGNUDA, ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER
PETER SEVCIK, P.E., DISTRICT ENGINEER
TINA GRIETENS, UTILITY SUPERINTENDENT
JON SEITZ, GENERAL COUNSEL

Serving the Community Since 1965

148 SOUTH WILSON STREET POST OFFICE BOX 326 NIPOMO, CA 93444 - 0326
(805) 929-1133 FAX (805) 929-1932 Website address: ncsd.ca.gov

February 9, 2012

Mr. Harold Snyder
P. O. Box 926
Nipomo, California 93444
kochcal@earthlink.net

Dear Mr. Snyder:

SUBJECT: JANUARY 31, 2011 PUBLIC DOCUMENT REQUEST

Enclosed are copies of the following:

- NCS D presentation map and slides from January 23, 2012, workshop.
- NCS D presentation map and slides from January 28, 2012, workshop.
- NCS D presentation map and slides from January 30, 2012, workshop.
- NCS D presentation map and slides from February 1, 2012, workshop.

As per the public document request dated January 30, 2012, and received in the District office on January 31, 2012. These are ready for your pick up at the District Office. The cost of coping these records are \$31.90. (\$1.50 first page, \$.20 each additional page, 153 pages).

Very truly yours,

NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Michael S. LeBrun
General Manager

Enclosure(s): NCS D presentation slides 01-23-12
NCS D presentation slides 01-28-12
NCS D presentation slides 01-30-12
NCS D presentation slides 02-01-12
NCS D presentation maps
120130 Snyder Request

Harold Snyder
P.O. Box 926
Nipomo, CA 93444

January 30, 2012

Michael LeBrun,
Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD)
148 Wilson Street, P.O. Box 326
Nipomo, CA 93444

mlebrun@ncsd.ca.gov
(805) 929-1133 Phone
(805) 929-1932 Fax

Dear Michael LeBrun:

This letter is a request for public records which are in the possession of the Nipomo Community Services District pursuant to the California Public Records Act (Govt. Code 6250, et seq.).

The following is a list of the reasonably identifiable public records which I request copies of:


1. I am making a public record request for a copy of the NCSD presentation maps shown on the Monday, January 23rd 2012 presentation for Rural Water Customers, Sunday, January 28th 2012 presentation for NCSD Water Customers, and the Monday, January 30th 2012 presentation for Woodlands Water Customers.
1. I am making a public record request for a copy of the NCSD presentation slides shown on the Monday, January 23rd 2012 presentation for Rural Water Customers.
2. I am making a public record request for a copy of the NCSD presentation slides shown on the Sunday, January 28th 2012 presentation for NCSD Water Customers.
3. I am making a public record request for a copy of the NCSD presentation slides shown on the Monday, January 30th 2012 presentation for Woodlands Water Customers.
4. I am making a public record request for a copy of the NCSD presentation slides shown on the Monday, February 1st 2012 presentation for GSWC Water Customers.

If a portion of the information contained in the records we have requested is exempt from disclosure by express provisions of law, Govt. Code 6254 requires segregation and deletion of that material in order that the remainder of the information may be released.

Please take note that Govt. Code 6256 requires the Nipomo Community Services District to determine, within ten (10) days after receipt of this request, whether the Nipomo Community Services District will comply with this request. If the Nipomo Community Services District decides not to comply with all or any portion of this request, Govt. Code 6256 requires notification to us of the reasons for the determination not later than ten (10) days from your receipt of this request. Further, Govt. Code 6256.2 prohibits the use of any provision of the Public Records Act to delay access for the purposes of inspecting public records. Govt. Code 6256.2 also requires that any notification of denial of this request for records must set forth the names and titles or positions of each person responsible for the denial.

If you place the presentation slides on your web site I can get the documents there. If not my understanding is the copying cost is \$15 per CD or DVD. If you have any questions please let me know.

Thank You


Harold Snyder

RECEIVED
JAN 31 2012
NIPOMO COMMUNITY
SERVICES DISTRICT



*A Working
Session on the
Nipomo Mesa's
Affordable
Fresh Water
SOLUTION*

Rural Water Co. Community Workshop

January 23, 2012 / 7:00-8:30pm

Mesa Middle School

Agenda

- **PART 1: The Nipomo Mesa Water Problem and Supplemental Water Project**
 - A brief review
- **PART 2: The ASSESSMENT PROCESS and the Assignment of Benefit Units**
- **Questions & Answers**

Part 1: A Brief Review

**Nipomo Mesa
Water Shortage**

**Ed Eby, NCSD
Board of Directors**


**Water Supply
Options**

**Mike Winn, NCSD
Board of Directors**


**Supplemental
Water Project**

**Michael S. LeBrun
NCSD General Manager**

Santa Maria Groundwater Basin



Nipomo Mesa Water Company Boundaries and Proposed Assessment District



Our Water Problem

The Nipomo Mesa has
only ONE source of water supply. . .

. . . the groundwater beneath us.

Our Water Problem

**The Nipomo Mesa has NO
alternate water supplies:**

No lakes

No rivers

No reservoirs

No accessible pipelines


No desalination plants

Our Water Problem


The experts tell us . . .

- We are using much more groundwater than is being replaced by rainfall
- Our water table has been dropping since 2000 – despite some years of above-average rainfall
- Water demand for urban uses has more than doubled in the past 20 years
- Many wells have fallen below sea level
- Neighboring communities have experienced seawater intrusion


We share our aquifer with the Pacific Ocean



When fresh water table stays above sea level...
Seawater stays offshore.




Too much pumping...
Can cause the fresh water table to fall below sea level...
Creating an invitation for seawater intrusion.



NOTES:
 Coordinate System: UTM Zone 10N
 Horizontal Datum: NAD 83



2010 Fall Groundwater Contours




**NMMA
 Technical
 Group**

DATE: 4/21/11

BY: J. Herbert

Nipomo Mesa Water Company Boundaries and Proposed Assessment District



Seawater Intrusion

	Los Osos	Oceano	Nipomo Mesa
Aquifer shared with The Pacific Ocean	X	X	X
Decreasing well levels	X	X	X
Pumping freshwater wells below sea level	X	X	X
Seawater intrusion documented	X	X	Not yet...
Freshwater Wells Permanently Lost to Seawater Intrusion	X	Not yet...	Not yet...

Our Water Problem

Nipomo Mesa Water Shortage Consequences:

- Seawater Intrusion - Contaminated Groundwater
- Permanent Loss of Fresh Water Wells
- Prolonged Water Shortages
- Significant Negative Property Value Impacts
- Extreme Water Rationing

Criteria for the Optimal Solution

Origin	Outside the Nipomo Mesa Management Area – NEW WATER
Quantity	2,500 acre-feet per year minimum, per Court ruling
Schedule	ASAP
Cost	Lowest
Reliability	Uninterrupted year around
Quality	Little or no purification required

Top Six Solutions

Acceptable
Marginal
Fatal Flaw

Option	Origin	Quantity	Schedule	Cost	Reliability	Quality
State Water Pipeline		Unavailable				
Santa Maria Pipeline		2,500-6,300	2 years	\$25M for 3,000 AFY capacity	Best	Better
Desalination			15-20 years	\$100-400M	Best	Best
Building Moratorium		2X overuse remains				
Reclaimed Water	No new water	600-1,400	4 years	\$15M		
Conservation		100% for urban users				

What do the Experts recommend?

“The TG* recommends that the Nipomo Supplemental Water Project be implemented *as soon as possible.*”
(2nd Annual Report, Calendar Year 2009)

“The TG recommends that the Nipomo Supplemental Water Project be implemented *as soon as possible.*”
(3rd Annual Report, Calendar Year 2010)

*Nipomo Mesa Management Area Technical Group (TG)

What do our Neighbors recommend?

“Please join our city in providing your full support for this critically important regional project.”

Arroyo Grande City Council, 8/26/11

“The Nipomo Supplemental Water Supply Project is a necessary and urgent first step to begin to manage the regional water resources sustainably, and protect the economy of the South County area.”

Pismo Beach City Council, 9/8/11

Benefits of Importing Fresh Water:


Importing water will allow us to reduce our pumping to protect the diminishing groundwater supply

Pumping reduction will significantly reduce the risk of seawater intrusion near the Rural Water Company fresh water wells

Increased sources of supply increase supply reliability.

Santa Maria Pipeline

Most Cost-Effective Near-Term Solution



Santa Maria Pipeline

Most Cost-Effective Near-Term Solution

IMMEDIATELY CONNECTS TO:

- NCSD
- Golden State water system
- Woodlands water system
- 1.5 miles to Rural connection

COST: \$25.9M

Design and construction

TIMELINE:

18 months to complete

Santa Maria Pipeline Construction Budget


As of December 2011

Item	Cost
Engineering Design	\$6.9M
Engineering Contingency (10%)	\$0.7M
Construction	\$15.9M
Construction Contingency (15%)	\$2.4M
State Grant	Less \$2.3M
Total Construction Cost	\$23.6M

\$25.9M
Design &
Construction

Santa Maria Pipeline - SCHEDULE

Task	2011	2012			2013	2014
Assessment Engineer's Report	→					
Benefit Unit Verification	↔					
Assessment Ballot - VOTE	↔					
Finalize Design	←→					
Solicit Construction Bids	↔					
Award Contracts	↔					
Construction	←→					



Where we are today

Part 2: Assessment Process/ Assignment of Benefit Units

Kari Wagner, P. E.
Assessment Engineer


Formation of Assessment Districts

- Formed to fund a specific benefit to property owners in district boundaries
- **REQUIRED:** majority vote of PROPERTY OWNERS (not voters) – per State law
- Loan (bond) is made for advance payment of benefit (e.g., a pipeline project)
- Loan is paid back over time (e.g. 30 years)
- Property Owner payment options: 1) pay their portion in advance all at one time; or 2) pay their portion over time – over the life of the bond
 - Advance payment avoids interest charges

Assessment District Boundaries and Cost Share

- Area of service for water purveyors
- **Rural Water Company** properties –
 - Entitled to 7% of water
 - Will pay 7% of total project costs
- NCSD = 72%
- Woodlands Mutual Water Company = 14%
- Golden State Water Company = 7%


Assessment District Cost Share



Properties Assigned “Benefit Units” as “Basis for Assessment”

- Average water use determined by
 - Property size
 - Land use or zoning
 - Existing development and/or development potential
- Benefit Units based on average water use (likely benefit to property)

Rural Water Area Cost Share



Rural = 7% “piece of the pie”
With (\$2.1M), RWC* has an
estimated 1,558 Benefit Units

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cost per Benefit Unit} \\ &= \$2.1\text{M}/1,558 \\ &= \$1,348 \end{aligned}$$

* RWC = Rural Water Company

The Letter You Received . . .



Nipomo Community Services District
148 South Wilson Street
Post Office Box 326
Nipomo, CA 93444-5320

January 12, 2012

Dear **MERGE PROPERTY OWNER NAME**,

As you may know, we have a serious water shortage on the Nipomo Mesa. **Over the past several months a number of informational mailings have been sent and community forums conducted to help educate local residents about the problem—and the solution.** A plan has been developed to fund an affordable solution: the **Nipomo Mesa Supplemental Water Project** will ensure a continuing supply of fresh water to the Nipomo Mesa. Local property owners will have the opportunity to vote on the plan in the spring of 2012—in effect authorizing the formation of an assessment district to secure the funding needed to implement the plan.

To invite property owner input on all effected properties and ensure the accuracy of each assessment, YOUR INPUT IS NEEDED. Please take this opportunity to confirm the following information about your property.

The records of the San Luis Obispo County Assessor show that you are the owner of the property located at **MERGE SITE ADDRESS**.

Your property is identified by Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) **MERGE APN #**.

The records also show that this property size is **MERGE ACREAGE**.

You are in a location served by **MERGE WATER PURVEYOR**.

If local property owners approve the plan in a vote scheduled for the spring of 2012, Proposed Assessments will be determined by "Benefit Units" assigned to each property that reflect the maximum allowable development and potential water usage on each property.

The District's Assessment Engineer currently indicates that your property qualifies for **MERGE BENEFIT UNITS** Benefit Units.

If you do not plan to add any future water connections or services to your property you may eligible for a reduction in Benefit Units.

If the above property information is correct, you do not need to respond.

If any property address, property owners list, APN or acreage is **incorrect** or if you believe the Assessment Engineer should consider a **reduced number of Benefit Units** contact:

Karl Wagner, P.E.
Wallace Group
612 Clarkson Court
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

No later than **February 16, 2012**.

For more information contact Karl Wagner, P.E. at (805) 344-4011 or Karlw@wallacegroup.us

Verify that the property information is correct

Respond to the letter- options:


- Do nothing
- Correct errors
- Request change of Benefit Units

Basis for Assessment for Rural Water Company Properties

Group	Sub Group	Land Use Category	Description	Parcel Sizes Included (acres)	Basis of Assessment
1	A	Residential with 1 unit (RSF, RMF, RR, RS, RL)	All residential parcels with one unit	<= to 0.35	1.00 Equiv. BU
	B			>0.35 & <= 0.65	1.60 BU
	C			>0.65	2.00 BU
2	A	Residential with 2 units	Second Unit on a residential property	<=1.00	0.00 BU
	B			>1.00	0.30 BU for 2nd unit
3	A	Commercial (CS, OP, CR)	Commercial Services, Office Professional, Commercial Retail	<= to 0.35	1.0 BU
	B			>0.35 & <= 0.65	1.60 BU
	C			>0.65 & <= 2.00	3.00 BU
	D			>2.00	6.00 BU
4	A	Hotel	Hotel or Bed & Breakfast	All Parcel Sizes	0.40 BU/room
5	A	School	School	<= to 0.35	1.00 BU
	B			>0.35 & <= 0.65	1.60 BU
	C			>0.65 & <= 2.00	3.00 BU
	D			>2.00	3.00 BU plus 1.0 BU for every acre above 2.0 acres
6	A	Recreational	Parks, Fields, etc	All Parcel Sizes	1.00 BU per acre
7	A	Public Facilities w/ No Irrigation	Public Facilities with no irrigation (i.e. wells, tanks, lift stations)	All Parcel Sizes	0.00 BU
8	A	Public Facilities w/ Irrigation	Public Facilities with irrigation	All Parcel Sizes	1.00 BU/acre
9	A	Open Space w/ No Irrigation	Open Space w/ no irrigation (i.e. medians, parking lots, etc)	All Parcel Sizes	0.00 BU
10	A	Open Space w/ Irrigation	Open Space w/ existing irrigation	All Parcel Sizes	1.00 BU/acre
11	A	WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant		1.00 BU
12	A	Exempted Parcels	Parcels with their own water source	All Parcel Sizes	0.00 BU

Typical Rural Water Company Property Assessments

Group 1, Subgroup A
Group 2, Subgroup A



1.0 Benefit Unit
0.0 Benefit Unit

$\$1,348/\text{Benefit Unit} \times 1.0 \text{ Benefit Unit} = \$1,348$

OPTION 1: Can be paid in advance to avoid bond financing and interest charges (~18% discount)

OR

OPTION 2: Can be paid annually over time via property tax bill at \$240 per year.

The \$240 was a mistake and should be \$120, see correction:


As I explained, we double counted the debt service on RWC portion of Bond resulting in a number that was twice as high as our conservatively high estimate should be.

If this is your website, we'd appreciate it if the correction could be made. Respectfully,

Michael S. LeBrun, P.E.

General Manager

Rural Water Benefit Unit Distribution



Property Owner Assessment Worksheet for Rural Water Company Customers (Approximate Current ESTIMATE)

1

Total Assessment

(Example)

- a. Enter your Benefit Units _____ 1.0
- b. Multiply a. by \$1,348 _____ $1.0 \times \$1,348 = \$1,348$
- c. Multiply a. by \$1,090 _____ $1.0 \times \$1,090 = \$1,090$
if prepayment is made



This is your Total Assessment

2

Yearly Payment

(Example)

- a. Enter your Benefit Units _____ 1.0
- b. Multiply a. by \$240 _____ $1.0 \times \$240 = \240

This is your estimated
Yearly Payment on your
Property Tax Bill



The \$240 was a mistake and should be \$120, see correction:
As I explained, we double counted the debt service on RWC portion of Bond resulting in a number that was twice as high as our conservatively high estimate should be.
If this is you website, we'd appreciate it if the correction could be made. Respectfully,
Michael S. LeBrun, P.E.

The Ballot & Voting Process

- Property Owners will receive a ballot in the mail
- Benefit Units and maximum assessment cost for your property will be stated
- Your vote will be weighted based on dollar value of your assessment
- ALL voting will occur 100% by mail
- If 50% plus one of the value of returned ballots are YES, the Assessment District will be formed
- Only ballots returned will be counted

If You Have Questions...

- **Please wait for the roving microphone to ask your questions**
 - **Specific questions** regarding YOUR property can be answered following the meeting or by contacting Kari Wagner directly
- **Focus your questions** on the Funding Plan and Assessment District Formation
- **For more info** – visit www.NCSD.ca.gov (click on Water Shortage News)

Basis for Assessment for Rural Water Company Properties

Group	Sub Group	Land Use Category	Description	Parcel Sizes Included (acres)	Basis of Assessment
1	A	Residential with 1 unit (RSF, RMF, RR, RS, RL)	All residential parcels with one unit	<= to 0.35	1.00 Equiv. BU
	B			>0.35 & <= 0.65	1.60 BU
	C			>0.65	2.00 BU
2	A	Residential with 2 units	Second Unit on a residential property	<=1.00	0.00 BU
	B			>1.00	0.30 BU for 2nd unit
3	A	Commercial (CS, OP, CR)	Commercial Services, Office Professional, Commercial Retail	<= to 0.35	1.0 BU
	B			>0.35 & <= 0.65	1.60 BU
	C			>0.65 & <= 2.00	3.00 BU
	D			>2.00	6.00 BU
4	A	Hotel	Hotel or Bed & Breakfast	All Parcel Sizes	0.40 BU/room
5	A	School	School	<= to 0.35	1.00 BU
	B			>0.35 & <= 0.65	1.60 BU
	C			>0.65 & <= 2.00	3.00 BU
	D			>2.00	3.00 BU plus 1.0 BU for every acre above 2.0 acres
6	A	Recreational	Parks, Fields, etc	All Parcel Sizes	1.00 BU per acre
7	A	Public Facilities w/ No Irrigation	Public Facilities with no irrigation (i.e. wells, tanks, lift stations)	All Parcel Sizes	0.00 BU
8	A	Public Facilities w/ Irrigation	Public Facilities with irrigation	All Parcel Sizes	1.00 BU/acre
9	A	Open Space w/ No Irrigation	Open Space w/ no irrigation (i.e. medians, parking lots, etc)	All Parcel Sizes	0.00 BU
10	A	Open Space w/ Irrigation	Open Space w/ existing irrigation	All Parcel Sizes	1.00 BU/acre
11	A	WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant		1.00 BU
12	A	Exempted Parcels	Parcels with their own water source	All Parcel Sizes	0.00 BU