

From: [Roy Moosa](#)
To: [Simonds,Keene](#)
Subject: Fallbrook Public Utility District[SUSPECTED SPAM]
Date: Thursday, July 30, 2020 6:14:59 PM

July 29, 2020

Mr. Keene Simonds
Executive Officer
San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission
9335 Hazard Way, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92123

Re: Detachment Application by the Fallbrook Public Utility District

Dear Mr. Simonds,
I respectfully request that LAFCO support the detachment application by the Fallbrook Public Utility District.

For years, ratepayers within the Fallbrook Public Utility District have been paying for San Diego County Water Authority pipelines and facilities that we do not need. The fact is, given our unique location in the northern-most part of San Diego County, we do not to utilize this infrastructure.

To reduce the cost of water for Fallbrook ratepayers while continuing to supply a stable source of water for our community, the Fallbrook Public Utility District has entered into an agreement with the Eastern Municipal Water District, which will allow our district to purchase water at a much lower rate. In fact, the ratepayers of Fallbrook would save an estimated \$3-4 million a year if this detachment application is approved.

I am hopeful that you and the LAFCO members will approve Fallbrook's application.

Thank you for your consideration.
Roy Moosa
431 South Main Avenue
Fallbrook, Ca. 92028
760-728-8323



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: [Jerri Patchett](#)
To: [Simonds,Keene](#)
Subject: Fallbrook Public Utility District Detachment
Date: Thursday, July 30, 2020 9:43:38 AM

July 30, 2020

Mr. Keene Simonds

Executive Officer

San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission

9335 Hazard Way, Suite 200

San Diego, CA 92123

Dear Mr. Simonds,

I am writing to express my support for the Fallbrook Public Utility District's application to detach from the San Diego County Water Authority.

In these challenging times, families are struggling to make ends meet – whether it's putting food on the table or paying for everyday expenses like electricity and water.

By detaching from the San Diego County Water Authority and joining the Eastern Municipal Water District, the ratepayers within the Fallbrook Public Utility District would save millions of dollars a year – money that can otherwise be used for other necessities. Just as important, the people of Fallbrook would continue to receive an equally reliable supply of water.

On behalf of my family and many of my neighbors, we hope that LAFCO will approve this application.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Jerri Patchett

3737 Lake Ridge Road
Fallbrook, CA 92028
(760) 723-8635



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

777 South Figueroa Street
34th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
T 213.612.7800
F 213.612.7801

Lloyd W. Pellman
D 213.612.7802
lpellman@nossaman.com

Refer To File # 501668-0005

**VIA EMAIL: KEENE.SIMONDS@SDCOUNTY.CA.GOV
AND FIRST CLASS MAIL**

July 31, 2020

Mr. Keene Simonds
Executive Officer
San Diego County LAFCO
9335 Hazard Way, Suite 200
San Diego, California 92123

Re: Fallbrook PUD and Rainbow MWD Wholesaler Reorganization (2020)
(RO20-04; RO20-05)

Dear Mr. Simonds:

This to address the issue stated at the July 6, 2020 advisory committee meeting regarding applications RO20-04 and RO20-05 regarding an “exit fee.” Although we believe the relevant statutes are clear and the obligation of RMWD ratepayers to SDCWA is on-going payment of property taxes, we understand that LAFCO could propose certain terms and conditions related to any LAFCO action. The term “exit fee” has been used by LAFCO in the context of discussions with the subcommittee established by the Commission. As we will describe below, this term is not founded in statute – either within the CWA Act or CKH. We do not want more casual observers of this process to think that the concept of an “exit fee” is some sort of benchmark that we must reach. We had hoped that the parties could jointly agree to an alternative arrangement and propose these mutually agreed upon terms to LAFCO. Unfortunately, after well over a year of efforts, we have not been able to achieve any level of substantive engagement with SDCWA on the matter.

As a result, the issue of an “exit fee” is already addressed in the Act, which governs the proposed detachments.

Section 45-11 of the Act expressly addresses the process for detachments. Section 45-11(a)(2) of the Act expressly states in relevant part as follows:

“...the taxable property within the excluded area shall continue to be taxable by the county water authority for the purpose of paying the bonded and other indebtedness of the county water authority outstanding or contracted for at the time of the exclusion and until the bonded or other indebtedness has been satisfied; provided further, that if the taxable property within the excluded area or any part thereof is, at the time of the exclusion, subject to special taxes levied or to be levied by the county water authority pursuant to the terms and conditions previously fixed

under subdivision (c) or (d) of Section 10 for the annexation of the excluded area or part thereof to the county water authority, the taxable property within the excluded area or part thereof so subject to the special taxes shall continue to be taxable by the county water authority for the purpose of raising the aggregate sums to be raised by the levy of special taxes upon taxable property within the respective annexing areas pursuant to the terms and conditions for the annexations as so fixed and until the aggregate sums have been so raised by the special tax levies.”

In sum, the detaching district's property taxes continue to be paid to the SDCWA until the existing debt is paid off.

No other provision of the Act provides for any other sums to be calculated and paid to SDCWA in the event of a detachment.

C-K-H is silent as to any provisions for any other payment to be made to SDCWA in the event of a detachment by a member district.

The State Legislature has provided for a detaching agency to forfeit to the SDCWA its property taxes for so long as the SDCWA debt existing needs the property tax contributions to retire the existing debt although the detaching agency is no longer receiving services from SDCWA. The forfeiture to SDCWA of the property taxes generated in the detaching area on such a continuing basis is the only statutory fee for exiting SDCWA. The Act has been amended 40 times since its original enactment; the process for annexation has been amended 7 times, the last in 2000, while the process for exclusion or detachment has been amended 3 times, the last in 1985. (A compilation of the amendments is attached.)

SDCWA has no other such rights, powers, or authority under the Act regarding detachments beyond the continuing collection of property taxes necessary to retire debt existing at the time of detachment.

Contrast that with the process for a district to join SDCWA through annexation as provided in Section 45-10 of the Act.

The application of a district to annex to SDCWA is to be made to the board of directors of the SDCWA (45-11(c) and the board may grant or deny the application. If the board exercises its discretion and grants the application, the board may fix terms and conditions and those terms and conditions must be imposed in addition to any terms and conditions required by the commission (45-11(d)(1)). The issue of annexation subject to the terms and conditions imposed by the SDCWA board and by LAFCO would be voted upon by the electors within the district. If annexation occurs the district then becomes responsible for its property tax being used to pay existing debts of the SDCWA.

The distinction between annexations and detachments are clear in that the SDCWA Board has been given by the Legislature much control over the process of joining SDCWA. The Legislature, having failed to grant SDCWA any such powers in the event of a detachment, such powers cannot be implied from the provisions of the Act. Most significant is the fact that in annexations the Board, if approving of such, may impose terms and conditions which LAFCO is expressly required to impose; that is not true for detachments.

The only "exit fee" provided by the Legislature is the continuation of the property tax payments for existing SDCWA debt.

This should resolve any misconceptions that might have arisen regarding the basis for an "exit fee."

Very truly yours,



Lloyd W. Pellman
Nossaman LLP

LWP:ls

Attachment

cc: Via email:

Robert Barry, Chief Policy Analyst, San Diego LAFCO
Holly Whatley, Counsel, San Diego LAFCO
Aleks Giragosian, Deputy Counsel, San Diego LAFCO
Tom Kennedy, General Manager, Rainbow Municipal Water District
Alfred Smith, General Counsel, Rainbow Municipal Water District
Jack Bebee, General Manager, Fallbrook Public Utilities District
Paula C. P. de Sousa, General Counsel, Fallbrook Public Utilities District
Sandra L. Kerl, General Manager, San Diego County Water Authority
Mark J. Hattam, General Counsel, San Diego County Water Authority

- § 45-5. Powers
 - Stats.1945, c. 670, p. 1337, § 1 – approved 6/4/45
 - (6)
 - Removed the specific rate the authority has to pay for land if its primary actions, such as constructing roads or water conveyances, rendered that land valueless or unsalable.
 - Removed the specific rate the authority has to pay for land if any of its actions that did not fit the prior category rendered the land valueless or unsalable and replaced that rate with “the reasonable rate determined by the Division of State Lands.”
 - Stats.1968, c. 424, p. 876, § 1 – approved 6/28/68
 - (11)
 - Removed the exception for the purchase of water from the requirement that “a portion of the water served by the authority which shall...bear the same ratio to all of the water supply by the authority as the total accumulation of amounts paid by such public agency to the authority on tax assessments and otherwise...toward the capital cost and operating expense.”
 - Stats.1975, c. 586, p. 1257, § 4 – approved 9/8/75
 - (5)
 - Removed the provision explicitly stating that in any proceeding related to eminent domain, the authority shall have the same rights, powers, and privileges as a municipal corporation.
 - There was also some general re-wording of the remaining phrase, but it seems to hold the same meaning in the new version, just with more clarity.
 - Stats.1978, c. 363, p. 1066, § 1 – approved 7/6/78
 - (11)
 - Removed the limit that the authority could not acquire water and water rights within the county in which the authority is organized and/or located.
 - Removed language stating the authority could provide, sell, and deliver water at wholesale for municipal, domestic, and other beneficial uses and purposes and replaced it with broader language stating the authority could provide, sell, and deliver water for beneficial uses.
 - ◆ Changed language in a later related clause from “domestic, municipal or other beneficial uses” to “beneficial uses.”
 - Removed language requiring the authority to give one year’s written notice to purchasers of surplus water before reallocating it on a determination it is needed within the authority’s district.
 - Added a new section (12) and (13), renumbering the previous (12) as a new (14).

- Stats.1981, c. 456, p. 1708, § 1 – approved 9/11/81
 - (12)
 - Removed clause limiting the authority’s powers with respect to sewage/waste/sea waters to situations where those functions are assigned to the county water authority by elected officials and in accordance with Section 208 of the federal Water Pollution Control Act.
- Stats.1989, c. 32, § 1 [page 96] – approved 5/30/89
 - (11)
 - Removed clause giving public agencies preferential right to purchase water from the authority given certain requirements.
 - Added sentence requiring the board of directors, as far as practicable, to provide its member agencies with adequate water supplies.
 - Added sentence requiring the board to adopt reasonable rules, regulations, and restrictions to allocate available water supplies to its member agencies for the greatest public interest and benefit if the authority’s water supplies are inadequate to fully meet the needs of those agencies.
- SB 1173 – approved 7/5/1995
 - Digest
 - (1) The County Water Authority Act authorizes an authority formed pursuant to that act to acquire, store, treat, reclaim, reuse, distribute, and sell sewage water, wastewater, and seawater for beneficial uses and purposes.
 - ◆ This bill would additionally authorize an authority to repurify and sell those waters, and would define “repurify” for that purpose. The bill would authorize an authority to change its name.
 - (2) Existing law requires the board of an authority to consist of at least one representative of each public agency located within the authority that is appointed in a specified manner. Existing law prohibits a member of a governing body of a public agency from appointing himself or herself to the board of an authority.
 - ◆ This bill would delete that prohibition.
 - Introductory language
 - Changed from “Any authority shall have power:” to “An Authority may do all of the following:”
- (12)
 - Added repurify as an option and defined repurify.
- (15)
 - Added this section, which allows the authority to change its name.

- § 45-5.1. Hydroelectric power
 - SB 552 – approved 9/30/2000
 - (b) (1)
 - Added the ability to sell hydroelectric power at wholesale.
 - Added (c) (1) and (2) – provisions providing power specifically to authorities in San Diego County related to providing gas or electricity to its member agencies.
 - (d)
 - Took existing language and created its own sub-section.
- § 45-5.2. Standby water charges
 - SB 444 – approved 7/2/07
 - (a)
 - Added requirement for authorities to abide by the notice, protest, and hearing procedures in Section 53753 of the Government Code.
 - (b)
 - Added that the maximum cost of standby charges did not apply to a standby charge imposed pursuant to the Uniform Standby Charge Procedures Act.
 - (c)
 - Removed existing procedural requirements and replaced them with those in Section 53753 of the Government Code.
 - Allowed previously adopted charges to stay in place.
- § 45-5.5. Surplus money; investment
 - SB 106 – approved 8/25/97
 - Removed existing procedural requirements and changed them to those in Article 1 (commencing with Section 53600) of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code.
- § 45-6. Directors; total financial contribution and vote of member public agencies of the San Diego County Water Authority
 - Stats.1957, c. 1356, p. 2684, § 1 – approved 7/4/57
 - Increased the value of assessed valuation per additional representative from one extra per every \$50 million to one extra per every \$70 million.
 - Stats.1959, c. 1561, p. 3895, § 1 – approved 7/3/59
 - Increased the value of assessed valuation per additional representative from one extra per every \$70 million to one extra per every \$90 million.
 - Stats.1963, c. 711, p. 1715, § 1 – approved 7/3/63
 - Increased the value of assessed valuation per additional representative from one extra per every \$90 million to one extra per every \$100 million.
 - Stats.1968, c. 424, p. 880, § 2 – approved 6/28/68
 - Increased the value of assessed valuation per additional representative from one extra per every \$100 million to one extra per every \$115 million.

- Stats.1972, c. 605, p. 1069, § 1 – approved 8/9/72
 - Removed the method of valuation of additional representatives and replaced it with allowing agencies to appoint one additional representative for each full 5% of the assessed value of taxable property.
 - The term of any representative shall not be changed or terminated.
- Stats.1973, c. 754, p. 1356, § 1 – approved 9/25/73
 - Added subsections (a) – (e) to existing text, solely breaking up existing text with the exception of the change listed below.
 - (b) [previously second paragraph]
 - Added details on who could and could not be appointed from water districts.
- Stats.1987, c. 272, § 1 – approved 7/29/87
 - Added section (f)
 - Added requirement and definition for a quorum and allowed some business to continue without a quorum.
- SB 1173 – approved 7/5/95
 - (b)
 - Removed prohibition on a member of a governing body appointing themselves for appointment.
- AB 692 – approved 8/26/97
 - (c)
 - Removed provision allowing for the recall of any member by a majority vote of the governing body of the public agency from which the member is appointed.
 - Replaced the provision mentioned above with provision stating representative serve at the will of the governing body from which they are appointed and may be removed by a majority vote without a showing of good cause.
 - Completely changed the format of (d) and subsequent sections.
 - Section (d) was split into (d) and (e) [the new section (d) came from the middle of the old section (d).]
 - Added sections (f) – (i).
 - Previous sections (e) and (f) became ((j) and (k), respectively.
 - (e)
 - Added section giving agencies the ability to adopt, by ordinance, a policy that the votes of more than 50% of its members can represent all of the votes for the agency at the board of directors.
 - ◆ If the largest member has more than 38% of the total financial contribution, then over 55% is required for a group vote.
 - (k)
 - Added section providing that designees under section (g) do not count toward quorum.

- AB 540 – approved 7/26/98
 - (e)
 - Added that a meeting may be continued by a vote.
- AB 2243 – approved 6/23/04
 - (b)
 - Removed reference to water district, thus allowing a member of a governing body of a member agency to serve as the agency’s representative.
 - Added that for a member agency that is not a water district, only one of the representatives may be a member of the governing body of the agency.
- § 45-7. Bond issues
 - Stats.1961, c. 1505, p. 3348, § 1
 - (i)
 - Removed procedural requirements for determining the validity of bonds and replaced it with those in Chapter 9 (commencing with Section 860) of Title 10 of Part 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure.
- § 45-8. Contract to incur indebtedness; election; indebtedness by contract in lieu of bond issuance; second indebtedness by contract if project construction not commenced
 - Stats.1976, c. 1457, p. 6530, § 1 – approved 10/1/76
 - Added sentence providing that an authority may incur indebtedness by contract other than by voting bonds, limits that debt it 0.1% of total assessed valuation of taxable property, and requires a three-fourths vote.
 - Changes situation where a vote of qualified electors is required from acquiring debt over \$1 million to either acquiring debt that is over 0.1% or situations when compensation shall be payable in a timeframe longer than 20 years.
 - Stats.1981, c. 874, p. 3356, § 1 – approved 9/27/81
 - Added that the 0.1% of assessed valuation is that as defined in Section 135 of the Revenue and Taxation Code or as otherwise hereafter defined by the Legislature.
 - Stats.1985, c. 1408, § 1 – approved 10/1/85
 - Added sections, grouping the entire previous version under (a).
 - Added (b)
 - If a proposition met the requirements of the Revenue Bond Law of 1941, the authority may instead acquire that amount by contract as long as it is payable in 30 or fewer years.
 - Stats.1987, c. 436, § 1 – approved 9/3/87
 - Added (c)
 - If the contract incurred under (b) is repaid in full because the project was not commenced due to administrative/court/other reasons, an authority may incur a second contract no larger than the first contract.

- SB 290 – approved 7/13/99
 - (a)
 - Increased the time frame necessitating voter approval from contracts longer than 20 years to contracts longer than 40 years.
 - Added a new section (b), moving the previous sections from (b) and (c) to (c) and (d), respectively
 - (b)
 - A contract that is between 20-40 years is subject to a referendum.
 - The referendum is initiated by a petition protesting the proposed action that is signed by at least 5% of the total votes for governor in that jurisdiction in the most recent election.
- § 45-8.2. Borrowing money; short-term revenue certificates
 - SB 133 – approved 9/24/98
 - (e)
 - Added that the board may arrange for a letter of credit from a bank or other financial institution (was previously only a line of credit).
 - SB 966 – approved 7/12/99
 - (b)
 - Added that no resolution or indenture can preclude payment from the proceeds of sale of a letter of credit, matching section (e).
- § 45-9. Taxation
 - Stats.1968, c. 424, p. 881, § 3 approved 6/28/68
 - (d)
 - Changed the date before the governing body may elect to pay property taxes from 12/25 to 12/15.
 - Stats.1971, c. 1499, p. 2959, § 3 – approved 11/12/71
 - (d)
 - Added that the governing body cannot elect to pay its property taxes out of funds derived from an ad valorem property tax.
 - Stats.1981, c. 874, p. 3357, § 2 – approved 9/27/81
 - (e)
 - Removed clause that if any fraction of a cent occurs, it must be taken as a full cent on each \$100.
- § 45-10. Annexation
 - Stats.1947, c. 922, p. 2133, § 1 – approved 6/23/47
 - Added new sections and renumbered existing subsections, essentially rewriting the entire section.
 - Added a new section (a) which defined “city” and “water district” for this section.
 - (b) (2)
 - Changed the second option for annexation from focusing on applying to the controller of a county water authority to annexation to, or consolidation with, any city.

- Added subsections ((b) (2) (aa) – (h).
 - Stats.1953, c. 1236, p. 2793, § 1 – approved 6/20/53
 - (c)
 - Added requirement that notice of the election shall be mailed to each qualified voter.
 - (c) (1)
 - ◆ Added/clarified that an authority can annex the corporate areas of either one or more water districts as separate units, regardless of whether they are currently in one or more water districts.
 - ◆ Added the following language “...or which water district shall include as a part of its corporate area the corporate areas, or portion thereof, already included within such county water authority, of any water districts (whether one or more) whose corporate areas, in whole or in part...”
 - ◆ Made other minor changes referencing that this subsection now applies to both cities and water districts, whereas it previously just applied to cities.
 - Added (c) (2).
 - Added a new section (e), moving the former (e) to (f), (f) to (g), etc.
 - Stats.1957, c. 357, p. 1097, § 244 – approved 1/16/57
 - (c)
 - Removed the existing procedural requirements for posting notice of the election to those in Section 6061 of the Government Code.
 - (d) (2)
 - Removed the existing procedural requirements for posting notice of the election to those in Section 6061 of the Government Code.
 - Stats.1985, c. 1408, § 2 – approved 10/1/85
 - Relabeled previous sections (2) (aa), (bb), and (cc) as (2) (A), (B), and (C), respectively.
 - (d)
 - Added that if a governing body of a water district applies to be annexed, the action of the authority’s board of directors in response shall be submitted to the local area formation commission (previously was just the governing body).
 - (d) (1)
 - ◆ Added that the annexation may be subject to terms by the local area formation commission.
 - (d) (2)
 - ◆ Added a requirement that a territory have at least 12 registered voters to be able to get consent to annexation through a proposition.

- ◆ Added that if a territory has under 12 registered voters, the authority can host a hearing in place of the proposition, and it will be approved by written consent of more than 50% of the assessed valuation of the territory.
 - (e)
 - ◆ Changed the responsibility for filing the paperwork to certify the proceedings resulting in annexation from the governing body of the water district or city to the local area formation commission.
 - ◆ Removed the sub-header (e) (1) and included its text directly in (e).
 - Changed the responsibility for preparing, executing, and filing a certificate of completion from the governing body of the water district or city to the local area formation commission.
 - AB 692 – approved 8/26/97
 - (i)
 - Removed the phrase that made this subsection apply to determining how the number of votes to be cast by directors.
 - SB 1652 – approved 9/24/98
 - (b) (1) (B)
 - Changed the party receiving the filing of the ordinance from the Secretary of State to the county clerk.
 - ◆ [Made similar changes elsewhere throughout the document.]
 - (i)
 - Added back in the phrase deleted in AB 692.
 - SB 1350 – approved 9/17/00
 - (b) (1) (B)
 - Clarifies that the correct county clerk is the one in which the county water authority is situated.
 - (i)
 - Re-removed the phrase deleted in AB 692.
- § 45-10.2. Annexation of territory within federal military reservation to county water authority
 - AB 692 – approved 8/26/97
 - (g)
 - Added that a military reservation shall be deemed to be a public agency for purposes of this act.
 - Removed section that provided that as a member of the board of directors, the representative of the military reservation shall be entitled to cast a vote independent of the assessed valuation of taxable property within the reservation.

- SB 1652 – approved 9/24/98
 - (e)
 - Changed the party with whom the proceedings are filed from the Secretary of State to the county clerk of the county in which the county water authority is situated.
 - ◆ [Made similar changes elsewhere throughout the document.]
 - (g)
 - Removed the addition from AB 692 related to a military reservation being deemed a public agency.
 - Re-added in section related to the voting rights of the military representative.
- SB 1350 – approved 9/17/00
 - (g)
 - Added back in the phrase deleted by SB 1652 and originally added by AB 692.
 - Re-removed the addition from SB 1652 (that was also in the original bill) related to voting rights of the military representative.

- § 45-11. Exclusion of territory

- [Original document for reference](#) (pg. 2004 of the pdf)
- [Stats.1951, c. 997, p. 2628, § 1](#) – approved 6/1/51 (pg. 2508 of the pdf)
 - Made substantial additions to the original bill.
 - The entire original section was put into (a) (2).
 - Sections (a) (1), (b), and (c) (1) – (3) were added.
 - (a) (2)
 - Changed that the process in this subsection applied
 - Changed the applicability of this subsection from a vote on withdrawing from “any authority incorporated thereunder” to “such county water authority.”
 - ◆ Made related changes in the section from “authority” to “county water authority.”
 - Added section providing that if the area that is being excluded is subject to special taxes levied or to be levied by the authority under the provisions of paragraphs (c) and (d) of section 10, then it shall continue to be taxable for the purpose of raising certain sums until that money has been raised.
 - Added section providing that the Secretary of State shall issue a certificate within 10 days of receiving the filing.
 - ◆ Added that the Secretary of State shall then transmit the original of that certificate to the secretary of the water authority and shall forward a certified copy to the county clerk in the county in which the authority is located.

- [Stats.1957, c. 1356, p. 2685, § 3](#) – approved 7/4/57 (pg. 2142 of the pdf)
 - Added subsections to (a) (1): (a), (b), (c), (d).
 - These subsections explain when exclusion pursuant to (a) (1) shall not occur.
- [Stats.1985, c. 1408, § 3](#) – approved 10/1/85 (pg. 906 of the pdf)
 - (a) (1) [former (a) (1) (a) – (a) (1) (d)]
 - Removed subsections (a) (1) (a) – (a) (1) (d) and replaced the type of situation in which exclusion shall not occur.
 - Added section (d).
- § 45-13. Administrative authority
 - Stats.1985, c. 1408, § 4 – approved 10/1/85
 - Added that all matters and things necessary for the administration of the affairs of the authority can be provided by resolution (previously was just by ordinance).
 - SB 629 – approved 7/6/99
 - Added sections (b) (1) – (b) (3)
 - AB 650 – approved 10/12/03
 - Added section (c)
 - SB 373 – approved 10/06/05
 - Added section (d)
- § 45-15.5. Claims for money or damages; law governing
 - Stats.1963, c. 1715, p. 3409, § 92 – approved 7/15/63
 - Changed the section of the Government Code applicable to claims against the authority from Chapter 2 of Division 3.5 of Title 1 to Part 4 of Division 3.6 of Title 1.



July 31, 2020

Sandra L. Kerl
General Manager
San Diego County Water Authority
4677 Overland Drive
San Diego, CA 92123

Subject: Clarification of Statements Included in Your Letter of July 15, 2020, regarding the San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Special Advisory Committee Meeting and Next Steps

Dear Ms. Kerl,

We are in receipt of your letter dated July 15, 2020, regarding the LAFCO Special Advisory Committee July 6, 2020, meeting and next steps for the Fallbrook Public Utility District (Fallbrook) and Rainbow Municipal Water District (Rainbow) applications for detachment from San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) and annexation into Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD).

Your letter includes several claims and statements regarding EMWD that we believe warrant clarification. As such, the purpose of this letter is to clearly and accurately characterize EMWD's positions on certain matters, provide complete information to ensure readers of your letter are not left with incorrect impressions, and to address what we believe are several inaccuracies.

Metropolitan Water District voting entitlement and representation: Your letter suggests that EMWD has a vested interest in becoming the wholesale water provider for Fallbrook and Rainbow for the benefit of increasing its voting rights as a member agency of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (Metropolitan). To be clear, this is not a driving factor for EMWD's willingness to consider annexation of the Fallbrook and Rainbow service areas as evidenced by the fact that any resulting change in voting entitlement at Metropolitan would be inconsequential. As you are aware, Metropolitan employs a

Board of Directors

Ronald W. Sullivan, *President* Philip E. Paule, *Vice President* Stephen J. Corona Randy A. Record David J. Slawson

2270 Trumble Road • P.O. Box 8300 • Perris, CA 92572-8300

T 951.928.3777 • F 951.928.6177 www.emwd.org

weighted vote and determines the number of Board representatives for a given agency based upon assessed valuation. EMWD's current weighted vote at Metropolitan is 2.72 percent. Adding Rainbow and Fallbrook under the proposed annexation would merely increase this amount by 0.3 percent, equating to an adjusted weighted vote for EMWD of 3.02 percent. Additionally, the number of Metropolitan board representatives is calculated based upon each agency being assigned one (1) board seat as a member of Metropolitan, with agencies receiving additional board seats for each five percent increment of Metropolitan's assessed valuation. As such, the addition of Fallbrook and Rainbow to EMWD's service area would not change EMWD's number of representatives on the Metropolitan board, which is currently, and would remain at one (1) representative. Similarly, SDCWA's current voting weight would change negligibly from 17.37 percent to 17.07 percent, and its representation on the Metropolitan board would remain unchanged with four (4) Metropolitan board representatives.

Incorrect statement regarding EMWD voting for higher property taxes at Metropolitan: Contrary to the footnote in your letter, EMWD has not voted to increase Metropolitan's property taxes. However, EMWD along with a majority of Metropolitan's member agencies has voted to maintain Metropolitan's current ad valorem property tax rate of 0.0035 percent per MWD Act Section 124.5. Our rationale is that all property owners within Metropolitan's service area benefit from a regional water system that allows imported water to be delivered throughout Southern California. Maintaining Metropolitan's increment of ad valorem tax helps ensure that property owners pay for the benefit that regional water service confers on their property. It should also be noted that the Metropolitan ad valorem tax rates paid and the benefits received by Fallbrook and Rainbow customers will remain the same whether their wholesale agency is SDCWA or EMWD.

Clarification regarding SDCWA vs. Metropolitan litigation: Your letter also states that EMWD is an adverse party in litigation that has been pending for more than 10 years. To be clear, EMWD and other Metropolitan member agencies are co-defendants in litigation brought by SDCWA against Metropolitan. The action referenced is one of six different lawsuits filed by SDCWA to challenge Metropolitan's water rate structure, and would result in millions of dollars in financial obligations being inappropriately shifted from SDCWA to other Metropolitan member agencies, including EMWD. EMWD intervened as a defendant in the case, along with several other Metropolitan member agencies, to protect their ratepayers. Your parenthetical statement that SDCWA has "*(successfully)*" challenged Metropolitan implies full victory by SDCWA in these lawsuits. As you know, only two of the six cases have been litigated, and a final judgment in those two cases has not been entered. These cases were filed by SDCWA in 2010 and 2012; SDCWA filed subsequent cases in 2014, 2016, 2017 and 2018. The court has not yet determined which party it considers to be the prevailing party. This issue will be

litigated and decided in the next few months. We expect Metropolitan's position to be that it is the prevailing party, as the financial impact of the rulings have been substantially in Metropolitan's favor. Once the 2010 and 2012 cases are decided, the court will take up the later filed cases.

EMWD's willingness to provide Fallbrook and Rainbow water reliability benefits: Your letter also states that EMWD will not make any of its independent supplies and facilities available to the applicants, and that EMWD is simply a "middleman" for Fallbrook and Rainbow to acquire imported water. This is an incorrect statement. As is the case with other agencies to which EMWD provides wholesale water service, EMWD is not just a Metropolitan water pass-through; and with respect to Fallbrook and Rainbow, EMWD has indicated a willingness to allow those agencies to voluntarily participate in new/future water supply reliability projects and programs from which they may benefit. This aspect of their potential annexation into EMWD was initially contemplated and included in section 10.d of the attached August 7, 2019, Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) executed among EMWD, Rainbow and Fallbrook. This section of the MOU states:

"Any new or additional water supply projects, program, or other measures implemented by EMWD that would benefit Rainbow and/or Fallbrook in terms of supply reliability enhancement under Metropolitan's Water Supply Allocation Plan (WSAP) or other Metropolitan Board adopted supply allocation plan in effect at the time of such allocation may, at Eastern's discretion, be offered to Rainbow or Fallbrook for consideration and financial participation."

EMWD has made significant investments in the development of local water supplies to increase water supply reliability and reduce reliance on imported water supplied by Metropolitan. EMWD has a diverse water supply portfolio that includes recycled water, groundwater, and desalinated groundwater, that in conjunction with imported water purchased from Metropolitan, reliably meets EMWD's service area demands. Although if annexed, Fallbrook and Rainbow may not have physical connections to EMWD's local supplies, these sources increase EMWD's overall wholesale and retail water supply reliability and performance under Metropolitan's adopted Water Shortage Allocation Plan. As described in the attached February 12, 2020, technical memorandum entitled: *"Analysis of Eastern Municipal Water District's Water Supply and System Reliability with the Potential Annexation of Fallbrook Public Utility District and Rainbow Municipal Water District"*, EMWD is able to balance its local and imported supplies to meet wholesale and retail demands even during a regional water supply shortage and would continue to be able to do so if Fallbrook and Rainbow's imported water supply was provided through EMWD.

Sandra L. Kerl

July 31, 2020

Page 4

Additional clarifications: We would also like to take the opportunity to clarify two other points raised in your letter: one in the footnote that suggests the detachment will cause environmental impacts in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta); and another that suggests the detachment involves “*substantially complex water supply*” issues.

Fallbrook and Rainbow are currently being supplied with imported water from Metropolitan’s Robert A. Skinner Water Treatment Plant and if annexed into EMWD, would continue to be supplied by EMWD with the same source of imported water. Importantly, the potential detachment of Fallbrook and Rainbow would allow for a reduction in the amount of imported water SDCWA currently receives from Metropolitan and a corresponding equivalent increase in the amount of imported water EMWD receives from Metropolitan. There would be no net increase in imported water to the region and therefore would not result in Metropolitan, as a State Water Contractor, increasing its reliance on the Delta. This is also explained in the attached technical memorandum.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide you and the other LAFCO Advisory Committee members, who have been tasked with examining the details of a potential Fallbrook and Rainbow detachment from SDCWA and annexation into EMWD, clarification on the statements made in your letter regarding EMWD.

In closing, in the early stages of Rainbow and Fallbrook’s efforts, you and I had the opportunity to meet and discuss your concerns with their proposed detachment, ways in which the process might be responsive to those concerns and the professional decorum that we agreed needed to be maintained among the agencies involved. I thought that meeting was productive and in effort to avoid further misunderstandings, I would be happy to reinitiate discussions with you at your convenience.

Thank you and please call me at 951-928-6130 or email at jonesp@emwd.org should you wish to discuss further.

Sincerely,



Paul D. Jones II, P.E.
General Manager

Sandra L. Kerl

July 31, 2020

Page 5

C:

Dianne Jacob, Chair, San Diego LAFCO

Holly Whatley, Commission Counsel

Aleks Giragosian, Deputy Commission Counsel

Robert Barry, Chief Policy Analyst

Kristina Lawson, Counsel, San Diego County Water Authority

Gary Croucher, Vice Chair SDCWA Board of Directors/ President Otay Water District Board

David Cherashore, Director SDCWA Board and City of San Diego Representative

Brian Albright, Director of Parks and Recreation San Diego County

Rachel Cortes, SANDAG Regional Model Analyst

Gary Thompson, Executive Officer, Riverside LAFCO

Keene Simonds, Executive Officer, San Diego LAFCO

Jack Bebee, General Manager, Fallbrook Public Utility District

Paula C. P. de Sousa, Counsel, Fallbrook Public Utility District

Kim Thorner, LAFCO Special Districts Advisory Committee/Olivenhain General Manager

Lydia Romero, LAFCO Cities Advisory Committee/Lemon Grove City Manager

Nick Kanetis, Deputy General Manager, Eastern MWD

Tom Kennedy, General Manager, Rainbow Municipal Water District

Alfred Smith, Counsel, Rainbow Municipal Water District

Jeff Kightlinger, General Manager, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

Board of Directors, San Diego County Water Authority

Board of Directors, Eastern Municipal Water District

Attachments:

[Technical Memorandum, dated February 12, 2020 – “Analysis of Eastern Municipal Water District’s Water Supply and System Reliability with the Potential Annexation of Fallbrook Public Utility District and Rainbow Municipal Water District](#)

[Memorandum of Understanding, dated August 7, 2019 – “Planning Process and General Terms and Conditions for Consideration of the Annexation of Rainbow Municipal Water District and Fallbrook Public Utility District into Eastern Municipal Water District for Wholesale Imported Water Service”](#)