

November 2, 2020

CSD Members

My wife and I strongly support Site E and oppose site C for the following reasons:

1. Per the environmental review and per the districts' trusted experts, Site E is the preferred and recommended site.
2. Site E does not impact private wells unlike Site C.
3. No future mitigations to domestic well owners will be necessary which could prove to be very costly for the CSD and very inconvenient for the homeowners and renters.
4. Site E does not require the CSD to surrender water to a developer.
5. Site E requires less permitting.
6. Site E has easier access for drilling, constructions and maintenance.
7. Site E can be pumped from the upper aquifer unlike Site C.
8. Site E will not cost as much as Site C which is great for tax payers and it is good for the CSD because it shows fiscal responsibility.

It seems to us that Site E is a win-win for everyone. We strongly support Site E and we hope you do also.

Peter Zotovich

Katherine Zotovich



November 2, 2020

Dear Los Osos Board of Directors,

We are writing to urge you to select Site E (Former Bayridge Estates Wastewater Treatment Site) as the location for the Program C well site. Site E is recommended by the staff (District General Manager, District Engineer, Cleath Harris Hydrologist), as well as the Utility Advisory Committee. Our reasons for supporting your selection of Site E include:

- Unlike Site C (Andre Site), Site E will not impact domestic well owners. No future mitigations to domestic well owners will be necessary, which could prove costly for the CSD and very inconvenient for the homeowners and renters. On page 8 of the August 2018 CHG memorandum (see attached document) several potentially costly mitigations are recommended if Site C was selected.
- Site E does not require the CSD to surrender water to any developers. Why would the CSD relinquish 10% of the water of a municipal well? Will this 10% reserve hasten development in our dry basin?
- Per the environmental report, Site E is the preferred and recommended site.
- Site E requires less permitting which will make the project faster and less expensive.
- Site E has the easiest access for drilling, construction and maintenance.
- Site E has the potential to pump from the upper aquifer, unlike Site C. This could provide significantly more water than stated in the Program C Well Site comparison reports.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Greg Neal DVM and Carolyn Taylor Neal



- An estimated 8 of the 29 Upper Aquifer wells surveyed in the study area did not meet the reliable well criteria in Fall 2016, even without an Expansion Well at Site C. With the Expansion Well pumping a maximum of 200 AFY, interference for Upper Aquifer wells in the study area is estimated to range from 3 to 6 feet, resulting in one additional well falling below the 50-foot minimum water column threshold. The average depth of the Upper Aquifer wells subject to potentially significant water level impacts during drought is 140 feet (ranging from 110 feet to 160 feet deep).
- The Perched Aquifer well did not meet the reliability criteria, but would likely not be significantly affected by Expansion Well operation. All of the mixed aquifer wells (and any Lower Aquifer wells in the area) are projected to meet the reliable well criteria established for this analysis.

Recommendations

The following steps are recommended if a Site C Expansion Well is pursued:

- Establish a voluntary Site C groundwater monitoring program for wells within the study area that are 160 feet deep or less.
- Determine the actual pumping rate, pump depth setting, and specific capacity for wells in the Site C groundwater monitoring program, or any well in the study area per well owner request, regardless of depth. Recalculate the impacts threshold for each well using site specific information, including minimum water column above the pump.
- Provide owners of those wells not meeting site-specific impacts threshold with options to mitigate potential impacts from a Site C Expansion Well. These could include lowering the well pump, reducing pump size with increased pressure tank capacity, and cleaning the well to remove sand and increase specific capacity. Mitigation options would be offered at no cost to well owner.
- Monitor actual interference from the Expansion Well at wells in the Site C groundwater monitoring program. If the interference causes a private domestic well to become unreliable to a level that would not support the existing use, the impact would be mitigated at no cost to well owner. The appropriate mitigation measure would be determined at that time.

10/31/2020

LOCSD Board Members

We are writing to state our objection to the use of site C (Andre Ave) for the Program C well. There are many reasons that site C is inappropriate. Site E (former Bayridge Estates Wastewater Treatment Site) is a more appropriate choice for this project.

Using Site C will result in many potential problems. It will impact many private wells that the local residents depend on as their only water source. Future mitigations to the domestic well owners will be required which could prove very costly to the CSD. Also, Site C requires that we relinquish 10% of the municipal well water. This may hasten development in our dry basin.

Most importantly there are potential health and safety issues to using Site C. As you know, drilling any well could contaminate the aquifer. Secondly there could be casing leaks that would allow seepage between aquifers. There is definitely a concern that placing a municipal well at Site C will overtax the aquifer for the surrounding domestic wells. There is significant opposition from the neighbors to this site.

Site E is a much better choice for this project. Per the environmental review and per the District's trusted experts, Site E is the preferred and recommended site. Unlike Site C, Site E can be pumped from the upper aquifer. Site E does not require us to surrender 10% to a developer. Site E requires less permitting. Site E has easier access for drilling, construction and maintenance. No mitigations will be required at site E and it will cause less inconvenience to the surrounding residents.

Please choose site E for the Program C well.

Sincerely,

Larry Bender

Marcia Page



11/01/2020

CSD Board Members:

Re: Community Water Well site issues

I live on Andre Avenue. I am opposed to placement of a community well on our street (site C). Generally speaking, I am opposed to future further development of Los Osos. The water needs of the current population of homeowners is already at risk.

To even consider putting a community well in a residential area such as exists in the neighborhood of Andre Avenue is ludicrous. That plan speaks to the needs of outside developers and others who do not live in this area. It seems to me that some people seem to wish to make Los Osos into a community which does not reflect the desires of those of us who have chosen to live here for many years.

Please understand that the water needs of the current inhabitants will be threatened if you were to choose Site C. Our peaceful community is feeling threatened already just by the consideration of putting this well in our neighborhood. (And by the way, giving away water rights to a developer is unconscionable in my opinion and I am astonished that you would consider it in any circumstance.)

My neighbors and I are wanting to be heard. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Sabra Scott

10/31/2020

I am writing this email to advise you about our position in support of Site E well site and our opposition to Site C well site.

Site E will not impact private wells where as Site C will. Site E does not require the CSD to surrender water to a developer. Even the District's experts agree that Site E is the preferred and recommended site. It will also require less permitting and has easier access for drilling, construction and maintenance. The most important issue to us is that the well at Site E will be pumping from the upper aquifer which will not infringe on the basin Site C occupies where we and our neighbors have our wells.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ernie and Kristie Dalidio

