

Exhibit F

This page intentionally left blank.

PLN210152 (Rio Vista Group LLC)
CEQA Comments regarding Draft EIR

Review period of December 23, 2021 through January 24, 2022

1. January 6, 2022 – Anthony Nicola
2. Susan Street residents
3. Christine Shaw
4. Anna Rosa Ramirez
5. Maria Isabel Padilla
6. Guadalupe Alvarez
7. Eustacio Cardenas
8. Monica Maldonado
9. Jose Estanquero
10. Jose Ramirez
11. Stanley Mano
12. David Parra
13. Anonymous
14. Michael DeLapa, LandWatch Monterey County
15. Chris Bjornstad, CalTrans District 5

Friedrich, Michele x5189

From: Anthony Nicola <anthonymnicola@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 3, 2022 4:55 PM
To: ceqacomments
Cc: Spencer, Craig x5233
Subject: PLN210152



[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

Hi Craig,

This is a comment on the notice of intent to adopt a mitigated negative declaration for PLN210152, APN 117-361-016-000, 51, 53, 55 & 57 Susan St, Royal Oaks 95076.

There is a large error in both the source and quality of information in regards to the water usage of the previous farming operation.

In the "Env. Health Complete Letter" you can see where EHB accepted the 5.25 acre feet per acre equalizing 19.22 acre feet of water per year, and refers to simply a letter written by Lakeside Organics, a private company, explicitly stating that no metering was available.

The letter from Lakeside Organics is located at the very end of the "LET_NOHR_PLN210152_112321" document. A few concerns with that - I don't think Lakeside Organics is a legitimate source for data, especially with no metering. They also claim to have farmed there for four years, typically 10 years is needed to establish a bonafide history.

In the initial study for the Davis project(PLN190127, a very similar project), "Initial Study Davis Pg92" they cite a much more legitimate source on page 92, MCWRA annual Groundwater Extraction Summary Report, showing an average of 2.645 AFY/acre.

This information is in the document titled, "2018GWExtSummaryReport Pg12", and located on pg 12.

The information available from PVWMA is not as direct as it is from MCWRA, but in the document titled "BMP_Update_Final_February_2014_screen" Pages 23-25, vegetable row crops reflect a 31% of ag land use, totaling 8900 acres. Using the total water drawn from the aquifer at that time(including urban uses as well), 52,000 acre feet, the per acre usage calculates:

$$(52,000\text{AFY} \times 31\%) / 8900 \text{ acres} = 1.8 \text{ AFY/acre}$$

Lower than the MCWRA data, but still highlights the severity of error for what is currently being proposed.

If using the MCWRA data of 2.645 AFY/acre, with their 3.66 acre parcel, they should at the most have only 9.68 AFY to offset any proposed usage, not 17.9 as currently proposed.

For the record, I have no intention of wanting this project to not go through, as you know I have the project next door, I just want a fair playing field, and felt the need to call out the pretty obviously fake water number they came up with. I spoke with a handful of my farming contacts, and they all agree those are made-up numbers.

I'm sure there are even more sources for water data out there that will confirm this.

Thanks Craig,
Could you confirm receipt of this?
I'll drop off hard copies of all these documents next week.

Anthony
831-214-0404



_2018GWExtSummaryReport Pg12.pdf

_BMP_Update_Final_February_2014_screen.pdf

_Env. Health Complete Letter.pdf

_Initial Study Davis Pg92.pdf

_Initial Study.pdf

_LET_NOHR_PLN210152_112321.pdf

Project Referral Sheet

Monterey County HCD Planning
1441 Schilling Pl South 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901
(831) 755-5025

TO: FIRE DEPARTMENT
PUBLIC WORKS
PARKS DEPARTMENT

HEALTH DEPARTMENT
WATER RESOURCES AGENCY
OTHER: _____

PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS FOR THIS APPLICATION BY: Monday, December 20, 2021

Project Title: KALL ROBERT E & JANET ROSE (RIO VISTA GROUP LLC)

File Number: PLN210152

File Type: PC

Planner: ARCHBOLD

Location: 51, 53, 55 & 57 SUSAN ST ROYAL OAKS

Assessor's No: 117-361-016-000

Project Description:

Combined Development Permit consisting of: 1) a Use Permit to allow the construction of four (4) 16,286 square foot apartment buildings totaling 60 units for agricultural workforce housing and 1 manager unit; and 2) a Variance to allow lot coverage exceeding 5%. The property is located at 51, 53, 55 & 57 Susan Street, Royal Oaks (Assessor's Parcel Number 117-361-016-000), North County Area Plan.

Status: COMPLETE/INCOMPLETE (highlight/circle one)

SECOND TIME THROUGH IDR

Recommended Conditions:

The Environmental Health Bureau (EHB) has reviewed the above referenced project and can consider the project as complete without conditions.

Notes to EHB

Land Use: APN# 117-361-016-000 is 3.66 acres. Property is proposing 61 two-bedroom units (8 occupants per unit) for 488 Occupants, as well as 1 one-bedroom Unit (Resident Manager/Office) for 1 occupant. There is centralized laundry proposed for this site.

Wastewater: "Conditional" Can and Will Serve letter from Pajaro County Sanitation District (PCSD) dated 11/17/21 received, verifying sewer service.

Water: Pajaro/Sunny Mesa Community Services District (PSMCSD) Can-And-Will-Serve letter dated August 20, 2021 received with application (Page 52/132) that confirms drinking water service for the proposed 61 units. Initial Water Use/Nitrate Impact Questionnaire received with application (Page 54/132). Parcel is zoned as farmlands and is currently used for farming crops.

Water Demand: Letter from Lakeside Organic Gardens dated 11/17/21 provides a crop history from what was grown on the blocks proposed to be considered for development on APN# 117-361-016-000. Well meter data is reportedly not available for this site. According to Lakeside Organic Gardens, the average total water consumption on an annual basis, based on historical crop data) uses 5.25 acre feet per acre, per year (on 3.66 acres, that is 19.22 acre feet per year).

The applicant furnished to EHB a letter dated 12/7/2021 that included empirical data from 2 previously completed employee housing projects that are similar in use, design and implementation of water conservation devices to support a water use estimate of 45gallons of water per person, per day. A full season's worth of data has been received from the Boronda Villas Agricultural Employee Housing Project at 1144 Madison lane, Salinas, as well as 3 months of data from a newly approved Employee Housing Project located in Greenfield. The total water use (domestic, laundry and landscape) in gallons per day per person show averages of 35.48 and 34.04, respectively, with peak use observed at 39.24 gallons per day per person in July 2021. Based on the empirical data received, the project is advocating a value of 45 gallons per day per person for 8 month-occupancy which equals approximately 16.2 acre feet per year of water demand, adequately demonstrating that the project will incur a minor or insubstantial net use of water compared to the existing use. However, County staff will require analysis that assumes a 12-month occupancy. EHB anticipates the applicant will coordinate with HCD-Planning to adjust the

Signature: Connor Cappi, REHS

Please return a copy to RMA Planning

Date: December 20, 2021

project parameters so that the water use estimate will not exceed the estimated (from crop records) historical water use for the site.

Solid Waste/Recycling: Waste Management Can-And-Will-Serve dated August 20, 2021 received with application (Page 53/132) that guarantees Waste Management will serve Pajaro Apartments to provide weekly collection services of trash, recyclables and organic waste. Trash enclosure locations called out on pages C1.4, C1.1, and A1.1.

Hazardous Materials Management Services:

Hazardous Materials Questionnaire included on page 58/132 of the application. Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment also included on page 63/132.

Consumer Health Protection Services:

An employee housing permit will be required prior to occupancy. Prior to issuance of construction permit, an employee housing permit and plan check application with associated fees will be need to be submitted to EHB's Consumer Health Protection Services for review and acceptance.

Signature: Connor Cappi, REHS
Please return a copy to RMA Planning

Date: December 20, 2021



November 17, 2021

To whom it may concern,

Lakeside Organic Gardens is the largest family-owned and operated solely organic vegetable grower/shipper in the USA. Producing over 45 commodities year-round, they are committed to being 100% organically grown in California and ship across the USA and Canada. Lakeside Organics produce is sold nationwide and into Western Canada through distributors, national chain grocers, and processors.

Lakeside Organic Gardens has been farming the Miller Ranch at the end of Susan street in Pajaro, CA for the past 4 years. On an annual basis there are several factors that attribute to the yield and crop selection variety to be harvested. These factors can be grouped into three categories which are technological, biological and environmental variations.

I have been asked to provide a crop history of what we grew on the blocks proposed to be considered for development on APN# 117-361-016-000. Estimated water calculations are based upon nozzle flow rates, operating pressure, irrigation pipe size, run times and number of cycles for each specific crop cycle. In a typical year on average, we have 3 cycles / turns of crop on the blocks associated with this parcel. The average total water consumption on an annual basis uses 5.25 Acre Feet Per Acre per year.

The three crops we grow, and the water used are as follows:

- 1) Celery (2 Acre/Feet Per Acre Per Cycle)
- 2) Spinach (1 Acre/Feet Per Acre Per Cycle)
- 3) Brussels Sprouts (2.25 Acre/Feet Per Acre Per Cycle).

If any more information is needed, please let me know.

Thank you,

Juan Gonzalez

Operations Supervisor

Lakeside Organic Gardens, LLC

577 Judd Road Watsonville, CA 95076

Cell 831.278.2451 | Office 831.722.6266 | Fax 831.722.6286

Juan@lakesideorganic.com | www.lakesideorganic.com

Lakeside Organic Gardens, LLC
577 Judd Road Watsonville, CA 95076
Office 831.722.6266 | Fax 831.722.6286

Discussion/Conclusion/Mitigation:

Utilities and services are furnished to the project site by the following providers:


- Wastewater Treatment: City of Salinas, Department of Public Works
- Water Service: California Water Company (Cal Water)
- Solid Waste: Waste Management
- Natural Gas & Electricity: Monterey Bay Community Power and PG&E

19(a): Less Than Significant Impact. There are two existing sanitary sewers within the project site. The proposed project would be connected to the existing City of Salinas Davis Road Trunk Sewer, which runs parallel to Davis road, just outside the west shoulder. On-site storm drainage improvements would be provided in conformance with the Post Construction Stormwater Management Requirements for Development Projects in the Central Coast Region, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Resolution No. R3-2013-0032 (“Regional Permit”) and the guidance documents promulgated by the Monterey Regional Stormwater Management Program (MRSWMP), including the Stormwater Technical Guide for Low Impact Development, dated February 18, 2014. The proposed project would not require additional construction or relocation of utility facilities which would cause significant environmental effects. The sanitary sewer connection and storm drainage improvements would result in less-than-significant impact.

19(b): No Impact. The subject property will be served by California Water Service Company Salinas District (CWSC). CWSC has issued a “Can and Will Serve” letter stating that they would provide water services to the proposed project. CWSC projected future demand increases in their 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (2015 UWMP). The 2015 UWMP describes the service area, system supply and demand, water supply reliability and water shortage contingency planning, demand management measures and climate change. The actual water use within the CWSC Salinas District was 14,659 AFY in 2015. The proposed project projected water demand is within Cal Water’s UWMP demand increase for multi-family residential use. The UWMP considers multi-year drought scenarios and concludes adequate supply would be available in accordance with CWSC urban water management planning. CWSC and Monterey County regulations also require conservation and water reduction during periods of drought.


Further, a Water Demand Assessment was prepared for the project by Schaaf & Wheeler, and is contained in **Appendix M**. The report details the total water demand post-project and compares with pre-project water use based upon current and historical agricultural use.

Water demand for the existing agricultural row on the site was estimated using MCWRA annual Groundwater Extraction Summary Reports, which summarize the reported water use within the SVGB Reported water use for vegetable (row crop) irrigation ranges from 2.4 to 2.9 acre-feet/year/acre (AFY/acre) within the Pressure Sub-Area, depending upon the annual rainfall. The average use from 2008 to 2018 was 2.645 AFY/acre. Applying that average use to the project site, the existing agricultural water demand is estimated to be 42.3 AFY.



2018	Berries (Net Acres)	Field (Net Acres)	Forage (Net Acres)	Grapes (Net Acres)	Nursery (Net Acres)	Other (Net Acres)	Trees (Net Acres)	Vegetables (Net Acres)
Pressure	2,326	208	25.0	1,491	-	499	374	33,337
East Side	3,262	50.2	-	3,015	362	163	68.0	22,400
Forebay	-	139	-	17,954	-	374	1,082	33,535
Upper Valley	-	220	115	20,952	-	-	358	26,447

Figure 17. 2018 Net Acres Reported by Crop Type and Subarea.



2018	Berries (AF/Acre)	Field (AF/Acre)	Forage (AF/Acre)	Grapes (AF/Acre)	Nursery (AF/Acre)	Other (AF/Acre)	Trees (AF/Acre)	Vegetables (AF/Acre)
Pressure	2.8	4.6	0.6	0.7	-	1.5	1.9	2.4
East Side	2.4	2.2	-	1.0	3.1	2.2	2.4	2.5
Forebay	-	2.3	-	1.3	-	3.8	1.6	3.3
Upper Valley	-	2.7	0.3	1.4	-	-	2.8	3.4

Figure 18. 2018 Acre-Feet/Acre by Crop Type and Subarea.

area and approximately 34,650 acres were in the model area. For this BMP Update, these data have been supplemented to include land use data within the PVWMA service area collected by PVWMA in 2011, 2012, and 2013. The total acreages for general land use type within the PVWMA boundaries are presented in Table 2-3 below. Due to the different areas analyzed (model area and service area), only trends are discussed.

Urban and rural residential land use has been steadily increasing, from approximately 5% of the total service area in 1966 to 17% of the total service area in 2006 (PVWMA, personal communication). DWR land use data were analyzed to determine historical agricultural land use changes in the basin. As shown in Table 2-3 between 1966 and 1975, agricultural land use increased by approximately 3,000 acres (about 10%) in the Pajaro Basin. From 1975 to 1989, agricultural land use in the basin increased by approximately 1,100 acres (3%). However, from 1989 to 1997, agricultural land use in the Pajaro Basin increased by approximately

200 acres (0.5%; Montgomery Watson/AT Associates 1999-2000). From 2011 to 2013, agricultural acreage has stayed stable, with less than a 500-acre increase.

An understanding of the historical land use conditions and cropping patterns is necessary to develop an understanding of the historic water use patterns. These data are also utilized by the PVHM's Farm Process (Schmid and Hanson 2009), which allows detailed simulations of agricultural pumping based on simulated crop water demand. Table 2-4 shows the relative breakdown by crop type and the changes in crop types planted in the Pajaro Valley Model Area over the last 47 years.

Table 2-3 Summary of Land Use

Land Use Type	Acreage							
	1966	1975	1982	1989	1997	2011	2012	2013
Total Agricultural Acreage	30,450	33,410	31,520	34,460	34,650	28,270	28,380	28,700
Urban Acreage	4,760	6,690	8,020	8,380	12,860	NA	NA	NA
Native Vegetation	61,300	56,410	56,970	53,660	49,000	NA	NA	NA

Values from 1966-1997 are for the model area; acreages from 2011-2013 are for PVWMA service area; data are rounded to the nearest 10 acres; NA = not available.

Sources: PVWMA 2002, and PVWMA data, 2013

Table 2-4 Historical Agricultural Land Use

Land Use Type	Historic Land Use: % of Surveyed Land							
	1966	1975	1982	1989	1997	2011	2012	2013
Strawberry	6	13	19	19	20	33	26	25
Irrigated Fallow	14	12	10	11	12	8	9	8
Caneberries, Bushberries, & Vines	0	0	2	4	5	16	18	19
Vegetable Row Crops	48	39	33	38	40	26	31	31
Field Crops	2	4	6	3	2	NA	NA	NA
Deciduous (apple orchards)	25	26	24	17	11	8	8	7
Pasture	4	5	3	3	4	NA	NA	NA
Nursery	1	2	4	6	6	5	5	7
Other/Unknown	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	3	3

Values from 1966-1997 are for the model area; acreages from 2011-2013 are for the PVWMA service area and represent consolidated land use categories. For example, Field Crops were mapped as Vegetable Row Crops. Data are rounded to the nearest percentage point and may not sum to 100% due to rounding. NA = Not Available.

Sources: PVWMA 2002, and PVWMA data, 2013

Current Land Use

Land use within the Pajaro Valley is primarily agricultural. Figure 2-19 shows the 2013 breakdown for the land uses within the PVWMA service area. Table 2-5 shows current land use acreages and estimated crop values. Most notably there has been a steady increase in caneberries, with raspberries and blackberries currently accounting for over 19% of the crops grown within the PVWMA service area. As these types of crops are more water intensive than some of the crops that have been replaced, such as apples, this trend has increased water use.

Future Land Use

Urban

As shown in Table 2-3 (previous page), urban land use in the Pajaro Valley increased from approximately 4,800 acres in 1966 to 12,900 acres in 1997 and 13,373 acres in 2006 (PVWMA, personal communication). Urban population growth will affect the Pajaro Valley

by causing the conversion of undeveloped areas or potentially agricultural land to urban land (expansion of urban areas for new development) and/or by increasing population density within existing urban areas (infill development and redevelopment). Table 2-6 projects future population growth for urban water users within the City of Watsonville as an example for projected population growth within the Pajaro Valley.

Agricultural

Based on the historical data in Table 2-3, the total agricultural land area has remained relatively constant from 1989 onward. Though crop rotation creates annual shifts in crop related land use, there have been significant shifts in the types of crops grown in the valley, as shown in Table 2-4 (previous page). The trend of replacing low-water-use crops with higher value, more-water-intensive crops may continue.

Table 2-5 Current Agricultural Land Use and Crop Value¹

Land Use Type	2011	2012	2013	\$ value per acre	2013 crop \$ value
Fallow	2,364	2,600	2,300	-	-
Vegetable Row Crops (Lettuce, Celery, Zucchini, Artichokes, etc.)	7,420	8,810	8,900	\$8,367	\$74,466,300
Strawberries	9,380	7,350	7,160	\$49,921	\$357,434,360
Caneberries	4,300	4,890	5,200	\$51,149	\$265,974,800
Blueberries	40	40	70	\$32,333	\$2,263,310
Vines/Grapes	150	130	120	\$8,532	\$1,023,840
Deciduous (Apple Orchards)	2,320	2,130	2,120	\$5,384	\$11,414,080
Nurseries/Flower/Subtropical Plants	1,380	1,400	1,860	\$97,930	\$182,149,800
Other (Irrigated Turf, Grazing Land, Unknown Ag, etc.)	920	930	970	-	-
Total Acreage	28,270	28,280	28,700		\$894,726,490

Source: PVWMA 2013 land use data and crop values from the Santa Cruz County Ag Commissioner 2012 Crop Report

¹Although the Pajaro Valley includes portions of both Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, Santa Cruz County crop values were assumed to be more reflective of the Pajaro Valley since Monterey County crop values may be heavily influenced by those of the Salinas Valley.

Table 2-6 Watsonville Estimated Population Growth

	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
Watsonville Population	65,739	66,826	68,759	71,318	73,691	75,073

Source: Watsonville Urban Water Management Plan 2010




Figure 2-19. Pajaro Valley Land Use Summer 2013
Source: PVWMA Data

2012). As shown in Figure 2-21 below, although population growth has continued to increase over the past fifteen years, urban water use has remained relatively constant, due to water conservation programs. **The City plans to continue to achieve no net increase in groundwater use in the future through a combination of expanded water conservation and increased surface water supply.**

Table 2-7 (following page) presents a detailed breakdown of water use within the Pajaro Valley from 2001-2013. The table identifies groundwater, surface water, and delivered water separately. The metered wells category represents 95% of agricultural wells, with the remaining wells including mutual wells and a number of wells used for non-agricultural purposes.

WATER USE

Pajaro Valley water use for 2000 to 2013 is shown in Figure 2-20. The five-year average for groundwater use from 2009-2013 is approximately 52,000 af. The five-year average from 2009-2013 for total water use, including delivered water and City of Watsonville surface water use, is approximately 55,000 afy.

The City of Watsonville’s stated goal regarding water demand is to have no net increase in groundwater use (Steve Palmisano, BMP Joint Meeting, August

WATER QUALITY

Water resources in the Pajaro Valley include both surface water and groundwater. Currently, groundwater is the predominant source of supply. However, since surface water represents potential sources for the future, it is important to understand the current state of both groundwater and surface water quality in the basin. The main water quality standards that apply are outlined in the Basin Plan for the Central Coastal Basin, prepared by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region (2011).




Figure 2-20. Pajaro Valley Groundwater and Delivered Water Use




Figure 2-21. Historical City of Watsonville Water Use

To the Monterey Planning Commission, we the residents of Susan Street contend that the proposed multilevel development PLN210152 would destroy our neighborhood.

-The traffic movements and parking requirements associated with the development present an unreasonable environmental impact. This will affect adjoining properties and pose an unacceptable safety risk to the residents, which include young children and senior citizens.

-The proposed location/s are not suitable for the density proposed, no less than a +55% variance is being requested.

-Increasing the TOTAL population of Pajaro by 25% on these two lots alone is shocking and unacceptable.

-Agricultural housing is inconsistent with the neighborhoods developed in the area. This type of proposed development is not sympathetic to the surrounding neighborhood and will devalue residential property values in the area, a circumstance that myself and many of my neighbors, who are senior citizens, can ill afford.

-There is no other development like this on Susan Street. It is out of character, without precedent and does not service the local community of Susan Street.

Ante la Comisión de Planificación de Monterey, nosotros, los residentes de Susan Street, afirmamos que el desarrollo de varios niveles PLN210152 propuesto destruiría nuestro vecindario.

-Los movimientos de tráfico y los requisitos de estacionamiento asociados con el desarrollo presentan un impacto ambiental irrazonable. Esto afectará las propiedades contiguas y representará un riesgo de seguridad inaceptable para los residentes, que incluyen niños pequeños y personas mayores.

-La/s ubicación/es propuestas no son aptas para la densidad propuesta, se solicita una variación no menor al +55%.

-Aumentar la población TOTAL de Pájaro en un 25% solo en estos dos lotes es impactante y inaceptable.

-La vivienda agrícola es inconsistente con los barrios desarrollados en el área. Este tipo de desarrollo propuesto no simpatiza con el vecindario circundante y devaluará los valores de las propiedades residenciales en el área, una circunstancia que yo y muchos de mis vecinos, que son personas de la tercera edad, no podemos permitirnos.

-No hay otro desarrollo como este en Susan Street. Está fuera de lugar, sin precedentes y no sirve a la comunidad local de Susan Street.


PRINCIPAL PETITIONER. Name: Christine Shaw Address: 24 Susan Street
Phone: 831-421-2052. Email: Lolamako@gmail.com

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS
1-15-22	Ruben Alvarez	32 Susan St
	Alejandra Garcia	35 Susan St
		7 " "
		7A " "
		21 " "
	ANA ROSA RAMIREZ	23 " "
01-15-2022	Ana Rosa Ramirez	39 " "
1/15/22	Ilda Rocha	43 Susan St.
* 1-15-22	Alan Manu	38 Susan St.
1-15-22	Carmen Cisneros	36 Susan St
1-15-22	Guadalupe Estanque	28 Susan St.
1-15-22	Araceli Lagunas	23 Susan St.
1-15-22	Daniel Ortiz	21 Susan St
* 1-15-22	Sharron Paz	20 Susan St.
1-15-22	Miguel Sanchez	7 Susan St
1/15/22	Walter Ortiz	7A Susan St
* 1/15/22		11 Susan St.
1-15-22	José Ramirez	9 Susan St
1-15-22	Christian Flores	10 Susan St
* 1/15/22	Amadeus Velazquez	201 Susan St.
1/15/22	JOSSE CA (Costa)	31 Susan Street
1-16-22	Sergio Linarez	27 Susan St
1/17/22	Martela Abundiz	10 Susan St
1-17-22	Rita Fung	9 Susan St
1-17-22	Daniel Hernandez	9 Susan St
1/17/22	CHRISTINE STAN	2A SUSAN ST.
1/17/22	VICTOR MENEZA	41 Susan St


1/17/22 Vince Arellano 27 Susan St

1-17-22 Kelly Manu 36 Susan St

1/17/22 David Faw 16 Susan St



Susan Street



Re: PLN210152 - Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration
Monterey County Planning Commission

Dear Planning Commission:

I am writing to you, pleading with you, to help our neighborhood. To hear our collective voices.

I am a mom and homeowner, supporting my husband and keeping our family together as he battles an aggressive form of non-hodgkin's lymphoma. His diagnosis came one day before my fathers passing from metastatic colon cancer after caring for him for the last ten weeks of his life.

I have so little left to give, and yet here I am having to advocate for my home, neighborhood and community. Most of whom work all day and have little left to give themselves.

Life has been hard, and the thought of losing the neighborhood, community and neighbors I have grown up with, had planned to raise my children in, is terrifying and overwhelming in the best of times, let alone now.

I, and my neighbors on Susan and Gonda Street, feel like we're being taken advantage of. I must say, looking at the other h2A housing in the area(Spreckels, Salinas, and Greenfield) the evidence seems to support something amiss(if I'm being generous) as NONE of those developments have been plopped into an existing neighborhood like ours, that would do such a huge amount of damage. They all utilize their own infrastructure connected to main roads and arteries.

What about our neighborhoods is at all able to handle 488 and 272 people?

The density is appalling. The lack of infrastructure in the form of SAFE roads to access the developments, and parking is concerning to say the least. Our roads are narrow, I invite ALL of you to spend some time on our streets to see for yourselves that this project is a giant boondoggle that only appears somewhat acceptable on paper.

There is NO parking, our streets CANNOT handle the increased traffic. When reading the transportation and traffic section of the mitigated negative declaration I couldn't help but wonder just how Mr. Higgins came to the conclusion that there was a "less than significant impact" on all studied fronts, and while on the subject, I see at least four intersections that have been studied but nothing about our current traffic, which there is little of.

Having a quiet neighborhood with little to no traffic, does not mean there is room for someone else's traffic. We enjoy allowing our kids to ride bikes, play basketball, soccer and tag safely on the street. Our senior citizens walk our street for exercise. Our street is alive with community. None of that will be possible with the addition of this development.

While he addressed a "worst case scenario" of the h2a being converted to traditional apartments(which is exactly what happened at the Tanimura & Antle project in Spreckels{"and would generate and estimated 454 daily trips which would be greater than the default threshold of 110 daily trips set by the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts at CEQA"}) no one is acknowledging that this project is already a worst case scenario for the residents of Susan Street.

If we look at the study results for the H2A housing, that is still a conservative estimate of 148 trips a day. Our neighborhood does not reach that on a holiday, with guests, not even close. With less than 70 cars total(I counted) for the entire Susan Street community, with a portion of those not being used daily, our current traffic is miniscule.

H2a workers will be bussed all over Monterey County, at all hours of the day and night. Busses will completely block our streets from safely entering and exiting. *How many buses, vans and cars does it take to move 488 people?*

This sounds unbelievable. I don't know how anyone who has spent any time at all on our street/s can think that is acceptable.

The sounds of kids playing in the street, tearing through yards, doing what I did as a kid on this street, is magic. Watching my senior citizen neighbors shower my kids with love and care, just like they did for me when I was a child, is priceless. Where do you find neighborhoods like this anymore? Where are we to go, when I've grown up with these people? I've been in 99% of the houses on this street as a child. This is a generational neighborhood. People live their entire lives here, myself included.

Houses don't go up for sale often here, people stay. Our properties are slowly going up in value, this type of structure is not at all compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. I am firmly convinced that such an edifice will devalue my property, a circumstance that myself and many of my neighbors, who are senior citizens, can ill afford.

Further reading about the population/housing impacts in regards to growth and the general plan, increasing the population of Pajaro by 25% on just these TWO LOTS, accessed by two streets that cannot allow more than one oversized vehicle to pass at a time, is imprudent and lacks compassion for the existing communities.

Reviewing The Land Use and Planning, section a and b, conclusion that this development would have a *"less than significant impact" on our established community, is a LIE.*

Using legal jargon and SPLITTING HAIRS within the general plans wording, not once actually taking into consideration the community they would be disrupting(ruining) this is a case of developers making choices from their ivory towers, with no real notion of what Pajaro is like, what our communities are like, what the PEOPLE are like.

One of the best examples of how these developers don't actually care about us; less than half of the streets residents received the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration, myself included(despite being on the distribution list...)My driveway falls about 3 feet short of the (inadequate) law of notifying those within 300 feet. Our street is under 700 feet long, under 20 homes, and they only did the bare minimum?

To add insult to injury, it was only sent in English. Did they not care that the majority of our neighborhood is of hispanic origin? My family included. Does their opinion not count? They say they're building this for farmworkers, who are in dire need of safe, clean and affordable housing(I agree) and yet they ignore that a large portion of the Susan and Gonda Street residents are farmworkers themselves, who by and large do not speak or read english. So they only matter when they work for large companies, bussed in from out of the area? Our long term residents, who make up Pajaro, don't matter?

In addition, while yes this land is currently, and has been, cultivated row crops, Susan Street has NEVER been an access point for the farm. No tractors, no buses or cars. The gate stays locked and I can count on one hand the number of times it has been opened (aside from the current project) The farm has had ZERO impact on Susan Street, most of us not even knowing when things are being harvested. The workers and all vehicles are brought in via San Juan Road.

Our community is not anti-development, not in the slightest, but this is not a good fit. The neighborhoods, density, lack of parking and infrastructure is not appropriate.



Susan Street Monday, January 17, 2022

Thank you for your time

Christine Shaw and Family
24 Susan Street

01-17-2022

To the Monterey Planning Commission,

I am writing this letter to express my strong opposition against the new project proposal in building apartment complexes in my neighborhood.

I have lived on Susan Street for over 45 years now. I have raised my children here along with my grandchildren. In addition my family owns and rents out 4 homes on Susan street, therefore I have to look out for the best interest of not just my family but also my tenant's.

Opening our street to a project of this magnitude would be devastating to my family, tenants and neighbors. We already have an ongoing parking problem that is addressed between neighbors. Adding 60 units would absolutely flood our streets. I would no longer feel safe letting my grandkids play outside due to all the traffic. We as homeowners need to stand up for what's right and moving forward with this project is not the right move, not the right area. Please reconsider your proposal.

Thank you

Ana Rosa Ramirez



39 Susan Street

Royal Oaks Ca. 95076

January 17, 2022

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Subject: H-2A Housing/Susan Street/Pajaro

I am writing in opposition of H-2A Housing at the end of Susan Street. As a member of the community and a home owner for more than 44 years, we believe that kind of housing is not in the community's best interest, and if approved, will lead this community in the wrong direction.


Regarding the location of the proposed project, did you know that most of the neighborhood has owned their homes here for decades. Some for more than 40 years. We've stuck by our community through good and bad times.

There are many problems associated with the proposed project. Morning and afternoon traffic is already horrendous where Susan St. and San Juan Rd. meet. Increased traffic poses a danger to the neighborhood children who play in the street and pedestrians walking and exercising. Some homes/lots already don't have proper sidewalks. If you disrupt our neighborhood's demographic balance, ex. with a bunch of males, that will create other dangers and nuisances.

Our property values, while lagging, would take a huge hit as well as any rent or sale potential.

What the Planning Commission should do right now is postpone all decisions until the public can participate fully in the review process. Logically, there are better sites suited for your project in the abundant acres of farms and ranches along San Juan Road and the rest of Monterey County. These sites would have better and direct access to main roads without disrupting and destroying our great neighborhood.

Sincerely,



Maria Isabel Padilla
11 SUSAN ST.

To whom it May concern

I have live in this house since I was 3. I think the project is going to affect us in a bad way. It's bad enough that we have limited parking, opening the street means that the parking situation will worsen. I believe it's a safety hazard for our children having so much traffic coming in and out of our street. I also think our property value will come down if you build low income apartments near our street

Sincerely

Guadalupe Alvarez

1/17/22

To whom it may concern,

We are the Cardenas Rocha family. Our home is located at 43 Susan Street. We are writing to you in this letter to express our concerns about the housing construction project in our community that will bring a lot of vehicular flow. In addition to this, we are concerned about our children, since we do not know with certainty about the background of the people who could inhabit the apartments. Another concern is that our children walk on the street, because we don't have sidewalks, and the over flow of cars will make it dangerous. We go out to work like all parents do and it would be very worrisome to go to work knowing that our children walk alone without being sure if they are safe, with more than a hundred cars and people trafficking on our street. On the other, it would be good to take into consideration that the residents of Pajaro unfortunately

live in permanent risk of flooding every rainy season. In past years, we were about to be evacuated because the Pajaro river was about to overflow. We ask that you take our concerns into consideration and not allow the construction of this Project.

Thank you,

Ilda Rocha

Eustacio Cardenas

11/7/22

To whom it may concern,

We are writing this letter in hopes that you reconsider using Susan St. as the entrance to the proposed apartment complex. As new homeowners I strongly believe that doing these will greatly have an impact on the value of our house. We have worked very hard to buy this property that cost us a little over half a million dollars.

I also would like to add that we have young children that spend a lot of time playing basketball out on the street. Susan St. has been a safe place. I'm concerned that adding apartments and using Susan St. will no longer be safe due to the increase in traffic that will be coming in and out of our street. We will greatly appreciate ~~that~~ if Susan St. wasn't use as an entrance to the proposed apartment complex.

Thank you.

Monica Maldonado



If you have any questions you can reach us at
406-2736

27 SUSAN ST.

January 17, 2022

TO whom it may concern:

I am the home owner of 28 Susan Street in Royal Oaks.

We were informed of the development happening at the end of Susan St. recently.

As a home owner on this street & living here for over 30 years, the news of the development is very disappointing as this street is very quiet, peaceful & not violent compared to the surrounding areas around us. We all know our neighbors who comes in & out, our kids, dogs, cats etc.

This letter is to object any new developments in our peaceful street.

Contact # 831-840-0572

Jose Guadalupe Estanquero

1-16-22

My name is Jose Ramirez, I reside at 9 Susan St. I have been here all of my life. I just heard that they're is going to be apartment complex of 400 unit plus but only 120 parking spots. We have had enough trouble trying to park now, can you imagine what that's going to look like.

Thank you,

Nosotros tenemos 32 años viviendo en este domicilio y no me gustaria que pusieran nada porque nos molestaria mucho Emos vivido muy tranquilos gracia
35 SUSAN ST

Monterey County
Housing & Community Development
1441 Schilling PL South 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Re: PLN210152 - Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration
Monterey County Planning Commission

Dear Planning Commission:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to PLN210152, at 51, 53, 55, & 57 Susan Street, Royal Oaks (117-361-016-000) for a combined development permit (Kall Robert E & Janet Rose (Rio Vista Group LLC)

This proposed project will significantly change the safe, friendly, family environment that will have adverse effects on the residents of Susan Street, if the high density apartments are constructed in 100 year flood plain. If development occurs in the floodway fringe, and there is an increase in flood stage, there will be an increase in flood damages for adjoining properties. Has it been demonstrated that there WILL NOT be an increase in the base flood elevation within our community, as a result of the proposed development?

The Pajaro River levee system is inadequate. Major flooding occurred in 1995 and 1998 that resulted in significant inundation and damage caused by overtopping or breaching of the levees. Floods in 1995 caused millions in damage and two people lost their lives, with additional damage in 1997 and 1998 and displacement of hundreds of residents. **Levels of flood protection along the Pajaro River system are among the lowest of any federal flood control project in California.** Poor levee strength further reduces this expected performance. Levees nearly broke again in the federally declared storm disasters of January-February 2017, and a 1600-foot-long seepage berm was needed to buttress the outboard levee flank when numerous observations of seepage and boils were made. The Pajaro River Flood Risk Management Project is a multi-benefit project that will reduce flood risk to the City of Watsonville and Pajaro, but is only in the CEQA environmental review process. To allow development/construction in the 100 year flood plain adjacent to the Pajaro River levee before the levee systems can be cleaned and strengthened is premature and detrimental to the well-being and safety of Susan Street residents as well as the workers who will reside in the apartments.

The layout and building density for 482 people at the proposed Pajaro Apartments is too large. The development size should be decreased. Page 47 of the Mitigated Negative Declaration mentions that none of the other agricultural employee housing projects have come close to actually being at maximum occupancy since units are often occupied by fewer than 8 people and tends to be seasonal. Why is it necessary to build additional apartments in Pajaro if other employee housing is not filled to capacity? I urge you to disapprove the proposed re-zoning for an increase in the 5% variance to 55.6%. A 200% increase is egregious and doesn't seem necessary or appropriate in the flood plain.

Monterey County
Housing & Community Development
1441 Schilling PL South 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Re: PLN210152 - Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration
Monterey County Planning Commission

Dear Planning Commission:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to PLN210152, at 51, 53, 55, & 57 Susan Street, Royal Oaks (117-361-016-000) for a combined development permit (Kall Robert E & Janet Rose (Rio Vista Group LLC)

I have lived on Susan Street since 1952, I own my home. I raised my children here, one of whom also owns a home here. My community and relationships are vital to my well being. This street has been quiet and safe for over 70 years. Not once have I considered moving away. Until now.

This project is too big, with too much traffic. If you want to develop the lot, use another way to get in. Why can't you use the Miller property? They want to develop it anyway.

Don't use our street. You'd be destroying our neighborhood in the process. You'd have senior citizens forced to move, all the while having lost equity in our homes, uprooting us from neighbors we've known most of our lives, to move where? I certainly won't be able to stay local. Feels like senior citizens really don't matter, that we're disposable.

Thank you



Stanley Mano
38 Susan Street

1-17-22



Christine Shaw <keepsusanstreetclosed@gmail.com>

Concerns about new project

1 message

david parra <david-parra@att.net>

Mon, Jan 17, 2022 at 6:53 PM

To: Christine Shaw <keepsusanstreetclosed@gmail.com>

I have concerns in regards to the new projects, such as affecting our homes price and market value. Traffic flow along with the security of both our family and home. We have been victims of vandalism for the past couple months, adding another 500 people will only make these incidents more common and even worse. We have issues with the shop in the front of the street and do not want to have another issue down the street. I am not the only one that shares these concerns and many of my fellow neighbors share the same ones or even more.

Sent from my iPhone

While I am aware that the planning commission has access to the Land Use Advisory Committee minutes, I am including them here with highlighted portions as I feel they are worth reviewing.

The members were able to hear our concerns and felt they were valid, advising the developers and relevant parties accordingly.

There is also a copy of the initial petition by Stanley Mano of 38 Susan Street.

* To note, at least four more Susan Street residents were present for the LUAC meeting, but due to accessibility issues were not able to voice their concerns. One resident is 85 and was unable to hear the meeting on his phone, and does not have a computer or smart phone. Two neighbors used one computer to access the meeting, Jessica Costa and Emilio Padilla. To clarify, they are two separate homes/residents, representing two separate families.

MINUTES
North County Land Use Advisory Committee
December 1, 2021

1. Meeting called to order by David Evans at 5:35 pm

2. Roll Call

Members Present:

David Evans, Sherry Owen, Michael Mastroianni, Lesley Noble (4)

Members Absent:

John Robinett, Emily Tafoya (2)



3. Approval of Minutes:

A. October 6, 2021 minutes

Motion: Lesley Noble (LUAC Member's Name)

Second: Sherry Owen (LUAC Member's Name)

Ayes: Sherry Owen, Lesley Noble, David Evans, Michael Mastroianni (4)

Noes: 0

Absent: John Robinett, Emily Tafoya (2)

Abstain: 0

4. **Public Comments:** The Committee will receive public comment on non-agenda items that are within the purview of the Committee at this time. The length of individual presentations may be limited by the Chair.

None

5. Scheduled Item(s)

6. **Other Items:**

A) Preliminary Courtesy Presentations by Applicants Regarding Potential Projects

None

B) Announcements

Introduction of new HCD LUAC liaison, Shawn Archbold

7. Meeting Adjourned: 6:59 pm

Minutes taken by: Lesley Noble



Action by Land Use Advisory Committee Project Referral Sheet

Monterey County Housing & Community Development
1441 Schilling Place 2nd Floor
Salinas CA 93901
(831) 755-5025



Advisory Committee: North County

1. **Item Title:** AB 361 FINDING
Description: On September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed AB 361. This legislation amends the Brown Act to allow meeting bodies subject to the Brown Act to meet via teleconference during a proclaimed state of emergency in accordance with teleconference procedures established by AB 361. For the December 1st remote meeting, the LUAC must make the findings.

Staff recommends, pursuant to AB 361 and in order for the LUAC to continue to meet remotely via teleconference, the LUAC find: 1) that the COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency declared by Governor Newsom is still in effect; 2) that the Planning Commission has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency; and 3) that the Monterey County Health Officer continues to recommend social distancing measures for meetings of legislative bodies of local agencies.

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion by: David Evans (LUAC Member's Name)

Second by: Michael Mastroianni (LUAC Member's Name)

X Acceptance of the Finding

 Rejection the Finding

Ayes: Sherry Owen, Lesley Noble, David Evans, Michael Mastroianni (4)

Noes: 0

Absent: John Robinett, Emily Tafoya (2)

Abstain: 0

Action by Land Use Advisory Committee Project Referral Sheet

Monterey County Housing & Community Development
1441 Schilling Place 2nd Floor
Salinas CA 93901
(831) 755-5025



Advisory Committee: North County

2. **Project Name:** KALL ROBERT E & JANET ROSE (RIO VISTA GROUP LLC)
 File Number: PLN210152
 Project Location: 51, 53, 55 & 57 SUSAN ST ROYAL OAKS
Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 117-361-016-000
 Project Planner: SHAWN ARCHBOLD
 Area Plan: NORTH COUNTY LAND USE PLAN
Project Description: Combined Development Permit consisting of: 1) a Use Permit to allow the construction of four (4) 16,286 square foot apartment buildings totaling 60 units for agricultural workforce housing and 1 manager unit; and 2) a Variance to allow lot coverage exceeding 5%.

Was the Owner/Applicant/Representative present at meeting? YES X NO

(Please include the names of the those present)

- Robert Kall
- Paul Davis, Architect
- Mike Avila & Jeff Nohr, Avila Construction
- Garrett Kaprieli, Egeineer

Was a County Staff/Representative present at meeting? Anna Quenga, Craig Spencer, Shawn Archbold (Name)

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	
Christine Shaw	X		Major concerns about traffic, flooding, potential crime, noise, ingress and egress. Ms. Shaw read a comprehensive letter to the Committee
Vince Arreano	X		The project lacked information about the flood waters.
Jessica Costa & Emilio Padilla	X		All agreed with the issues raised by Christina Shaw.

PUBLIC COMMENT CONTINUED:

Name	Site Neighbor?		Issues / Concerns (suggested changes)
	YES	NO	
Lida Rocha	X		How would gated community be monitored? Applicant's representative replied stating "a manager would be in place at the site".

LUAC AREAS OF CONCERN

Concerns / Issues (e.g. site layout, neighborhood compatibility; visual impact, etc)	Policy/Ordinance Reference (If Known)	Suggested Changes - to address concerns (e.g. relocate; reduce height; move road access, etc)
An Environmental Impact Report should be completed (Sherry Owen)		Provide EIR, provide Public Works report, provide fire dept review, discussion of Variance appearing to be excessive.
Concerned about flooding (David Evans)		Flooding mitigation
Will Title and Use be mandated for the project? (Lesley Noble)		Since the project involves agricultural use, will the structures be mandated to be only agricultural housing usage? No conversion.

ADDITIONAL LUAC COMMENTS:

- It was clear that Susan Street is not designed to properly allow such an influx of traffic. The project proposes 488 people will be housed at this project. With buses, vans & cars all traveling through a small, long established neighborhood.
- While the Committee agrees this nature of housing is needed, and needed in an area that has public water & sewage, it was felt this high density usage would infringe on the rights of the residents of Susan Street.
- It was suggested the Applicant attempt to procure an alternate easement/right-of-way to access the project & a wall potentially to separate the project from the Susan Street neighborhood.
- Housing fewer workers was also suggested to be considered.



RECOMMENDATION:

Motion by: Lesley Noble (LUAC Member's Name)

Second by: Sherry Owen (LUAC Member's Name)

 Support Project as proposed

 Support Project with changes

X Continue the Item

Reason for Continuance: While it was understood this was a preliminary hearing, the Committee did not have the benefit of the many reports (i.e. the EIR). It was determined a recommendation would not be made in the absence of the numerous reports required for this project to proceed to also be furnished to the Committee so an informed decision could be rendered.

Continue to what date: Date to be determined – when an EIR & other pertinent required reports could be furnished to the Committee

Ayes: Sherry Owen, Lesley Noble, David Evans, Michael Mastroianni (4)

Noes: 0

Absent: John Robinett, Emily Tafoya (2)

Abstain: 0



Friedrich, Michele x5189

From: Christine Shaw <keepsusanstreetclosed@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 12:06 PM
To: Lundquist, Erik; Dugan, John x6654; Escobar, Freda x5689; McDougal, Melissa x5146; Friedrich, Michele x5189; Kakimoto, Monique x5185; Spencer, Craig x5233; Quenga, Anna V. x5175; Sidor, Joe (Joseph) x5262; Guthrie, Jaime S. x6414; Taylor, Kenny x5096; Pham-Gallardo, Son x5226; Israel, Mary x5183; Nelson, Kayla x6408; Jensen, Fionna x6407; Angelo, Philip; Patton, Craig; Kim, Go Eun 'Victoria' x5198; Huang, Junya 'Michelle'; villatoros@co.monterey.ca.us; Archbold, Shawn x5114; Gonzales, Liz x5102; Hernandez, Domitila x5451; Bettencourt, Cynthia x5237; Bernal, Lucy (Luciana) x5235; Leon, Joanne x5138; Vargas, Fernando x5229; Akkaya, Bora x5050; Furtado, Tony x5234; Giles, Stacy x5898
Subject: PLN210152 protest petition
Attachments: REZONE 2.pdf; REZONE 1.pdf

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

We are formally submitting our opposition to the project PLN210152 in the form of a petition. I've included them as a PDF too.

Thank you for your time
Christine S



REZONING (CONDITONAL USE PERMIT) PROTEST PETITION

Protest Petition against opening up Susan St. and rezoning and building apartments and end Susan St.

We, the undersigned property owners, do hereby protest the (proposed rezoning from agriculture to multi residential and opening up Susan St. on the following described property: 0 Susan St.

We, the undersigned, have personally signed this petition and are the owners within the statutory area of the notification related to the area for which the rezoning is sought. Our residence addresses are correctly written after our names.

Note: Print name legible below or beside signature

PRINTED NAME AND REIDENCE ADDRESS DATE

SIGNATURE OF OWNER

STANLEY MAMO *Stanley Mamo* 35 Susan St Royal Oaks CA 10-6-21

Kelly Mamo 30 Susan St Royal Oaks CA 95076 10/7/21

Custodia Cardenas 43 Susan St Royal Oaks CA 95076 10/8/21

MARTO MEDINA *By: Susan St Protest* 10-08-21

Roberto Alvarez 32 Susan St ^{Royal Oaks} 10/8/21

David Ponce 16 Susan St 10/9/21

CHRISTINE SIMS 24 SUSAN ST 10/9/21
9 FAMILY



Hope Lopez / 24 Susan St 10/9/21
Jessica Costa 31 Susan St, R.C. 10/10/2021
Skarwan Day 20 Susan St. Royal Oaks 10/10/21
Vanessa Brooks 21 Susan St. Royal Oaks 10/10/21
Jose G. Estayuga 28 Susan St Royal Oaks 10/10/21
Carmen Cisneros 36 Susan St Royal Oaks 10-10-21
Vicente Arellano 27 Susan St Royal Oaks 10-10-21
CHRISTIAN FLORES 10 SUSAN ST ROYAL OAKS CA 10/13/21
JAIME PADILLA 11 SUSAN ST ROYAL OAKS, CA
Miguel Sanchez 7 Susan St West^{RO}bourneville P.C.
Baltazar Mora 35 SUSAN ST ROYAL OAKS
Jose Ramirez 9 SUSAN ST ROYAL OAKS





REZONING (CONDITONAL USE PERMIT) PROTEST PETION

Protest Petition against opening up Susan St. and rezoning and building apartments and end Susan St.

We, the undersigned property owners, do hereby protest the (proposed rezoning from agriculture to multi residential and opening up Susan St. on the following described property: 0 Susan St.

We, the undersigned, have personally signed this petition and are the owners within the statutory area of the notification related to the area for which the rezoning is sought. Our residence addresses are correctly written after our names.

Note: Print name legible below or beside signature

PRINTED NAME AND REIDENCE ADDRESS DATE

SIGNATURE OF OWNER

STANLEY MANO Stanley Mano 38 Susan St Royal Oaks Ca 10-6-21

Kelly Mano 36 Susan St Royal Oaks CA 95076 10/7/21

Eustacio Cardenas 43 Susan St Royal Oaks CA 95076 10/8/21

MARTO MODINA 39 Susan St Marina Medina 10-08-21

Rubén Alvarez 32 Susan St Royal Oaks Ca 10/8/21

Queen Pamela 16 Susan St 10/9/21

CHRISTINE SIMU 24 SUSAN ST 10/9/21
9 FAMILY

Hope Lopez / 24 Susan St 10/9/21
Jessica Costa 31 Susan St; R.O. 10/10/2021
Sharon Pay 20 Susan St. Royal Oaks 10/16/21
Vanessa Brooks 21 Susan St. Royal Oaks 10/10/21
Jose E. Estrada 28 Susan St Royal Oaks 10/10/21
Carmen Cisneros 36 Susan St Royal Oaks 10-10-21
Vicente Arellano 27 Susan St Royal Oaks 10-10-21
CHRISTIAN FLORES 10 SUSAN ST ROYAL OAKS CA 10/13/21
JALME Padilla 11 Susan St Royal Oaks, CA
Miguel Sanchez 7 Susan St West ^{RO}bourneville P.C.
Baltasar Mora 35 Susan St Royal Oaks
Jose Ramirez 9 Susan St Royal Oaks



To the Monterey Planning Commission, we the residents of Gonda Street contend that the proposed multilevel development PLN200203 would destroy our neighborhood.

-The traffic movements and parking requirements associated with the development present an unreasonable environmental impact. This will affect adjoining properties and pose an unacceptable safety risk to the residents, which include young children and senior citizens.

-The proposed location/s are not suitable for the density proposed, no less than a +55% variance is being requested.

-Increasing the TOTAL population of Pajaro by 25% on these two lots alone is shocking and unacceptable.

-Agricultural housing is inconsistent with the neighborhoods developed in the area. This type of proposed development is not sympathetic to the surrounding neighborhood and will devalue residential property values in the area, a circumstance that myself and many of my neighbors, who are senior citizens, can ill afford.

-There is no other development like this on Gonda Street. It is out of character, without precedent and does not service the local community of Gonda Street.

Ante la Comisión de Planificación de Monterey, nosotros, los residentes de Gonda Street, afirmamos que el desarrollo de varios niveles PLN210152 propuesto destruiría nuestro vecindario.

-Los movimientos de tráfico y los requisitos de estacionamiento asociados con el desarrollo presentan un impacto ambiental irrazonable. Esto afectará las propiedades contiguas y representará un riesgo de seguridad inaceptable para los residentes, que incluyen niños pequeños y personas mayores.

-La/s ubicación/es propuestas no son aptas para la densidad propuesta, se solicita una variación no menor al +55%.

-Aumentar la población TOTAL de Pájaro en un 25% solo en estos dos lotes es impactante y inaceptable.

-La vivienda agrícola es inconsistente con los barrios desarrollados en el área. Este tipo de desarrollo propuesto no simpatiza con el vecindario circundante y devaluará los valores de las propiedades residenciales en el área, una circunstancia que yo y muchos de mis vecinos, que son personas de la tercera edad, no podemos permitirnos.

-No hay otro desarrollo como este en Gonda Street. Está fuera de lugar, sin precedentes y no sirve a la comunidad local de Gonda Street.

PRINCIPAL PETITIONER. Name: Christine Shaw Address: 24 Susan Street
Phone: 831-421-2052. Email: Lolamako@gmail.com

The salty water is infiltrating about six inches every year, and this has been going on for 10 years. No new constructions are a bad idea. No New constructions on Dead End streets, Gonda & Susan.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS
1	01-15-22	Ana Betancourt	109 Gonda St B
2	01-15-22	Detawina Buitan	109A Gonda ST
3	01-15-22	Maria Berumen	109 B. Gonda St
4	1-15-22	MAROT ACCON	115 B Gonda ST
5	01/15/22	Ricardo Mora	112 Gonda St Apt. D.
6	01/15/22	Rosalinde Perez	117 B Gonda Street
7	1/15/22	Herminia Perez	117 B Gonda Street
8	1/15/22	Silvia Lopez	113 Gonda St #E
9	1/15/22	Carlos perea	113 Gonda st #E
10	1/15/22	Robertino Mendrae	115 Gonda st #A
11	1-5-22	Lorna machado	115 B Gonda st
12	1-15-22	Mariza Kuhl	115 C Gonda st
13	1/15/22	Sandra	117 TOPIC ST
14	01/15/22	Difonso Cruz	117C Gonda st
15	1/15/22	Ortiz Cruz	117 D Gonda st
16	1/15/22	F Buitan	117 AP 1 Gonda st
17	1/15-22	Jadir Manuel Velasco	117 B Gonda St
18	1/15-22	Ramon Lopez Pacheco	117 B Gonda ST
19	1/15/22	MAUVEL ABREGO	122A GONDA ST.
20	1-15-22	Maria E Berru	110 Gonda -st
21	1-15-22	miguel Reyes	94 Gonda -st
22	1/15/22	Melasia Pique	28 gonda st
23	1/15/22	Vernica Varela	1-A EISA st.
24	1/15/22	Kiana Varela	1 A EISA st
25	1/15/22	PAULINA HUANTE	1 EISA st
26	1/15/22	Jorge Jasso	21 Gonda st

1	1-15-22	En Carr H.	1 B Gonda St.
2	1-15-22	Gilberto Roque D.	28 Gonda St
3	1-15-22	2 Vicente Perez	24 Gonda St
4	1/15/22	A Jose L. Martin	20 Gonda St.
5	1-15-22	Olivia Rios	20 Gonda St
6	1-15-22	Ramiro Rocha	12 Gonda St.
7	1-15-22	Carmen Ponce	15 Gonda St
8	1/15/22	Ruby Rocha	15 Gonda St.
9	1/15/22	Hermano Rosas	15 Gonda St.
10	1-15-22	Antonio Valencia	17 Gonda St
11	1-15-22	Fuillermo Hernandez	28 Gonda St
12	1-16-22	Alonso Limon	101 San Juan RD.
13	1-16-22	Monica Martinez	11 Gonda St Apt A
14	1-16-22	Salvador Martinez	11 Gonda St
15	1-16-22	Salvador Martinez Jr	11 Gonda St
16	1-16-22	Yesenia Martinez	11 Gonda St
17	1-16-22	Ebentino Martinez	11 Gonda St
18	1-16-22	George Martinez	11 Gonda St
19	1-16-22	Carmen Martinez	11 Gonda St
20	1-16-22	Maricela Vasquez	12 Gonda St
21	1-16-22	Rocio Cervantes	121 San Juan Rd
22	1-16-21	Donny Ramirez	12 Gonda St
23	1-16-21	Jonny Martinez	12 Gonda St
24	1-16-21	Ramona Vasquez	12 Gonda St
25	1-16-21	Ramiro Vasquez	12 Gonda St
26	1-16-21	Armeda Vasquez	12 Gonda St
27	1-16-21	Devia Cervantes	121 San Juan Rd.
28	1/16/22	Rinda Sandora	15 1/2 Gonda St
29	1/16/22	Stegario Meza	107 Gonda St
30	1/15/22	Vall Carr	122 GOND ST
31	1-16-22	Juan Carlos Gomez	34 Gonda St
32	1-17-22	Asuncion Zepeda	16 Gonda St Watsonville CA.



January 6, 2021

County of Monterey
Housing & Community Development
Attn: Craig Spencer
1441 Schilling Pl South 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Subject: Negative Declaration for Kall Robert E & Janet Rose (Rio Vista Group LLC) -
PLN210152

Dear Mr. Spencer:

LandWatch Monterey County has reviewed the mitigated negative declaration (MND) for PLN210152) a combined development permit consisting of: 1) a use permit to allow the construction of four (4) 16,286 square foot apartment buildings totaling 60 units for agricultural workforce housing and 1 manager unit; and 2) a variance to allow building site coverage exceeding 5%.

The water analysis finds the project would have a significant environmental if it would substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. A review of baseline water data from the applicant, Pajaro Sunny Mesa, Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency, and the Monterey County Water Resources Agency (MCWRA) indicates an inconsistency among agencies. For example:

- In materials provided by the applicant, Lakeside Organics estimates 5.25 acre-feet of water per acre per year (AFY) from the prior agricultural use of the property.
- MCWRA annual Groundwater Extraction Summary Report shows an average of 2.645 AFY for the prior agricultural use.

This inconsistency should be addressed prior to finalizing the MND to assure that mitigation measure MM HYD-1 adequately addresses the project's impact on the Pajaro Valley groundwater basin.

The project draws water from the Pajaro Valley groundwater basin. According to State Water Resource Agency Bulletin 118, the basin groundwater levels have been declining due to pumping in excess of recharge. To approve the project, the 2010 Monterey County General Plan requires proof that a long-term, sustainable water supply exists to serve the project. (DEIR, p. 46)

Mitigation Measure MM HYD-1 requires the project shall not exceed the historical use of 17.9 AFY and requires the applicant to report actual use data to Monterey County Environmental Health Bureau every 4 months for the first two years following approval of a certificate of occupancy or final building permit inspection. (DEIR, p. 47)

LandWatch has supported numerous [affordable housing projects](#), in particular farmworker housing projects such as Spreckel's Crossing in Spreckels (Tanimura & Antle); Boronda Villas (Nunes, Hibino & Rodriguez families) and Harvest Moon Project (A conglomerate of agri-businesses) in Salinas; and Walnut & 3rd Apartments in Greenfield (Avila Construction). Provided the water consistency issue can be resolved, we would consider also supporting this project because it provides critically necessary farmworker housing in a location that is consistent with Monterey County General Plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael D. DeLapa". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Michael" written in a larger, more prominent script than the last name "DeLapa".

Michael D. DeLapa
Executive Director

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CALTRANS DISTRICT 5
50 HIGUERA STREET
SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA 93401-5415
PHONE (805) 549-3101
FAX (805) 549-3329
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov/dist05/



*Making Conservation
a California Way of Life.*

January 24, 2022

SCr-129-0.259
SCH#2021120560

Shawn Archbold
Assistant Planner
County of Monterey Housing
& Community Development
1441 Schilling Place South, 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Dear Mr. Archbold:

COMMENTS FOR THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (MND) – KALL ROBERT E & JANET ROSE (RIO VISTA GROUP LLC), MONTEREY COUNTY, CA

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 5, Development Review, has reviewed the Kall Robert E & Janet Rose project. This project proposes constructing 60 apartment units for up to 480 agricultural workers. Caltrans offers the following comments in response to the MND:

1. Caltrans supports local development that is consistent with State planning priorities intended to promote equity, strengthen the economy, protect the environment, and promote public health and safety. We accomplish this by working with local jurisdictions to achieve a shared vision of how the transportation system should and can accommodate interregional and local travel and development. Projects that support smart growth principles which include improvements to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure (or other key Transportation Demand Strategies) are supported by Caltrans and are consistent with our mission, vision, and goals.
2. We support the conditions of approval filling in or adding sidewalk segments and constructing ADA ramps to improve pedestrian connections around the project location.

Shawn Archbold
January 24, 2022
Page 2

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed project. If you have any questions, or need further clarification on items discussed above, please contact me at (805) 835-6543 or at Christopher.Bjornstad@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Chris Bjornstad
Associate Transportation Planner
District 5 Development Review



City of Watsonville

"A Community of Opportunities"

January 5, 2022

County of Monterey
Housing and Community Development
Attn: Craig Spencer
1441 Schilling Pl South 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Re: Kall Robert E & Janet Rose (Rio Vista Group LLC); File Number PLN210152

From: Agency Name: City of Watsonville, Wastewater Division
Contact Person: Ryan Smith, Wastewater Division Manager
Phone Number: (831) 768-3175

RS

- No Comments provided
- Comments noted below
- Comments provided in separate letter

COMMENTS:

1. Page 73: Wastewater Treatment section states "The City of Watsonville has stated PCSD has excess capacity for future development." This statement is inaccurate. My email to Jeff Nohr on September 23, 2021 reads as follows:

"Your development is outside Watsonville's jurisdiction and therefore inappropriate for us to issue you a will serve letter. That being said, there is an agreement between PCSD and the City that should be helpful for you. This is a



City of Watsonville

"A Community of Opportunities"

public document so I have no reservations in sending it to you. Please see attached.

In sum, PCSD has acquired capacity rights to the wastewater treatment facility. Theoretically, they "own" excess capacity than what is actually being discharged to our facility. If your development does not exceed PCSD's capacity, then there should be no problem with them issuing a will serve letter and you should be good to go.

I hope this helps, and that this email will suffice for your business needs."

A copy of this email and the referenced agreement are attached.

2. The referenced agreement between PCSD and the City of Watsonville was entered into on May 1, 2001 and outlines the District's capacity rights in Wastewater Facilities on Page 5 as follows:
 - 1.57 mgd (million gallons per day) of Flow
 - 7,372 pounds per day of Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)
 - 6,000 pounds per day of Suspended Solids

Our records show that the pounds of suspended solids per day in the months of November and December 2021 were 4,219 and 5,615 respectively. Therefore, there is an upward trend in suspended solids coming from PCSD, and is very closely approaching the District's capacity limit. A copy of this analysis is also attached.

3. A statement on Page 73 reads, "Pajaro County Sanitation District (PCSD) sewer service is conditioned upon a professionally prepared sanitary sewer capacity study. A sewer capacity study was provided indicating that there was adequate sewer capacity for the project."

Please provide me with a copy of this sanitary sewer capacity study.



Ryan Smith <ryan.smith@cityofwatsonville.org>

Fwd: Susan St, Pajaro Ag Housing Project PLN#210152

Ryan Smith <ryan.smith@cityofwatsonville.org>

Thu, Sep 23, 2021 at 11:57 AM

To: jeff@avilaconst.com

Cc: Christopher Gregorio <christopher.gregorio@cityofwatsonville.org>, Jim Crowley <jim.crowley@cityofwatsonville.org>

Hi Jeff,

Your development is outside Watsonville's jurisdiction and therefore inappropriate for us to issue you a will serve letter. That being said, there is an agreement between PCSD and the City that should be helpful for you. This is a public document so I have no reservations in sending it to you. Please see attached.

In sum, PCSD has acquired capacity rights to the wastewater treatment facility. Theoretically, they "own" excess capacity than what is actually being discharged to our facility. If your development does not exceed PCSD's capacity, then there should be no problem with them issuing a will serve letter and you should be good to go.

I hope this helps, and that this email will suffice for your business needs.

Regards,

--

Ryan Smith
Wastewater Division Manager
City of Watsonville - Public Works & Utilities
500 Clearwater Ln.
Watsonville, CA 95076
(831) 768-3175

[Quoted text hidden]

 **Pajaro Agreement.pdf**
971K

RESOLUTION NO. 88-01 (CM)

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE APPROVING THE WASTEWATER SERVICES AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE AND THE PAJARO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT FOR AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE SAME

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, AS FOLLOWS:

1. That the Wastewater Services Agreement between the City of Watsonville and Pajaro County Sanitation District, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, is fair and equitable and is hereby ratified and approved.

2. That the City Manager be and is hereby authorized and directed to execute Agreement for and on behalf of the City of Watsonville.


The foregoing resolution was introduced at a regular meeting of the Council of the City of Watsonville, held on the 24th day of April, 2001, by Council Member Bobeda, who moved its adoption, which motion being duly seconded by Council Member Phares, was upon roll call carried and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES:	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	Bobeda, de la Paz, Doering-Nielsen, Gomez, Lopez, Phares, Carter
NOES:	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	None
ABSENT:	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	None



Charles E. Carter, Mayor

ATTEST:



Roxanne Washburn
City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:



City Attorney

**WASTEWATER SERVICES AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE AND
PAJARO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT**

A08525

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into this 1st day of May, 2001, by and between **PAJARO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT**, a duly authorized sanitation district in the County of Monterey, hereafter called "DISTRICT", and **CITY OF WATSONVILLE**, a municipal corporation, hereafter called "CITY".

RECITALS

WHEREAS, it is in the public interest to coordinate efforts to provide properly for collection, transmission, treatment, and disposal of wastewater to protect the health and safety of the public; and

WHEREAS, City and District each have the power and authority to provide for the collection, transmission, treatment, and disposal of wastewater and are authorized to contract with each other regarding the joint exercise of any common power under Chapter 5, Division 7, Title 1 (commencing with Section 6500) of the Government Code; and

WHEREAS, City owns, operates and maintains existing wastewater treatment facilities in which District has acquired certain capacity rights; and

WHEREAS, The parties hereto are desirous of providing for the determination of apportionment of the costs of construction, reconstruction, enlargement, maintenance and operation of existing and proposed facilities and for the treatment and disposal of all sanitary and industrial wastewater.

It is agreed between the parties as follows:

ARTICLE 1. DEFINITIONS.

1. **Board of Directors** means Board of Supervisors of the County of Monterey, acting by virtue of office as Board of Directors of the Pajaro County Sanitation District.
2. **Wastewater Facilities Improvements** means improvements to the City's wastewater facilities which are used jointly by City and District.
3. **City Council** means the City Council of the City of Watsonville.
4. **District's Facilities** means all facilities owned and operated by District used for the purpose of determining wastewater flow volume, wastewater monitoring, and collection and conveyance of wastewater into City's Treatment Plant.
5. **District Engineer** means the engineer designated by District for services in relation to District's Facilities.
6. **Industrial User** means any non - domestic source of wastewater discharged Wastewater Facilities, that is covered under section 307 (b) (c) or (d) of the Clean

Water Act.

7. **Operation and Maintenance Costs** means the costs associated with the operation and maintenance of the City's wastewater facilities including but not limited to the costs of labor, power, chemicals, supplies, laboratory control and monitoring, administration, billing, overhead, accounting, Source Control Program, incidental items incurred during normal operation, and ordinary repairs, refurbishments and equipment replacements necessary to maintain the facilities in proper operating condition.
8. **Wastewater Treatment Facility Capacity Fee** means that fee which is payable to the City by the District for the purchase of additional capacity rights in the Wastewater Facilities.
9. **Significant Industrial User** means all Industrial Users subject to National Categorical Pretreatment Standards, any Industrial User that:
 - a. Discharges 25,000 gallons per day or more of process wastewater; or
 - b. Contributes a wastestream that makes up five (5 %) percent or more of the average dry weather hydraulic, BOD or Suspended Solids capacity of the Wastewater Facilities; or
 - c. Has reasonable potential in the opinion of the Director to adversely affect the Wastewater Facilities by inhibition, pass through of pollutants, sludge contamination, or endangerment of persons, facilities or the environment.
10. **Director** means the City's Public Works and Utilities Director.
11. **Wastewater Facilities** means all facilities owned and operated by the City for the purpose of treating, and disposing of all wastewater discharged to such facilities.

ARTICLE II. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

1. **Ownership of Facilities:** Nothing in this Agreement gives the District any ownership or other property rights in City's wastewater facilities except for rights granted to District in Article III hereof.
2. **Exceeding Capacity Rights:** District shall not exceed the maximum allowable peak month daily average discharge of flow volume, biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) mass loading, and suspended solids mass loading, designated in Article III as District's, capacity rights, without express approval of City. Exceeding capacity rights shall in no way constitute an allotment of additional capacity rights to District. Should District's discharge exceed its capacity rights, for any capacity rights parameter, the District shall immediately impose a moratorium on new connections to District's sanitary sewer system. Said moratorium shall remain in effect until such time that District has implemented measures to permanently reduce its discharge to a level below District's capacity rights, or until District has acquired additional capacity

rights in Wastewater facilities.

3. **District's Sewer Use Ordinance:** District shall enact and maintain a sewer use ordinance in accordance with State and Federal requirements. In no case shall District's Sewer Use Ordinance be less stringent than City's Sanitary Sewer Ordinance, Title 6, Chapter 6, in particular pertaining to the Use and Enforcement provisions of Articles 7 and 8 of Watsonville Municipal Code, existing or as amended by applicable Federal or State regulations.
4. **Modification:** This Agreement may from time to time be changed, altered or supplemented only by a written amendment signed by both parties and approved by resolution of their respective governing bodies.
5. **Manner of Giving Notice:** All notices required shall be given in writing and shall be personally served or mailed, postage prepaid, to the following address, or to such other addresses as the parties may designate:

CITY CLERK
CITY OF WATSONVILLE
P.O. Box 50000
Watsonville, CA 95077.

DISTRICT ENGINEER
MONTEREY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
PAJARO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT
312 East Alisal Street
Salinas, CA 93901.

6. **Severability:** If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or word of this Agreement, or the application thereof, to either party or to any other person or circumstance is for any reason held invalid, it shall be deemed severable and the validity of the remainder of the agreement or the application of such provision to the other party, or to any other persons or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. Each party hereby declares that it would have entered into this Agreement and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase and word thereof irrespective of the fact that one or more section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or word, or the application thereof to either party or any other person or circumstance be held invalid.
7. **Assignment:** This Agreement is between the City and existing District and may not be assigned or transferred by District to any other party, without the prior written approval of the City. The granting or withholding of approval of any assignment or transfer of the Agreement by the District shall be at the sole discretion of the City.
8. **Agreement Superseded:** This Agreement supersedes the agreement on this subject between the parties dated June 3, 1998. However, it shall not relieve the District of

any obligation due prior to this agreement.

9. Mutual Indemnification:

- (a) District shall defend, indemnify and save harmless, the City, its officers, agents, and employees from any and all claims, demands, damages, costs, expenses, or liability occasioned by the negligent performance of the provisions hereof, including but not limited to any negligent act or omission to act on the part of the District or its officers, agents, or employees, except that this provision shall not apply to the sole negligence or will full misconduct of the City.
- (b) City shall defend, indemnify and save harmless, the District, its officers, agents, and employees from any and all claims, demands, damages, costs, expenses, or liability occasioned by the negligent performance of the provisions hereof, including but not limited to any negligent act or omission to act on the part of the City or its officers, agents, or employees, except that this provision shall not apply to the sole negligence or will full misconduct of the District.

10. Termination of Agreement: This Agreement shall be terminated upon adoption of a new Agreement between the City and District.

11. Date of Agreement: The effective date of this Agreement is _____ 1, 2001.

ARTICLE III. CAPACITY RIGHTS GRANTED TO DISTRICT BY CITY

- 1. Right-of-Use: Subject to all of the conditions, limitations, restrictions, terms and provisions, or payment of fees & charges contained in this agreement, and District's faithful compliance with the performance of the same, City grants to District the right to discharge to City's Wastewater Treatment Facility the following maximum allowable peak month daily average quantities:

District's Capacity Rights in Wastewater Facilities

Table with 2 columns: Parameter and Value. Flow: 1.57 mgd; Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD): 7,372 pounds/day; Suspended Solids: 6,000 pounds/day.

Total Wastewater Facilities Capacity

Table with 2 columns: Parameter and Value. Flow: 12.0 mgd; Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD): 40,000 pounds/day; Suspended Solids: 47,000 pounds/day.

Districts Percentage Capacity Rights of Wastewater Facilities

Table with 2 columns: Parameter and Value. Flow: 13.1 %; Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD): 18.4 %; Suspended Solids: 12.7 % (with handwritten note 112.761).

In the event of a change in the Wastewater Facilities rated discharge capacity a reapportionment of Flow, BOD and Suspended Solids of Districts Capacity Rights will be made in proportion to the rated capacity.

ARTICLE IV. DETERMINATION OF DISTRICT'S DISCHARGE QUANTITIES

- 1. Wastewater Loading Records: City shall submit flow, BOD, suspended solids, information to District on a semi annual basis. The submitted information shall include total flow volume for the monitoring period as well as peak flow information. District's wastewater mass loadings of BOD and suspended solids shall be based on actual wastewater meter records and certified copies of wastewater analyses provided by City for each monthly monitoring period.

District shall provide City access to District's monitoring station. City shall operate, maintain and replace monitoring equipment as necessary, with these costs to be reimbursed to the City by District. District shall maintain "Site and primary flow measuring device".

ARTICLE V. PAYMENTS TO CITY BY DISTRICT

1. Districts Payment for Capacity Rights

The District desired capacity rights exceed purchased capacity by:

Flow	0 mgd
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)	4,055 pounds/day
Suspended Solids	0 pounds/day

To purchase the desired extra capacity and to satisfy all outstanding debts of the District to City for construction of existing wastewater facilities the District shall pay the City \$3,216,423. This sum shall be paid in accordance with the amortization tables attached as Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B"

The District is scheduled to receive a grant in the amount of \$ 1,110,615 from the SWRCB. This grant is to fund a portion of the District's cost of the secondary treatment plant upgrade. Upon receipt of the grant, the District will make a lump-sum cash payment to the City in an amount equal to the grant. Until the City receives this payment, the District will submit payment (for the desired capacity and outstanding debts) in accordance with the amortization table shown in Exhibit "A". Upon receipt of this payment, the City will apply this sum to the District's unpaid balance. Following this payment, the District will utilize the amortization table shown in Exhibit "B" for all subsequent payments. If the grant payment is paid to the City later than in June, Exhibit B will be revised to reflect the proper timing of when the payment occurred, maintaining all the terms of the note.

In the event of a default by District in the payment for capacity rights under this Agreement, the District shall only have rights to that capacity for which the City has received payment.

2. Wastewater Facilities Improvement Charges:

- a. The District shall be responsible for their share of costs for all wastewater facility improvements which increase treatment effectiveness, efficiency, and/or which are necessary to comply with regulatory agency requirements. The District's share of these costs shall be based upon the District's capacity rights at the time of the completion of said improvements. These capacity-based costs will be determined in accordance with Article III of this Agreement.
- b. The cost of wastewater facility improvements necessary to increase treatment capacity shall be shared in the ratio that the City and District utilize these improvements, respectively. City shall apportion the costs of said improvements to the parameters of Flow, BOD and Suspended Solids, in proportion to the percentage of said costs that are attributable to Flow, BOD and Suspended Solids, respectively.

3. User Charges: District shall pay City monthly user charges. User charges shall be based on discharges of flow, BOD, and suspended solids as measured at District's monitoring

station, in proportion to the total discharge of these parameters from all sources as measured at the Wastewater Treatment Facility. User charges shall cover District's share of operation and maintenance costs. For the purpose of allocating operation and maintenance costs to the parameters of Flow, BOD and Suspended Solids, it shall be agreed that the total O&M costs are attributable as follows; 20% to Flow, 40% to BOD, and 40% to Suspended Solids. User charges shall be assessed monthly, using rates calculated to recover 1/12th of the estimated annual operation and maintenance costs. Operation and maintenance cost estimates shall be based on District's share of wastewater facilities loading from the preceding fiscal year.

At the end of the fiscal year a cost reconciliation shall be performed, to reimburse City or District (as appropriate) for the difference between the estimated and actual costs of operation and maintenance and estimated and actual loadings of the wastewater facilities during that fiscal year. If, through reconciliation, it is determined that the City should reimburse District, City will reimburse District first, by crediting overpayment to any amount owed to City by District. If a credit balance remains the City will subtract an amount equal to the reconciled costs from District's next fiscal year charges. No cash refunds will be made directly to the District. If, through reconciliation, it is determined that the District should reimburse City, City will add an amount equal to the reconciled costs to District's next fiscal year charges.

4. **Estimate of Costs:** Annually, by no later than March 15, City shall provide District with an estimated budget for Capital Improvement Costs and User Charges for the ensuing fiscal year.

5. **Time of Payment:** District shall pay to City its share of Capital Improvement Costs and User Charges by no later than thirty days following the date of invoice by City. All user charge changes shall take effect on July 1 of each year.

ARTICLE VI. SOURCE CONTROL REQUIREMENTS

1. **Compliance with NPDES Permit:** District shall comply with the requirements of the latest revision of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit issued for City and District and the Standard Provisions and Reporting Requirements specified in California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Coast Region Discharge Order Number 81-46 and subsequent Orders.

2. **Source Control Ordinance:** District shall maintain a Source Control Ordinance, in order to allow compliance with Federal Pretreatment Program requirements. District shall not adopt an ordinance that is less stringent than Title 6, Chapter 6, Article 5 of the Watsonville Municipal Code. Whenever the City adopts changes to Chapter 6 article 5 of the Watsonville Municipal Code, District shall enact an amendment to District Ordinance, to incorporate such changes.

3. **Local Limits:** District shall adopt Local Limits for Industrial Users which cover the

same parameters and are at least as stringent as Watsonville Local Limits.

4. **Right of Entry/Inspection and Sampling:** District has the primary duty to inspect and sample Industrial Users facilities, to determine compliance with pretreatment requirements, District authorizes City the right of entry on Industrial Users premises to inspect, sample and monitor any Industrial User, for conditions which may impact the wastewater facilities.

5. **Permitting:** District has the primary responsibility for the permitting of Industrial Users located in the Districts jurisdiction. Copies of all permits shall be provided to the City for review and comment, prior to adoption.

6. **Collection of Industrial User Information:** District has primary responsibility for the routine update of the Industrial Waste Survey, to ensure current information on all Industrial Users.

7. **Connection Notification:** District shall inform City of the intent by any potential Significant Industrial User to connect to Districts Facilities. Notification shall occur at least thirty (30) days prior to the connection of said Industrial User to District's Facilities.

8. **Enforcement:** District has primary responsibility for taking enforcement action against noncomplying Industrial Users in Districts jurisdiction. In the event that District is unwilling or unable to enforce any portions of the ordinance which might affect City's compliance with Federal Pretreatment Program requirements, the Director shall enforce such portions of District's ordinance.

9. **Records Transfer:** District shall provide City access to all records compiled as part of the Districts pretreatment program activities.

10. **Submission of Pretreatment Program Reports:** District shall submit quarterly and annual pretreatment reports to the City. These reports shall be submitted as follows:

Quarterly reports.

Quarterly pretreatment reports shall be submitted to the City on or before April 30, July 30, October 30 and January 30. The reports shall list the Industrial Users (and their addresses) that are not in compliance for the quarter. The reports should also include descriptions of the violations resulting in noncompliance (including, where applicable the pollutants in violation, and their effluent values and limits) and the corrective and enforcement actions taken to correct these violations.

Annual reports.

An annual report shall be submitted to the City on or before January 30 of each year. The report shall include the following:

Updated list of Industrial Users regulated by the Districts pretreatment program

and summary of the compliance status of each Industrial User with applicable categorical standards and local limits.

Summary of District compliance inspection and sampling activities.

Summary of compliance and enforcement activities.

In witness hereon, City and District have caused this Agreement to be executed the day and dates herein below written.

CITY OF WATSONVILLE

4/25/01
DATE OF SIGNING

[Signature]
CITY MANAGER

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

[Signature]
CITY ATTORNEY

ATTEST:

[Signature]
CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM

WATSONVILLE CITY ATTORNEY

DATED: _____

DATE OF SIGNING

PAJARO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT

[Signature]
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

APPROVED AS TO FORM,

[Signature] Chief Asst
MONTEREY COUNTY COUNSEL

EXHIBIT A

Purchase 4055 pounds of BOD @ 586 2,376,230.00
 SWRCB State Grant to be applied 0.00
 Balance as of 4/30/01 PCSD's existing note 840,193.00
 Amount to Finance as of 5/1/01 3,216,423.00

			Orig Balance	Orig Rate	Term (yrs)	1st PMT	Future Value		
			\$3,216,423	7.00%	20	May-01	\$0		
Pmt #	Date	Yr Rate	P&I Payment	Principal	Interest	Extra Prin	New Balance	Cum. Interest	Yearly Total Int
-	Apr-01						\$3,216,423.00		
1	May-01	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,174.42	\$18,762.47	\$0.00	\$3,210,248.58	\$18,762.47	\$18,762.47
2	Jun-01	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,210.44	\$18,726.45	\$0.00	\$3,204,038.14	\$37,488.92	\$37,488.92
3	Jul-01	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,246.67	\$18,690.22	\$0.00	\$3,197,791.47	\$56,179.14	\$56,179.14
4	Aug-01	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,283.11	\$18,653.78	\$0.00	\$3,191,508.36	\$74,832.92	\$74,832.92
5	Sep-01	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,319.76	\$18,617.13	\$0.00	\$3,185,188.60	\$93,450.05	\$93,450.05
6	Oct-01	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,356.62	\$18,580.27	\$0.00	\$3,178,831.98	\$112,030.32	\$112,030.32
7	Nov-01	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,393.70	\$18,543.19	\$0.00	\$3,172,438.28	\$130,573.51	\$130,573.51
8	Dec-01	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,431.00	\$18,505.89	\$0.00	\$3,166,007.28	\$149,079.40	\$149,079.40
9	Jan-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,468.51	\$18,468.38	\$0.00	\$3,159,538.77	\$167,547.78	\$167,547.78
10	Feb-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,506.25	\$18,430.64	\$0.00	\$3,153,032.52	\$185,978.42	\$185,978.42
11	Mar-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,544.20	\$18,392.69	\$0.00	\$3,146,488.32	\$204,371.11	\$204,371.11
12	Apr-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,582.37	\$18,354.52	\$0.00	\$3,139,905.95	\$222,725.63	\$222,725.63
13	May-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,620.77	\$18,316.12	\$0.00	\$3,133,286.18	\$241,041.75	\$241,041.75
14	Jun-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,659.39	\$18,277.50	\$0.00	\$3,126,625.79	\$259,319.25	\$259,319.25
15	Jul-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,698.24	\$18,238.65	\$0.00	\$3,119,927.55	\$277,557.90	\$277,557.90
16	Aug-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,737.31	\$18,199.58	\$0.00	\$3,113,190.24	\$295,757.48	\$295,757.48
17	Sep-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,776.61	\$18,160.28	\$0.00	\$3,106,413.63	\$313,917.76	\$313,917.76
18	Oct-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,816.14	\$18,120.75	\$0.00	\$3,099,597.49	\$332,038.51	\$332,038.51
19	Nov-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,855.90	\$18,080.99	\$0.00	\$3,092,741.59	\$350,119.50	\$350,119.50
20	Dec-02	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,895.90	\$18,040.99	\$0.00	\$3,085,845.69	\$368,160.49	\$368,160.49
21	Jan-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,936.12	\$18,000.77	\$0.00	\$3,078,909.57	\$386,161.26	\$386,161.26
22	Feb-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$6,976.58	\$17,960.31	\$0.00	\$3,071,932.99	\$404,121.57	\$404,121.57
23	Mar-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,017.28	\$17,919.61	\$0.00	\$3,064,915.71	\$422,041.18	\$422,041.18
24	Apr-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,058.22	\$17,878.67	\$0.00	\$3,057,857.49	\$439,919.85	\$439,919.85
25	May-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,099.39	\$17,837.50	\$0.00	\$3,050,758.10	\$457,757.35	\$457,757.35
26	Jun-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,140.80	\$17,796.09	\$0.00	\$3,043,617.30	\$475,553.44	\$475,553.44
27	Jul-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,182.46	\$17,754.43	\$0.00	\$3,036,434.84	\$493,307.87	\$493,307.87
28	Aug-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,224.35	\$17,712.54	\$0.00	\$3,029,210.49	\$511,020.41	\$511,020.41
29	Sep-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,266.50	\$17,670.39	\$0.00	\$3,021,943.99	\$528,690.80	\$528,690.80
30	Oct-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,308.88	\$17,628.01	\$0.00	\$3,014,635.11	\$546,318.81	\$546,318.81
31	Nov-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,351.52	\$17,585.37	\$0.00	\$3,007,283.59	\$563,904.18	\$563,904.18
32	Dec-03	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,394.40	\$17,542.49	\$0.00	\$2,999,889.19	\$581,446.67	\$581,446.67
33	Jan-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,437.54	\$17,499.35	\$0.00	\$2,992,451.65	\$598,946.02	\$598,946.02
34	Feb-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,480.92	\$17,455.97	\$0.00	\$2,984,970.73	\$616,401.99	\$616,401.99
35	Mar-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,524.56	\$17,412.33	\$0.00	\$2,977,446.17	\$633,814.32	\$633,814.32
36	Apr-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,568.45	\$17,368.44	\$0.00	\$2,969,877.72	\$651,182.76	\$651,182.76

EXHIBIT A

Purchase 4055 pounds of BOD @ 586 2,376,230.00
 SWRCB State Grant to be applied 0.00
 Balance as of 4/30/01 PCSD's existing note 840,193.00
 Amount to Finance as of 5/1/01 3,216,423.00

		Orig Balance	Orig Rate	Term (yrs)	1st PMT	Future Value			
		\$3,216,423	7.00%	20	May-01	\$0			
Pmt #	Date	Yr Rate	P&I Payment	Principal	Interest	Extra Prin	New Balance	Cum. Interest	Yearly Total Int
37	May-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,612.60	\$17,324.29	\$0.00	\$2,962,265.12	\$668,507.05	\$87,060.38
38	Jun-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,657.01	\$17,279.88	\$0.00	\$2,964,608.11	\$685,786.93	\$104,340.26
39	Jul-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,701.68	\$17,235.21	\$0.00	\$2,946,906.43	\$703,022.14	\$121,575.47
40	Aug-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,746.60	\$17,190.29	\$0.00	\$2,939,159.83	\$720,212.43	\$138,766.76
41	Sep-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,791.79	\$17,145.10	\$0.00	\$2,931,368.04	\$737,357.53	\$155,910.86
42	Oct-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,837.24	\$17,099.65	\$0.00	\$2,923,530.80	\$754,457.18	\$173,010.51
43	Nov-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,882.96	\$17,053.93	\$0.00	\$2,915,647.84	\$771,511.11	\$190,064.44
44	Dec-04	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,928.94	\$17,007.95	\$0.00	\$2,907,718.90	\$788,519.06	\$207,072.39
45	Jan-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$7,975.20	\$16,961.69	\$0.00	\$2,899,743.70	\$805,480.75	\$16,961.69
46	Feb-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,021.72	\$16,915.17	\$0.00	\$2,891,721.98	\$822,395.92	\$33,876.86
47	Mar-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,068.51	\$16,868.38	\$0.00	\$2,883,653.47	\$839,264.30	\$50,745.24
48	Apr-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,115.58	\$16,821.31	\$0.00	\$2,875,537.89	\$856,085.61	\$67,566.56
49	May-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,162.92	\$16,773.97	\$0.00	\$2,867,374.97	\$872,859.58	\$84,340.62
50	Jun-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,210.54	\$16,726.35	\$0.00	\$2,859,164.43	\$889,585.93	\$101,066.87
51	Jul-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,258.43	\$16,678.46	\$0.00	\$2,850,906.00	\$906,264.39	\$117,746.33
52	Aug-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,306.60	\$16,630.29	\$0.00	\$2,842,599.40	\$922,894.68	\$134,375.62
53	Sep-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,355.08	\$16,581.83	\$0.00	\$2,834,244.34	\$939,476.51	\$150,957.45
54	Oct-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,403.80	\$16,533.09	\$0.00	\$2,825,840.54	\$956,009.60	\$167,490.54
55	Nov-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,452.82	\$16,484.07	\$0.00	\$2,817,387.72	\$972,493.67	\$183,974.61
56	Dec-05	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,502.13	\$16,434.76	\$0.00	\$2,808,885.59	\$988,928.43	\$200,409.37
57	Jan-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,551.72	\$16,385.17	\$0.00	\$2,800,333.87	\$1,005,313.60	\$16,385.17
58	Feb-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,601.61	\$16,335.28	\$0.00	\$2,791,732.26	\$1,021,648.88	\$32,720.45
59	Mar-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,651.79	\$16,285.10	\$0.00	\$2,783,080.47	\$1,037,933.98	\$49,005.55
60	Apr-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,702.25	\$16,234.64	\$0.00	\$2,774,378.22	\$1,054,168.62	\$65,240.19
61	May-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,753.02	\$16,183.87	\$0.00	\$2,765,625.20	\$1,070,352.49	\$81,424.06
62	Jun-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,804.08	\$16,132.81	\$0.00	\$2,756,821.12	\$1,086,486.30	\$97,556.87
63	Jul-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,855.43	\$16,081.46	\$0.00	\$2,747,965.69	\$1,102,566.76	\$113,638.33
64	Aug-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,907.09	\$16,029.80	\$0.00	\$2,739,058.60	\$1,118,596.56	\$129,668.13
65	Sep-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$8,959.05	\$15,977.84	\$0.00	\$2,730,099.55	\$1,134,574.40	\$145,645.97
66	Oct-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,011.31	\$15,925.58	\$0.00	\$2,721,088.24	\$1,150,499.98	\$161,571.55
67	Nov-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,063.88	\$15,873.01	\$0.00	\$2,712,024.36	\$1,166,372.99	\$177,444.66
68	Dec-06	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,116.75	\$15,820.14	\$0.00	\$2,702,907.61	\$1,182,193.13	\$193,264.70
69	Jan-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,169.93	\$15,766.96	\$0.00	\$2,693,737.66	\$1,197,960.09	\$15,766.96
70	Feb-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,223.42	\$15,713.47	\$0.00	\$2,684,514.26	\$1,213,673.56	\$31,480.43
71	Mar-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,277.22	\$15,659.67	\$0.00	\$2,675,237.04	\$1,229,333.23	\$47,140.10
72	Apr-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,331.34	\$15,605.55	\$0.00	\$2,665,905.70	\$1,244,938.78	\$62,745.65
73	May-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,385.77	\$15,551.12	\$0.00	\$2,656,519.93	\$1,260,489.90	\$78,296.77
74	Jun-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,440.52	\$15,496.37	\$0.00	\$2,647,079.41	\$1,275,986.27	\$93,793.14
75	Jul-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,495.59	\$15,441.30	\$0.00	\$2,637,583.82	\$1,291,427.57	\$109,234.44
76	Aug-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,550.98	\$15,385.91	\$0.00	\$2,628,032.84	\$1,306,813.48	\$124,620.35
77	Sep-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,606.70	\$15,330.19	\$0.00	\$2,618,426.14	\$1,322,143.67	\$139,950.54
78	Oct-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,662.74	\$15,274.15	\$0.00	\$2,608,763.40	\$1,337,417.82	\$155,224.69
79	Nov-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,719.10	\$15,217.79	\$0.00	\$2,599,044.30	\$1,352,635.61	\$170,442.48
80	Dec-07	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,775.80	\$15,161.09	\$0.00	\$2,589,268.50	\$1,367,796.70	\$185,603.57
81	Jan-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,832.82	\$15,104.07	\$0.00	\$2,579,436.68	\$1,382,900.77	\$15,104.07
82	Feb-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,890.18	\$15,046.71	\$0.00	\$2,569,545.50	\$1,397,947.48	\$30,150.78
83	Mar-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$9,947.87	\$14,989.02	\$0.00	\$2,559,597.63	\$1,412,936.50	\$45,139.80
84	Apr-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,005.90	\$14,930.99	\$0.00	\$2,549,591.73	\$1,427,867.49	\$60,070.79
85	May-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,064.27	\$14,872.62	\$0.00	\$2,539,527.46	\$1,442,740.11	\$74,943.41
86	Jun-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,122.98	\$14,813.91	\$0.00	\$2,529,404.48	\$1,457,554.02	\$89,757.32
87	Jul-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,182.03	\$14,754.86	\$0.00	\$2,519,222.45	\$1,472,308.88	\$104,512.18
88	Aug-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,241.43	\$14,695.46	\$0.00	\$2,508,981.02	\$1,487,004.34	\$119,207.64
89	Sep-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,301.17	\$14,635.72	\$0.00	\$2,498,679.85	\$1,501,640.06	\$133,843.36
90	Oct-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,361.26	\$14,575.63	\$0.00	\$2,488,318.59	\$1,516,215.89	\$148,418.99
91	Nov-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,421.70	\$14,515.19	\$0.00	\$2,477,896.89	\$1,530,730.88	\$162,934.18

EXHIBIT A

Purchase 4055 pounds of BOD @ 586 2,376,230.00
 SWRCB State Grant to be applied 0.00
 Balance as of 4/30/01 PCSD's existing note 840,193.00
 Amount to Finance as of 5/1/01 3,216,423.00

			Orig Balance	Orig Rate	Term (yrs)	1st PMT	Future Value		
			\$3,216,423	7.00%	20	May-01	\$0		
Pmt #	Date	Yr Rate	P&I Payment	Principal	Interest	Extra Prin	New Balance	Cum. Interest	Yearly Total Int
92	Dec-08	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,482.49	\$14,454.40	\$0.00	\$2,467,414.40	\$1,545,185.28	\$177,388.58
93	Jan-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,543.64	\$14,393.25	\$0.00	\$2,456,870.76	\$1,559,578.53	\$14,393.25
94	Feb-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,605.14	\$14,331.75	\$0.00	\$2,446,265.62	\$1,573,910.28	\$28,725.00
95	Mar-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,667.01	\$14,269.88	\$0.00	\$2,435,598.61	\$1,588,180.16	\$42,994.88
96	Apr-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,729.23	\$14,207.66	\$0.00	\$2,424,869.38	\$1,602,387.82	\$57,202.54
97	May-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,791.82	\$14,145.07	\$0.00	\$2,414,077.56	\$1,616,532.89	\$71,347.61
98	Jun-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,854.77	\$14,082.12	\$0.00	\$2,403,222.79	\$1,630,615.01	\$85,429.73
99	Jul-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,918.09	\$14,018.80	\$0.00	\$2,392,304.70	\$1,644,633.81	\$99,448.53
100	Aug-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$10,981.78	\$13,955.11	\$0.00	\$2,381,322.92	\$1,658,588.92	\$113,403.64
101	Sep-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,045.84	\$13,891.05	\$0.00	\$2,370,277.08	\$1,672,479.97	\$127,294.69
102	Oct-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,110.27	\$13,826.62	\$0.00	\$2,359,166.81	\$1,686,306.59	\$141,121.31
103	Nov-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,175.08	\$13,761.81	\$0.00	\$2,347,991.73	\$1,700,068.40	\$154,883.12
104	Dec-09	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,240.27	\$13,696.62	\$0.00	\$2,336,751.46	\$1,713,765.02	\$168,579.74
105	Jan-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,305.84	\$13,631.05	\$0.00	\$2,325,446.62	\$1,727,396.07	\$182,211.05
106	Feb-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,371.79	\$13,565.10	\$0.00	\$2,314,073.83	\$1,740,961.17	\$195,786.15
107	Mar-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,438.13	\$13,498.76	\$0.00	\$2,302,636.70	\$1,754,459.93	\$209,294.91
108	Apr-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,504.85	\$13,432.04	\$0.00	\$2,291,130.85	\$1,767,891.97	\$222,732.95
109	May-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,571.96	\$13,364.93	\$0.00	\$2,279,558.89	\$1,781,256.90	\$236,101.88
110	Jun-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,639.46	\$13,297.43	\$0.00	\$2,267,919.43	\$1,794,564.33	\$249,401.31
111	Jul-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,707.36	\$13,229.53	\$0.00	\$2,256,212.07	\$1,807,783.86	\$262,630.84
112	Aug-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,775.65	\$13,161.24	\$0.00	\$2,244,436.42	\$1,820,945.10	\$275,791.08
113	Sep-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,844.34	\$13,092.55	\$0.00	\$2,232,592.08	\$1,834,037.65	\$288,881.63
114	Oct-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,913.44	\$13,023.45	\$0.00	\$2,220,678.64	\$1,847,061.10	\$301,892.08
115	Nov-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$11,982.93	\$12,953.96	\$0.00	\$2,208,695.71	\$1,860,015.06	\$314,822.04
116	Dec-10	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,052.83	\$12,884.06	\$0.00	\$2,196,642.88	\$1,872,899.12	\$327,671.10
117	Jan-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,123.14	\$12,813.75	\$0.00	\$2,184,519.74	\$1,885,712.87	\$340,437.76
118	Feb-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,193.86	\$12,743.03	\$0.00	\$2,172,325.88	\$1,898,455.90	\$353,121.88
119	Mar-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,264.99	\$12,671.90	\$0.00	\$2,160,060.89	\$1,911,127.80	\$365,722.68
120	Apr-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,336.53	\$12,600.36	\$0.00	\$2,147,724.36	\$1,923,728.16	\$378,240.04
121	May-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,408.50	\$12,528.39	\$0.00	\$2,135,316.86	\$1,936,256.55	\$390,673.49
122	Jun-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,480.88	\$12,456.01	\$0.00	\$2,122,834.98	\$1,948,712.56	\$403,021.44
123	Jul-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,553.69	\$12,383.20	\$0.00	\$2,110,281.29	\$1,961,095.76	\$415,283.64
124	Aug-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,626.92	\$12,309.97	\$0.00	\$2,097,654.37	\$1,973,405.73	\$427,451.61
125	Sep-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,700.57	\$12,236.32	\$0.00	\$2,084,953.80	\$1,985,642.05	\$439,525.93
126	Oct-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,774.66	\$12,162.23	\$0.00	\$2,072,179.14	\$1,997,804.28	\$451,506.16
127	Nov-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,849.18	\$12,087.71	\$0.00	\$2,059,329.96	\$2,009,891.99	\$463,392.87
128	Dec-11	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,924.13	\$12,012.76	\$0.00	\$2,046,405.83	\$2,021,904.75	\$475,185.63
129	Jan-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$12,999.52	\$11,937.37	\$0.00	\$2,033,406.31	\$2,033,842.12	\$486,884.37
130	Feb-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,075.35	\$11,861.54	\$0.00	\$2,020,330.96	\$2,045,703.66	\$498,389.91
131	Mar-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,151.63	\$11,785.26	\$0.00	\$2,007,179.33	\$2,057,488.92	\$509,704.17
132	Apr-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,228.34	\$11,708.55	\$0.00	\$1,993,950.99	\$2,069,197.47	\$520,922.72
133	May-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,305.51	\$11,631.38	\$0.00	\$1,980,645.48	\$2,080,828.85	\$532,041.10
134	Jun-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,383.12	\$11,553.77	\$0.00	\$1,967,262.36	\$2,092,382.62	\$543,054.87
135	Jul-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,461.19	\$11,476.70	\$0.00	\$1,953,801.17	\$2,103,858.32	\$553,969.57
136	Aug-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,539.72	\$11,397.17	\$0.00	\$1,940,261.45	\$2,115,255.49	\$564,780.74
137	Sep-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,618.70	\$11,318.19	\$0.00	\$1,926,642.75	\$2,126,573.69	\$575,492.68
138	Oct-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,698.14	\$11,238.75	\$0.00	\$1,912,944.61	\$2,137,812.43	\$586,100.68
139	Nov-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,778.05	\$11,158.84	\$0.00	\$1,899,166.56	\$2,148,971.27	\$596,609.52
140	Dec-12	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,858.42	\$11,078.47	\$0.00	\$1,885,308.14	\$2,160,049.74	\$607,014.99
141	Jan-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$13,939.26	\$10,997.63	\$0.00	\$1,871,368.88	\$2,171,047.37	\$617,321.63
142	Feb-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,020.57	\$10,916.32	\$0.00	\$1,857,348.31	\$2,181,963.69	\$627,524.95
143	Mar-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,102.36	\$10,834.53	\$0.00	\$1,843,245.95	\$2,192,798.22	\$637,628.48
144	Apr-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,184.62	\$10,752.27	\$0.00	\$1,829,061.33	\$2,203,550.49	\$647,636.75
145	May-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,267.37	\$10,669.52	\$0.00	\$1,814,793.96	\$2,214,220.01	\$657,544.27
146	Jun-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,350.59	\$10,586.30	\$0.00	\$1,800,443.37	\$2,224,806.31	\$667,352.57

EXHIBIT A

Purchase 4055 pounds of BOD @ 586 2,376,230.00
 SWRCB State Grant to be applied 0.00
 Balance as of 4/30/01 PCSD's existing note 840,193.00
 Amount to Finance as of 5/1/01 3,216,423.00

Pmt #	Date	Yr Rate	P&I Payment	Principal	Interest	Extra Prin	New Balance	Cum. Interest	Yearly Total Int
				Orig Balance	Orig Rate	Term (yrs)	1st PMT	Future Value	
				\$3,216,423	7.00%	20	May-01	\$0	
147	Jul-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,434.30	\$10,502.59	\$0.00	\$1,786,009.07	\$2,295,908.90	\$75,259.16
148	Aug-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,518.50	\$10,418.39	\$0.00	\$1,771,490.57	\$2,245,727.29	\$85,677.55
149	Sep-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,603.20	\$10,333.69	\$0.00	\$1,756,887.37	\$2,266,060.98	\$96,011.24
150	Oct-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,688.38	\$10,248.51	\$0.00	\$1,742,198.99	\$2,286,309.49	\$106,259.75
151	Nov-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,774.06	\$10,162.83	\$0.00	\$1,727,424.93	\$2,276,472.32	\$116,422.58
152	Dec-13	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,860.24	\$10,076.65	\$0.00	\$1,712,564.69	\$2,286,548.97	\$126,499.23
153	Jan-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$14,946.93	\$9,989.98	\$0.00	\$1,697,617.76	\$2,296,638.93	\$9,989.96
154	Feb-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,034.12	\$9,902.77	\$0.00	\$1,682,583.64	\$2,306,441.70	\$19,892.73
155	Mar-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,121.82	\$9,815.07	\$0.00	\$1,667,461.82	\$2,316,256.77	\$29,707.80
156	Apr-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,210.03	\$9,726.86	\$0.00	\$1,652,251.79	\$2,325,983.63	\$39,434.66
157	May-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,298.75	\$9,638.14	\$0.00	\$1,636,953.04	\$2,335,621.77	\$49,072.80
158	Jun-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,388.00	\$9,548.89	\$0.00	\$1,621,565.04	\$2,345,170.66	\$58,621.69
159	Jul-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,477.76	\$9,459.13	\$0.00	\$1,606,087.28	\$2,354,629.79	\$68,080.82
160	Aug-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,568.05	\$9,368.84	\$0.00	\$1,590,519.23	\$2,363,998.63	\$77,449.66
161	Sep-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,658.86	\$9,278.03	\$0.00	\$1,574,860.37	\$2,373,276.66	\$86,727.69
162	Oct-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,750.20	\$9,186.69	\$0.00	\$1,559,110.17	\$2,382,463.35	\$95,914.38
163	Nov-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,842.08	\$9,094.81	\$0.00	\$1,543,268.09	\$2,391,558.16	\$105,009.19
164	Dec-14	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$15,934.49	\$9,002.40	\$0.00	\$1,527,333.60	\$2,400,560.56	\$114,011.59
165	Jan-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,027.44	\$8,909.45	\$0.00	\$1,511,306.16	\$2,409,470.01	\$8,909.45
166	Feb-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,120.94	\$8,816.95	\$0.00	\$1,495,185.22	\$2,418,285.96	\$17,725.40
167	Mar-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,214.98	\$8,724.91	\$0.00	\$1,478,970.24	\$2,427,007.87	\$26,447.31
168	Apr-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,309.56	\$8,632.33	\$0.00	\$1,462,660.68	\$2,435,635.20	\$35,074.64
169	May-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,404.70	\$8,539.19	\$0.00	\$1,446,255.98	\$2,444,167.39	\$43,606.83
170	Jun-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,500.40	\$8,445.49	\$0.00	\$1,429,755.58	\$2,452,603.88	\$52,043.32
171	Jul-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,596.65	\$8,349.24	\$0.00	\$1,413,158.93	\$2,460,944.12	\$60,383.56
172	Aug-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,693.46	\$8,243.43	\$0.00	\$1,396,465.47	\$2,469,187.55	\$68,626.99
173	Sep-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,790.84	\$8,146.05	\$0.00	\$1,379,674.63	\$2,477,333.60	\$76,773.04
174	Oct-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,888.79	\$8,048.10	\$0.00	\$1,362,785.84	\$2,485,381.70	\$84,821.14
175	Nov-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$16,987.31	\$7,949.58	\$0.00	\$1,345,798.53	\$2,493,331.28	\$92,770.72
176	Dec-15	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$17,086.40	\$7,850.49	\$0.00	\$1,328,712.13	\$2,501,181.77	\$100,621.21
177	Jan-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$17,186.07	\$7,750.82	\$0.00	\$1,311,528.06	\$2,508,932.59	\$7,750.82
178	Feb-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$17,286.82	\$7,650.57	\$0.00	\$1,294,239.74	\$2,516,583.16	\$15,401.39
179	Mar-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$17,387.16	\$7,549.73	\$0.00	\$1,276,852.58	\$2,524,132.89	\$22,951.12
180	Apr-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$17,488.58	\$7,448.31	\$0.00	\$1,259,364.00	\$2,531,581.20	\$30,399.43
181	May-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$17,590.60	\$7,346.29	\$0.00	\$1,241,773.40	\$2,538,927.49	\$37,745.72
182	Jun-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$17,693.21	\$7,243.68	\$0.00	\$1,224,080.19	\$2,546,171.17	\$44,989.40
183	Jul-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$17,796.42	\$7,140.47	\$0.00	\$1,206,283.77	\$2,553,311.64	\$52,129.87
184	Aug-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$17,900.23	\$7,036.66	\$0.00	\$1,188,383.54	\$2,560,348.30	\$59,166.53
185	Sep-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$18,004.65	\$6,932.24	\$0.00	\$1,170,378.89	\$2,567,280.54	\$66,098.77
186	Oct-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$18,109.88	\$6,827.21	\$0.00	\$1,152,269.21	\$2,574,107.75	\$72,925.98
187	Nov-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$18,215.32	\$6,721.57	\$0.00	\$1,134,053.89	\$2,580,829.32	\$79,647.55
188	Dec-16	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$18,321.58	\$6,615.31	\$0.00	\$1,115,732.81	\$2,587,444.63	\$86,262.86
189	Jan-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$18,428.45	\$6,508.44	\$0.00	\$1,097,303.86	\$2,593,953.07	\$92,808.44
190	Feb-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$18,535.95	\$6,400.94	\$0.00	\$1,078,767.91	\$2,600,354.01	\$12,909.38
191	Mar-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$18,644.08	\$6,292.81	\$0.00	\$1,060,123.83	\$2,606,646.82	\$19,202.19
192	Apr-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$18,752.83	\$6,184.06	\$0.00	\$1,041,371.00	\$2,612,830.88	\$25,386.25
193	May-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$18,862.23	\$6,074.66	\$0.00	\$1,022,508.77	\$2,618,905.54	\$31,460.91
194	Jun-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$18,972.26	\$5,964.63	\$0.00	\$1,003,536.51	\$2,624,870.17	\$37,425.54
195	Jul-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$19,082.93	\$5,853.96	\$0.00	\$984,453.68	\$2,630,724.13	\$43,279.50
196	Aug-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$19,194.24	\$5,742.65	\$0.00	\$965,259.34	\$2,636,466.78	\$49,022.15
197	Sep-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$19,306.21	\$5,630.68	\$0.00	\$945,953.13	\$2,642,097.46	\$54,652.83
198	Oct-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$19,418.83	\$5,518.06	\$0.00	\$926,534.30	\$2,647,615.52	\$60,170.89
199	Nov-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$19,532.11	\$5,404.78	\$0.00	\$907,002.19	\$2,653,020.30	\$65,575.67
200	Dec-17	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$19,646.04	\$5,290.85	\$0.00	\$887,356.15	\$2,658,311.15	\$70,866.52
201	Jan-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$19,760.65	\$5,176.24	\$0.00	\$867,595.50	\$2,663,487.39	\$5,176.24

EXHIBIT A

Purchase 4055 pounds of BOD @ 586 2,376,230.00
 SWRCB State Grant to be applied 0.00
 Balance as of 4/30/01 PCSD's existing note 840,193.00
 Amount to Finance as of 5/1/01 3,216,423.00

			Orig Balance	Orig Rate	Term (yrs)	1st PMT	Future Value		
			\$3,216,423	7.00%	20	May-01	\$0		
<u>Pmt #</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Yr Rate</u>	<u>P&I Payment</u>	<u>Principal</u>	<u>Interest</u>	<u>Extra Prin</u>	<u>New Balance</u>	<u>Cum. Interest</u>	<u>Yearly Total Int</u>
202	Feb-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$19,875.92	\$5,060.97	\$0.00	\$847,719.58	\$2,668,548.36	\$10,237.21
203	Mar-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$19,991.86	\$4,945.03	\$0.00	\$827,727.72	\$2,673,493.39	\$15,182.24
204	Apr-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$20,108.48	\$4,828.41	\$0.00	\$807,619.24	\$2,678,321.80	\$20,010.65
205	May-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$20,225.78	\$4,711.11	\$0.00	\$787,393.46	\$2,683,032.91	\$24,721.76
206	Jun-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$20,343.76	\$4,593.13	\$0.00	\$767,049.70	\$2,687,626.04	\$29,314.89
207	Jul-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$20,462.43	\$4,474.46	\$0.00	\$746,587.27	\$2,692,100.50	\$33,789.35
208	Aug-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$20,581.80	\$4,355.09	\$0.00	\$726,005.47	\$2,696,455.59	\$38,144.44
209	Sep-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$20,701.86	\$4,235.03	\$0.00	\$705,303.61	\$2,700,690.62	\$42,379.47
210	Oct-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$20,822.62	\$4,114.27	\$0.00	\$684,480.99	\$2,704,804.89	\$46,493.74
211	Nov-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$20,944.08	\$3,992.81	\$0.00	\$663,536.91	\$2,708,797.70	\$50,486.55
212	Dec-18	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$21,066.26	\$3,870.63	\$0.00	\$642,470.65	\$2,712,668.33	\$54,357.18
213	Jan-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$21,189.14	\$3,747.75	\$0.00	\$621,281.51	\$2,716,416.08	\$58,177.75
214	Feb-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$21,312.75	\$3,624.14	\$0.00	\$599,968.76	\$2,720,040.22	\$61,971.89
215	Mar-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$21,437.07	\$3,499.82	\$0.00	\$578,531.69	\$2,723,540.04	\$65,711.71
216	Apr-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$21,562.12	\$3,374.77	\$0.00	\$556,969.57	\$2,726,914.81	\$69,426.48
217	May-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$21,687.90	\$3,248.99	\$0.00	\$535,281.67	\$2,730,163.80	\$73,095.47
218	Jun-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$21,814.41	\$3,122.48	\$0.00	\$513,467.26	\$2,733,286.28	\$76,717.95
219	Jul-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$21,941.66	\$2,995.23	\$0.00	\$491,525.60	\$2,736,281.51	\$80,281.18
220	Aug-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$22,069.66	\$2,867.23	\$0.00	\$469,455.94	\$2,739,148.74	\$83,798.41
221	Sep-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$22,198.40	\$2,738.49	\$0.00	\$447,267.54	\$2,741,887.23	\$87,258.90
222	Oct-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$22,327.89	\$2,609.00	\$0.00	\$424,929.65	\$2,744,496.23	\$90,672.90
223	Nov-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$22,458.13	\$2,478.76	\$0.00	\$402,471.52	\$2,746,974.99	\$94,036.66
224	Dec-19	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$22,589.14	\$2,347.75	\$0.00	\$379,882.38	\$2,749,322.74	\$97,354.41
225	Jan-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$22,720.91	\$2,216.98	\$0.00	\$357,161.47	\$2,751,538.72	\$100,621.98
226	Feb-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$22,853.45	\$2,083.44	\$0.00	\$334,308.02	\$2,753,622.16	\$103,849.42
227	Mar-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$22,986.76	\$1,950.13	\$0.00	\$311,321.26	\$2,755,572.29	\$107,029.55
228	Apr-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$23,120.85	\$1,816.04	\$0.00	\$288,200.41	\$2,757,388.33	\$110,165.59
229	May-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$23,255.72	\$1,681.17	\$0.00	\$264,944.69	\$2,759,069.50	\$113,256.76
230	Jun-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$23,391.38	\$1,545.51	\$0.00	\$241,553.31	\$2,760,615.01	\$116,302.27
231	Jul-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$23,527.83	\$1,409.06	\$0.00	\$218,025.48	\$2,762,024.07	\$119,303.33
232	Aug-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$23,665.07	\$1,271.82	\$0.00	\$194,360.41	\$2,763,295.89	\$122,259.15
233	Sep-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$23,803.12	\$1,133.77	\$0.00	\$170,557.29	\$2,764,429.66	\$125,176.92
234	Oct-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$23,941.97	\$994.92	\$0.00	\$146,615.32	\$2,765,424.58	\$128,051.84
235	Nov-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$24,081.63	\$855.26	\$0.00	\$122,533.69	\$2,766,279.84	\$130,881.10
236	Dec-20	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$24,222.11	\$714.78	\$0.00	\$98,311.58	\$2,766,994.62	\$133,665.88
237	Jan-21	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$24,363.41	\$573.48	\$0.00	\$73,948.17	\$2,767,568.10	\$136,405.48
238	Feb-21	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$24,505.53	\$431.36	\$0.00	\$49,442.64	\$2,767,999.46	\$139,100.84
239	Mar-21	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$24,648.47	\$288.42	\$0.00	\$24,794.17	\$2,768,287.88	\$141,753.26
240	Apr-21	7.00%	\$24,936.89	\$24,794.17	\$144.63	(\$0.00)	\$0.00	\$2,768,432.51	\$144,377.89

EXHIBIT B

Balance as of 6/30/01 (Exhibit A) 3,204,038.14
 SWRCB State Grant to be applied (1,110,615.00)
 Amount to Finance as of 7/1/01 2,093,423.14

		Orig Balance	Orig Rate	Term (yrs)	1st PMT	Future Value			
		2,093,423.14	7.00%	19.83	Jul-01	\$0			
Pmt #	Date	Yr Rate	P&I Payment	Principal	Interest	Extra Prin	New Balance	Cum. Interest	Yearly Total Int
		Orig Balance		Orig Rate	Term (yrs)	1st PMT	Future Value		
		2,093,423.14		7.00%	19.83	Jul-01	\$0		
Pmt #	Date	Yr Rate	P&I Payment	Principal	Interest	Extra Prin	New Balance	Cum. Interest	Yearly Total Int
	Jun-01						\$2,093,423.14		
	Jun-01						\$2,093,423.14		
3	Jul-01	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,082.66	\$12,211.63	\$0.00	\$2,089,340.48	\$12,211.63	\$12,211.63
4	Aug-01	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,106.47	\$12,187.82	\$0.00	\$2,085,234.01	\$24,399.45	\$24,399.45
5	Sep-01	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,130.42	\$12,163.87	\$0.00	\$2,081,103.59	\$36,563.32	\$36,563.32
6	Oct-01	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,154.52	\$12,139.77	\$0.00	\$2,076,949.07	\$48,703.09	\$48,703.09
7	Nov-01	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,178.75	\$12,115.54	\$0.00	\$2,072,770.32	\$60,818.63	\$60,818.63
8	Dec-01	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,203.13	\$12,091.16	\$0.00	\$2,068,567.19	\$72,909.79	\$72,909.79
9	Jan-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,227.65	\$12,066.64	\$0.00	\$2,064,339.54	\$84,976.43	\$12,066.64
10	Feb-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,252.31	\$12,041.98	\$0.00	\$2,060,087.23	\$97,018.41	\$24,108.62
11	Mar-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,277.11	\$12,017.18	\$0.00	\$2,055,810.12	\$109,035.59	\$36,125.80
12	Apr-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,302.06	\$11,992.23	\$0.00	\$2,051,508.06	\$121,027.82	\$48,118.03
13	May-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,327.16	\$11,967.13	\$0.00	\$2,047,180.90	\$132,994.95	\$60,086.16
14	Jun-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,352.40	\$11,941.89	\$0.00	\$2,042,828.50	\$144,936.84	\$72,027.05
15	Jul-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,377.79	\$11,916.50	\$0.00	\$2,038,450.71	\$156,863.34	\$83,943.55
16	Aug-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,403.33	\$11,890.96	\$0.00	\$2,034,047.38	\$168,744.30	\$95,834.51
17	Sep-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,429.01	\$11,865.28	\$0.00	\$2,029,618.37	\$180,609.58	\$107,699.79
18	Oct-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,454.85	\$11,839.44	\$0.00	\$2,025,163.52	\$192,449.02	\$119,539.23
19	Nov-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,480.84	\$11,813.45	\$0.00	\$2,020,682.68	\$204,262.47	\$131,352.68
20	Dec-02	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,506.97	\$11,787.32	\$0.00	\$2,016,175.71	\$216,049.79	\$143,140.00
21	Jan-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,533.27	\$11,761.02	\$0.00	\$2,011,642.44	\$227,810.81	\$11,761.02
22	Feb-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,559.71	\$11,734.58	\$0.00	\$2,007,082.73	\$239,545.39	\$23,495.60
23	Mar-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,586.31	\$11,707.88	\$0.00	\$2,002,496.42	\$251,253.37	\$35,203.58
24	Apr-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,613.06	\$11,681.23	\$0.00	\$1,997,883.36	\$262,934.60	\$46,884.81
25	May-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,639.97	\$11,654.32	\$0.00	\$1,993,243.39	\$274,588.92	\$58,539.13
26	Jun-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,667.04	\$11,627.25	\$0.00	\$1,988,576.35	\$286,216.17	\$70,166.38
27	Jul-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,694.26	\$11,600.03	\$0.00	\$1,983,882.09	\$297,816.20	\$81,766.41
28	Aug-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,721.64	\$11,572.65	\$0.00	\$1,979,160.45	\$309,388.85	\$93,339.06
29	Sep-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,749.19	\$11,545.10	\$0.00	\$1,974,411.26	\$320,933.95	\$104,884.16
30	Oct-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,776.89	\$11,517.40	\$0.00	\$1,969,634.37	\$332,451.35	\$116,401.56
31	Nov-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,804.76	\$11,489.53	\$0.00	\$1,964,829.61	\$343,940.88	\$127,891.09
32	Dec-03	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,832.78	\$11,461.51	\$0.00	\$1,959,996.83	\$355,402.39	\$139,352.60
33	Jan-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,860.93	\$11,433.31	\$0.00	\$1,955,135.85	\$366,835.70	\$11,433.31
34	Feb-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,889.33	\$11,404.96	\$0.00	\$1,950,246.52	\$378,240.66	\$22,838.27
35	Mar-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,917.85	\$11,376.44	\$0.00	\$1,945,328.67	\$389,617.10	\$34,214.71
36	Apr-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,946.54	\$11,347.75	\$0.00	\$1,940,382.13	\$400,964.85	\$45,562.46
37	May-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$4,975.39	\$11,318.90	\$0.00	\$1,935,406.74	\$412,283.75	\$56,881.36
38	Jun-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,004.42	\$11,289.87	\$0.00	\$1,930,402.32	\$423,573.62	\$68,171.23
39	Jul-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,033.61	\$11,260.68	\$0.00	\$1,925,368.71	\$434,834.30	\$79,431.91
40	Aug-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,062.97	\$11,231.32	\$0.00	\$1,920,305.74	\$446,065.62	\$90,663.23
41	Sep-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,092.51	\$11,201.78	\$0.00	\$1,915,213.23	\$457,267.40	\$101,865.01
42	Oct-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,122.21	\$11,172.08	\$0.00	\$1,910,091.02	\$468,439.48	\$113,037.09
43	Nov-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,152.09	\$11,142.20	\$0.00	\$1,904,938.93	\$479,581.68	\$124,179.29
44	Dec-04	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,182.15	\$11,112.14	\$0.00	\$1,899,756.78	\$490,693.82	\$135,291.43
45	Jan-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,212.38	\$11,081.91	\$0.00	\$1,894,544.40	\$501,775.73	\$11,081.91
46	Feb-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,242.78	\$11,051.51	\$0.00	\$1,889,301.62	\$512,827.24	\$22,133.42
47	Mar-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,273.36	\$11,020.93	\$0.00	\$1,884,028.26	\$523,848.17	\$33,154.35
48	Apr-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,304.13	\$10,990.16	\$0.00	\$1,878,724.13	\$534,838.33	\$44,144.51
49	May-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,335.07	\$10,959.22	\$0.00	\$1,873,389.06	\$545,797.55	\$55,103.73
50	Jun-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,366.19	\$10,928.10	\$0.00	\$1,868,022.87	\$556,726.65	\$66,031.83
51	Jul-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,397.49	\$10,896.80	\$0.00	\$1,862,625.38	\$567,622.45	\$76,928.63
52	Aug-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,428.98	\$10,865.31	\$0.00	\$1,857,196.40	\$578,487.76	\$87,793.94

EXHIBIT B

Balance as of 6/30/01 (Exhibit A) 3,204,038.14
 SWRCB State Grant to be applied (1,110,615.00)
 Amount to Finance as of 7/1/01 2,093,423.14

Pmt #	Date	Yr Rate	P&I Payment	Principal	Interest	Extra Prin	New Balance	Cum. Interest	Yearly Total Int
	Jun-01						\$2,093,423.14		
53	Sep-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,460.64	\$10,833.65	\$0.00	\$1,851,735.76	\$589,321.41	\$98,827.59
54	Oct-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,492.50	\$10,801.79	\$0.00	\$1,846,243.26	\$600,123.20	\$109,429.38
55	Nov-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,524.54	\$10,769.75	\$0.00	\$1,840,718.72	\$610,892.95	\$120,199.13
56	Dec-05	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,556.76	\$10,737.53	\$0.00	\$1,835,161.96	\$621,630.48	\$130,936.66
57	Jan-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,589.18	\$10,705.11	\$0.00	\$1,829,572.78	\$632,335.59	\$10,705.11
58	Feb-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,621.78	\$10,672.51	\$0.00	\$1,823,951.00	\$643,008.10	\$21,377.62
59	Mar-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,654.58	\$10,639.71	\$0.00	\$1,818,296.42	\$653,647.81	\$32,017.33
60	Apr-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,687.56	\$10,606.73	\$0.00	\$1,812,608.86	\$664,254.54	\$42,624.06
61	May-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,720.74	\$10,573.55	\$0.00	\$1,806,888.12	\$674,828.09	\$53,197.61
62	Jun-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,754.11	\$10,540.18	\$0.00	\$1,801,134.01	\$685,368.27	\$63,737.79
63	Jul-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,787.67	\$10,506.62	\$0.00	\$1,795,346.34	\$695,874.89	\$74,244.41
64	Aug-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,821.44	\$10,472.85	\$0.00	\$1,789,524.90	\$706,347.74	\$84,717.26
65	Sep-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,855.39	\$10,438.90	\$0.00	\$1,783,669.51	\$716,786.64	\$95,166.16
66	Oct-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,889.55	\$10,404.74	\$0.00	\$1,777,779.96	\$727,191.38	\$105,560.90
67	Nov-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,923.91	\$10,370.38	\$0.00	\$1,771,856.05	\$737,561.76	\$115,931.28
68	Dec-06	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,958.46	\$10,335.83	\$0.00	\$1,765,897.69	\$747,897.69	\$126,267.11
69	Jan-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$5,993.22	\$10,301.07	\$0.00	\$1,759,904.37	\$758,198.66	\$10,301.07
70	Feb-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,028.18	\$10,266.11	\$0.00	\$1,753,876.19	\$768,464.77	\$20,567.18
71	Mar-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,063.35	\$10,230.94	\$0.00	\$1,747,812.84	\$778,695.71	\$30,798.12
72	Apr-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,098.72	\$10,195.57	\$0.00	\$1,741,714.12	\$788,891.28	\$40,993.69
73	May-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,134.29	\$10,160.00	\$0.00	\$1,735,579.83	\$799,051.28	\$51,153.69
74	Jun-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,170.07	\$10,124.22	\$0.00	\$1,729,409.76	\$809,175.50	\$61,277.91
75	Jul-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,206.07	\$10,088.22	\$0.00	\$1,723,203.69	\$819,263.72	\$71,366.13
76	Aug-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,242.27	\$10,052.02	\$0.00	\$1,716,961.42	\$829,315.74	\$81,418.15
77	Sep-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,278.68	\$10,015.61	\$0.00	\$1,710,682.74	\$839,331.35	\$91,433.76
78	Oct-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,315.31	\$9,978.98	\$0.00	\$1,704,367.43	\$849,310.33	\$101,412.74
79	Nov-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,352.15	\$9,942.14	\$0.00	\$1,698,015.28	\$859,252.47	\$111,354.88
80	Dec-07	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,389.20	\$9,905.09	\$0.00	\$1,691,626.08	\$869,157.56	\$121,259.97
81	Jan-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,426.47	\$9,867.82	\$0.00	\$1,685,199.61	\$879,025.38	\$9,867.82
82	Feb-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,463.96	\$9,830.33	\$0.00	\$1,678,735.65	\$888,855.71	\$19,698.15
83	Mar-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,501.67	\$9,792.62	\$0.00	\$1,672,233.98	\$898,648.33	\$29,490.77
84	Apr-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,539.59	\$9,754.70	\$0.00	\$1,665,694.39	\$908,403.03	\$39,245.47
85	May-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,577.74	\$9,716.55	\$0.00	\$1,659,116.65	\$918,119.58	\$48,962.02
86	Jun-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,616.11	\$9,678.18	\$0.00	\$1,652,500.54	\$927,797.76	\$58,640.20
87	Jul-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,654.70	\$9,639.59	\$0.00	\$1,645,845.84	\$937,437.35	\$68,279.79
88	Aug-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,693.52	\$9,600.77	\$0.00	\$1,639,152.32	\$947,038.12	\$77,880.56
89	Sep-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,732.57	\$9,561.72	\$0.00	\$1,632,419.75	\$956,599.84	\$87,442.28
90	Oct-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,771.84	\$9,522.45	\$0.00	\$1,625,647.91	\$966,122.29	\$96,964.73
91	Nov-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,811.34	\$9,482.95	\$0.00	\$1,618,836.57	\$975,605.24	\$106,447.68
92	Dec-08	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,851.08	\$9,443.21	\$0.00	\$1,611,985.49	\$985,048.45	\$115,890.89
93	Jan-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,891.04	\$9,403.25	\$0.00	\$1,605,094.45	\$994,451.70	\$9,403.25
94	Feb-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,931.24	\$9,363.05	\$0.00	\$1,598,163.21	\$1,003,814.75	\$18,766.30
95	Mar-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$6,971.67	\$9,322.62	\$0.00	\$1,591,191.54	\$1,013,137.37	\$28,088.92
96	Apr-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,012.34	\$9,281.95	\$0.00	\$1,584,179.20	\$1,022,419.32	\$37,370.87
97	May-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,053.24	\$9,241.05	\$0.00	\$1,577,125.96	\$1,031,660.37	\$46,611.92
98	Jun-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,094.39	\$9,199.90	\$0.00	\$1,570,031.57	\$1,040,860.27	\$55,811.82
99	Jul-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,135.77	\$9,158.52	\$0.00	\$1,562,895.80	\$1,050,018.79	\$64,970.34
100	Aug-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,177.40	\$9,116.89	\$0.00	\$1,555,718.40	\$1,059,135.68	\$74,087.23
101	Sep-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,219.27	\$9,075.02	\$0.00	\$1,548,499.13	\$1,068,210.70	\$83,162.25
102	Oct-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,261.38	\$9,032.91	\$0.00	\$1,541,237.75	\$1,077,243.61	\$92,195.16
103	Nov-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,303.74	\$8,990.55	\$0.00	\$1,533,934.01	\$1,086,234.16	\$101,185.71
104	Dec-09	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,346.34	\$8,947.95	\$0.00	\$1,526,587.67	\$1,095,182.11	\$110,133.66
105	Jan-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,389.20	\$8,905.09	\$0.00	\$1,519,198.47	\$1,104,087.20	\$8,905.09
106	Feb-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,432.30	\$8,861.99	\$0.00	\$1,511,766.17	\$1,112,949.19	\$17,767.08
107	Mar-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,475.65	\$8,818.64	\$0.00	\$1,504,290.62	\$1,121,767.83	\$26,585.72

EXHIBIT B

Balance as of 6/30/01 (Exhibit A) 3,204,038.14
 SWRCB State Grant to be applied (1,110,615.00)
 Amount to Finance as of 7/1/01 2,093,423.14

Pmt #	Date	Yr Rate	P&I Payment	Principal	Interest	Extra Prin	New Balance	Cum. Interest	Yearly Total Int
	Jun-01						\$2,093,423.14		
108	Apr-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,519.26	\$8,775.03	\$0.00	\$1,496,771.26	\$1,130,542.86	\$35,360.75
109	May-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,563.12	\$8,731.17	\$0.00	\$1,489,208.14	\$1,139,274.03	\$44,091.92
110	Jun-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,607.24	\$8,687.05	\$0.00	\$1,481,600.90	\$1,147,961.08	\$52,778.97
111	Jul-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,651.62	\$8,642.67	\$0.00	\$1,473,949.28	\$1,156,603.75	\$61,421.64
112	Aug-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,696.25	\$8,598.04	\$0.00	\$1,466,253.03	\$1,165,201.79	\$70,019.68
113	Sep-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,741.15	\$8,553.14	\$0.00	\$1,458,511.88	\$1,173,754.93	\$78,572.82
114	Oct-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,786.30	\$8,507.99	\$0.00	\$1,450,725.58	\$1,182,262.92	\$87,080.81
115	Nov-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,831.72	\$8,462.57	\$0.00	\$1,442,893.86	\$1,190,725.49	\$95,543.38
116	Dec-10	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,877.41	\$8,416.88	\$0.00	\$1,435,016.45	\$1,199,142.37	\$103,960.26
117	Jan-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,923.36	\$8,370.93	\$0.00	\$1,427,093.09	\$1,207,513.30	\$8,370.93
118	Feb-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$7,969.58	\$8,324.71	\$0.00	\$1,419,123.51	\$1,215,838.01	\$16,695.64
119	Mar-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,016.07	\$8,278.22	\$0.00	\$1,411,107.44	\$1,224,116.23	\$24,973.86
120	Apr-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,062.83	\$8,231.46	\$0.00	\$1,403,044.61	\$1,232,347.69	\$33,208.32
121	May-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,109.86	\$8,184.43	\$0.00	\$1,394,934.75	\$1,240,532.12	\$41,389.75
122	Jun-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,157.17	\$8,137.12	\$0.00	\$1,386,777.58	\$1,248,669.24	\$49,526.87
123	Jul-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,204.75	\$8,089.54	\$0.00	\$1,378,572.83	\$1,256,758.78	\$57,616.41
124	Aug-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,252.62	\$8,041.67	\$0.00	\$1,370,320.21	\$1,264,800.45	\$65,658.08
125	Sep-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,300.76	\$7,993.53	\$0.00	\$1,362,019.45	\$1,272,793.98	\$73,651.61
126	Oct-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,349.18	\$7,945.11	\$0.00	\$1,353,670.27	\$1,280,739.09	\$81,596.72
127	Nov-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,397.88	\$7,896.41	\$0.00	\$1,345,272.39	\$1,288,635.50	\$89,493.13
128	Dec-11	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,446.87	\$7,847.42	\$0.00	\$1,336,825.52	\$1,296,482.92	\$97,340.55
129	Jan-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,496.14	\$7,798.18	\$0.00	\$1,328,329.38	\$1,304,281.07	\$7,798.15
130	Feb-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,545.70	\$7,748.59	\$0.00	\$1,319,783.68	\$1,312,029.66	\$15,546.74
131	Mar-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,595.55	\$7,698.74	\$0.00	\$1,311,188.13	\$1,319,728.40	\$23,245.48
132	Apr-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,645.69	\$7,648.60	\$0.00	\$1,302,542.44	\$1,327,377.00	\$30,894.08
133	May-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,696.13	\$7,598.16	\$0.00	\$1,293,846.31	\$1,334,975.16	\$38,492.24
134	Jun-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,746.86	\$7,547.44	\$0.00	\$1,285,099.46	\$1,342,522.60	\$46,039.68
135	Jul-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,797.88	\$7,496.41	\$0.00	\$1,276,301.58	\$1,350,019.01	\$53,536.09
136	Aug-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,849.20	\$7,445.09	\$0.00	\$1,267,452.38	\$1,357,464.10	\$60,981.18
137	Sep-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,900.82	\$7,393.47	\$0.00	\$1,258,551.56	\$1,364,857.57	\$68,374.65
138	Oct-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$8,952.74	\$7,341.55	\$0.00	\$1,249,598.82	\$1,372,199.12	\$75,716.20
139	Nov-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,004.96	\$7,289.33	\$0.00	\$1,240,593.86	\$1,379,488.45	\$83,005.53
140	Dec-12	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,057.49	\$7,236.80	\$0.00	\$1,231,536.37	\$1,386,725.25	\$90,242.33
141	Jan-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,110.33	\$7,183.96	\$0.00	\$1,222,426.04	\$1,393,909.21	\$7,183.96
142	Feb-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,163.47	\$7,130.82	\$0.00	\$1,213,262.57	\$1,401,040.03	\$14,314.73
143	Mar-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,216.93	\$7,077.36	\$0.00	\$1,204,045.64	\$1,408,117.39	\$21,392.14
144	Apr-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,270.69	\$7,023.60	\$0.00	\$1,194,774.95	\$1,415,140.99	\$28,416.74
145	May-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,324.77	\$6,969.52	\$0.00	\$1,185,450.18	\$1,422,110.51	\$35,385.26
146	Jun-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,379.16	\$6,915.13	\$0.00	\$1,176,071.02	\$1,429,025.84	\$42,300.39
147	Jul-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,433.88	\$6,860.41	\$0.00	\$1,166,637.14	\$1,435,886.05	\$49,160.80
148	Aug-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,488.91	\$6,805.38	\$0.00	\$1,157,148.23	\$1,442,691.43	\$55,966.18
149	Sep-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,544.26	\$6,750.03	\$0.00	\$1,147,603.97	\$1,449,441.46	\$62,716.21
150	Oct-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,599.93	\$6,694.36	\$0.00	\$1,138,004.04	\$1,456,135.82	\$69,410.57
151	Nov-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,655.93	\$6,638.36	\$0.00	\$1,128,348.11	\$1,462,774.18	\$76,048.93
152	Dec-13	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,712.26	\$6,582.03	\$0.00	\$1,118,636.85	\$1,469,356.21	\$82,630.96
153	Jan-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,768.91	\$6,525.38	\$0.00	\$1,108,866.94	\$1,475,881.59	\$6,525.38
154	Feb-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,825.90	\$6,468.39	\$0.00	\$1,099,041.04	\$1,482,349.98	\$12,993.77
155	Mar-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,883.22	\$6,411.07	\$0.00	\$1,089,157.82	\$1,488,761.05	\$19,404.84
156	Apr-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,940.87	\$6,353.42	\$0.00	\$1,079,216.95	\$1,495,114.47	\$25,758.26
157	May-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$9,998.86	\$6,295.43	\$0.00	\$1,069,218.09	\$1,501,409.90	\$32,053.69
158	Jun-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,057.18	\$6,237.11	\$0.00	\$1,059,160.91	\$1,507,647.01	\$38,290.80
159	Jul-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,115.85	\$6,178.44	\$0.00	\$1,049,045.06	\$1,513,825.45	\$44,469.24
160	Aug-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,174.86	\$6,119.43	\$0.00	\$1,038,870.20	\$1,519,944.88	\$50,588.67
161	Sep-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,234.21	\$6,060.08	\$0.00	\$1,028,635.99	\$1,526,004.96	\$56,648.75
162	Oct-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,293.91	\$6,000.38	\$0.00	\$1,018,342.08	\$1,532,005.34	\$62,649.13

EXHIBIT B

Balance as of 6/30/01 (Exhibit A)	3,204,088.14
SWRCB State Grant to be applied	<u>(1,110,615.00)</u>
Amount to Finance as of 7/1/01	<u>2,093,473.14</u>

Pmt #	Date	Yr Rate	P&I Payment	Prncplal	Interest	Extra Prin	New Balance	Cum. Interest	Yearly Total Int
	Jun-01						\$2,093,473.14		
163	Nov-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,353.96	\$5,940.33	\$0.00	\$1,007,988.12	\$1,537,945.67	\$68,589.46
164	Dec-14	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,414.36	\$5,879.93	\$0.00	\$997,573.76	\$1,543,825.60	\$74,469.39
165	Jan-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,475.11	\$5,819.18	\$0.00	\$987,098.65	\$1,549,644.78	\$5,819.18
166	Feb-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,536.21	\$5,758.08	\$0.00	\$976,562.44	\$1,555,402.86	\$11,577.26
167	Mar-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,597.68	\$5,696.61	\$0.00	\$965,964.76	\$1,561,099.47	\$17,273.87
168	Apr-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,659.50	\$5,634.79	\$0.00	\$955,305.26	\$1,566,734.26	\$22,908.66
169	May-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,721.68	\$5,572.61	\$0.00	\$944,583.58	\$1,572,306.87	\$28,481.27
170	Jun-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,784.22	\$5,510.07	\$0.00	\$933,799.36	\$1,577,816.94	\$33,991.34
171	Jul-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,847.13	\$5,447.16	\$0.00	\$922,952.23	\$1,583,264.10	\$39,438.50
172	Aug-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,910.40	\$5,383.89	\$0.00	\$912,041.83	\$1,588,647.99	\$44,822.39
173	Sep-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$10,974.05	\$5,320.24	\$0.00	\$901,067.78	\$1,593,968.23	\$50,142.63
174	Oct-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,038.06	\$5,256.23	\$0.00	\$890,029.72	\$1,599,224.46	\$55,398.86
175	Nov-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,102.45	\$5,191.84	\$0.00	\$878,927.27	\$1,604,416.30	\$60,590.70
176	Dec-15	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,167.21	\$5,127.08	\$0.00	\$867,760.06	\$1,609,543.39	\$66,717.78
177	Jan-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,232.36	\$5,061.93	\$0.00	\$856,527.70	\$1,614,605.31	\$5,061.93
178	Feb-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,297.88	\$4,996.41	\$0.00	\$845,229.82	\$1,619,601.72	\$10,058.34
179	Mar-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,363.78	\$4,930.51	\$0.00	\$833,866.04	\$1,624,532.23	\$14,988.85
180	Apr-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,430.07	\$4,864.22	\$0.00	\$822,435.97	\$1,629,396.45	\$19,863.07
181	May-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,496.75	\$4,797.54	\$0.00	\$810,939.22	\$1,634,193.99	\$24,650.61
182	Jun-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,563.81	\$4,730.48	\$0.00	\$799,375.41	\$1,638,924.47	\$29,381.09
183	Jul-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,631.27	\$4,663.02	\$0.00	\$787,744.14	\$1,643,587.49	\$34,044.11
184	Aug-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,699.12	\$4,595.17	\$0.00	\$776,045.02	\$1,648,182.66	\$38,639.28
185	Sep-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,767.36	\$4,526.93	\$0.00	\$764,277.66	\$1,652,709.59	\$43,168.21
186	Oct-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,836.00	\$4,458.29	\$0.00	\$752,441.66	\$1,657,167.88	\$47,624.50
187	Nov-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,905.05	\$4,389.24	\$0.00	\$740,536.61	\$1,661,557.12	\$52,013.74
188	Dec-16	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$11,974.49	\$4,319.80	\$0.00	\$728,562.12	\$1,665,876.92	\$56,333.54
189	Jan-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,044.34	\$4,249.95	\$0.00	\$716,517.78	\$1,670,126.87	\$4,249.95
190	Feb-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,114.60	\$4,179.69	\$0.00	\$704,403.18	\$1,674,306.56	\$8,429.64
191	Mar-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,185.27	\$4,109.02	\$0.00	\$692,217.91	\$1,678,415.58	\$12,538.66
192	Apr-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,256.35	\$4,037.94	\$0.00	\$679,961.56	\$1,682,453.62	\$16,576.60
193	May-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,327.85	\$3,966.44	\$0.00	\$667,633.71	\$1,686,419.96	\$20,543.04
194	Jun-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,399.76	\$3,894.53	\$0.00	\$655,233.95	\$1,690,314.49	\$24,437.67
195	Jul-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,472.09	\$3,822.20	\$0.00	\$642,761.86	\$1,694,136.69	\$28,259.77
196	Aug-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,544.85	\$3,749.44	\$0.00	\$630,217.01	\$1,697,886.13	\$32,009.21
197	Sep-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,618.02	\$3,676.27	\$0.00	\$617,598.99	\$1,701,562.40	\$35,685.48
198	Oct-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,691.63	\$3,602.66	\$0.00	\$604,907.36	\$1,705,165.06	\$39,288.14
199	Nov-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,765.66	\$3,528.63	\$0.00	\$592,141.70	\$1,708,693.69	\$42,816.77
200	Dec-17	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,840.13	\$3,454.16	\$0.00	\$579,301.57	\$1,712,147.85	\$46,270.93
201	Jan-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,915.03	\$3,379.26	\$0.00	\$566,386.54	\$1,715,527.11	\$3,379.26
202	Feb-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$12,990.37	\$3,303.92	\$0.00	\$553,396.17	\$1,718,831.03	\$6,683.18
203	Mar-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,066.15	\$3,228.14	\$0.00	\$540,330.02	\$1,722,059.17	\$9,911.32
204	Apr-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,142.36	\$3,151.93	\$0.00	\$527,187.66	\$1,725,211.10	\$13,063.25
205	May-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,219.03	\$3,075.26	\$0.00	\$513,968.63	\$1,728,286.36	\$16,138.51
206	Jun-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,296.14	\$2,998.15	\$0.00	\$500,672.49	\$1,731,284.51	\$19,136.66
207	Jul-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,373.70	\$2,920.59	\$0.00	\$487,298.79	\$1,734,205.10	\$22,057.25
208	Aug-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,451.71	\$2,842.58	\$0.00	\$473,847.08	\$1,737,047.68	\$24,899.83
209	Sep-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,530.18	\$2,764.11	\$0.00	\$460,316.90	\$1,739,811.79	\$27,663.94
210	Oct-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,609.11	\$2,685.18	\$0.00	\$446,707.79	\$1,742,496.97	\$30,349.12
211	Nov-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,688.49	\$2,605.80	\$0.00	\$433,019.30	\$1,745,102.77	\$32,954.92
212	Dec-18	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,768.34	\$2,525.95	\$0.00	\$419,250.96	\$1,747,628.72	\$35,480.87
213	Jan-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,848.66	\$2,445.63	\$0.00	\$405,402.30	\$1,750,074.35	\$2,445.63
214	Feb-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$13,929.44	\$2,364.85	\$0.00	\$391,472.86	\$1,752,439.20	\$4,810.48
215	Mar-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,010.70	\$2,283.59	\$0.00	\$377,462.16	\$1,754,722.79	\$7,094.07
216	Apr-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,092.43	\$2,201.86	\$0.00	\$363,369.73	\$1,756,924.65	\$9,295.93
217	May-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,174.63	\$2,119.66	\$0.00	\$349,195.10	\$1,759,044.31	\$11,415.59

EXHIBIT B

Balance as of 6/30/01 (Exhibit A) 3,204,038.14
 SWRCB State Grant to be applied (1,110,615.00)
 Amount to Finance-as of 7/1/01 2,093,423.14

			Orig Balance	Orig Rate	Term (yrs)	1st PMT	Future Value		
			2,093,423.14	7.00%	19.83	Jul-01	\$0		
Pmt #	Date	Yr Rate	P&I Payment	Principal	Interest	Extra Prjn	New Balance	Cum. Interest	Yearly Total Int
-	Jun-01						\$2,093,423.14		
218	Jun-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,257.32	\$2,036.97	\$0.00	\$334,937.78	\$1,761,081.28	\$13,452.56
219	Jul-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,340.49	\$1,953.80	\$0.00	\$320,597.29	\$1,763,035.08	\$15,406.36
220	Aug-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,424.14	\$1,870.15	\$0.00	\$306,173.15	\$1,764,905.23	\$17,276.51
221	Sep-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,508.28	\$1,788.01	\$0.00	\$291,664.87	\$1,766,691.24	\$19,062.52
222	Oct-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,592.91	\$1,701.38	\$0.00	\$277,071.96	\$1,768,392.62	\$20,763.90
223	Nov-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,678.04	\$1,616.25	\$0.00	\$262,393.92	\$1,770,008.87	\$22,380.15
224	Dec-19	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,763.66	\$1,530.63	\$0.00	\$247,630.26	\$1,771,539.50	\$23,910.78
225	Jan-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,849.78	\$1,444.51	\$0.00	\$232,780.48	\$1,772,984.01	\$1,444.51
226	Feb-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$14,936.40	\$1,357.89	\$0.00	\$217,844.08	\$1,774,341.90	\$2,802.40
227	Mar-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,023.53	\$1,270.76	\$0.00	\$202,820.55	\$1,775,612.66	\$4,073.16
228	Apr-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,111.17	\$1,183.12	\$0.00	\$187,709.38	\$1,776,795.78	\$5,256.28
229	May-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,199.32	\$1,094.97	\$0.00	\$172,510.06	\$1,777,890.75	\$6,351.25
230	Jun-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,287.98	\$1,006.31	\$0.00	\$157,222.08	\$1,778,897.06	\$7,357.56
231	Jul-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,377.16	\$917.13	\$0.00	\$141,844.92	\$1,779,814.19	\$8,274.69
232	Aug-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,466.86	\$827.43	\$0.00	\$126,378.06	\$1,780,641.62	\$9,102.12
233	Sep-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,557.08	\$737.21	\$0.00	\$110,820.98	\$1,781,378.83	\$9,839.33
234	Oct-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,647.83	\$646.46	\$0.00	\$95,173.15	\$1,782,025.29	\$10,485.79
235	Nov-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,739.11	\$555.18	\$0.00	\$79,494.04	\$1,782,580.47	\$11,040.97
236	Dec-20	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,830.92	\$463.37	\$0.00	\$63,603.12	\$1,783,043.84	\$11,504.34
237	Jan-21	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$15,923.27	\$371.02	\$0.00	\$47,679.85	\$1,783,414.86	\$371.02
238	Feb-21	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$16,016.16	\$278.13	\$0.00	\$31,663.69	\$1,783,692.99	\$649.15
239	Mar-21	7.00%	\$16,294.29	\$16,109.59	\$184.70	\$0.00	\$15,554.10	\$1,783,877.69	\$833.85
240	Apr-21	7.00%	\$16,644.83	\$15,554.10	\$90.73	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,783,968.42	\$924.58

RESOLUTION NO. 334-93 (CM)

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE APPROVING AGREEMENT BETWEEN PAJARO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT AND THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE REGARDING WASTEWATER DISPOSAL, AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE SAME

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, AS FOLLOWS:

1. That the Agreement between the Pajaro County Sanitation District and the City of Watsonville regarding wastewater disposal, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, is fair and equitable and hereby ratified and approved.

2. That the City Manager be and is hereby authorized and directed to execute the Agreement for and on behalf of the of the City of Watsonville.


The foregoing resolution was introduced at a special meeting of the Council of the City of Watsonville, held on the 30th day of November, 1993, by Council Member Eves, who moved its adoption, which motion being duly seconded by Council Member Rios, was upon roll call carried and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES:	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	Alcala, Bobeda, Campos, Rios, Eves, Hurst
NOES:	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	None
ABSENT:	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	McFarren



Mayor

ATTEST:



City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:



City Attorney

PAJARO COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT WASTEWATER LOADINGS

		DISTRICT CAPACITY RIGHTS:		BOD	TSS		
FISCAL YEAR 21/22				1.57	6,000		
				mgd	lbs. per day	lbs. per day	
						TOTAL POUNDS YEARLY	
						BOD	SS
JULY	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo		
7/2/2021	600	350					
7/14/2021	404	470	10.832	42,098	35,006		
7/21/2021	510	400	0.349	1358	1129	42,098	35,006
7/27/2021	350	330					
AVERAGE	466	388					
AUGUST	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo		
8/3/2021	450	340	9.828	36,611	26,502		
8/20/2021	440	340	0.317	1181	855	78,709	61,509
8/25/2021	450	290					
AVERAGE	447	323					
SEPT	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo		
9/2/2021	680	570	9.946	41,267	30,069		
9/8/2021	470	300	0.321	1331	970	119,977	91,578
9/15/2021	500	320					
9/21/2021	340	260					
AVERAGE	497.5	362.5					
OCT	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo		
10/5/2021	340	260	10.72	33,080	32,186		
10/13/2021	470	460	0.346	1067	1038	153,056	123,763
10/21/2021		490					
10/26/2021	300	230					
AVERAGE	370	360					
NOV	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo		
11/2/2021	600	1000	9.879	92,072	130,795		
11/10/2021	370	280	0.319	2970	4219	245,128	254,559
11/18/2021	1000	970					
11/23/2021	2500	4100					
AVERAGE	1118	1588					
DEC	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo		
12/8/2021	1200	1400	15.973	150,977	174,067		
12/17/2021	1200	1900	0.515	4870	5615	396,105	428,626
12/21/2021	1000	620					
AVERAGE	1133	1307					
JAN	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo		
1/5/2021	710	690	10.302	57,136	52,625		
1/14/2021	980	1200	0.332	1843	1698	453,241	481,252
1/20/2021	390	240					
1/26/2021	580	320					

AVERAGE	665	613						
FEB	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo			
2/2/2021	420	463	10.112	56,504	73,877			
2/11/2021	760	665	0.349	1948	2547	509,745	555,128	
2/18/2021	740	1248						
2/24/2021	760	1128						
AVERAGE	670	876						
MAR	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo			
3/12/2021	570	660	11.45	42,972	40,425			
3/19/2021	350	330	0.369	1386	1304	552,717	595,554	
3/24/2021	430	280						
AVERAGE	450	423						
APR	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo			
4/2/2021	410	340	11.126	40,364	37,348	593,081	632,902	
4/7/2021	540	480	0.359	1302	1205			
4/13/2021	330	350						
4/27/2021	460	440						
AVERAGE	435	403						
MAY	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo			
5/4/2021	580	770	10.193	43,992	40,380	637,073	632,912	
5/14/2021	480	360	0.329	1419	1303			
5/19/2021	490	300						
5/26/2021	520	470						
AVERAGE	518	475						
JUNE	AVG BOD mg/L	AVG SS mg/l	Q. MG/mo	BOD Lbs/Mo	SS Lbs/Mo			
6/2/2021	570	640	10.274	46,913	43,485	683,986	676,397	
6/8/2021	500	530	0.331	1513	1403			
6/17/2021	680	490						
6/25/2021	440	370						
AVERAGE	548	508						
			130.635					

PLN210152 (Rio Vista Group LLC)

[Formerly Kall]

CEQA Comments regarding Draft EIR

Review period of December 23, 2021 through January 24, 2022

Comments received outside of the review period

Friedrich, Michele x5189

From: Anthony Nicola <anthonymnicola@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 9:20 AM
To: Spencer, Craig x5233
Cc: ceqacomments; Archbold, Shawn x5114; Israel, Mary x5183
Subject: Re: PLN210152



[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

Here is an update to my previous comment:

Hi Craig,

This is an update to my previous comment on the notice of intent to adopt a mitigated negative declaration for PLN210152, APN 117-361-016-000, 51, 53, 55 & 57 Susan St, Royal Oaks 95076.

Since making the initial comment, it has been discovered that 51% of all effluent that goes out the sewer line of these proposed buildings is recycled into ag water that otherwise would have been pumped from the aquifer. Meaning, regardless if the previous water calculations are correct or not, the proposed project is either going to show zero increase in water demand with the demise of the farming, or it will actually be showing a decrease in overall water usage, positively affecting the aquifer.

Thank you

On Tue, Feb 22, 2022 at 9:07 AM Spencer, Craig x5233 <SpencerC@co.monterey.ca.us> wrote:

Mr. Nicola,

You can provide an comment as an update to your previous comment but it cannot be rescinded now.

Thank you

Craig Spencer

Monterey County

Housing and Community Development

Phone: (831) 755-5233

Email: spencerc@co.monterey.ca.us

From: Anthony Nicola <anthonymnicola@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 8:28 AM

To: Spencer, Craig x5233 <SpencerC@co.monterey.ca.us>

Cc: ceqacomments <ceqacomments@co.monterey.ca.us>; Archbold, Shawn x5114 <ArchboldS@co.monterey.ca.us>; Israel, Mary x5183 <IsraelM@co.monterey.ca.us>

Subject: Re: PLN210152

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

Craig & Shawn,

May I rescind my comment on this project? In light of finding out that half of our sewer water gets recycled, the point is moot.

Thank you

On Tue, Jan 4, 2022 at 11:01 AM Spencer, Craig x5233 <SpencerC@co.monterey.ca.us> wrote:

Hello Mr. Nicola,

Your comments have been received.

Thank you

Craig Spencer

Monterey County

Housing and Community Development

Phone: (831) 755-5233

Email: spencerc@co.monterey.ca.us

From: Anthony Nicola <anthonymnicola@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 3, 2022 4:55 PM
To: ceqacomments <ceqacomments@co.monterey.ca.us>
Cc: Spencer, Craig x5233 <SpencerC@co.monterey.ca.us>
Subject: PLN210152

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

Hi Craig,

This is a comment on the notice of intent to adopt a mitigated negative declaration for PLN210152, APN 117-361-016-000, 51, 53, 55 & 57 Susan St, Royal Oaks 95076.

There is a large error in both the source and quality of information in regards to the water usage of the previous farming operation.

In the "Env. Health Complete Letter" you can see where EHB accepted the 5.25 acre feet per acre equalling 19.22 acre feet of water per year, and refers to simply a letter written by Lakeside Organics, a private company, explicitly stating that no metering was available.

The letter from Lakeside Organics is located at the very end of the "LET_NOHR_PLN210152_112321" document. A few concerns with that - I don't think Lakeside Organics is a legitimate source for data, especially with no metering. They also claim to have farmed there for four years, typically 10 years is needed to establish a bonafide history.

In the initial study for the Davis project(PLN190127, a very similar project), "Initial Study Davis Pg92" they cite a much more legitimate source on page 92, MCWRA annual Groundwater Extraction Summary Report, showing an average of 2.645 AFY/acre.

This information is in the document titled, "2018GWExtSummaryReport Pg12", and located on pg 12.

The information available from PVWMA is not as direct as it is from MCWRA, but in the document titled "BMP_Update_Final_February_2014_screen" Pages 23-25, vegetable row crops reflect a 31% of ag land use, totaling 8900 acres. Using the total water drawn from the aquifer at that time(including urban uses as well), 52,000 acre feet, the per acre usage calculates:

$(52,000\text{AFY} \times 31\%) / 8900 \text{ acres} = 1.8 \text{ AFY/acre}$

Lower than the MCWRA data, but still highlights the severity of error for what is currently being proposed.

If using the MCWRA data of 2.645 AFY/acre, with their 3.66 acre parcel, they should at the most have only 9.68 AFY to offset any proposed usage, not 17.9 as currently proposed.

For the record, I have no intention of wanting this project to not go through, as you know I have the project next door, I just want a fair playing field, and felt the need to call out the pretty obviously fake water number they came up with. I spoke with a handful of my farming contacts, and they all agree those are made-up numbers.

I'm sure there are even more sources for water data out there that will confirm this.




Thanks Craig,

Could you confirm receipt of this?

I'll drop off hard copies of all these documents next week.

Anthony

831-214-0404



[_Initial Study.pdf](#)

[_LET_NOHR_PLN210152_112321.pdf](#)

From: [gloria lopez](#)
To: [293-pchearingcomments](#); [Archbold, Shawn x5114](#); [greg.mayon4@gmail.com](#); [mona.zarate](#); [Frances Ayón](#); [Sigi Lopez](#)
Subject: PLN210152
Date: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 1:38:17 PM

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

Re: Proposed Housing Development (Kall Robert E & Janet Rose, Rio Vista Group LLC), File Number PLN210152.

Dear Planning Commission;

I am a homeowner at 28, 34 and 107 Gonda St; a home that has been part of our family since the 1960s. I am a third-generation owner, born and raised on Gonda St; I raised my children, 4th generation Gonda residents, on that Street. We are a close-knit community and throughout the years we have survived earthquakes, floods, and are currently surviving the pandemic.

I would like to express the impact this structure would have on our tight-knit community. Most of my neighbors are unaware of the impact this change would have on our community because they have not been informed in their native language. The majority of the residents are monolingual Spanish speakers, who do not understand or write English AND the notices have been provided in English.

My concerns arise from the tremendous changes this would have on our community, our way of life.

- Traffic: Susan and Gonda are Dead-end streets with one-way in and out. Currently, it's a struggle to find parking on these narrow streets. This project will add to the traffic problem, increasing traffic to San Juan Rd. Currently, during peak work hours San Juan Rd is already overly congested giving homeowners limited access to their driveways to be able to access their homes.
- This project will change the community that my family has known for 4 generations. It will affect the ability to safely walk to school, church and to support our local mom and pop shops. Our children should continue to be able to play outside like it's been done for generations.

Going forward, I formally request that the correspondence be sent out in English and in Spanish; this way all stakeholders will properly receive a notice and know what is

happening in their neighborhood; everyone, Spanish speaking included, need to be taken into consideration.

Additionally, I request that the Full Environmental Impact Report be provided to the Susan, Gonda, Elsa, and San Juan Road residents.

Best Regards,
Gregorio and Ramona Ayon
Gloria and Sigifredo Lopez

Re: PLN210152 - Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration
Monterey County Planning Commission

Dear Planning Commission:

I am writing to you, pleading with you, to help our neighborhood. To hear our collective voices.

I am a mom and homeowner, supporting my husband and keeping our family together as he battles an aggressive form of non-hodgkin's lymphoma. His diagnosis came one day before my fathers passing from metastatic colon cancer after caring for him for the last ten weeks of his life.

I have so little left to give, and yet here I am having to advocate for my home, neighborhood and community. Most of whom work all day and have little left to give themselves.

Life has been hard, and the thought of losing the neighborhood, community and neighbors I have grown up with, had planned to raise my children in, is terrifying and overwhelming in the best of times, let alone now.

I, and my neighbors on Susan and Gonda Street, feel like we're being taken advantage of. I must say, looking at the other h2A housing in the area(Spreckels, Salinas, and Greenfield) the evidence seems to support something amiss(if I'm being generous) as NONE of those developments have been plopped into an existing neighborhood like ours, that would do such a huge amount of damage. They all utilize their own infrastructure connected to main roads and arteries.

What about our neighborhoods is at all able to handle 488 and 272 people?

The density is appalling. The lack of infrastructure in the form of SAFE roads to access the developments, and parking is concerning to say the least. Our roads are narrow, I invite ALL of you to spend some time on our streets to see for yourselves that this project is a giant boondoggle that only appears somewhat acceptable on paper.

There is NO parking, our streets CANNOT handle the increased traffic. When reading the transportation and traffic section of the mitigated negative declaration I couldn't help but wonder just how Mr. Higgins came to the conclusion that there was a "less than significant impact" on all studied fronts, and while on the subject, I see at least four intersections that have been studied but nothing about our current traffic, which there is little of.

Having a quiet neighborhood with little to no traffic, does not mean there is room for someone else's traffic. We enjoy allowing our kids to ride bikes, play basketball, soccer and tag safely on the street. Our senior citizens walk our street for exercise. Our street is alive with community. None of that will be possible with the addition of this development.

While he addressed a "worst case scenario" of the h2a being converted to traditional apartments(which is exactly what happened at the Tanimura & Antle project in Spreckels{"and would generate and estimated 454 daily trips which would be greater than the default threshold of 110 daily trips set by the Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts at CEQA"}) no one is acknowledging that this project is already a worst case scenario for the residents of Susan Street.

If we look at the study results for the H2A housing, that is still a conservative estimate of 148 trips a day. Our neighborhood does not reach that on a holiday, with guests, not even close. With less than 70 cars total(I counted) for the entire Susan Street community, with a portion of those not being used daily, our current traffic is miniscule.

H2a workers will be bussed all over Monterey County, at all hours of the day and night. Busses will completely block our streets from safely entering and exiting. *How many buses, vans and cars does it take to move 488 people?*

This sounds unbelievable. I don't know how anyone who has spent any time at all on our street/s can think that is acceptable.

The sounds of kids playing in the street, tearing through yards, doing what I did as a kid on this street, is magic. Watching my senior citizen neighbors shower my kids with love and care, just like they did for me when I was a child, is priceless. Where do you find neighborhoods like this anymore? Where are we to go, when I've grown up with these people? I've been in 99% of the houses on this street as a child. This is a generational neighborhood. People live their entire lives here, myself included.

Houses don't go up for sale often here, people stay. Our properties are slowly going up in value, this type of structure is not at all compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. I am firmly convinced that such an edifice will devalue my property, a circumstance that myself and many of my neighbors, who are senior citizens, can ill afford.

Further reading about the population/housing impacts in regards to growth and the general plan, increasing the population of Pajaro by 25% on just these TWO LOTS, accessed by two streets that cannot allow more than one oversized vehicle to pass at a time, is imprudent and lacks compassion for the existing communities.

Reviewing The Land Use and Planning, section a and b, conclusion that this development would have a *"less than significant impact" on our established community, is a LIE.*

Using legal jargon and SPLITTING HAIRS within the general plans wording, not once actually taking into consideration the community they would be disrupting(ruining) this is a case of developers making choices from their ivory towers, with no real notion of what Pajaro is like, what our communities are like, what the PEOPLE are like.

One of the best examples of how these developers don't actually care about us; less than half of the streets residents received the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration, myself included(despite being on the distribution list...)My driveway falls about 3 feet short of the (inadequate) law of notifying those within 300 feet. Our street is under 700 feet long, under 20 homes, and they only did the bare minimum?

To add insult to injury, it was only sent in English. Did they not care that the majority of our neighborhood is of hispanic origin? My family included. Does their opinion not count? They say they're building this for farmworkers, who are in dire need of safe, clean and affordable housing(I agree) and yet they ignore that a large portion of the Susan and Gonda Street residents are farmworkers themselves, who by and large do not speak or read english. So they only matter when they work for large companies, bussed in from out of the area? Our long term residents, who make up Pajaro, don't matter?

In addition, while yes this land is currently, and has been, cultivated row crops, Susan Street has NEVER been an access point for the farm. No tractors, no buses or cars. The gate stays locked and I can count on one hand the number of times it has been opened (aside from the current project). The farm has had ZERO impact on Susan Street, most of us not even knowing when things are being harvested. The workers and all vehicles are brought in via San Juan Road.

Our community is not anti-development, not in the slightest, but this is not a good fit. The neighborhoods, density, lack of parking and infrastructure is not appropriate.



Susan Street Monday, January 17, 2022

Thank you for your time

Christine Shaw and Family
24 Susan Street

To the Monterey Planning Commission, we the residents of Gonda Street contend that the proposed multilevel development PLN200203 would destroy our neighborhood.

-The traffic movements and parking requirements associated with the development present an unreasonable environmental impact. This will affect adjoining properties and pose an unacceptable safety risk to the residents, which include young children and senior citizens.

-The proposed location/s are not suitable for the density proposed, no less than a +55% variance is being requested.

-Increasing the TOTAL population of Pajaro by 25% on these two lots alone is shocking and unacceptable.

-Agricultural housing is inconsistent with the neighborhoods developed in the area. This type of proposed development is not sympathetic to the surrounding neighborhood and will devalue residential property values in the area, a circumstance that myself and many of my neighbors, who are senior citizens, can ill afford.

-There is no other development like this on Gonda Street. It is out of character, without precedent and does not service the local community of Gonda Street.

Ante la Comisión de Planificación de Monterey, nosotros, los residentes de Gonda Street, afirmamos que el desarrollo de varios niveles PLN210152 propuesto destruiría nuestro vecindario.

-Los movimientos de tráfico y los requisitos de estacionamiento asociados con el desarrollo presentan un impacto ambiental irrazonable. Esto afectará las propiedades contiguas y representará un riesgo de seguridad inaceptable para los residentes, que incluyen niños pequeños y personas mayores.

-La/s ubicación/es propuestas no son aptas para la densidad propuesta, se solicita una variación no menor al +55%.

-Aumentar la población TOTAL de Pájaro en un 25% solo en estos dos lotes es impactante y inaceptable.

-La vivienda agrícola es inconsistente con los barrios desarrollados en el área. Este tipo de desarrollo propuesto no simpatiza con el vecindario circundante y devaluará los valores de las propiedades residenciales en el área, una circunstancia que yo y muchos de mis vecinos, que son personas de la tercera edad, no podemos permitirnos.

-No hay otro desarrollo como este en Gonda Street. Está fuera de lugar, sin precedentes y no sirve a la comunidad local de Gonda Street.

PRINCIPAL PETITIONER. Name: Christine Shaw Address: 24 Susan Street
Phone: 831-421-2052. Email: Lolamako@gmail.com

The salty water is infiltrating about six inches every year, and this has been going on for 10 years. No new constructions are a bad idea. No New constructions on Dead End streets, Gonda & Susan.

	DATE	NAME	ADDRESS
1	01-15-22	Am. Betancourt	109 Gonda St B
2	01-15-22	Delawina Villard	109A Gonda ST
3	1-15-22	Maria Berumen	109 B. Gonda St
4	1-15-22	MARCO FACCON	115 B Gonda ST
5	01/15/22	Ricardo Mora	112 Gonda St A.A.D.
6	01/15/22	Rosalinde Perez	117 B Gonda Street
7	1/15/22	HERMINIA PEREZ	117 B Gonda Street
8	1/15/22	Silvia Lopez	113 Gonda St #E
9	1/15/22	Carlos Perez	113 Gonda St #E
10	1/15/22	Robertino Mendez	115 Gonda St #A
11	1-15-22	Lorna Machado	115 B Gonda St
12	1-15-22	Mariza Kuhl	115 C Gonda St
13	1/15/22	SEVERO	117 TOPIC ST
14	01/15/22	Dioniso Cruz	117 Gonda St
15	1/15/22	Art Cruz	117 ^D Gonda St
16	1/15/22	A. B. Cruz	117 A P. Gonda St
17	1/15-22	Juan Manuel Velasco	117 B Gonda St
18	1-15-22	Ramon Lopez Balino	117 B Gonda ST
19	1/15/22	MAURICIO ABREGO	122A GONDA ST.
20	1-15-22	Maria E. Brann	110 Gonda - St
21	1-15-22	Miguel Reyes	94 Gonda - St
22	1-15-22	Melasia Pique	28 Gonda St
23	1/15/22	Vernica Virek	1-A EISA St
24	1/15/22	Kiana Varela	1 A EISA St
25	1/15/22	PAULINA HUANTE	1 EISA St
26	1/15/22	Jorge Lopez	21 Gonda St

1	1-15-22	Cenara H.	13 Gonda St,
2	1-15-22	Guillermo Roque D.	28 Gonda St
3	1-15-22	Vicente Perez	24 Gonda St
4	1-15-22	A Jose L. Martin	20 Gonda St.
5	1-15-22	Olivera Rios	20 Gonda St
6	1-15-22	Ramiro Rocha	12 Gonda St.
7	1-15-22	Carmen Paredano	15 Gonda St
8	1-15-22	Ruby Rocha	15 Gonda St.
9	1-15-22	Hermano Rosas	15 Gonda St.
10	1-15-22	Antonio Valencia	17 Gonda St
11	1-15-22	Guillermo Hernandez	28 Gonda St
12	1-16-22	Alonso Limon	101 San Juan RD.
13	1-16-22	Monica Martinez	11 Gonda St Apt A
14	1-16-22	Salvador Martinez	11 Gonda St
15	1-16-22	Salvador Martinez Jr	11 Gonda St
16	1-16-22	Yesenia Martinez	11 Gonda St
17	1-16-22	Urbentino Martinez	11 Gonda St
18	1-16-22	George Martinez	11 Gonda St
19	1-16-22	Carmen Martinez	11 Gonda St
20	1-16-22	Maricela Vasquez	12 Gonda St
21	1-16-22	Rocio Cervantes	121 San Juan Rd
22	1-16-22	Donny Ramirez	12 Gonda St
23	1-16-22	Jonny Martinez	12 Gonda St
24	1-16-22	Ramona Vasquez	12 Gonda St
25	1-16-22	Ramiro Vasquez	12 Gonda St
26	1-16-22	Carmela Vasquez	12 Gonda St
27	1-16-22	Perla Cervantes	121 San Juan Rd
28	1-16-22	Linda Sandoval	15 1/2 Gonda St
29	1-16-22	Maguila Mesa	107 Gonda St
30	1-15-22	Val Garcia	122 Gonda St
31	1-16-22	Josacio Gonzalez	34 Gonda St
32	1-17-22	Asuncion Zepeda	16 Gonda St WISSAVILLE CA 95076

Dear LUAC,

I apologize that the letters and petitions are addressed to the Planning Commission. I only found out about this meeting on Thursday January 27, 2022 at the Agricultural Advisory Meeting, 3 days after the public commenting period ended, to which I had already spent hours helping my neighbors with translation, gather and submit their own comments. I feel that they are still relevant and valuable to your committee.

Thank you for your time
Christine Shaw
24 Susan Street
Pajaro Ca 95076
831-421-2052
lolamako@gmail.com

I want to address the damage this would do to our community, and the civil rights injustices used to obfuscate and confuse those they are meant to represent and serve.

The residents of Susan Street did not receive proper notification. The NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION was ONLY sent in english. The majority of our residents do not speak or read english. They have no way of knowing what they received unless they had someone to interpret for them, which is an unreasonable and prejudiced expectation.

The onus is on the county to make sure that all legal materials are accessible for those notified and within their purview.

Susan Street residents are legally entitled to submit comments for review, and sending the notification in only one language is tantamount to sandbagging working class, hispanic citizens.

While I received the LUAC agenda in Spanish, I only got it after I asked for it(at 7:19am) it came in at 1:03 pm on Monday January 31st, 2022. I can only assume that if I want my community to attempt to attend, I am to print, collate and distribute them myself, either at night when people are home from work, or the day before the meeting?

Despite the hoops I've had to jump through to try and get all material sent out following Monterey county's own board policy(P-130 states "Material translation: Departments distributing documents to the public should endeavor to make available those documents, at minimum, in Spanish and English. Materials should be translated by a qualified translator and be reviewed by at least two staff members.") I have had time to review the mnd, and it is filled with out right lies via omission.

To have an MND that states on almost all fronts that these housing projects will have a "less than significant" impact on us, implying they know whats best, is a luxury belief, one made from the developers ivory towers, that will have irreparable consequences for the community.

All that we've fought hard for and invested in, creating neighborhood stability for our children, would be obliterated, and done with such apathy for those they purport to care about : Chicanos/Mechicas/Latinos/Farmworkers.

Even Bob Roach told the ag committee that anyone telling you this development uses less water than row crops, well, they should recheck those numbers.

If the results of the water issue in the MND are so unbelievable that the former ag commissioner himself felt the need to stand up and say something, when he was there for another matter altogether, doesn't that bear investigation?

Myself and every single one of my neighbors ask they you advise the planning commission to ask for a full environmental impact report.

A development of this magnitude, with so much at stake, not just the quiet enjoyment of our homes, but the vulnerable levee, needs to be scrutinized by those that are NOT invested in its misbegotten gains.

Like so much of what has transpired the last six months, the planning commission did not provide the ag committee with the mnd or LUACS recommendations, not in advance, not at the meeting, NOT AT ALL. The decision to suggest approval was made solely on Craig Spencer's input, which was again, lies via omission. There was no powerpoint, no discussion on the size and density The ag committee specifically asked what LUAC recommended, to which Mr.Spencer replied "they told us to come back with the mnd, they wanted to see the mnd" and nothing else.

I informed the committee of the LUAC recommendations. To which they asked Mr.Spencer if they had looked into any of them, he replied only the alternative access point and there wasn't one, and that was ALL that was said about that. I wish I knew just what that investigation entailed...

In the information packet provided, the site plans were not resized to one page but many pages including blank ones, huge swaths of white. Even having the site plans in front of me to refer to, I cannot put this paper puzzle together to form a decipherable picture.

The ends don't justify the means is a saying for a reason. To increase the population of Pajaro by 25% on just these two lots, coming down these two narrow and quiet streets, using an already incredibly impacted San Juan Road, is absurd.

Mr.Higgins did the traffic study in the off season. My husband gets up to go to work before the sun rises, like 99% of my neighbors do, during the growing season(the majority of the year) San Juan Road is bumper to bumper, as is Porter Drive.

Which brings me to the county approving projects in a piecemeal fashion, a lot of things can be said to be beneficial if we only look at the impact in one area: at who benefits, who profits.

To have the ag committee look at these through such a narrow, and willfully uninformed scope, creates an aura of uprightness within these projects, when in fact the developers are disingenuous at best, duplicitous at worst.

The conflict of interest within the investors that make up Tres Guapos LLC and Supervisor Phillips office should not go uninvestigated.

The commodification of our community and our social resources that we established is **WRONG, UNJUST**, as well as **UNSAFE**.

Where is the due diligence to protect our human rights from being violated?

We ask of you to slow this project down, as there are many, many issues that deserve further scrutiny in the form of a ***full environmental impact report***. Lest we find our community in a situation we cannot recover from.


Thank you for your continued time and service

Christine Shaw

24 Susan Street
Pajaro, CA 95076
831-421-2052
Lolamako@gmail.com



Find address or place



Legend

Levee



FEMA 100 Year Flood Hazard Areas



FEMA 500 Year Flood Hazard Areas



1mi
-121.862 36.923 Degrees

To the Monterey Planning Commission, we the residents of Susan Street contend that the proposed multilevel development PLN210152 would destroy our neighborhood.

-The traffic movements and parking requirements associated with the development present an unreasonable environmental impact. This will affect adjoining properties and pose an unacceptable safety risk to the residents, which include young children and senior citizens.

-The proposed location/s are not suitable for the density proposed, no less than a +55% variance is being requested.

-Increasing the TOTAL population of Pajaro by 25% on these two lots alone is shocking and unacceptable.

-Agricultural housing is inconsistent with the neighborhoods developed in the area. This type of proposed development is not sympathetic to the surrounding neighborhood and will devalue residential property values in the area, a circumstance that myself and many of my neighbors, who are senior citizens, can ill afford.

-There is no other development like this on Susan Street. It is out of character, without precedent and does not service the local community of Susan Street.

Ante la Comisión de Planificación de Monterey, nosotros, los residentes de Susan Street, afirmamos que el desarrollo de varios niveles PLN210152 propuesto destruiría nuestro vecindario.

-Los movimientos de tráfico y los requisitos de estacionamiento asociados con el desarrollo presentan un impacto ambiental irrazonable. Esto afectará las propiedades contiguas y representará un riesgo de seguridad inaceptable para los residentes, que incluyen niños pequeños y personas mayores.

-La/s ubicación/es propuestas no son aptas para la densidad propuesta, se solicita una variación no menor al +55%.

-Aumentar la población TOTAL de Pájaro en un 25% solo en estos dos lotes es impactante y inaceptable.

-La vivienda agrícola es inconsistente con los barrios desarrollados en el área. Este tipo de desarrollo propuesto no simpatiza con el vecindario circundante y devaluará los valores de las propiedades residenciales en el área, una circunstancia que yo y muchos de mis vecinos, que son personas de la tercera edad, no podemos permitirnos.

-No hay otro desarrollo como este en Susan Street. Está fuera de lugar, sin precedentes y no sirve a la comunidad local de Susan Street.

PRINCIPAL PETITIONER. Name: Christine Shaw Address: 24 Susan Street
Phone: 831-421-2052. Email: Lolamako@gmail.com

DATE	NAME	ADDRESS
1-15-22	Ruben Alvarez	32 Susan St
	Alejandra Garcia	35 Susan St
		7 " "
		7A " "
		21 " "
	ANA ROSA RAMIREZ	23 " "
01-15-2022	Ana Rosa Ramirez	39 " "
1/15/22	Ilda Rocha	43 Susan St.
* 1-16-22	Alan Manu	38 Susan St.
1-15-22	Carmen Cisneros	36 Susan St
1-5-22	Guadalupe Estanque	28 Susan St
1-15-22	Araceli Lagunas	23 Susan St.
1-15-22	Daniel Ortiz	21 Susan St.
* 1-15-22	Sharron Paz	20 Susan St.
1-15-22	Miguel Sanchez	7 Susan St
1/15/22	Alfonso Ortiz	7A Susan St
* 1/15/22		11 Susan St.
1-15-22	José Ramirez	9 Susan St
1-15-22	CHRISTIAN FLORES	10 SUSAN ST
* 1/15/22	Amadeus Velazquez	201 SUSAN ST
1/15/22	JOSSELYN COSTA	31 SUSAN STREET
1-16-22	Sergio Alvarez	27 Susan St
1/17/22	Martela Andiz	10 Susan St
1-17-22	Rita Rung	9 Susan St
1-17-22	Daniel Hernandez	9 Susan St
1/17/22	CHRISTINE STAN	24 SUSAN ST.

1/17/22 VICTOR MENESA 41 SUSAN ST

1/17/22 Vince Arellano 27 SUSAN ST

1-17-22 Kelly Manu 36 Susan St

1/17/22 David Ruiz 16 SUSAN ST

1/17/22

To whom it may concern,

We are the Cardenas Rocha family. Our home is located at 43 Susan street. We are writing to you in this letter to express our concerns about the housing construction project in our community that will bring a lot of vehicular flow. In addition to this, we are concerned about our children, since we do not know with certainty about the background of the people who could inhabit the apartments. Another concern is that our children walk on the street, because we don't have sidewalks, and the over flow of cars will make it dangerous. We go out to work like all parents do and it would be very worrisome to go to work knowing that our children walk alone without being sure if they are safe, with more than a hundred cars and people trafficking on our street. On the other, it would be good to take into consideration that the residents of Pajaro unfortunately

live in permanent risk of flooding every rainy season. In past years, we were about to be evacuated because the Pajaro river was about to overflow. We ask that you take our concerns into consideration and not allow the construction of this Project.

Thank you,

Ilda Rocha
Eustacio Cardenas

To whom it May concern

I have live in this house since I was 3. I think the project is going to affect us in a bad way. It's bad enough that we have limited parking, opening the street means that the parking situation will worsen. I believe it's a safety hazard for our children having so much traffic coming in and out of our street. I also think our property value will come down if you build low income apartments near our street

Sincerely

Guadalupe Alvarez

1-16-22

My name is Jose Ramirez, I reside at 9 Susan St. I have been here all of my life. I just heard that they're is going to be apartment complex of 400 unit plus but only 120 parking spots. We have had enough trouble trying to park now, can you imagine what that's going to look like.

Thank you,

Nosotros tenemos 32 años viviendo en este domicilio y no me gustaria que pusieran nada porque nos molestaria mucho Hemos vivido muy tranquilos gracias
35 SUSAN ST

January 17, 2022

TO whom it may concern:

I am the home owner of 28 Susan Street in Royal Oaks.

We were informed of the development happening at the end of Susan St. recently.

As a home owner on this street & living here for over 30 years, the news of the development is very disappointing as this street is very quiet, peaceful & not violent ~~compare~~ compared to the surrounding areas around us. We all know our neighbors who comes in & out, our kids, dogs, cats etc.

This letter is to object any new develop. ments in our peaceful street.

Contact # 831-840-0572

Jose Guadalupe Estanquero

January 17, 2022

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Subject: H-2A Housing/Susan Street/Pajaro

I am writing in opposition of H-2A Housing at the end of Susan Street. As a member of the community and a home owner for more than 44 years, we believe that kind of housing is not in the community's best interest, and if approved, will lead this community in the wrong direction.


Regarding the location of the proposed project, did you know that most of the neighborhood has owned their homes here for decades. Some for more than 40 years. We've stuck by our community through good and bad times.

There are many problems associated with the proposed project. Morning and afternoon traffic is already horrendous where Susan St. and San Juan Rd. meet. Increased traffic poses a danger to the neighborhood children who play in the street and pedestrians walking and exercising. Some homes/lots already don't have proper sidewalks. If you disrupt our neighborhood's demographic balance, ex. with a bunch of males, that will create other dangers and nuisances.

Our property values, while lagging, would take a huge hit as well as any rent or sale potential.

What the Planning Commission should do right now is postpone all decisions until the public can participate fully in the review process. Logically, there are better sites suited for your project in the abundant acres of farms and ranches along San Juan Road and the rest of Monterey County. These sites would have better and direct access to main roads without disrupting and destroying our great neighborhood.

Sincerely,



Maria Isabel Padilla
11 SUSAN ST.

01-17-2022

To the Monterey Planning Commission,

I am writing this letter to express my strong opposition against the new project proposal in building apartment complexes in my neighborhood.

I have lived on Susan Street for over 45 years now. I have raised my children here along with my grandchildren. In addition my family owns and rents out 4 homes on Susan street, therefore I have to look out for the best interest of not just my family but also my tenant's.

Opening our street to a project of this magnitude would be devastating to my family, tenants and neighbors. We already have an ongoing parking problem that is addressed between neighbors. Adding 60 units would absolutely flood our streets. I would no longer feel safe letting my grandkids play outside due to all the traffic. We as homeowners need to stand up for what's right and moving forward with this project is not the right move, not the right area. Please reconsider your proposal.

Thank you

Ana Rosa Ramirez

Ana Rosa Ramirez

39 Susan Street

Royal Oaks Ca. 95076

1117122

To whom it may concern,

We are writing this letter in hopes that you reconsider using Susan St. as the entrance to the proposed apartment complex. As new homeowners I strongly believe that doing these will greatly have an impact on the value of our house. We have worked very hard to buy this property that cost us a little over half a million dollars.

I also would like to add that we have young children that spend a lot of time playing basketball out on the street. Susan St. has been a safe place. I'm concerned that adding apartments and using Susan St. will no longer be safe due to the increase in traffic that will be coming in and out of our street. We will greatly appreciate ~~that~~ if Susan St. wasn't use as an entrance to the proposed apartment complex.

Thank you.

Monica Maldonado

Vivie

If you have any questions you can reach us at
406-2736

27 SUSAN ST.

Monterey County
Housing & Community Development
1441 Schilling PL South 2nd Floor
Salinas, CA 93901

Re: PLN210152 - Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration
Monterey County Planning Commission

Dear Planning Commission:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to PLN210152, at 51, 53, 55, & 57 Susan Street, Royal Oaks (117-361-016-000) for a combined development permit (Kall Robert E & Janet Rose (Rio Vista Group LLC)

This proposed project will significantly change the safe, friendly, family environment that will have adverse effects on the residents of Susan Street, if the high density apartments are constructed in 100 year flood plain. If development occurs in the floodway fringe, and there is an increase in flood stage, there will be an increase in flood damages for adjoining properties. Has it been demonstrated that there WILL NOT be an increase in the base flood elevation within our community, as a result of the proposed development?

The Pajaro River levee system is inadequate. Major flooding occurred in 1995 and 1998 that resulted in significant inundation and damage caused by overtopping or breaching of the levees. Floods in 1995 caused millions in damage and two people lost their lives, with additional damage in 1997 and 1998 and displacement of hundreds of residents. **Levels of flood protection along the Pajaro River system are among the lowest of any federal flood control project in California.** Poor levee strength further reduces this expected performance. Levees nearly broke again in the federally declared storm disasters of January-February 2017, and a 1600-foot-long seepage berm was needed to buttress the outboard levee flank when numerous observations of seepage and boils were made. The Pajaro River Flood Risk Management Project is a multi-benefit project that will reduce flood risk to the City of Watsonville and Pajaro, but is only in the CEQA environmental review process. To allow development/construction in the 100 year flood plain adjacent to the Pajaro River levee before the levee systems can be cleaned and strengthened is premature and detrimental to the well-being and safety of Susan Street residents as well as the workers who will reside in the apartments.

The layout and building density for 482 people at the proposed Pajaro Apartments is too large.

The development size should be decreased. Page 47 of the Mitigated Negative Declaration mentions that none of the other agricultural employee housing projects have come close to actually being at maximum occupancy since units are often occupied by fewer than 8 people and tends to be seasonal. Why is it necessary to build additional apartments in Pajaro if other employee housing is not filled to capacity? I urge you to disapprove the proposed rezoning for an increase in the 5% variance to 55.6%. A 200% increase is egregious and doesn't seem necessary or appropriate in the flood plain.

I am opposed to the development/construction of this magnitude anywhere in the 100 year flood plain, especially at this time. The Pajaro River Flood Risk Management Project should be completed before any approval or re-zoning in the flood plain that may risk the health and safety of all Pajaro residents.

Thank you for your consideration and continued service and support of our communities.

Respectfully,

Jessica Costa
Susan Street Resident
Royal Oaks, CA 95076




Susan Street





GARBAGE TRUCK WAITING TO FOR OTHER GARBAGE TRUCK TO EXIT SUSAN STREET. ONLY ONE OVERSIZED VEHICLE AT A TIME. THEY MUST BACK OUT ONTO SAN JUAN ROAD TO TURN AROUND AND DRIVE BACK DOWN THE STREET TO GET BOTH SIDES. THE OTHER TRUCK BLOCKS TRAFFIC WHILE IT WAITS, USUALLY TRAFFIC UITLIZES THE TURNOUT TO PASS THEM.



From: [gloria lopez](#)
To: [293-pchearingcomments](#); [Archbold, Shawn x5114](#); [greg.mayon4@gmail.com](#); [mona.zarate](#); [Frances Ayón](#); [Sigi Lopez](#)
Subject: PLN210152
Date: Tuesday, February 1, 2022 1:38:17 PM

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

Re: Proposed Housing Development (Kall Robert E & Janet Rose, Rio Vista Group LLC),
File Number PLN210152.

Dear Planning Commission;

I am a homeowner at 28, 34 and 107 Gonda St; a home that has been part of our family since the 1960s. I am a third-generation owner, born and raised on Gonda St; I raised my children, 4th generation Gonda residents, on that Street. We are a close-knit community and throughout the years we have survived earthquakes, floods, and are currently surviving the pandemic.

I would like to express the impact this structure would have on our tight-knit community. Most of my neighbors are unaware of the impact this change would have on our community because they have not been informed in their native language. The majority of the residents are monolingual Spanish speakers, who do not understand or write English AND the notices have been provided in English.

My concerns arise from the tremendous changes this would have on our community, our way of life.

- Traffic: Susan and Gonda are Dead-end streets with one-way in and out. Currently, it's a struggle to find parking on these narrow streets. This project will add to the traffic problem, increasing traffic to San Juan Rd. Currently, during peak work hours San Juan Rd is already overly congested giving homeowners limited access to their driveways to be able to access their homes.
- This project will change the community that my family has known for 4 generations. It will affect the ability to safely walk to school, church and to support our local mom and pop shops. Our children should continue to be able to play outside like it's been done for generations.

Going forward, I formally request that the correspondence be sent out in English and in Spanish; this way all stakeholders will properly receive a notice and know what is

happening in their neighborhood; everyone, Spanish speaking included, need to be taken into consideration.

Additionally, I request that the Full Environmental Impact Report be provided to the Susan, Gonda, Elsa, and San Juan Road residents.

Best Regards,
Gregorio and Ramona Ayon
Gloria and Sigifredo Lopez