

John O. Pinkney, Esq. (SBN 162586)  
Chelsea M. Healey, Esq. (SBN 311417)  
Slovak Baron Empey Murphy & Pinkney, LLP  
1800 East Tahquitz Canyon Way  
Palm Springs, California 92262  
Telephone (760) 322-2275  
Facsimile (760) 322-2107  
pinkney@sbemp.com / healey@sbemp.com

Fee Exempt Per Cal. Gov. Code § 6103

FILED  
ENDORSED  
2017 MAR 13 AM 11:01  
SACRAMENTO COUNTY  
SUPERIOR COURT  
OF CALIFORNIA

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae, MISSION SPRINGS WATER DISTRICT

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

CALIFORNIA MANUFACTURERS AND  
TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION, et al.,

CASE No. 34-2014-80001850

[Case Assigned to Hon. Christopher Krueger, Dept. 44]

Petitioners,

NOTICE OF FILING AMICUS CURIAE LETTER  
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS

v.

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL  
BOARD

Defendants.

PETITION FILED:

MAY 29, 2014

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT Amicus Curiae MISSION SPRINGS WATER DISTRICT ("Mission Springs") hereby files and serves the attached Amicus Curiae letter in support of Petitioners, CALIFORNIA MANUFACTURERS AND TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION and SOLANO COUNTY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION. Mission Springs respectfully requests that this Court review and consider Mission Spring's letter dated March 10, 2017, which is attached hereto as *Exhibit "A"* and incorporated herein by this reference.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: March 9, 2017

SLOVAK BARON EMPEY MURPHY & PINKNEY LLP

By:

John O. Pinkney, Esq.

Chelsea M. Healey, Esq.

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae, Mission Springs Water District



66576 Second Street, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240 • www.mswd.org • p 760.329.5169 • f 760.329.2482

March 10, 2017

The Honorable Christopher Krueger  
Superior Court of California  
County of Sacramento  
Department 44  
720 9th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: *California Manufacturers and Technology Association, et al., v. State Water Resources Control Board; Case No. 34-2014-80001850***

To the Honorable Christopher Krueger:

Mission Springs Water District ("Mission Springs") respectfully submits this Amicus Letter in support of Petitioners, California Manufacturers and Technology Association and Solano County Taxpayers Association.

Mission Springs is a county water district serving principally the City of Desert Hot Springs, in Riverside County, California. As such, Mission Springs provides drinking water to approximately 37,000 customers within its service area, which is 100 percent disadvantaged, with significant portions designated as severely disadvantaged. As a water provider, Mission Springs has always been successful in providing safe, clean drinking water to its customers at the lowest possible rates.

I am writing on behalf of Mission Springs to express our concerns regarding the significant financial impact that the State Water Resources Control Board's ("Water Board") new hexavalent chromium maximum contaminant level ("MCL") of 10 parts per billion ("ppb") drinking water regulations currently have and will continue to have on our community. The new MCL was a drastic change that is proving to have far greater costs than originally calculated by the Water Board when establishing the current MCL of 10 ppb.

Mission Springs has historically produced between 8,000 to 12,000 acre feet per year ("AFY") of water supplies. In four of Mission Springs' twelve well production facilities (nearly 50 percent of overall production volume), untreated groundwater does not meet the new hexavalent chromium MCL. As a result, Mission Springs has removed two wells from service and has modified operations at two other wells. While removing wells from service has been an acceptable short-term solution, Mission Springs must either treat water supplies at the groundwater production wells or create new supplies to meet demands moving forward.



The Honorable Christopher Krueger  
RE: Case No. 34-2014-80001850  
March 10, 2017  
Page 2

Through our own investigation, Mission Springs has determined that water treatment will be the most cost effective solution. However, Mission Springs estimates the cost of compliance to be approximately \$21 million for construction of the treatment systems, and an additional \$2 million per year for operations and maintenance. Currently, Mission Springs has an annual capital improvement budget of approximately \$2.5 million per year for the next three years. The cost of compliance would be devastating to Mission Springs' budget. Additionally, Mission Springs' customers would be better served if these funds were used instead to repair aging infrastructure. As a result of this new MCL, Mission Springs will require a rate increase of at least 25 percent. Historically, when rates have been raised, our community responds by reducing its water usage in order to save money. A rate increase of this magnitude, specifically due to the new regulation, would likely induce an even more dramatic drop in consumption, resulting in inadequate revenues being generated to fund compliance efforts of Mission Springs' already severely disadvantaged community.

Mission Springs believes that through careful evaluation of the financial and operational circumstances facing California's water agencies, the Water Board will be able to formulate a revised regulation and MCL that is protective of human health and supportive of our continuing efforts to supply safe, clean, and affordable water to the public. As such, Mission Springs requests that the Water Board please consider a revised MCL in the 20-25 ppb range.

Mission Springs, as a friend of this Court, respectfully urges this Court to take into consideration the foregoing matters in ruling on *California Manufacturers and Technology Association, et al., v. State Water Resources Control Board*, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 34-2014-80001850.

DATED: March 10, 2017

Respectfully submitted:



Arden Wallum, General Manager  
Mission Springs Water District