Survey Results
August 20, 2019

DOWN VALLEY WATER & SEWER
Purpose

To gauge community interest in providing centralized water and sewer service in Placerville and Down Valley

Background: 2003 Wastewater Collection and Treatment Feasibility Study
  • Recommended independent Placerville and Fall Creek facilities
321 Parcels
Applebaugh: 31
Fall Creek: 128
Lower Placerville: 33
Placerville: 83*
Sawpit: 46**

*27 parcels are owned by San Miguel County or held by the Trustee
**24 Sawpit parcels are unincorporated and 22 are incorporated. Sawpit has public water service in the municipal limits
## Land Use Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applebaugh</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Creek</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Placerville/Ellererville</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placerville</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawpit</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td><strong>79%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Assessor's Records/San Miguel County GIS*

- As a percentage of number of parcels
- Some Vacant parcels may not be suited for development due to size, terrain or other factors

### AVERAGE PARCEL SIZE

- Residential: 1.95 acres
- Vacant Land: 4.72 acres
- Commercial: 0.31 acres
Survey Responses

Total Responses: 91
31% Response Rate

Applebaugh: 9
Fall Creek: 39
Lower Placerville: 7
Placerville: 31
Sawpit: 5
Survey Responses – Placerville, Lower Placerville

Lower Placerville/Ellerdville:
33 Parcels
7 responses (21%)

Placerville:
83 Parcels total (Includes SMC/Trustee)
56 Parcels surveyed
31 Responses (55%)
Survey Responses – Applebaugh, Fall Creek & Sawpit

Applebaugh:
31 Parcels
9 responses (29%)

Fall Creek:
128 Parcels
39 Responses (30%)

Sawpit:
46 Parcels
5 responses (11%)
Water Problems

All Responses:
- Yes: 66
- No: 1
- Not Applicable: 3
- No Response: 0

Locations:
- Applebaugh: 1 Yes, 1 No
- Fall Creek: 5 Yes, 2 No
- Lower Placerville/Elderdville: 2 Yes, 5 No
- Placerville: 13 Yes, 1 No
- Sawpit: 5 Yes, 2 No

Legend:
- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable
- No Response
Septic Problems

- Applebaugh: 9 Yes, 5 No, 2 Not Applicable, 1 No Response
- Fall Creek: 31 Yes, 5 No, 2 Not Applicable, 1 No Response
- Lower Placerville/Ellderville: 6 Yes, 1 No, 1 Not Applicable, 1 No Response
- Placerville: 8 Yes, 1 No, 1 Not Applicable, 1 No Response
- Sawpit: 5 Yes, 1 No, 1 Not Applicable, 1 No Response

ALL RESPONSES:
- 72 Yes, 13 No, 4 Not Applicable, 2 No Response
Age of Septic Systems

Median Reported Age of Septic Systems: 16-20 Years

Typical life expectancy of a septic system is 25-30 years

One-third of reported systems are 25 years old or more
System Replacement

**Room for Replacement:**
- YES – 33%
- NO – 40%
- Maybe – 2%
- No Response – 25%

**Soil Treatment Area Setbacks:**
- 100’ to well
- 25’ to water supply line
- 5’ to septic tank
- 10 – 20’ to structure
- 10’ to property line
- 50’ to river, creeks, ponds
- 25’ to dry gulch, fill area or cut bank

**A 3-bedroom house requires a Soil Treatment Area (leach field) of 630 to 1,000 s.f.**
- 1,000 s.f. = 2 beds @ 12’ x 43’ each, with 6-foot separation (1,290 s.f.)

**Additional setbacks for septic tanks**
Central Water for Fire Flow

All Responses:
- Important: 46%
- Somewhat Important: 26%
- Not Important: 22%
- No Response: 5%

Location-Specific Responses:
- Applebaugh: 44% Important, 44% Somewhat Important
- Fall Creek: 51% Important, 28% Somewhat Important, 11% Not Important, 3% No Response
- Lower Placerville/Ellerdville: 57% Important, 29% Somewhat Important, 14% Not Important, 3% No Response
- Placerville: 52% Important, 23% Somewhat Important, 16% Not Important, 10% No Response
- Sawpit: 60% Important, 20% Somewhat Important, 14% Not Important, 20% No Response
Are You In Favor of Centralized Water & Sewer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>Yes Sewer Only (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Maybe (%)</th>
<th>No Response (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applebaugh</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Creek</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Placerville/Ellerdville</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placerville</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawpit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Responses:
- Yes: 66%
- Yes Sewer Only: 20%
- No: 11%
- Maybe: 2%
- No Response: 1%
Reasons For & Against Centralized Water

**REASONS FOR**
- Health – 58
- Improved Property Values – 47
- Development Potential – 37
- Other – 20

**REASONS AGAINST**
- Cost – 23
- Recently replaced system – 11
- Expanding government – 11
- Other – 2
# Governance Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Special District</th>
<th>Placerville Incorporation*</th>
<th>Homeowner’s Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE INFORMATION</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Placerville Area respondents only

**Public Improvement District (PID):**
- Provides public improvements and services in unincorporated areas, e.g. water, sewer, roads, drainage, parks
  - *Typically provides services government does not provide or provides only on a limited basis*
- Formed by Petition and Election
- Separate political subdivision of state; BOCC serves as PID governing board
  - *A PID advisory committee may be formed to provide input to the BOCC*
- Financed through ad valorem taxes, service rates, tolls and fees
- Debt financing (bonds) is permitted
Other Issues

5 = Most Important, 1 = Not Important

Average: 4.38  4.17  3.38  3.89  2.73  3.96  3.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic/Sewer</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage/Flooding</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Most Important, 5 = Not Important
Next Steps

- Establish Community Working Group
- Secure Funding for New Study
  - Funding needs to come from Residents as well as County and Grants
- Conduct Preliminary Engineering Study
- Present Study Results
- Determine as a community whether to act on new Study
  - Governance
  - Financing
  - Site acquisition
  - Water Rights