May 17, 2013
Ms. Elizabeth Kim
The Planning Center|DC\&E
3 MacArthur Place, Suite 1100
Santa Ana, CA 92707
Re: Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report to Orange County Great Park Environmental Impact Report for High School No. 5 Project in the City of Irvine

Dear Ms. Kim:
The Irvine Ranch Water District (IRWD) has received The Planning Center|DC\&E's letter relative to the Preparation of a Supplemental EIR for the Great Park - High School No. 5 Project in the City of Irvine. The following responses have been prepared to answer the questions posed in the High School No. 5 Supplemental EIR Questionnaire, which accompanied the subject letter:

1. Is the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (accessible at http://www.irwd.com/doing-business/engineering-planning/urban-water-management-plan.html) IRWD's most recent adopted urban water management plan? If not, please provide the most recently updated version.

The 2010 Urban Water Management Plan is the most recent plan prepared by IRWD. This plan can be found in the Engineering \& Planning section of the "Doing Business" tab of www.irwd.com.
2. From what sources does the District obtain its water supply and in what quantities?

Metropolitan Water District, groundwater and recycled water are IRWD's primary sources of water supply.

Attached is a list of supply sources from IRWD's most recent Water Supply Assessment. (WSA for PA-33, January, 2012). For a complete copy of the WSA, please contact IRWD's Water Resources Manager, Kellie Welch at (949) 453-5586.
3. What are the average water consumption and sewer generation rates for the high school and golf course uses within the City?

IRWD would expect the project will maximize the use of recycled water (RW). Please see the attached from the IRWD Water Resources Master Plan for potable, recycled, and
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sewer demands by land use (Table 3-1 Land Use and Water Use Factors, September 2012). Please note that the local interior column of the local demands category reflects average sewer demands and the irrigation demands category reflects average recycled water demands. For planning purposes, IRWD uses land code 1260 for schools and 1830 for golf courses.
4. What is the size and location of existing water and sewer mains that would serve the project site? Are there currently any deficiencies on the water and sewer systems within the project area? What new facilities, if any, are necessary to serve the proposed project?

Attached are copies for the atlas pages near the shown proposed high school site. As discussed in our March 27 meeting with IUSD, potable water and recycled water could be served from existing pipelines in Irvine Boulevard. Currently, no sewer pipe exists adjacent to the school site.
5. We understand that a Sub Area Master Plan (SAMP) was prepared for PA 51 (for the OC Great Park). In the event that the high school is developed prior to the surrounding development, what are the required infrastructures to serve the proposed high school?

As discussed in our March 27 meeting with IUSD, an Addendum to the PA-51, 30 SAMP should be prepared by IUSD. The scope and the final review of the addendum should be coordinated with IRWD planning staff.
6. Which wastewater treatment facility would the project-generated wastewater ultimately be conveyed to and treated at? What is the daily capacity and average treatment volume at this facility? Is there any plan for expansion?

Wastewater from this project would be directed to and treated at the Michelson Water Recycling Plant (MWRP), located in the City of Irvine. The plant currently treats up to 18 million gallons per day (mgd) and is presently undergoing an expansion to increase its capacity to 28 mgd . The MWRP expansion is scheduled for completion later this year.
7. The questionnaire does not include a question No. 7.
8. What mitigation measures, if any, would you recommend for the proposed project?

IRWD has not performed any environmental analysis for the project. Identification of environmental impacts and mitigation measures are typically a function of the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These activities are the responsibility of the lead agency for the project.
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IRWD appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed SEIR and provide information for the proposed High School No. 5 Water and Sewer Questionnaire. Should you have any questions, or require additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,


Jo Ann Corey
Engineering Technician III
cc: Mike Hoolihan, IRWD
Kelly Welch, IRWD

## Enclosures

S:/Deptlist/Admin/70/jac/IRWD Water and Sewer Response Questionnaire SEIR Great Park_May 17_2013 .docx


| Table 3-1 Land Use and Water Use Factors (September 2012) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cods | Land Use Deseription | Land Use Agency | Land Uee Denstly |  | Local Demands |  |  | Itrigation Demands |  |
|  |  |  | Average | Units | Loeal Interiar | Local Exterior | Total Local | \% Irrignted Area | Irrigation Factor |
| 1100 | Realdential |  |  |  | Galpuray |  |  | GaVAcrepar |  |
| 1111 | Rural Densty | Orange | 0.3 | du/acre | 250 | 170 | 420 | 0\% | 1,000 |
| 1112 | Rural Denalty | invine | 0.3 | du/acre | 250 | 750 | 1,000 | 5\% | 2,800 |
| 1115 | Rural Density | Courty | 0.26 | du/acre | 300 | 950 | 650 | 5\% | 2,800 |
| 1121 | Estate Densily | Orange | 1.2 | du/acre | 300 | 350 | 650 | 6\% | 2,800 |
| 1122 | Estate Density | irvine | 0.5 | du/acre | 300 | 225 | 525 | 5\% | 2,800 |
| 1126 | Estate Density | Lake Forest | 0.5 | du/acre | 300 | 350 | 650 | 7\% | 3,000 |
| 1131 | Low Density | Orange | 4 | duacre | 300 | 350 | 860 | 8\% | 2,500 |
| 1132 | Low Denslly | invins | 9 | du/acre | 225 | 180 | 405 | 16\% | 2,200 |
| 1133 | Low Densily | Newport Beach | 1 | du/acre | 290 | 220 | 510 | 17\% | 2,800 |
| 1134 | Low Denaliy PC | Tuetin | 4.5 | du/acre | 450 | 1,650 | 2,000 | 17\% | 2,800 |
| 1135 | Suburban Denstity | County | 9.25 | du/acre | 165 | 95 | 200 | 15\% | 2,500 |
| 1138 | Low Dansity | Lake Forest | 3 | du/acre | 270 | 150 | 420 | 20\% | 2,800 |
| 1141 | Low-Medium Density | Orange | 10.5 | du/acre | 235 | 145 | 380 | 15\% | 2,600 |
| 1146 | Low-Medlum Density | Lake Forest | 11 | du/acre | 205 | 150 | 355 | 10\% | 3,000 |
| 1153 | Mactum.Low Density | Newport Beach | 2.76 | du/acre | 400 | 350 | 750 | 10\% | 2,800 |
| 1161 | Medium Density | Orange | 19.5 | du/acre | 200 | 150 | 350 | 15\% | 2,800 |
| 1162 | Madum Denaly | Irvine | 7.5 | du/acre | 200 | 100 | 300 | 15\% | 2,800 |
| 1163 | Medium Deneity | Newport Beaoh | 5 | du/acre | 225 | 205 | 430 | 20\% | 2,800 |
| 1164 | Madium Densily PC | Tustin | 11.8 | du/acre | 155 | 95 | 250 | 15\% | 2,800 |
| 1166 | Medium Densly | Lake Forest | 7.5 | du/acre | 140 | 60 | 200 | 15\% | 2,800 |
| 1772 | Medum-High Density | Irvine | 17.5 | du/aore | 130 | 30 | 160 | 22\% | 2,400 |
| 1175 | Uban Densily | County | 29 | du/acre | 140 | 45 | 185 | 20\% | 2,800 |
| 1176 | Medium-HIgh Density | Lake Forest | 17.5 | du/acre | 145 | 70 | 215 | 17\% | 2,500 |
| 1182 | High Density | Irvine | 32.5 | du/acre | 130 | 13 | 143 | 20\% | 2,800 |
| 1183 | High Densty | Newport Beach | 12.25 | du/acre | 115 | 10 | 125 | 20\% | 3,200 |
| 1184 | High Density PC | Tustin | 17.4 | dufabre | 115 | 10 | 125 | 15\% | 2,800 |
| 1186 | High Density | Lake Forest | 32.5 | du/acre | 115 | 10 | 125 | 20\% | 2,800 |
| 1181 | High Rise Density | Orange | 35 | du/acre | 115 | 10 | 125 | 20\% | 2,800 |
| 1192 | High Rise Dansity | Irvine | 40 | du/aore | 115 | 10 | 125 | 20\% | 2,800 |
| 1200 | Commercial |  |  |  | Gal/KSEIDay |  |  | GaVAcre/Day |  |
| 1210 | General Oflice |  | 20 | ketfacre | 62 | 10 | 72 | 20\% | 2,500 |
| 1221 | Community Commercial |  | 9 | kst/acre | 142 | э३ | 175 | 20\% | 3,500 |
| 1222 | Reglonal Commercial |  | 10 | ksflacre | 130 | 10 | 140 | 20\% | 3,500 |
| 1230 | Commerclal Recreation |  | 8 | kst/acre | 41 | 20 | 81 | 30\% | 3,000 |
| 1235 | Hotel |  | 45 | rooms/acre | 110 | 50 | 160 | 30\% | 2,800 |
| 1240 | Insthutlonal |  | 8 | kst/acre | 30 | 15 | 45 | 30\% | 2,750 |
| 1244 | Hospital |  | 9 | kst/acre | 165 | 65 | 230 | 30\% | 2,850 |
| 1280 | School |  | 10 | ksffacre | 20 | 8.0 | 28.0 | 50\% | 2,600 |
| 1261 | UCl |  | 10 | kst/acre | 215 | 15 | 230 | 40\% | 3,800 |
| 1273 | Military Alr Field |  | 0 | kstfacre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 1290 | Hotel |  | 45 | rooms/acre | 110 | 50 | 160 | 30\% | 2,800 |
| 1300 | Industrial |  | 9.081 |  | 600 | 25 | 625 | 20\% | 2,800 |
| 1310 | Industrial - Llght |  | 18 | kst/acre | 60 | 10 | 70 | 20\% | 2,800 |
| 1320 | Industrial - Heavy |  | 25 | kst/acre | 2,000,0 | 18 | 2,018 | 20\% | 2,800 |
|  | Open Space and Other |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gatacraiday |  |
| 1414 | Alports |  | 0 | acte/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 1413 | Freeways \& Major Road |  | 0 | acrefacre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 1820 | Community Park |  | 1 | aore/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86\% | 2,200 |
| 1830 | Reglonal Park |  | 1 | acre/aocre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75\% | 2,200 |
| 1840 | Fuel Moditicallon Zone |  | 1 | acre/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100\% | 1,000 |
| 1850 | Wlldille Preserve |  | 0 | acrelacre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 1880 | Open Space (Rec) |  | 0 | 日cre/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 1800 | Vaoant |  | 1 | acre/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0 |
| 4100 | Water |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 |
| 2000 | Aarlcuiturs |  |  | acre/acre |  |  |  |  | Gal/Acre/Day |
| 2100 | Low-Irigaled AG Potable |  | 1 | acre/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80\% | 1,800 |
| 2110 | Low-Irigated AG Unitreated |  | 1 | acre/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80\% | 1,800 |
| 2120 | Low-Irigated AG Recycled |  | 1 | acre/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80\% | 1,800 |
| 2200 | High-Irligated AG Potable |  | 1 | acre/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80\% | 3,100 |
| 2210 | High-Irigatad AG Unireatad |  | 1 | acre/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80\% | 3.100 |
| 2220 | High-Irrigation AG Recycled |  | 1 | acre/acre | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80\% | 3,100 |

## 2. Information concerning supplies

(a)(1) Existing sources of identified water supply for the proposed project: IRWD does not allocate
particular supplies to any project, but identifies total supplies for its service area, as shown in the following table:

|  | Max Day (cts) | Avg. Annual (AFY) | Annual by Category (AFY) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Supplies |  |  |  |
| Potable - Imported |  |  |  |
| East Orange County Feeder No. 2 | 41.4 | 16,652 |  |
| Allen-McColloch Pipeline* | 64.7 | 26,024 |  |
| Orange County Feeder | 18.0 | 7,240 | 49,916 |
| Potable - Groundwater |  |  |  |
| Dyer Road Wellfield | 80.0 | 28,000 |  |
| OPA Well | 1.4 | 1,000 |  |
| Deep Aquifer Treatment System-DATS | 10.0 | 8,900 |  |
| Wells 21 \& 22 | 6.0 | 6,300 |  |
| Irvine Desalter | 10.6 | 5,640 | 49,840 |
| Total Potable Current Supplies | 232.1 |  | 99,756 |
| Nonpotable - Reclaimed Water |  |  |  |
| MWRP (18 mgd) | 23.9 | 17,340 |  |
| LAWRP ( 5.5 mgd ) | 8.3 | 5,975 | 23,315 |
| Nonpotable - Imported |  |  |  |
| Baker Aqueduct | 52.7 | 15,262 |  |
| Irvine Lake Pipeline | 65.0 | 9,000 | 24,262 |
| Nonpotable - Groundwater |  |  |  |
| Irvine Desalter-Nonpotable | 5.4 | 3,898 | 3,898 |
| Nonpotable Native |  |  |  |
| Irvine Lake | 5.5 | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| Total Nonpotable Current Supplies | 160.8 |  | 55,475 |
| Total Combined Current Supplies | 392.9 |  | 155,231 |
| Supplies Under Development |  |  |  |
| Potable Supplies |  |  |  |
| Well 106 | 2.2 | 1,300 |  |
| Well 53 | 4.5 | 3,000 |  |
| Future OPA Wells | 8.0 | 5,000 |  |
| Anaheim wellfield | 10.0 | 6,500 |  |
| Wells 51 \& 52 | 9.0 | 5,500 |  |
| Tustin Legacy wells | 9.0 | 5,000 |  |
| Total Potable Under Development Supplies | 42.7 | 26,300 | 26,300 |
| Nonpotable Supplies: Future MWRP\&LAWRP Reclaimed | 20.0 | $14,450{ }^{10}$ | 14,450 |
| Total Under Development | 105.4 |  | 40,750 |
| Total Supplies |  |  |  |
| Potable Supplies | 274.8 |  | 126,056 |
| Nonpotable Supplies | 180.7 |  | 69,925 |
| Total Supplies (Current and Under Development) | 455.6 |  | 195,981 |

[^0]
[^0]:    1 Based on converting maximum day capacity to average by dividing the capacity by a peaking factor of 1,8 (see Footnote 3, page 22).
    2 Contract amount - See Potable Supply-Groundwater(III).
    3 Contract amount - See Potable Supply-Groundwater (iv) and (v). Maximum day well capacity is compallble with contract amount.
    4 MWRP 18.0 mgd treatment capacity ( 17,400 AFY RW production) and LAWRP 5.5 mgd tertiary treatment capacity ( 5,975 AFY)
    5 Based on converting maximum day capacity to average by dividing the capacity by a peaking factor of 2.5 (see Footnote 3, page 22).
    6 Based on IRWD's proportion of Invine Lake Imported waler storage; Actual ILP capacity would allow the use of additional imported water from MWD through the Santiago Lateral.
    7 Contract amount - See Nonpotable Supply-Groundwater (i) and (ii). Maximum day well capacity (cfs) is compatible with contract amount.
    8 Based on 70 years historical average of Santiago Creek Inflow into Irvine Lake.
    9 Estimaled comblned capacily of wells.
    10 Future estimated MWRP \& LAWAP reclaimed water productlon.
    *64.7 cis is current assigned capacity; based on increased peak flow, IRWD can purchase 10 cfs more (see page 23 (b)(1)(1II))

