

From: Hammer, Mark [Mark.Hammer@hdrinc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2008 8:26 AM
To: Miller, John
Subject: FW: Policy comments.doc

Mark J Hammer, Jr PE

HDR ONE COMPANY | *Many Solutions*
2365 Iron Point Road, Suite 300 | Folsom, CA | 95630
Phone: 916. 817.4700 | Fax: 916.817.4797
Direct: 916.817.4835 | Cell: 916.799.0845
email: mhammer@hdrinc.com

The basis for the comment includes:

- 14-1 {
1. The water and wastewater facilities required for year 2025 were not developed, therefore I could not foresee how policies could be developed. I now understand that land is the basis for future facilities and given that clarity, there is a basis for policy development.

There is no doubt that a series of policies can be developed given the information available in the report on existing needs and future facilities based on land use.
- 14-2 {
2. I remain concerned in those locations where the LUD is significantly less than the HUD. In areas with significant differences, it seems that they would represent different visions of the future. Are policies going to be developed for the LUD or HUD needs?
 3. The report is confusing at the end of the water and wastewater sections. The sections titled Policy Recommendations state:
- 14-3 {
- This technical report will be used to guide development of the Community Infrastructure and Services Element and the recommended policies therein.
- The water issues to be addressed in the community infrastructure and services element include goals, policies, and programs for the following issues:
- Ability to Function – the need is clear, lumping managerial, financial, aging infrastructure, growth, and regulations together is a rather broad brush.
- Rates – there was no analysis or presentation of rates in the report. It is unclear that rates “generally do not adequately cover the costs of providing water service.” There is an economic estimate of the rate increase due to repairs and system needs, but it is not in the context of existing rates.

Funding of Infrastructure – the need is clear. I found the presentation of repair costs in terms of connection fees to be confusing. Costs should be paid for by rates and it is not clear what the presentation was for. Especially in the wastewater cost estimates, repair and maintenance capital costs were mixed with costs associated with treatment expansion to accommodate growth. These costs should be separate to allow policies to be developed for maintenance versus expansion or regulatory improvements.

14-4

Just as a side note: From the information in the report and our discussion, it seems that there should be a distinction for wastewater treatment between urban and rural areas.

14-5

The aforementioned items relate to existing conditions. It is unclear if any issues related to growth will be developed as policies.

14-6

It is not that the report does not contain the basis for the following items, but that this section stops short. I would have expected to see the list continue with items such as:

Maximum usefulness – maintain adequate levels of facilities and services for existing and new development. This leads to goals for identifying and allocating existing capacity for new growth and maintaining adequate capacity and levels of service to meet future development.

Water supply quality and adequate wastewater treatment – maintain appropriate water quality and levels of wastewater treatment to serve new growth, protect public health, and preserve natural resources. (this could be used to address urban and rural areas separately and address issues related to septic tanks).