

Attachment via email

To: CSD Board of Directors Jenco, Pohl, Butler & Maybee

cc: Gail Bullen, Michael Fritschi, Amelia Wilder (for board communication and committee packet inclusion)

Subject: Comments to items 5 & 6 Improvements Committee Agenda for meeting date December 7, 2022.

I apologize for the late delivery of these comments. The public is not informed of the agenda and provided with a packet until the Friday before the Tuesday meeting. The current packet contains a letter from Chris Pahule, a lead planner at Sacramento County Planning. The packet also includes a memo to the improvements committee from Mr. Fritschi. Michael asks the committee to recommend that the CSD Board award Maddaus Water Management (MWM) a contract to prepare an Integrated Water Master Plan (IWMP) in 2023.

Maddaus Water Management Contract Award:

*I respectfully disagree with Mr. Fritschi in his assessment that MWM is the best choice for this project.* I also contest that RMCSD has fully satisfied the search for the best consultant to prepare a IWMP. Michael has encountered difficulties encouraging additional vendors to bid on this project. However, I do not believe CSD has fully exhausted the pool of talent that is available to perform this work and that a vendor selection is premature. While researching the Folsom 2020 Urban Plan, I contacted WSC, the consultant for Folsom's 2020 Urban Water Plan. I spoke at length with Rob Notoli, a water engineer in the WSC'S Folsom office. Mr Notoli stressed WSC's extensive experience with IWMP and urban water plans. WSC was anxious to schedule a team meeting and suggested six days and times that they would make themselves available. After our discussion, WSC followed up immediately with Mr. Fritschi. Reviewing the WSC website (<https://expectwsc.com>), I found WSC's credentials most impressive. They have capacity and are eager to discuss our project in detail. I also have information about the Folsom 2015 plan, prepared by

another consultant. I am happy to share this. I see no reason to engage any firm until RMCSD has fully exhausted this talent pool.

*The selection of MWM gives me great concern.* Ms. Maddaus has managed both the 2010 IWMP (as the lead engineer for Brown & Caldwell) and the 2016 Water Supply Assessment since rejoining her family firm. I see this akin to retaining the same auditor year after year. There is an “unintended bias” that results from repeatedly focusing the same eyes on repetitive analysis. Ms. Maddaus prepared a Water Supply Assessment from the same IWMP she created in 2010. She was, in fact, being asked to validate her own work. This is NOT healthy.

Our 2006 IWMP was prepared by HDR and it is easy to identify distinct differences in both the approach and the recommendations in the 2006 and 2010 IWMP. These are healthy comparisons and support the introduction of new consultants into the mix.

This is the most important study this District has prepared and it will assess the impacts of 1000 new dwellings on our water supply. Both the 2006 and 2010 IWMP created doubt and concerns about water supply capacity. Many in our community continue to doubt the District’s ability to support such substantial growth. The selection of a “fresh face” will minimize a perception that the “good old boys” have recruited another of their “good old consultants.”

This IWMP is being bid as a joint venture by MWM and Adkins, an engineering company based in Oregon. I question the double billing and the potential confusion arising from two “principal consultants.” I also question the experience of Adkins to perform this complex analysis. I can find no evidence of water planning experience or execution of previous plans on their website.

My final concern is MWM and Adkins have omitted a budget and cost line for any public, board and staff workshops. There is no evidence that the bidders have considered any cost for public outreach. Historically, especially in 2006, we had five public meetings as the IWMP study progressed.

The lack of confidence in the 2006 IWMP brought about a IWMP “peer review” ordered by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors. It is

possible this will happen again if the vendor selection and bidding process create ratepayer distrust or if the selection appears to be “developer friendly”. The 2006 peer review reinforced many ratepayer concerns, particularly the potential for “stage 5”, fifty percent conservation levels in drought years. This understanding the “assumption of risk” asked of our present residents is a key issue. It is imperative the community understand what may be asked of them.

The board is working hard to regain the trust of the community. I think the “rush” to fill this contract will bring about more (not less) trust in the board. Many residents believe we have water issues that relate to the development of more than 1000 homes. Please do not shortcut this process. Find additional, qualified firms to consider before you solely award MWM with this contract.

Letter: Chris Pahule to Michael Fritschi (see packet)

I believe this letter creates an illusion that is far from the actual reality of this incomplete development application. It is similar to the 2014 illusion that was created around the “need for speed” to build a new water plant. Sacramento County disallowed the hotel project “until such time as a new water plant was completed”, This created a “developer generated” sense of urgency which ultimately caused the water plant project to begin without an approved contract or a valid bid. The result of that exercise is now fully on display. The plant cost nearly \$14,000,000. It was well over budget and delivered extremely late to the original schedule. This will happen again if we do not attract additional bidders, review pricing and execute a proper contract. This project, is far from ready to warrant the announcement of a notice of preparation (NOP) which will begin the formal preparation of an EIR.

***YOU HAVE TIME! IF YOU WISH TO EXTEND THIS BIDDING PROCESS TO THE END OF FEBRUARY, YOU CAN DO SO WITHOUT CONCERN***

The Rancho North project was modified and resubmitted to the County on March 30, 2022. The submittal was, once again, rendered incomplete and a notice was sent to the developer notifying him of each deficient item. These include, but are not limited to: a complete traffic study (TSMP) a

new tree inventory, detail on which trees will be removed in every village, trail compliance (RMA), density issues (cluster homes & accessory dwellings) and a host of incomplete technical studies. In addition, a drainage plan, submitted to RMCS D for comment, was submitted and remains in the county file. However, this plan never answered ANY of CSD's concerns about the inadequate plan that was submitted and reviewed by the District. RMCS D flatly rejected this plan and communicated this decision to the planning department. If the county were to permit an NOP to be issued before the required submittals are complete, it will be vigorously contested at the scoping meetings. Let me be clear that since the March 30, 2022 revision of the development, not a single document has been submitted to support the new proposal.

The Water Supply Assessment, issued by the district in 2016 took six months to complete and was done without a single county complaint. This development project has been dormant since 2014 and it has been revised numerous times. In 2016, the developer was granted six stakeholder meetings to help facilitate his project. Nothing happened. Most development application are only allowed two years of inactivity before they are rejected and returned for re-submission.

In contrast to this development process, the EIR was recently completed for the Jackson Township (6500 homes and 2 million feet of commercial space). The preparation of technical studies, the scoping of the NOP and the environmental impact report was completed in ten years. The Rancho North project has been open for nine years. Completion dates of the studies and the generation of an NOP is impossible to calculate. Please do not be rushed by this developer. Nothing done to date warrants any special treatment by RMCS D simply because we are being pressured to do so. I am only asking for a two month delay.

I look forward to an active conversation on the IWMP First, we must properly pick a qualified consultant and be sure everyone who lives in the District has a fair shake at the water supply.