

South American Subbasin Draft GSP comments

Jennifer Larsen of Kennedy Jenks at SASbGSP_Comments@kennedyjenks.com.

As a 34 year resident of Elk Grove and active participant in local government, it was only after another community member began sharing information with me on SCGA meetings and the GSP, did I begin attending meetings and reading documents--and it was only after taking these steps did I begin to understand the importance in developing and implementing a plan. Were it not for the community member reaching out to me and discussing the GSP and meetings of the various GSA's would I have had any idea of the future of water in our area. This document suggested there has been extensive outreach. I believe the final GSP document needs to further elaborate on "extensive". Many in my community have no idea what will be required of them in the future and the cost burden of implementing the various projects.

How have the members of the SCGA board been communicating to the general public they represent? I had requested the City of Elk Grove communicate with the residents in a manner which would peak curiosity; what will be required of the residents? Will residents be required to reduce use and carry the financial obligations of program implementation imposed by increasing fees, taxes and water bills?

As a resident of Elk Grove, I pay taxes and fees to the City of Elk Grove, Elk Grove Water District, and Sacramento County Sanitation District. All are members of SCGA who contribute monies to support the functions of SCGA. There will be costs to implementing the programs and the costs should be clearly estimated and defined within the GSP. Who will cover the costs? How will the cost burden be distributed? Will there be equity in sharing the burden of the costs? What about "Unknown" costs of programs and facilities. "Costs of facilities and activities uncertain and will be developed as need arises".

5.1.6 Projects are group 1, group 2 and group 3. What are the projects under each grouping? Understandably the Projects are further discussed in another area of the document. How about listing the projects in the Executive Summary? Projects in group 3 are supplemental and in a "conceptual stage". What are the concepts being contemplated? A description of the "conceptual stage" lends transparency to this document. Funding by the individual entities and sponsors should be included.

5.1.7 Continuation of education, outreach and engagement should and needs to include property owners and ratepayers.

5.2.2 Needs to include the costs for each GSA. The GSP should be able to give an estimate of the "unknown" costs for the potential projects or infrastructure need. This needs to be a transparent process with the financial obligations defined. Harvest Water Project is still seeking an additional \$100 million in funding. An area within the Harvest Water Project will be urbanized under Elk Grove City's general plan and will not remain Agricultural. This needs to be discussed in the GSP as I understand Harvest Water is to bring recycled water to area farmers easing groundwater pumping.

Will the new urban areas be using recycled water for domestic use? Will this project be adding additional future drinking water for the region? Is this in the conceptual stage? I have presented this question at SCGA meetings and what I heard is that SCGA is not a land use agency. How can there be

coordination between land use agencies and SCGA if the GSP is not based on updated General Plans of the cities and counties? How can this be a transparent process when the agencies involved in serving Elk Grove are not coordinating meetings to reach out to the ratepayers in a meaningful understandable way? Ratepayers are Stakeholders and have not been identified as such in the draft GSP. However, ratepayers have been identified as a financial source for the funding of projects.

What will the quality of local groundwater be when GSP projects are implemented? Will there be significant changes to the quality of the water and treatment process? Will our groundwater become contaminated? What will be the estimated costs of treating the water to make it drinkable and meeting minimal State/EPA standards? The GSP needs to evaluate this and include it in the document. It is of no value to have water available that is more contaminated and harmful to the health and environment of the region and therefore unusable.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.

Lynn Wheat

Wheat91@yahoo.com