Valley Water
SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT

NON-AGENDA

January 14, 2022

Board Policy EL-7 Communication and Support to the Bard
The BAOs shall inform and support the Board in its work.

Page		
		CEO BULLETIN & NEWSLETTERS
		CEO Bulletin: None.
		BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS & INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
4		**BMR/IBMR Weekly Reports:** 01/13/22
5		Memo from Michele King, COB, to the Board of Directors, dated 01/11/22, regarding January 10, 2022 Agenda Item 2.1.
		INCOMING BOARD CORRESPONDENCE
9		**Board Correspondence Weekly Report:** 01/13/22
10		Email from Dom Cortese, to Chair Estremera, dated 01/05/22, regarding Cortese Brother Water System including a Reservoir, Wells, Pipeline, Pump Station, and connection to the City's Water System (C-22-0002).
13		Email from Aditi Vaghashia, to the Board of Directors, dated 01/06/22, regarding Homeless Activity along Coyote Creek (C-22-0003).
18		Email from Daniel Flynn, to the Board of Directors, dated 01/07/22, regarding the Board Election (C-22-0004).
19		Letter from Daniel Flynn, to the Board of Directors, dated 01/07/22, regarding the Anderson Dam (C-22-0005).
20		Email from Greg Pensinger, to the Board of Directors, dated 01/10/22, regarding Fair Oaks Outreach (C-22-0006).
21		Email from Matthew Toenies, to the Board of Directors, dated 01/10/22, regarding the New Wildlife Monitoring Program (C-22-0007).
		OUTGOING BOARD CORRESPONDENCE
24		Email from Director Santos, to Aditi Vaghashia, dated 01/11/22, regarding Homeless Activity along Coyote Creek (C-22-0003).
29		Letter from Chair Kremen, to Scott Vanderlip, dated 01/11/22, regarding Water Conservation (C-21-0187).

Board correspondence has been removed from the online posting of the Non-Agenda to protect personal contact information. Lengthy reports/attachments may also be removed due to file size limitations. Copies of board correspondence and/or reports/attachments are available by submitting a public records request to publicrecords@valleywater.org.

CEO BULLETIN

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS and Informational Items

Report Name: Board Member Requests

Request	Request Date	Director	BAO/Chief	Staff	Description	20 Days Due Date	Expected Completion Date	Disposition
R-21-0007	12/14/21	Santos	Tippets	Codianne	Send letters/communications to creek owners, i.e. cities, County, school districts, private property owners, etc. requesting that they remove debris/obstructions on the portion(s) of the creek which they own.	01/03/22		
R-22-0001	01/11/22	Hsueh	Richardson	Bourgeois	Staff to investigate comments by Mr. Mulligan regarding whether a CEQA analysis was conducted on the wild boar issue at Anderson Dam.	01/31/22		

Valley Water

MEMORANDUM

FC 14 (08-21-19)

TO:	Board of Directors	**FROM**:	Michele King, Clerk of the Board
SUBJECT:	January 10, 2022 Agenda Item 2.1	**DATE**:	January 11, 2022

Please find attached comment received after the cut-off for Agenda Item 2.1. at the January 10, 2022, Board Meeting.

(Work Study Session on Fiscal Years 2023-27 Preliminary Capital Improvement Program and Preliminary Fiscal Year 2022-23 Groundwater Production Charges.)

Michelle Critchlow

From: Clerk of the Board
Subject: FW: SCVWD Agenda Comment Form

From: ifdrupaladmin@ifsight.net <ifdrupaladmin@ifsight.net>
Sent: Monday, January 10, 2022 2:08 PM
To: Clerk of the Board <clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org>
Subject: SCVWD Agenda Comment Form

Submitted on Mon, 01/10/2022 - 2:08 PM

Submitted values are:

Name
Katja Irvin

Address
215 S 19th St
San Jose, California. 95116

Email
katja.irvin@sbcglobal.net

Agency, Business or Group (if applicable)
Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

Board Meeting Date
2022-01-10

Agenda Item Number
2.1

I would like to
No Position--Comment Only

Comment Form
Please consider the follow comments regarding today's staff report.

First, the staff report is misleading regarding the State Water Project Tax. The report says that Valley Water is required to levy a Tax sufficient to provide for all payments under its SWP contract with the California Department of Water Resources. This is not true. There are other SWP contractors who do not use the SWP Tax at all, or only for some of their SWP obligations. Also, the tax is not to be used for water purchases, only for operations and maintenance.

Second, it doesn't make sense to say the new Pacheco Reservoir project cost changed due to inflation and then say the total project cost decreased. Inflation means "a general, continuous increase in prices," which means costs going up. This needs to be explained better because it's confusing.

Third, it isn't likely that the County will return to "normal" water use by 2026. It's more likely the next five years will be

drier than normal and water demand will continue to be substantially below prior projections. It's good to see staff looking at other demand scenarios, but it seems the rate projections are using the highly optimistic baseline scenario to project rate increases. That may cause less public outrage, but it isn't accurate. Demand will be lower, and rates will need to go up more than what is being projected in this staff report. It would be more conservative to use a scenario with low or no future rebound in demand.

The water rate increases are of great concern. Over the next 3 years at the baseline scenario, average San Jose water bill will go up by $323 per year, and that's the optimistic scenario. And that's only Valley Water's cost increases. The utilities will have cost increases too. This is unsustainable. Something has to change.

Valley Water really needs to re-evaluate the CIP and look for projects that are not necessary that can be eliminated. Because water needs to be affordable. Many people here are wealthy, but there are also a lot of people who struggle to pay their bills.

What makes most sense is to stop the new Pacheco Reservoir project. The staff report says the project will provide extra water during droughts, but previous reports have said it will not. The only real benefit of the project is in-county water storage. This is not enough benefit to justify spending billions of dollars and over-burdening the residents of Santa Clara County. Nearby San Luis Reservoir is expanding and can be used for additional storage. Los Vaqueros Reservoir is another option.

Aside from that, if Anderson Reservoir is any guide, the cost for Pacheco will go up again at every stage, from 10% to 30% to 60% to 90% design, and on into construction.

Thank you for your consideration.