

**From:** [Clerk of the Board](#)  
**To:** [Candice Kwok-Smith](#)  
**Cc:** [Stephanie Simunic](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Valley Water Board - Please reject GP-9.3 Proposed Changes  
**Date:** Monday, July 20, 2026 3:31:46 PM

---

**From:** Hamilton Hitchings

**Sent:** Monday, July 20, 2026 2:19 PM

**To:** Clerk of the Board <clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org>; Shiloh Ballard

<SBallard@valleywater.org>; Nai Hsueh <NHsueh@valleywater.org>; Tony Estremera

<TEstremera@valleywater.org>; Rebecca Eisenberg <Reisenberg@valleywater.org>

**Cc:** Greer Stone <greer.stone@paloalto.gov>; Keith Reckdahl <keith.reckdahl@paloalto.gov>;

Margaret Bruce <mbruce@sfcjpa.org>; lgauthier@smcgov.org; mdinan@cityofepa.org;

dcombs@menlopark.gov; keakin@redwoodcity.org; cttaylor@menlopark.gov;

rabrica@cityofepa.org; Melanie Richardson <mrichardson@valleywater.org>

**Subject:** Valley Water Board - Please reject GP-9.3 Proposed Changes

Dear Valley Water Board,

I respectfully ask the Board to reject proposed Section 9.3.3.

It states:

“Board representatives shall timely notify the Board of any upcoming votes that, in their judgment, require full Board input or approval, including matters involving financial commitments, project progress, or organizational changes, and shall obtain the Board’s direction before voting.”

Keeping the Board informed is reasonable. But this proposal requires representatives to obtain Board direction before voting on broad and undefined categories of decisions.

At the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority, “project progress” could include nearly every meaningful operational decision—technical criteria, design direction, consultant work, schedules, and work plans.

The JPA agreement already protects Valley Water on matters that truly require full Board approval. Valley Water must approve its own funding or contribution to a capital project, its contribution to the JPA’s annual operating budget, and any amendment to the JPA agreement. Those important financial and governance decisions cannot be made by Valley Water’s JPA representative alone.

Section 9.3.3 would therefore mainly restrict the ordinary JPA decisions that the representative was appointed to make. It would place Valley Water’s representative under a constraint the other four directors do not have. If a proposal changes during discussion, the representative may have to delay, abstain, or vote without clear authorization.

That could weaken Valley Water’s influence. The JPA may proceed without Valley Water’s position, or flood-protection work may be delayed while everyone waits for another Valley Water Board meeting.

It would also blur accountability. Valley Water appoints a representative to exercise judgment and be accountable for that judgment. Because major financial and governance decisions already require full Board approval, requiring prior direction on additional ordinary decisions would diffuse responsibility rather than improve oversight.

Representatives should keep this Board informed. But that does not require restricting their ability to perform the job they were appointed to do.

Please reject Section 9.3.3.

Thank you.

**Hamilton Hitchings**

Palo Alto flood zone resident