

Michele King

From: Santa Clara Valley Water <system-generated@valleywater.org>
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2023 6:18 PM
To: Clerk of the Board
Subject: SCVWD Agenda Comment Form

*** This email originated from outside of Valley Water. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. ***

Submitted on Mon, 02/27/2023 - 6:17 PM

Submitted values are:

Name

Doug Muirhead

Address

15901 Village Way
15901 Village Way, California. 95037

Telephone

(408) 706-8150

Email

doug.muirhead@stanfordalumni.org

Agency, Business or Group (if applicable)

Public-Morgan Hill

Board Meeting Date

2023-02-28

Agenda Item Number

2.7

I would like to

Express Support

Comment Form

I urge the Board to direct staff to allow the IMC to make recommendations for adjustments and modifications which would better reflect achievements towards the project outcomes and Program priorities and fairly reflect staff's work towards those outcomes.

This must include KPIs that are meaningful to people who are not water professionals. Examples where you could improve accountability include:

- * Flow conveyance improvement not cubic yards of sediment removed
- * Measurable benefit of dollars contributed to project not just dollars.

- * More accurate and comprehensive historical context
- * Multi-year perspective to identify recurring systemic reasons for delays and cost over-runs
- * Audit timeline must continue from 2012 and not reset by Measure S

Sadly, many of the recommendations for meaningful KPIs have been made before, including my time on the 2017-2018 IMCs.

Director Hsueh graciously allowed me BPPC time in March 2019 to discuss my post-mortem comments about my IMC experience. Staff concluded that:

- * IMC's review process is working well
- * The review process is set by the IMC each year; staff's role is to support the IMC's selected process
- * The IMC has taken a cautious approach to recommending modifications to voter-approved Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

My experience was that it was staff resistance (claiming Board burden from public hearings) and not IMC cautiousness that kept meaningful KPIs from being introduced.

And Director Keegan said that the IMC process was planned for review in a few years so you should wait. Did that review ever happen?

The report also mentions previous recommendations in the Moss Adams Audit in 2017. I have never heard of this audit and it is not findable by search of your web site; it is additional evidence that the current standards and limitations have repeatedly been questioned yet no action taken by staff and Board.