

From: [Michelle Critchlow](#) on behalf of [Board of Directors](#)
To: [Michele King](#)
Subject: FW: Comments for June 23, 2020 Agenda Item 2.7 FERC Order Compliance Project
Date: Thursday, June 18, 2020 12:02:00 PM
Attachments: [062320 Agenda Item 2.7 FOCP public participation comment.pdf](#)

From: Katja Irvin <katja.irvin@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2020 11:53 AM
To: Clerk of the Board <clerkoftheboard@valleywater.org>; Board of Directors <board@valleywater.org>
Subject: Comments for June 23, 2020 Agenda Item 2.7 FERC Order Compliance Project

Dear Valley Water Board of Directors,

It is very discouraging and disappointing trying to be an involved member of the public and repeatedly seeing the District ignore public input. The attached comments include a list of reasons why the outreach on the FOCP exemplifies the District's approach to input from constituents and other informed stakeholders.

Overall, the District comes off as arrogant and dismissive when the few members of the public who care and actually participate constantly have their input ignored. The District claims to want more public participation and outreach but that seems to be lip service since actions show that the public is not taken seriously.

Please consider ways to get the public involved so our input can make a meaningful difference.

Katja Irvin
District 2 Resident

Comments for June 23, 2020 Agenda Item 2.7 FERC Order Compliance Project

It is very discouraging and disappointing trying to be an involved member of the public and repeatedly seeing the District ignore public input. Here is a list of reasons why the outreach on the FOCP exemplifies the District's approach to input from constituents and other informed stakeholders:

1. The response to the Sierra Club comment letter was never sent to the Sierra Club.
2. The response to the Sierra Club comment letter included the following information on the operation of the chillers to maintain the cold water management zone. However, this information was not added to the project description in the Engineers Report. This information would improve the project description and there seems to be no reason not to include it, other than a prevalent attitude to dismiss public input and a tendency towards secrecy.
 - During the FOCP and ADSRP, Valley Water plans to keep the reach from the base of Anderson Dam to Ogier Ponds, known as the cold water management zone, wet using a combination of available local water passed through the construction area and imported Central Valley Project water released through an existing pipeline about ¼ mile downstream of Anderson Dam.
3. In response to the Sierra Club letter, the District minimizes any responsibility to inform the public about the environmental impacts and mitigation measures related to the FOCP. The District needs to study those impacts and develop mitigations anyway and should make some effort to provide transparency to the public about environmental impacts. This may not be a full CEQA process for the FOCP, but providing this information to the public would show some commitment to make up for the important public process that has been discarded because this is an "emergency." Instead, the District is taking the path of secrecy by declaring that the only place these impacts will be considered is under cumulative impacts in the Anderson Dam Seismic Retrofit Project EIR, and that mitigation monitoring for the FOCP will not be integrated with mitigation monitoring for the ADSRP.
4. The only meeting on the FOCP on Thursday 5/28/20 was announced two days before the meeting. Three other meetings were organized as meetings about the Coyote Creek flood control projects.
5. In the meeting on Coyote Creek flood control on Wednesday 6/17/20, the meeting was ended 5 minutes early when there were still 10 unanswered questions in the chat box (according to the meeting facilitator). Rather than leave 5 minutes early, a good public outreach process would be willing to stay 5 minutes late to finish answering the public's questions. This is especially true when the outreach process is already compromised by use of a remote conferencing tool (which was used to prevent participants from seeing who else was attending the meeting, and was used to hide all questions until District staff decided to answer them).
6. At the meeting on Wednesday 6/17/20, I asked the following question which was unanswered. Staff said they would respond to all the unanswered questions. I don't have confidence that they actually will, and especially no confidence that these answers will be made public.
 - Can the staff report for the Board of Directors on June 23 discuss how far along design is for each of the projects in the FOCP and how the projects might change as design moves forward? The Board should be informed of these uncertainties. I imagine a table that includes columns for each project such as: % design complete, factors still to be determined (such as location and operation of chillers); potential for design changes; permits required; etc.

Overall, the District comes off as arrogant and dismissive when the few members of the public who care and actually participate constantly have their input ignored. The District claims to want more public participation and outreach but that seems to be lip service since actions show that the public is not taken seriously.

Please consider ways to get the public involved so our input can make a meaningful difference.

Katja Irvin
District 2 Resident