

**From:** [Ananya Kaewphokha](#)  
**To:** [Michele King](#)  
**Subject:** Coyote Creek Flood Protection Project, 6/23/20 Hearing, Agenda Item 2.7  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 23, 2020 12:34:19 PM

---

Dear Board of Directors:

My name is Ananya, I reside at 180 Arroyo Way, San Jose, which is located on Coyote Creek in Reach 7 of the Project. Of the two Preferred Alternatives I urge you to select #10 because it allows VW to elevate my home. I am 61 years old and want to live out my life in the home I shared with my deceased husband, who built it. Only Preferred Alternatives #10 recognizes that the properties at issue are more than parcels of land. They are homes, with good friends and neighbors, in a historic neighborhood, with bonds and attachments that required years to build. This is the kind of investment that cannot be purchased and money cannot replace.

Under the other Preferred Alternative, #7, VW would 'acquire' and demolish my home. I strenuously object to this course of action as it is unnecessary, would disrupt my life, and separate me from my creek-side home and community I love.

If the only issue is the chance of flood prior to completion of the dam, then my neighbor, Grace Pugh, has submitted an elegant, yet simple plan that is cost effective and merits your consideration and a brief continuation of today's decision (she submitted this to Jose Villereal and Damaris Villalobos-Galindo, on 6/22. I have attached a copy for your benefit). Basically she suggests you set aside the monies intended to demolish our homes. Allow us to continue living in them. At the completion of the new dam, if there has not been flooding, you can return the money to your coffers, saving you a significant sum, and we can go on living our lives in our homes and neighborhoods. If a flood does occur, then the money is still there and can be acted on.

A third alternative is to simply allow us, the homeowners, to take our chances and remain living in our homes during dam construction. If during that time we are flooded, we will bear the cost. Otherwise we remain unaffected in our unaltered homes.

To summarize, my position in order of preference is: (1) Adopt Preferred Alternative #10 and elevate my home. (2) Set aside money to purchase Reach 7 properties but allow the homeowners to continue living in their homes while the dam is re-built. If during that period there is no flood, then VW pays nothing. If a flood occurs rendering our homes unsafe or uninhabitable, then VW can buy out those affected. (3) Let us homeowners, in Reach 7, stay in our homes and take our chances.

Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully,

Ananya Kaewphokha  
180 Arroyo Way, San Jose 95112, [kaewphokha@gmail.com](mailto:kaewphokha@gmail.com)

Attached is Grace's email to Damaris and Jose:

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Grace Pugh <[brownbat@gmail.com](mailto:brownbat@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Thu, Jun 18, 2020 at 11:21 AM

Subject: Coyote Creek Flood Protection: Input on the acquire vs elevate option for Arroyo Way

To: <[jvillarreal@valleywater.org](mailto:jvillarreal@valleywater.org)>, <[dvillalobos-galindo@valleywater.org](mailto:dvillalobos-galindo@valleywater.org)>

Hello Damaris and Jose,

I was shocked to learn that the two options being considered for the significant and historic properties on Arroyo Way is to either elevate or acquire - both of which would result in a loss of architectural history and character in a historic neighborhood of Naglee park. The elevate option fundamentally destroys the character of these homes. The acquire option destroys them entirely.

I am particularly dismayed given that once the dam is fixed, I believe the goal is that this kind of 25 year flood event would be a thing of the past and would be able to be managed by controlling the outlet flow and preventing a surge event of the type that inundates the houses. I am also dismayed because if the dam had been repaired in a timely manner, we probably wouldn't even be having these considerations about these properties as the last flood would have been avoided.

Given the enormous expense associated with both options, is there another way: to keep that money earmarked in the event there IS a 25 year flood before the dam is fixed and at that point acquire the properties rather than repair them or elevate them while repairs are taking place, but in the event a 25 year flood does NOT occur before the dam is fixed to then allow the properties to continue in their current state? Doesn't the goal of keeping the dam low volume at all times from this point until it is fixed also decrease the risk of one of these cataclysmic flood events? Why are we doing this NOW when these properties have survived two floods and are still wonderful homes, loved by their owners and neighbors? I hope the city will consider a one size does NOT fit all approach.

Thanks for considering my input,  
Grace Pugh  
165 Arroyo Way